GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

: Case No.

Hoffman-Struever Waterfront, : 11-03

LLC - First-Stage PUD & Related Map Amendment at

Southwest Waterfront

Monday, July 18, 2011

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 11-03 by the District of Colum bia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD Chairman KONRAD W. SCHLATER Vice Chairman MICHAEL G. TURNBULL Commissioner FAIA, (AOC)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Board of Zoning Adjustment District of Columbia CASE NO.Transcript EXHIBIT NO.null

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary JAMISON WEINBAUM, ESQ., Director

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

HARRIET TREGONING, Director JENNIFER STEINGASSER MATT JESICK JOEL LAWSON

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STAFF PRESENT:

CHRIS DELFS
JAMIE HANSEN
MARTIN PARKER

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT STAFF PRESENT:

NINA ALBERT

This transcript cons titutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on July 18, 2011.

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

<pre>WELCOME:</pre>
Anthony Hood, Chairman6
ZC CASE NO. 11-03 - HOFFMAN-STRUEVER WATERFRONT, LLC - FIRST-STAGE PUD & RELATED MAP AMENDMENT:
PRELIMINARY MATTERS:
6thStreet - Party Status Request12Vote: 3-0-2 to Grant Party Status15Gangplank Party Status Request17Vote: 3-0-2 to Grant Party Status18Tiber Party Status Request18Vote: 3-0-2 to Grant Party Status19Vestry Party Status Request20Vote: 3-0-2 to Grant Party Status21Harbor Square Party Status Request22Vote: 3-0-2 to Deny Party Status23Disclosure from Commissioner May24
<pre>DMPED: Matthew Troy</pre>
Proffer 3 Expert Witnesses:
Grant Expert Witness Status: 37
HOFFMAN-STRUEVER PRESENTATION: Norman Glasgow, Jr., Attorney 38 Monty Hoffman
Stan Eckstut, EEK Architects 57 Daniel VanPelt 80
Steven Sher, H&K
Cross-Exam by Tiber Island: 170 Cross-Exam by Gangplank: 175
Cross-Exam by 6 th Street:

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S OFFICE OF PLANNING: Harriet Tregoning, Director..... 183 DDOE: Nina Albert 194 DDOT: Board Questions: 209 Cross-Exam by Applicant: 220 ANC-6D: Andy Litsky, 6D04................. 221/236 PARTIES/PERSONS IN SUPPORT: Kwasi Holman, Vestry......240 Cross-Exam by 6th Street: 244 Conrad Hitchcock, Tiber 244 Paul Greenberg, Tiber 246 Fredrica Kramer 258 Kay Williams 264 Reverend Ruth Hamilton 272 Judith Claire 286 Debra Frazier 288 Juanita Jones 291 Melissa Rohan 293 Tom Des Jardins 296 Cara Lee Shockley, ANC-6D02..... 303 Richard Westbrook 310 PARTIES/PERSONS IN OPPOSITION: Benisse Lester 327

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:35 p.m.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's begin. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a Pu blic Hearing of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia for Monday, July 18, 2011.

My name is Anthony Hood. Joi ning me are Vice Chairman Schlater and Commissioner Turnbull.

Commissioner May will be reading the record and participating in this case.

We are also joined by the Zoning staff, Mr. Weinbaum and Ms. Schellin. Office of Planning, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Jesick. We have new members of DDOT, so I have a list here, Mr. Martin Parker. Can you raise your hand? I know you, Mr. Parker. Mr. Jamie Hansen, who is going to be our presenter, and Mr. Chris Delfs. I think we know you.

Okay. This proceeding is being recorded by a C ourt Reporter and is also

webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room.

subject of this The evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case No. 11-03. This is a request by Hoffman -Struever, hopefully Ι pronounced that correctly, Waterfront, LLC for approval of a First-Stage PUD and Related Map Amendment for property located at Square 390, 391, 471W, 472, 473 and 503.

Notice of today's hearing w as published in the \underline{DC} Register on June 3, 2011 and copies of that announcement are available to my left on the wall near the door.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with provisions of 11 DCMR 3022 as follows: Preliminary matters, applicant's case, report of the Office of Planning, report of other Government agencies, report of ANC-6D, organizations and persons in support, organizations and persons in oppo sition,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

rebuttal and closing by the applicant.

The following time con straints will be maintained in this meeting: The applicant 90 minutes, organizations 5 minutes, individuals 3 minutes.

The Commission intends to adher e to the time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations, if necessary, and notes that no time shall be ceded.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the door. Up on coming forward to speak to the Commis sion, please, give both cards to the report er sitting to my right before taking a seat at the table.

When presenting information to the Commission, please, turn on and speak into the microphone, first, stating your name and home

1	address. When you are finished speaking,
2	please, turn your microphone off, so that your
3	microphone is no longer picking up sound or
4	background noise.
5	The decision of the Commission in
6	this case must be based exclusively on the
7	public record. To avoid any appearance to the
8	contrary, the Commission requests that persons
9	present not engage the Me mbers of the
10	Commission in conversation during any r ecess
11	or at any time.
12	The staff will be available
13	throughout the hearing to discuss proc edural
14	questions.
15	Please, turn of f all beepe rs and
16	cell phones, at this time, so not to disrupt
17	these proceedings.
18	Let me just note that we have also
19	been joined by Ms. Jennifer Steingasser from
20	the Office of Planning.
21	Would all individuals wishing to

testify, please, rise to take the oath?

1	Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
2	administer the oath?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Please, raise
4	your right hand.
5	(Whereupon, the witnesses were
6	sworn.)
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you .
9	At this time, the Commission will consider
LO	any preliminary matters.
L1	Does the staff have any
12	preliminary matters?
L3	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. I have a
L4	disclosure to read from Commissio ner May and
L 5	we have several party status requests. The
L 6	applicant has proffered expert or has
L7	proffered some expert witnesses and Mr. Troy
L 8	is here from DMPED to testify prior to the
L 9	applicant's presentation.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. If Mr. Troy
21	would just indulge us f or a moment, I would
22	like to do the party status first and also the

1	disclosure by Commissioner May, which
2	shouldn't take us long, a nd then we will go
3	right into Mr. Troy. Where is Mr. Troy? If
4	you can come on up to the table, so we will
5	hear from you third, but we should be able to
6	go through these procedures.
7	Were those the only three?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Proffered experts.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: We will get to
11	those after.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We can do t hat.
13	We can do that after we hear from Mr. Troy.
14	Okay. Let's take up party status applications
15	first. And I would ask everyone to indulge
16	us. We have a number of appl ications and we
17	are going to try to go through them as quickly
18	as possible.
19	Okay. Commissioners, let's begin
20	with Exhibit 27. This is an individual who is
21	in opposition, it states, who lives on M

Street. We also had another person on ${\tt M}$

1 Street, Exhibit 28. I'll try to get them all. 2 Exhibit 33. I think I'm missing a few o n M 3 Okay. Exhibit 27, which I have Street. stated, Exhibit 28, Exhibit 32, Exhibit 33 and 4 I believe this is Exhibit 30, Alice Wender. 5 6 All live on M Street in the 4000 7 or so Block of M Street for the most part. mean, I'm sorry, 400 Block of M Street. 8 Commissioners, my recommenda tion 9 10 is that this group hopefully they will conform to one party and I'm not sure if we would call 11 them the M Street Neighbors or if they have a 12 13 name, but I would recommend, Commissioners that they form into one party. 14 15 there a representative for 16 Street? If you can come forward and introduce yourself? Oh, your mike is not on. 17 18 MS. RANDOLPH: Sorry. I'm Le slie 19 Randolph, resident of 462 M Street. And I'm 20 individual party, but I'm going to speaking for the three residents, Bill McLin, 21

Alice Wender and Susie Humphreys. And even

1	though our homes are on M Street, our homes
2	are physically on 6 th Street, S.W., within 50
3	feet of Parcel 11.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I was
5	trying to get th e addresses in front of me.
6	You say 458 M Street, that's what I'm going
7	by.
8	MS. RANDOLPH: Do you need our
9	addresses?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, I don't need
11	them. I'm going by the submission.
12	MS. RANDOLPH: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The su bmission
14	says M Street, so that's what I'm going by.
15	If the house turns another w ay, we can if
16	these are the people, Alice Wender, William
17	McLin
18	MS. RANDOLPH: Correct.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So Leslie
20	Randolph.
21	MS. RANDOLPH: And Susie
22	Humphreys.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And Susie
2	Humphreys. Thank you. So that group, I'm
3	asking to join together and become one party
4	and you can call it M Street or 6 th Street or
5	whatever. Okay? Are we all in agreement on
6	that?
7	Okay. Come to the mike and let's
8	make sure we have it straight.
9	MS. RANDOLPH: We will refer to
10	ourselves as the 6 th Street Homeowners.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm going
12	to be very interested to find out exactly how
13	that works, because on the submission it has M
14	Street, but we can talk about that. I'll be
15	asking that question.
16	Okay. The 6 th Street Homeowners.
17	Ms. Schellin, I would move that we grant the
18	6 th Street Homeowners party status as a party
19	in opposition and ask for a second.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any further
22	discussion? Do we have any discussi on? Are

1	you ready for the question?
2	All those in favor aye.
3	ALL: Aye.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
5	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, please,
6	record the vote?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
8	the vote 3 -0-2 to grant party status in
9	opposition to the 6 th Street Homeowners.
10	Commissioner Hood moving, Commiss ioner
11	Turnbull seconding, Commissioner Schlater in
12	support. Commissioners May and Selfridge not
13	present not voting.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Glasgow, I did
15	not mean to overlook you, bu t did you have a
16	party or a problem with what we just did?
17	MR. GLASGOW: What I wanted was
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Turn your
19	microphone on.
20	MR. GLASGOW: T hank you. With
21	respect to just clarification, we have a site
22	that is about three-quarters of a mile long.

From what I've read from their statement, those things that were most impacted were on Parcels 10 and 11. And so we would like to make sure that they are -- that those comments/cross-examination where they have relevancy is to the southern end of the site and not things that are three-quarters of a mile away.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think this is going along just fine, because I see a nod in agreement. So thank you for bringing that up.

And, Mr. Glasgow, if you could stay there while we go through the rest of the party status applications?

MR. GLASGOW: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Again, we have a n application, Exhibit 37, t No. his is Gangplank, Jason Kopp, I believe is the party, who is requesting party s tatus. This application, colleagues, was not -- I think this was timely. Okay. This one was timely. But I was not in favor of giving him party

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 status.

I think that he can actually go -hold on one second. M s. Schellin, if you
could help me, is this the applicant that they
first filed in opposition and no w they are in
support?

MS. SCHELLIN: Correct. Their initial application was in opposition and then they then filed in support. That was Exhibit 29 that was in opposition. And then Exhibit 37 is in support.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So now they are in support. Mr. Glasgow, d o you have any objections?

MR. GLASGOW: No.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't think so.

Okay. Commissioners, I would rule that we -
I would make a motion that we approve this

Gangplank Slipholders Association as the

applicant in this case -- I mean, as a party

in this case in support and ask for a second.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly Any further discussion? Are you 2 seconded. 3 ready for the question? All those in favor aye? 4 5 ALL: Aye. 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any 7 opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, p lease, record the vote? 8 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records 9 10 the vote 3 - 0 - 2 to grant party status in 11 support Gangplank Slipholders to the 12 Association. Commissioner Hood 13 Commissioner Schlater seconding, Commissioner Turnbull in support. Commissioners May and 14 15 Selfridge not present not voting. 16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, let's go to the Tiber Island Community Residents in 17 I'm trying to remember 18 opposition. 19 exhibit. Okay. Let me do this. Let me look at what I have in front of me. 20 I have the cooperative there in support. They are going 21

to be represented by Mr. Cornish Hitchcock and

1	I believe they have spoken with the applicant
2	to try to mitigate their presentation.
3	So I would be in support of giving
4	the Tiber Island Cooperative Homes party
5	status in support.
6	Mr. Glasgow, do you hav e any
7	opposition?
8	MR. GLASGOW: No, sir.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
10	Commissioners, any discussion? Okay. I would
11	move that we grant party status to the Tiber
12	Island Cooperative Homes in support in this
13	case and ask for a second.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Second.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It has been
16	moved and properly sec onded. Any further
17	discussion?
18	All those in favor?
19	ALL: Aye.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
21	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, p lease,
22	record the vote?

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
2	the vote 3 -0-2 to grant party status in
3	support to the Tiber Island Cooperative Homes,
4	Inc. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner
5	Turnbull seconding, Commissioner Schlater in
6	support. Commissioners May and S elfridge not
7	present not voting.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, let's
9	do the Vestry of St. Augustine's Parish in
10	support. They are repres ented by Jacques
11	DePuy and Kate Olson from the Law Firm of
12	Greenstein DeLorme & Luchs. And I think they
13	have asked for five minutes, so, Mr. Glasgow,
14	do you have
15	MR. GLASGOW: No objection.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. No
17	objection. Okay. We will grant party status
18	to Vestry of St. Augustine's Parish in support
19	of this application. I move that we give them
20	party status and ask for a second.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It has been

1	moved and properly sec onded. Any further
2	comments? Any further discussion?
3	All those in favor?
4	ALL: Aye.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
6	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, p lease,
7	record the vote?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
9	the vote $3-0-2$ to grant party status in
10	support to the Vestry of St. Augustine's
11	Parish. Commissioner Hood mo ving,
12	Commissioner Schlater seconding, Commissioner
13	Turnbull in support. Commissioners May and
14	Selfridge not present not voting.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I need t o go back
16	to the I want to go to the Tiber Island
17	Community Residents. Which exhibit?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: That was the g roup
19	that you guys combined together.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's the 6 th
21	Street group?
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: They changed their
3	name now, yes.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: 6 th Street, okay.
5	Okay. Next, we have the last request we
6	have is from Kay Williams for Harbor Square
7	Cooperative. And actually, I think, we
8	received a letter from them this evening
9	explaining why the filing was late.
10	I would not be in favor of
11	granting them party status. I think that the
12	submission did not really warrant for them to
13	rise to the occasion of part y status. But I
14	will also note that they will be able to
15	testify when it's time for individuals to
16	testify or organizations to testify in that
17	capacity.
18	Mr. Glasgow?
19	MR. GLASGOW: No objection.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
21	Commissioners, any comments? Okay. I would
22	move that we deny Kay Williams for Harbor

1	Square Cooperative for party status with the
2	caveat that they will be able to testify when
3	we get to organizations and persons in support
4	or opposition. So that's my motion. I ask
5	for a second.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It is moved and
8	properly seconded. Any further discussion ?
9	Are you ready for the question?
10	All those in favor?
11	ALL: Aye.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
13	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you, p lease,
14	record the vote?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
16	the vote 3-0-2 to deny party status in
17	opposition to Kay Williams for Harbor Square
18	Cooperative. Commissioner Hood moving,
19	Commissioner Turnbull seconding, Commissioner
20	Schlater in support of denial. Commissioners
21	May and Selfridge not present not voting.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's tak e

the disclosure from Commissioner May.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. "I would like to disclose the following information for the record of tonight's case.

National Park Servic e As t.he representative, I was briefed on the developers' early plans for the site and have also participated in information presentations at the National Capital Planning Commission. I believe these presentations were preliminary in nature, focused primarily in the overall arrangement of the site and building massing with some discussion of NPS property adjacent to the development.

There was no discussion specific to the zoning of the propert y and I have not participated in any discussions with the applicant since the zoning case was filed.

I cannot be present for to night's hearing due to another commitment, but I do plan to participate in the case and I will review the record and participate in

1 subsequent hearings, if any. Commiss 2 May." 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, 4 Ms. Schellin. Let me ask the parties and ANC, included, or applicant, does anyone have any 5 6 comments on the disclosure that you heard from 7 Commissioner May who will be -- who would like to participate in this case? 8 any comments? 9 Does anyone have 10 Okay. Not hearing none, so noted. Mr. Troy, hopefully, that wasn't too 11 Okay. We appreciate you coming down to 12 13 testify and we will now take your comments. Thank you for ha 14 MR. TROY: 15 Can everybody hear me okay? Okay. me. 16 evening, Members of the Commission. My name is Matthew Troy and I am a Project Manager in 17 the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning 18 19 and Economic Development. 20 I'm here to discuss with you today the Planned Unit Development for the Southwest 21 22 Waterfront Redevelopment Project.

The District of Columbia in partnership with the Hoffman-Struever Waterfront, LLC, the applicant, plann ed to redevelop the 23 acres of publicly-owned land and adjacent riparian rights along the Southwest Waterfront.

The project is plann ed to be a LEED-Gold neighborhood development mixed-use project with world class residential, retail, hotel, cultural, institutional and office space.

The importance of this project to the District of Columbia and particularly to the southwest neighb orhood cannot be understated. It is a legacy Anacostia Waterfront Initiative project, which, like all AWR projects, is intended to increase the access to the District waterfront, provide new cultural and recreational opportunities and prioritize environmental sustainability.

The Southwest Waterfront redevelopment also has specific e conomic

NEAL R. GROSS

development benefits. It will serve as a gateway between downtown and the emerging Capitol Riverfront neighborhood and connect the National Mall to the waterfront.

The redevelopment project will create a new cultural and entertai nment destination for the city, boo kended by the historic fish market to the west and Arena Stage to the east.

Finally, the project will vastly increase the economic productivity of a currently under-utilized deteriorating and District-owned asset.

Since being awarded the project in 2006, the applicant has worked tirelessly with the District to craft a disposition package that is acceptable to both parties and meets a variety of specific policy goals that the District wants to achieve.

I would like to highlight for the Commission some of the public benefits the District will receive should the Stage One PUD

NEAL R. GROSS

be approved and the project is able to expeditiously move forward through the remaining entitlement steps towards closing.

The first and perhaps most important benefit to the District is the amount of affordable housing and work force housing that will be delivered as part of the project.

160,000 gross square feet of residential development on the site will be set aside for households after 30 and 60 percent area median income levels. In addition to that, 20 percent of all additional residential development, over 500 units, will be set aside for households at the 100 and 120 percent AMI levels.

This is by far one of the most aggressive affordable and work force housing goals in the District's history. There will also be a significant amount of public open space within the development.

Currently, over 10 acres of the

NEAL R. GROSS

land site area is reserved for open or park space, including a central lawn on the eastern part of the project. All of th e open spaces are designed to maximize the viewing corridors water with the ho the pe of drawing to pedestrians to the site from points n orth, east and west and also mi nimizing the impact of the development and the impact development has on the views of the nearby stakeholders.

Thirdly, the applicant must comply with a number of District hir ing and leasing requirements. For example, 20 percent of the total amount of retail delivered at the site will be set aside for unique non -national, meaning five locations or less, or locally -owned retail businesses.

Also, 51 percent of all new jobs created by the project will be reserved for District residents and 30 percent of all construction apprenticeship opportunities will be reserved for District residents living east

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of the Anacostia River.

This is in addition to the usual District LSDBE contra cting equity participation requirements.

Lastly, the redevelopment of the Southwest Waterfront will generate a significant amount of annual tax revenues for the District. Current estima tes of sales, property, hotel and income taxes are between \$30 and \$40 million per year. And even after the annual debt ser vice for the TIF/PILOT bonds, the amount the District will achieve in tax revenues will be significantly higher than what it receives today.

This is especially important in the budget-constrained environment that the city is currently in.

In conclusion, I would like to state my support for the proposed PU D. This project, as planned, meets all the District's economic development and public policy goals.

It has been vetted extensively with the

1	community and restores a deteriorating
2	waterfront area with a development that will
3	be at the forefront of sustainable design.
4	Therefore, I urge the Zonin g
5	Commission to approve both the PUD and the
6	Zoning Map Amendment changes and I am happy to
7	answer any questions you may have, at this
8	time.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
10	MR. TROY: Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
12	much, Mr. Troy. We appreciate your comments.
13	Commissioners, any questions?
14	Okay. I have my list now of how we are going
15	to cross-examine. Actually, Mr. Troy, we may
16	have some cross-examination for you, so let me
17	see.
18	Mr. Glasgow, does the applicant?
19	MR. GLASGOW: No, sir.
20	
	CHAIRMAN HOOD: ANC-6D? Vestry of
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: ANC-6D? Vestry of St. Augustine? Tiber Island? Gangplank

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	to come to the table.
2	I was just getting ready to say
3	that we have never had anybody ask questions,
4	but I shouldn't have started to say that. So
5	you can go ahead.
6	MS. RANDOLPH: I'll be very brief.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
8	MS. RANDOLPH: One question.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Randolph?
10	MS. RANDOLPH: It is apparent to
11	me that the original PUD did not mention that
12	the church, Parcel 11, was originally zoned as
13	residential R-3. And did the city consider
14	the impact on the residents who live within 50
15	feet of the PUD Parcel 11, particularly in
16	regard to what is an inadequate traffic study?
17	MR. TROY: So the particular
18	parcel you are talking about is all the way to
19	the east of the site, correct?
20	MS. RANDOLPH: Correct. We are
21	speaking about Parcel 11, which technicall y

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

belongs to the Vestry.

1	MR. TROY: Right. I can tell you
2	that I personally my main concern is as the
3	project moves east, the density decreases
4	substantially. With the impact on your
5	particular home, I cannot say t hat I
6	personally have thought about that. I am more
7	than happy to meet with you.
8	MS. RANDOLPH: Most
9	MR. TROY: As you
10	MS. RANDOLPH: importantly, the
11	traffic is a significant issue.
12	MR. TROY: Okay.
13	MS. RANDOLPH: And the closure o f
14	our street and a partial closure from two-lane
15	traffic to one-lane traffic.
16	MR. TROY: An d you are talking
17	about?
18	MS. RANDOLPH: We're speaking
19	about 6 th Street.
20	MR. TROY: 6 th Street.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to
22	make sure let's make sure we jus t ask a

1 question. We don't want to get into 2 presentation. 3 MS. RANDOLPH: Okay. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just ask If you can answer it now or if not, 5 question. 6 you can give a --7 MS. RANDOLPH: Did the city --CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hold on. Let 8 me finish. Ask a question. If you can give the 9 10 answer now, if not, you can make some other arrangements. 11 MR. TROY: Okay. 12 13 MS. RANDOLPH: Thank you. Did the city consider the traffic imp acts upon the 14 Island components, including the 6th 15 Street homeowners, who reside on 6 th Street, 16 S.W., which is now going to be 17 partially 18 closed or shrunken to a one-lane, one-way 19 street emerging from a tr affic circle and exiting onto M Street and 6th Street, S.W.? 20 MR. TROY: So all t raffic studies 21 22 and planning is done in conjunction with DDOT

1	and the Office of Planning. Do you mind if I
2	circle back with DDOT and the Office of
3	Planning?
4	MS. RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you.
5	MR. TROY: Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
7	very much. We appreciate your testimony.
8	Also, let me announce w e are
9	joined by the Director of the Office of
10	Planning, Ms. Tregoning. I didn't see her
11	when I first called down and so welcome.
12	Okay. Let's ask the applicant to
13	come forward. Thank you very much, Mr. Troy.
14	We appreciate it.
15	Mr. Glasgow, you have some
16	proffered witnesses. Let's run through that
17	list.
18	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, sir. I have
19	three proposed for expert witness status. And
20	I believe that their info rmation has been
21	submitted for you in your packet. We have Mr.
22	Stan Eckstut of EEK Ar chitects, Mr. Dan

1	VanPelt of Gorove/Slade Associates and Steven
2	Sher, Director of Land Use Services of Holland
3	& Knight. And I believe all their information
4	is in order.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All except for the
6	first one. The last I think the last
7	three, Mr. VanPelt, Mr. Sher and you named one
8	other person. What was it?
9	MR. GLASGOW: No, there is just
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. VanPelt
11	and Mr. Sher, I think, have been previously
12	accepted. I don't think we need to go back
13	through that again. They have been accepted
14	on more than one occasion by this Commission,
15	unless there's any objection.
16	Mr. Eckstut, is that ho w you
17	pronounce his name?
18	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, Eckstut.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Eckstut.
20	Commissioners, let's open i t up. When I
21	looked at or reviewed the resume, I thought it
22	was very substantial and actually it met our

1	requirement. I was kind of sorry Commissioner
2	May is not here, because it talked about all
3	the projects they have done that mirror this
4	project that is in front of us tonight.
5	So let me op en it up for any
6	discussion.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm fin e
8	with all of them, Mr. Chair.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We have to
10	let Commissioner May know this is one for the
11	record. So thank you, Mr. Glasgow, they all
12	have expert status. So you can bring them up
13	and I guess we can begin.
14	MR. GLASGOW: All right. If the
15	development team would come forward?
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Glasgow, let's
17	work this out now. How much time did you work
18	out with the other pa rties that are in
19	support?
20	MR. GLASGOW: Well, there are five
21	minutes that we are giv ing to the Vestry of
22	St. Augustine. Gangplank, I think, will need

1	two or three minutes.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So three minutes?
3	MR. GLASGOW: Yes. I think we can
4	do our presentation in 50. We should be able
5	to do it in 50 for us. Tiber Island, I don't
6	know whether they requested any parti cular
7	time or not.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Could we clear
9	that up? Mr. Hitchcock, if you could just
10	come Mr. Hitchcock is telling me five
11	minutes.
12	MR. GLASGOW: That's fine. All
13	right. So that would leave us with 47
14	minutes.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We
16	just want to make sure w e stay within our
17	regulations. So okay, you may begin.
18	MR. GLASGOW: All right. T hank
19	you, Mr. Chairman.
20	Good evening, Members of th e
21	Commission. For the record, my name is Norman
22	Glasgow, Jr. of the Law F irm of Holland &

Knight. Here with me this evening are Mr. Monty Hoffman of PN Hoffman representing the applicant in the case, Mr. Stan Eckstut of EEK Architects, Mr. Dan VanPelt, Mr. Steven Sher.

Also here this evening is Ms. Elinor Bacon who has spent substantial time and effort in community meetings on this project.

First, I would want to mention to the Commission that in my over 30 years of practice, I have never been involved with a project where there has been more time, energy and effort associated with site planning for a First-Stage PUD.

There has been over four years of preparation and over 300 community mee tings, in which representatives of the applicant either made presentations or were available for questions and discussion of the project with attendees.

These are reflected in the list which Ms. Bacon has compiled, so that there

NEAL R. GROSS

has been extraordinary community outreach involved in this case and I think the previous witness, Matt Troy, mentioned that also.

Also, there have been significant efforts by the applica nt reflected in its diligence with the District of Col umbia Government, both with the Executive Branch and the Council in this application and I would like to note briefly the support of the following:

The Office of Planning in its set-down and public hearing report, DDOT's report on recommending First-Stage PUD approval with additional information and coordination to be provided as Second-Stage applications are submitted.

We also have letters in the record from several Council Members and the support of the Deputy Mayor's office, which was evidenced here this evening.

With respect to the community, we have a support letter from AN C-6D with their

NEAL R. GROSS

comments and matters which they want further discussion on, which we have responded to those comments and that will be submitted for the record this evening. And we will continue to coordinate with ANC-6D and have since the issuance of their letter.

There are numerous neighbors, both residential and institutional, who are either parties in support or persons in support, and those that have written letters in support for the record.

From these collected efforts has evolved an extremely well-integrated plan and vision for the Southwest Waterfront for your consideration this evening.

This plan is fully consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including the Land Use Map, which designates most of this site for high density commercial, high densit y residential.

Those areas are proposed for C-3-C Zoning, but with only a 3.87 FAR total for the

NEAL R. GROSS

site and for those areas not so designated, we are proposing W-1 and R-5-B Zones. And those are the areas which ar e closest to Tiber Island and the Waterside, which is also proposed to be W -1, which would have much lower scale of development.

In summary, our request to the Zoning Commission this evening is for approval of the Stage One application for the PUD, including the rezoning to C-3-C, W-1 and R-5-B, the riparian areas, which would be Zoned W-1.

Next, we are withdrawing the request that the First-Stage be valid for a period of 18 months. We are moving very quickly with the District of Columbia with perspective tenants and with this project and we will be back within the one year period. We don't need the 18 months for that.

Next, that lot occupancy for r Parcel 11 be permitted to exceed 60 percent and we have requested flexibility for a mix of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	uses. But in that regard, we have been
2	mindful of the Commission's comments during
3	set-down and we think that we have provided a
4	range which meets that re quest in our
5	prehearing submission.
6	If there are no preliminary
7	questions, I would like to now call Mr.
8	Hoffman to discuss in more de tail the vision
9	and nature of the proposed development at the
10	Southwest Waterfront.
11	Mr. Hoffman, would you, please,
12	identify yourself for the record and proceed
13	with your testimony?
14	MR. HOFFMAN: Chairman Hood and
15	Zoning Commission, thank you for your time
16	tonight. I am Monty Hoffman and I'm the
17	principal of PN Hoffman, the managing member
18	of Hoffman-Madison Waterfront, LLC along with
19	St. Augustine Church and the District of
20	Columbia, we are the applicant for this PUD.
21	Individual members of the Hoffman-
22	Madison team include Trident Development, ER

Bacon Development, City Partners, Paramount Development, Struever Bros., Eccles and Rouse and Madison Marquette.

Madison joined our team about 1 4 months ago and the re st of us have been together since 2006, that's when we were awarded the privilege to develop th is world class waterfront.

We were drawn to this opportunity because we saw enormous potential and its immense importance to the District of Columbia. There are 26 miles of waterfront in the District of Columbia, yet, not one truly active waterfront community.

Yet, urban renewal of years ago isolated this piece of land and its shoreline and squandered a real chance of embracing a robust active waterfront that truly serves and elevates the quality of life in the southwest community, in the District of Columbia, in the Washington region and the world. That of course, is our mission today.

NEAL R. GROSS

Our efforts thus far have resolved political, technical and legal and economic obstacles. From the beginning, we have worked nonstop through the economic downturn over the past few years to fulf ill our promise of implementing this bold vision to the District of Columbia.

Since we began, this land has gone through several inner city transfers. From the NCRC to AWC and then to the Deputy Mayor's office. In the begin ning, the city only controlled actually about 60 percent of the waterfront. The rest belonged to five independent long-term lease holders for which Hoffman-Madison had to negotiate transaction agreements with in order to develop the waterfront.

This process was difficult and it took over 2.5 years to complete. We also approached the existing slipholder live - aboards to work with them to provide a transition plan during development in the

NEAL R. GROSS

live-aboard community and help give in put for the live-aboard community when we were complete.

We also recognized the adjoining church, St. A ugustine, that was strug gling with its maintenance. A religious presence is part of the fabric of a truly mixed —use redevelopment of this scale is important. So this became an op portunity not only to reposition the church to serve the southwest community for generations to come, but its redevelopment also assists with transitioning to the well-established neighborhood. This is why they are a part of this PUD.

And while the fish market next to the bridge is not part of this PUD, it is an important historic marker and a lifestyle, so which that we worked with the city to reposition its future, so its viability is protected and, in fact, becomes a key part of the District of Columbia's world class waterfront.

NEAL R. GROSS

We also worked closely with the Office of Planning and the Deputy Mayor in Planning Economic Development. We established the District's largest TIF/PILOT in the amount of \$198 million in order to rebuild the city's bulkhead and its shoreline and many large public piers, so that everybody has access to the water and add the Wharf and all the public infrastructure necessary for world class waterfront.

The PUD before you provides ove r \$40 million in annual tax revenue to the District and pays for these bonds. This TIF/PILOT and the plans for public improvements was unanimously approved by Council in 2009.

In fact, we went before City
Council five separate times, as was needed, to
approve our L and Disposition Agreemen t and
various other matters and we rece ived
unanimous approval every time.

Our approach to the plans you have before you has been to engage al 1

NEAL R. GROSS

jurisdictions and all stakeholders and to examine best practices throughout the world and hire the very best planners and consultants.

We have a large field office on site next to what is now Kastles Stadium and we have opened it to the public on Fridays, so people can ask questions and see the evolution of our plans.

We have given deep consideration to all aspects or plans, but also reco gnize that redevelopment of the Southwest Waterfront is vast in scope and with many competing interests making it impossible to resolve every single concern, but we tried.

All told, over the past five years, we have conducted over 300 meetings with outside parties, hired numerous consultants and planners and invested over \$30 million.

So our plans before you have evolved over time with considerable input from

NEAL R. GROSS

all these sources. There are several big ideas, but probably the most significant is to place the parking below grade.

This is very expensive along the waterfront, but it provides for ma ximum flexibility above-grade. Instead of having long parking structures above-grade creating super blocks, we are able to provide small lots, small blocks, which optimize access and visibility to the water.

This provides abundant light and air, circulation, views and conne ctivity creating unity throughout the waterfront. It also breaks down massing and opens up more cafe and small retail opportunities.

The Wharf along the water's edg e is over a half a mile long and it will provide access to the water for everyone while it adapts to the seasons, events, programming and other civic needs that people bring together—that bring people together.

The mix of t hese uses such as

NEAL R. GROSS

retail, office, educat ional, culture, hospitality, residential, religious and marina will create a real community on acti ve -- in an active living waterfront.

Our parks and open space account for over 60 percent of the site. Access to and from the waterfront will be available through improved pedestrian connection to the tidal basin, the L'Enfant Plaza. There will be bike drop-offs and lanes. We have access to the Metro stops at Waterside Mall and L'Enfant Plaza.

We have the 9th Street ramp to Route 395. We will be adding water taxis, circulator buses to the 7th Street and Maine Avenue and eventually the trolley car. The waterfront will be LEED-Gold community and we will be working with Washington Gas to examine the implementation of a co-generation plant to serve all the electrical, heating and cooling for our development.

The carbon s avings on this are

NEAL R. GROSS

immense. And this would act and serve as a model for the country. We have already received recognition from the W ashington Sustainable Growth Alliance. And our CBE and First Source Agreements are in place as well and we are ahead of those targets.

We have a million d ollar commitment towards work force intermediary and we have already spent \$250,000 towards this commitment. We are also working with the Cardozo-Shaw Design and Tra de Academy for apprenticeship training and vocational network opportunities.

We will be protecting and addin g on the fish market and we have studied Pike's Place, The Ferry Building and San Francisco and other markets around the world to help us create a better plan.

There are many features, bu t another noteworthy virtue is our resid ential mix. We have perhaps the most aggressive affordable housing and work force housing and

market rate housing mix of any development.

This will be a real inclusive community comprised of all social and economic backgrounds.

Our community outreach has been extensive. We have met individually in groups or in large forums over the past five years to gain ideas, to listen to concerns and improve our understanding of the neighborho od's traffic patterns and local experiences.

We are pleased to have overwhelming support, but because of the scale and complexity of the site, much of the sport -- much of the support is conditional. We have worked with these groups to resolve these conditions. I believe the ANC-6D is a good example.

We had our meeting early last week and I believe we met with the ANC Commissioners every day since that time. I believe we have resolv ed -- there were 27 items on that conditions list . I believe we

NEAL R. GROSS

have resolved most of them or at least provided information in areas wh ere it was more of a declarant statement than ask for resolution.

Harbor Square is another example.

With Harbor Square, we worked with them to
get their support and worked with their
conditions as well.

In doing so, we reduced the s cale of our development plans for Pier 4 and we got the support for that. So Harbor Square, which is the closest property to Pier 4 and most impacted, is supporting our development on Pier 4, as we have modified per their request.

Riverside Condominium, Tiber
Island Cooperative, Washington Waterfront
Association, Riverside Baptist Church, Arena
Stage, Disabled American Veterans, Gangplank
Slipholders Association, Capitol Square
Townhomes, Southwest Neighborhoo d Assembly,
The Mandarin Oriental Hotel and Capital Yacht
Club have all given support or at least

NEAL R. GROSS

conditional support with things that they are expecting of us.

We recognize that our meetings with these groups are not complete and we will continue to work with them moving forward.

One other point of interest I would like to make is the Parcel 9 and 10, 8, 9 and 10, that is clos est to Arena Stage. There is a case where Arena Stage is the most impacted from that massing and we work closely with their architect in order to gain their support.

We reduced the scale of those buildings. We have reshaped the buildings, so that they were more compatible with Arena Stage. And in the end, we have gotten acceptance from the architect and from Arena Stage for our changes made. And again, they were the most impacted neighbor there.

On the left side, as you look at the screen, you can see what we are calling Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. There we met numerous

NEAL R. GROSS

times with NCPC, an affected stakeholder. And we have modified the design and reduced the scale there to accommodate them to work with the suggestions they were making. And I believe we have their support for the plan as it stands.

of course, we take all these earned relationships and trust very seriously and will continue working with all the groups. And we recognize our role to continue working with the community as we refine our plans for the Stage Two submissions to you in the developing Phase 1.

We have certain leaseholds subject to PUD approval that we would like to meet our time line in breaking ground in the fourth quarter of 2012. And as Mr. Glasgow said earlier, we are -- we do have a time line and we are hopeful that that can be taken into consideration.

Of all of our planning experts and consultants, there is no one more important

NEAL R. GROSS

than our master plan for this project. We held an international competition for this role early on in our process and there were several well-known firms who competed in this process.

But the one that stood out and who met -- who we met in the District of Columbia also best felt suited creatin g world class waterfront authentic to the District of Columbia was a firm by the name of Ehrenkrantz Eckstut & Kuhn Architects.

They were chosen for a variety of reasons, not the le ast of which was their experience and -- in complex urban mix and use of master plans in waterfronts throughout the world.

They have since merged with Perkins Eastman and this substantially increases their resources that they can now call upon. Most importantly, the continuity remains in the principle, Stan Eckstut, who is personally involved from this from the

1	beginning and he has made the difference.
2	And I would like Stan to pick it
3	up from here.
4	MR. ECKSTUT: Thank you , Mr.
5	Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Members of the
6	Commission, thank you for giving us this time
7	this evening. If you don't mind, I would feel
8	more comfortable being next to the drawings
9	and being able to use this microphone and go
10	up.
11	Also, I don't know if there is any
12	ability to moderate the lights down a little
13	bit? That would be great. Thank you. Oh,
14	well, can you see them okay?
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's try it and
16	see what happens. Let's turn them off and you
17	let us know what works for you.
18	MR. ECKSTUT: Let's turn them off,
19	okay. I don't want anybody to go to sleep on
20	me though, that's the only thing.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, it's not 11:00
22	yet, so we're all right.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. ECKSTUT: Well, thank you very much. So, you know, watching this time thing, I feel like I'm back in the boxing ring here sort of to the end of the bout, but -- or at least the ring.

So we want to begin with an overview. Again, northwest to the left some pointers, Arena Stage down to the right here, 7th Street, 9th Street. We will be generally following the same orientation in all of the drawings.

Can everybody hear me okay in the audience? Sorry to turn my back on you.

The action metric is really about,

most of all, the big idea is bringing the

District back to the wa terfront. This is a

city that grew up at the waterfront and as

Monty said, we are going to bring it all back

and it's a waterfront like some of the

greatest waterfronts of the world where land

and water are planned together. It's not just

land. It's the water that is the most

important part and who has ge nerated much of our planning.

The parking below-grade, it's the first time I have ever worked with parking below-grade at a waterfront. No one has ever been able to afford it. It opens up enormous opportunities, especially with height, that allows us to get many more public benefits than we would ever get.

And the place is our object, not projects. We have over, probably over, 10 maybe 12 different places that are all popular destinations in the future and guarantee that this is not a project, but a place particularly set up for people that live in the District.

If we can go to the next slide,
the list of principles here are very
important, but they come from an approach that
is about integrating with and enhancing what
already exists. It isn't that we started from
scratch, far from it.

We have relied a great deal on successful precedents, particularly from D.C., also from afar, and w e have put all the emphasis on the public spaces. This is what really has led to the gr eatest cities in the world. It's so much a part of your own tradition in D.C. We just have to bring it to the edge.

May I have the next slide, please? The illustrative s ite plan is most importantly a market-driven plan for both land It's a very pragmatic vision, and water uses. one that we k now we can accomplish with all the benefits. It's a pedestrian-oriented waterfront for all seasons, not just the sunny days or 4 th of July, all days day and night. It's a mix of uses and ideas, just like you find in normal city fabric and it's opening up an unusual amount of open space access and views that we have done with the heights in particular and the parking below-grade.

We can go forward. Like many of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the cities of the world that represent the greatest waterfront destinations, they have brought their city right up to the water's edge and they have been assured of very active waterfronts adding much more to what exists today.

Next. We have looked at all the uplands, figured out, obviously, the connections, all the primary streets, L'Enfant, M Street and be able to concentrate development in a way that is appropriate, particularly at the left end. Again, where L'Enfant is here, M Street. The left end is the busiest, the most dense, maybe it stays open the latest. It's the most transient, the most boat traffic.

And as you move further to the right where there is more reside ntial neighborhoods, it gets quieter. It's a little bit more conservative in terms of land use, a little more moderate and stepping down to what exists.

NEAL R. GROSS REPORTERS AND TRANSCRI

Next. But this is w here it all began. It was a place — that was extremely active and busy. It had a great wharf on the water's edge. We have m et people that still remember this as children and we are aiming first and foremost to bring a wharf, a great public street where the water and the land mix together.

Next. It is also part of a bigger regional draw. This is the D.C. Waterfront. This is the center of the entire region and we believe will become one of the great waterfront destinations of the world and we have setup a major city dock to welcome the ships of the world.

Next. The key like in Baltim ore, they discovered long ago that in addition to the marinas, are all the commercial boats, the venues that appeal to people that do not own their own boats, could go out on tours, more the dinner boats, a lot of ferries back and forth, Potomac Park, all kinds of sizes.

NEAL R. GROSS

There is about 20 differ ent types of maritime activities and we want to bring them all here.

Next. We actually have a plan that has sorted out a way for the Yacht Club and the Gangplank to continue to grow and prosper with the live -aboards, but we have added many more facilities. A large day pier near the fish market for many visitors.

We have also a major transit pie r where most of the people are getting on and off the boats, on a regular basis, will be able to be accommodated. The big city pier at the end of 9 th Street, this is the city dock. Every great city has to have a front door.

L'Enfant planned the city, by the way, to come from the water. The ability for 7th Street, the park to end in a great recreational pier to concentrate all the dinner boats together at the commercial pier at the M Street landing.

Next. But the key besides water

NEAL R. GROSS

is how to organize the land. And one of the most important principles here is the size of blocks are all very small compared to your typical block, actually there is many more blocks in your city that are longer than 600 feet and 400, we are alw ays looking for many smaller blocks, that means many more streets and public spaces.

And the short blocks make it much more comfortable for walking and it gives an urban feeling of a much smaller environment and not these long commercial blocks that sort of wind up in parts of the city where people do not live.

Next. The preliminary phasing is we want to be gin from 7 th a little past 9 th, Parcels 2, 3, 4, 5, land and water together and also adding in the East End Park as part of Phase 1, so that we are from the beginning providing the public benefits that everyone wants.

Next. But the key, as Monty said,

NEAL R. GROSS

is the Wharf. It is typically 60 feet. It is where the pedestrian flow is continuous along the entire length of the waterfront, the Wharf itself on the promenade. This is a place that we feel is where all the glue will hold together all the many places along this new waterfront.

Next. The many examples around the world where cities have rediscovered their waterfronts, who choose to be exclusively water and industrial, have now come back. They have taken their streets, the great wharfs and made them into zones that are able to function year round, day and night, be able to bring de velopment right up to the edge.

Oslo is just one of many.

Next. Vehicular circulation is beginning first and foremost with -- we have the parking out of the way below-grade, but we are relying on Maine. We have added many more intersections, so people have an easier way to be able to cross to and fro.

NEAL R. GROSS

We have many intersections where we are able to come in through smaller streets and alleyways, so that we have the convenient service and parking garages, but they are out of sight. And so we are able to create public environments and handle this moderate density in a way that people can still enjoy the public environments.

We have certain places in traffic circles to slow lots of traffic calming and we have the ability, as well, for cars managed at certain times to be able to come out on the Wharf and go back and forth. We have certain emergency zones where there is no cars or vehicles allowed at all.

Next. We have taken many trips to places, particularly even in the United States where you are starting to see more shared ways of dealing with cars and pedestrians. What we are imagining like Pike's Place is that we are doing a pedestrian environment. One whose cars are sometimes allowed. And when they are

there, they behave themselves, because they can't go fast. They can't get anywhere.

It's really a place that accommodates all the modes: Wal king, bicycles, transit and cars . It's not a traffic street. There is no destination through. It's only for convenient drop-off. I also think on real ly slow times when the weather is really bad, it would be a lovely place to drive your car and take in the view.

But it is very low speed, always managed cars in off -hours, probably when bad weather, but mostly the precedents we are seeing around the world are more and more of the streets where drivers actually are irked. They really are annoyed because they can't get to where they want to go and it's the pedestrian that rules it most of all.

The maritime circulation will continue to be provided along the wharf to get to the marinas and the clubs, be able to service the city pier.

Next. The pedestrian though is the key. A pedestrian can go in any direction and everywhere. The continuous pedes trian flow along the promenade. All the connecting streets with direct easy access th rough improved and more intersections, more traffic lights, more calming.

Next. This is just some of our first sketches of m ixing all the modes of traffic together and transportation, including, I forgot, the boat.

Next. The bicycle ci rculation picking up on what the city's plans are to begin to introduce much more circulation along Maine itself as well as getting through to the promenade. Maybe in the early hours you can even drive when there is not that -- take your bicycle when there is not that many people.

Next. The key is Ma ine. Right now, Maine exists today, trees, curves, which we are keeping, but we are also setting back from the property line another 15 feet -- 12

NEAL R. GROSS

feet, so that we are able to get large sidewalks, a 10 foot bike lane in each direction, as well as parking and room for the future transit.

Next. The streetcar circulation.

We are providing right now the ability for it to come on the Wharf to head in the northwest direction. Also, to come back, obviously, on Maine, be able to go in several different directions as currently being planned with the red dots being the transit stops themselves.

Next. So here, an early picture of Maine where we see a boulevard that is growing up, becoming more like the boulevards of the city where there is, indeed, a prestigious address, a lot of animation and now transit. I guess I'm getting the cue. I'm not going fast enough, right? I'm running out of time.

Ground level uses, the key is animation on all streets, all fronts. There is no back doors, no back sides. Maine itself

NEAL R. GROSS

retail along the entire length. That retail probably much more serving the local neighborhoods and the residents and o ffice workers.

We have a variety of uses. Clubs, meaning the Capital Yacht Club, the Gangplank Marina. We see a music hall in the middle for more cultural uses and adding to the variety of mix of uses.

Next. The proposed uses, as shown here, blue is of fice. The mustard color is residential. The lighter gree n olive is a hotel color. Obviously, every block is mixed use. Always ensuring that the place is open all the time seven days a week day and night, that along with the Arena Stage and other uses nearby.

Much of what we have been able to accomplish started with the parking b elowgrade, which afforded an unusual oppor tunity for maximizing the amount of open space, which we have done, by doing a variety of heights

NEAL R. GROSS

that step up to 130 feet, which gives us untold advantages that we normally would not get.

It is allowing us to go up to a height of 130 feet. If we can go to the next slide, it gives us the ability to take a waterfront that, again, first and foremost, smaller blocks. That means much more access, many more views, a lot more open space of connecting upland with more light and air on the boulevard itself.

The shorter blocks and the shorter walls ensuring much more of a lower, smaller acceptable scale to ad ding density to the waterfront than we normally could not do.

And that is the key, next, to being able to -- we did some design models just to see how we would be able to mitigate height. And the key thing is when we can go up to 130, we get much more varie ty. So instead of a uniform lower building height, like a project, we are a ble to get enough

NEAL R. GROSS

height that it gives us the ability to get setbacks, lower corners.

The corners are probably the most visible places in all of the entire design. A key public place like the pier at 9th Street itself being able to accept and modulate height and massing in a way that is much more comfortable, must more visually appealing than sticking to a lower height that doesn't give us any of these benefits that we would normally be able to get.

The most important thing about this waterfront also is that we are at the edge of the city. We are not putting taller height in the middle of neighborhoods. We are doing it at the edge an d we are doing it, generally, on the north and east sid e of the public waterfront, which means we are not casting shadows by a couple more stories that are added to the height of the building.

So all of it fitting together in a design that, next, gives us an opportunity to

NEAL R. GROSS

leave open 60 percent of the land for public benefits and public space. This gives us a full range of open spaces, particularly the largest, as we get closer to where most people live at the eastern end.

We have been ab le to take open space to the Maine and continue it all the way through out to the water. We get much more land. We get much more flexibility to do many more things at full range and much more surface area, which is key to hide the surface and the parking areas. We need more surface area. We need more small alleys and streets in order to be able to hide and be ab le to create public spaces that are pedestrian-only.

Next. These are just some of the views of the open space starting with the city pier, which is bringing great hope all the way out to Maine.

Next. At the Arena, we have been able to open up the open spaces to bring the full view of the Arena.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 Next. At the East End Park, that 2 is all green, a total oasis. 3 Next. Out of this comes a series of places, each designed to be very different 4 5 from the next offering a full range of experiences, more reason to come more often 6 7 and stay longer. More than a dozen different environments. 8 S o we will walk through 9 Next. 10 quickly the Wharf. A very busy active place, but also a place Sunday morning quiet, just go 11 12 and read the paper. 13 Next. The Wharf is going thr ough many proposals. Right no w, it is broken up 14 15 into two upper and lower levels. 16 Next. We want to bring it all to one, much more flexible and more usable level. 17 We begin to introduce a variety of options. 18 19 Right now, it is about 40 feet. 20 We begin to setback Next. buildings so that we can get typical 21 22 and we begin to animate much more of the

1 environment with the piers and the total 2 waterfront setting with this wharf. 3 The o thing, Next. ne just 4 back, I'm sorry. Again, the key thing is with taller buildings, we can setback the smaller 5 6 buildings where most people are, where they 7 actually touch buildings, etcetera, mitigation works to our advantage. 8 At the Market Square, 9 Next. we 10 have a series of buildings picking u p on the fish 11 market environment adding more marketplace. 12 13 Next. We have done a master plan to be able to keep the fish market and add 14 15 other buildings that complime nt and add even 16 more choices of food an d beverage. We have worked very hard connecting Banne ker up even 17 temporarily and being part of the NCPC plan. 18 19 Next. We have a vie w here from 20 Banneker of existing and proposed. This is the drawings that 21 Next. 22 represent our work with NCPC of getting view

1	corridors through and being able to get their
2	support.
3	Next. The transit pier is a place
4	outside our music center where most of the
5	people will be arriving to and fro with
6	vessels. A full range of them.
7	Next. At the city pier, we want
8	to bring the maritime pier all the way to
9	Maine.
10	Next. This is a place which has
11	truly the opportunity to be the first real
12	true town square in Washington, D.C., a place
13	where all uses come to gether around the
14	maritime setting.
15	Next. Thi s is existing and
16	proposed.
17	Next. The club plaza right w here
18	we are relocating the Capital Yacht Club will
19	be like a por te-cochere for club as well as
20	hotel. It's much more of an urban setting
21	with the marina.
22	Next. The 7 th Street Park is a

1	beautiful central green place for all of the
2	neighborhoods as well as the wat er edge and a
3	great recreational pier for people only coming
4	out to the water's edge.
5	Next. The variety of activitie s
6	on land and water and even personal boating at
7	the lower level, kayaking and rowing.
8	Next. 7 th Street Park today and
9	proposed.
10	Next. At the grove, right next to
11	the Gangplank Marina, a smaller scale
12	environment, next, that adds an ar rival
13	experience of both urban and boating with a
14	little bit of a picnic setting.
15	Next. When we g o to the we
16	call them mews, these are small streets that
17	are being added, next, that get us to take
18	more advantage of the smaller streets
19	knowledge that really are very successful in
20	D.C.
21	Next. The M Street landing, the

Arena Stage at the top b eing able to expand,

next, and be able to create a plaza, if you will. They are actually putting the Arena Stage onto the waterfront with the great attraction of a plaza environment, existing and proposed.

Next. The parcels that are 10 and 11 next to the existing Tiber Island is the whole key here was to bring the scale down to what exists, next, and to take the existing right-of-way, next, and being able to bring the scale to about -- it is 100 fe et from building to building and be able to provide a really beautiful entrance into the new proposed East Park.

Next. The p ark itself is the largest space, rightfully so. It's the lowest scale.

Next. We see this as a wonderful opportunity to work with the community as we go forward in a full process of designing the park.

Next. This is it today and this

NEAL R. GROSS

is, next, what we propose.

Next. The Maine Avenue is yet another place. It's the edge. It's the boulevard of the city. We see it as a great urban destination and a place of walking as well.

Next. C learly, all of this -well, we missed a rendering somewhere. Sorry.
Go forward. All of this adding up to a
complete sustainability program covering the
entire site, open space in the water,
buildings, utilities, stormwater, you name it.

There is every opportunity, next, to achieve LEED-Gold at a minimum for the development, LEED-Silver for the buildings at a minimum. As Monty said, we are doing a lot of co-gen exploration and a lot of stormwater issues to get us to this high level of sustainability.

So that's it in a nutshell, I guess you would say. Sorry to have to rush through this. It is about bringing the city

NEAL R. GROSS

to the edge. It's about land and water together in a unique way that by putting that parking below-grade and getting up to 130, we can combine things in w ays that get us many more public benefits with a full mitigating of scale that gives the variety and the visual appeal that makes people comfortable.

And this mixed variety of reall y bringing an active animated city, all seasons, is what we think is going to make a uniquely D.C. Waterfront and great places. Thank you very much.

MR. GLASGOW: I would like to call the next witness, Mr. VanPelt.

MR. VANPELT: All right. Tha nks,
Chip. Goo d evening, Chairman Hood,
Commissioners Schlater and Turnbull. For the
record, my name is Dan VanPelt with Gorove/
Slade Associates, Transportation Planners and
Engineers.

I am here this evening to s peak with you about the transportation aspects of

NEAL R. GROSS

the PUD, Southwest PUD Stage One application.

I am also this evening joined by my

colleague, Rob Schiesel, who managed all the

technical analysis, so between the two of us,

we would be able to answer any of your

questions.

You know, we are excited about this project because the team has a ssembled a Stage One PUD with an overall transportation strategy that fits with the District character and policies and provides a quality multimodal base development.

The design enhances safety through several elements, promotes non-automobile use and employs sustainable practices.

The location of the project is not only physically close to downtown D.C., but is adjacent to many regional roadway connections, two Metrorail Stations, several significant bus routes, existing and future bi cycle routes, Zipcar and Capitol Bikeshare locations, not to mention future stre etcar

lines.

From a transportation standpoint, it is an excellent location for redevelopment. Gorove/Slade began working with the Southwest Waterfront team in the fa 11 of 2007 to help develop a site master plan. More recently over the last 12 to 18 months, we have been working to help form the transport ation elements of the PUD and develop our transportation analysis.

During this time, we have met with DDOT on several occasions to coordinate our traffic study scope and DDOT staff have also participated in design team work sessions, so the project could benefit from DDOT's input along the way.

We are also pleased to see that DDOT's report recommending approval o f the Stage One PUD. And since they have submitted their report, we have already had discussions on items contained within the report and we look forward to working along side DDOT on the

NEAL R. GROSS

Stage Two applications.

Instead of goin g into a detaile d review of the site transportation design, I'll just summarize transportation goals o f the project, which there are three primary ones.

First to enh ance safety through site design. One of the major ways this goal was met was in the tea ms desire to change Maine Avenue from a commuter -based corridor into an urban boulevard.

Part of the PUD's recommendation includes several new traffic signals that will increase the number of pedestrian crossings and to add curve extensions to shorten crosswalk lengths. The internal streets are designed in a way to promote low speeds of travel and parks to allow for better interaction between modes and increase safety.

Second, the PUD promotes non-automobile use in several ways. The PUD includes a dedicated grade-separated bidirectional cycle track along Maine Avenue,

NEAL R. GROSS

over 1,500 bicycle parking spaces and several new Bikeshare stations.

The parking garages will be sized to reach a balance between accommodating all users while not encouraging driving as a mode.

Each phase in parcel will be accommodated -- accompanied by extensive transportation demand management.

Third, the Southwest Waterfront employs sustainable transportation practices beyond just promoting non-automobile use. The location of the site ne ar the center of the District is a significant sustainable feature as it keeps the average trip length to and from the site short.

The mixed-use nature of the sit e reduces overall traffic demand as some of the trip demand will be accommodated internally. The project will reduce the amount of pervious pavement dedicated to parking and the design allows for flexibility in uses and shared resources between transportation modes and

facilities to help meet its transport ation needs.

Our report contains details of the individual sites such as loading, access parking and transit strategies. I'll be happy to answer any questions you have about those elements.

Our evaluation of the t raffic impacts of the project were based on national standards on analysis of development i mpacts and scoping meetings were held with DDOT.

total vehicular The study area included 32 study area intersections and details of the study, scope, methodology are contained in our repor t. Another element included in the standard traffic analysis for site development are traffic, also inc luded, were queuing analysis at several freeway off ramps in the study area, a multimodal trip generation analysis for vehicles, pedestrians, transit riders and cyclists, maps and routing for all modes of travel analyzed, pedestrian

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

level service calculation, recommendations for all modes.

In addition, DDOT has referenced a larger near southwest/southeast a study t hat they plan to con duct in the near future and the scope of our efforts was developed in a manner that will feed into that larger study.

The results of our existing conditions analysis found that Maine Avenue adjacent to the PUD operates at good levels of service with none of the intersections approaching the threshold unaccep table condition.

There is congestion that occurs on the corridor, but we concluded that the existing congestion is due to choke points on either end of the study area at M and South Capitol Street to the east of the site and near the connections with 395 on the east of the site.

These results make sense when you compare the average daily traffic volumes for

NEAL R. GROSS

major roadways in the District. As this table shows, Maine Avenue adjacent to the PUD carries less traffic than many other District arterials.

As with all analyses of development, the main comparison of the future -- is of future conditions with and wit hout the PUD. Comparing these two future conditions provides the determination of impact.

For the future condition without the PUD, we generated and distributed traffic for 24 separate developments in the near southwest/southeast area. The detail s are contained in our report, alth ough we would point out that the tot al amount of trips generated by these background developments was over 3.5 times the amount of trips generated by the Southwest Waterfront Project.

The results of the future analysis without the project show that at intersections within the study area, there is present

NEAL R. GROSS

significant capacity in traffic from beyond -from background developments and uses a large
portion of that remaining capacity. But they
do not generate any results that exceed the
threshold of acceptable conditions.

The analysis of future conditions with the Southwest Waterfr ont also includes trips from the project and the proposed Avenue adjacent changes to Maine to the Including the new traffic signals, project. there is also this analys is showed unacceptable levels of congestion at the study area intersections.

These results are contingent on a of traffic sign al mitigation measures including changes to signal timings, modifications to phasings and other up grades Two of these locations at three locations. at site access p oints for signal modification work and will be necessary to accommodate the changes due to the Southwest Waterfront construction.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

As we concluded, the PUD accomplishes its transportation cycles of enhancing safety, promoting non-automobile use employing sustainable practices. capacity analysis shows that the traffic levels will rise at intersections within the study area and in large part due to many other projects anticipated in the area, but that no capacity analysis results exceeded the threshold acceptable conditions.

Thus, we can say that the Southwest Waterfront Stage One PUD will not have adverse impacts to the transport ation system and we look forward to working with DDOT and the team in the future Stage Two studies.

MR. SHER: Mr. Ch airman, Members of the Commission, for the record, my name is Steven E. Sher, the Director of Zoning and Land Use Services with the Law Firm of Holland & Knight.

I'm going to be fairly brief in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the time that is left. The Commission has my full report before it and I'm certainly not going to go through all that.

The existing zo ning on this sit e is a combination of W-1 and R-3. The proposed zoning, is shown on Sheet 2.1 of the plans you have before you, is a combination of C-3-C, R-5-B, for the St. Augustine's property, and W-1 to remain for part of the site on the southeast end and on the water side of the wharf property itself.

The Comprehensive Plan, with which zoning must be not inconsistent, is a treasure trove of items that are supportive of what this project is all about. In our pages 20 through 45, 25 pages of analysis of the Comprehensive Plan, I have go ne through in great detail all of the various pieces of the plan that support what is going on here.

We start perhaps most importantly with the two maps, the General Policy Map and the Future Land Use Map. The Generalized

NEAL R. GROSS

Policy Map shows the Southwest Waterfront as a land use change area, a pretty signi ficant concept for taking what is there now to something else.

The Future L and Use Map has a number of different categories that apply to the property. The largest part of the site is in the mixed-use high density commercial, high density residential category, which is what we believe supports the rezoning to C-3-C.

The strip along the waterfront is shown in green, parks, recreation and open space. The St. Augustine's property is moderate density commercial and the parking lot to the southeast of that is mixed-use, parks, recreation and open space and low density commercial.

Waterfront near southwest element of the plan, and particularly the Southwest Waterfront policy focus area, that's my analysis of those as set forth on pages 40 through 45. There is

NEAL R. GROSS

a lot of very specific discussion of how the waterfront is anticip ated to evolve, the changes that are likely to occur there and, in particular, how this particular plan satisfies those objectives, policies and goals.

As far as the PUD is conc erned, under Chapter 24 of the Zoning Regulations, the Commission is required to take a balancing test. That is you are to look on the one hand on the development incenti ves and requested flexibility that the project seeks from you and on the other hand the benefits and amenities that will accrue to the city and the community.

The list of benefits was partially enumerated by Mr. Hoffman earlier on, in the presentation on pages 13 through 19, of the outline, I have listed them all, so that you have them all in one place.

With respect to incentives, well, we have asked for height under the C-3-C. We would like to get to 130 feet in places and

NEAL R. GROSS

Mr. Eckstut went through that and explained what the basis for that was and why that is important to the project.

We are not asking for any additional FAR over what C -3-C allows as a matter-of-right. In fact, our matter-of-right FAR is about half of what C-3-C allows. So high density commercial gets you to the high height, but not to the high density.

With respect to the other flexibility that we are asking for, I think, Mr. Glasgow enumerated those in the beginning and I'm running out of time, so I'm not going to go into those in any greater detail, at this point.

The one thing I do want to impress upon the Commission as I conclude here is this is a preliminary PUD only. No part of this can go forward until it comes back to you for Second-Stage review with a much more detailed plan showing architecture, the exact p arking computations and all the zoning comput ations

for each and eve ry site. All those details are going to be coming back before you.

an overall context/concept for this development. I think Mr. Eckstut enunciated that far better than I could, so I'm not going to try and repeat anything that he said, but I think what you have before yo u is the making of a full-blown preliminary PUD suitable and appropriate for your approval.

Thank you very much.

MR. GLASGOW: That concludes the eapplicant's direct presentation.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. You have 44 seconds. Okay. Thank you very much. And, Mr. Sher, I'm glad you made that last statement about this being a First-Stage PUD. As I reviewed it, I kept reminding myself of that when I kept asking myself other questions, so I appreciate that comment.

And also, Mr. Hoffman, it doesn't

NEAL R. GROSS

1	go unnoticed that I was sitting here looking
2	at all the meetings and I just obviously,
3	it's in alphabetical order an d I'm looking
4	here at, I guess, about 10 pages of meetings.
5	And that says a lot about someone wanting to
6	come in and develop in the community.
7	So that does not go unnoticed by
8	me. I may ask some questions, but I'm going
9	to yield to my colleagues, as I've done enough
10	talking just trying to get party status
11	straight.
12	So what I'm going to do now is go
13	to my colleagues a nd see if they have any
14	questions. And also, tonight, I'm giving the
15	task of asking a few questions from
16	Commissioner May. So I'm asking my questions
17	and his questions, so I 'm sure I'll be good
18	and mixed up when I get finished.
19	So who would like to start us off?
20	Commissioner Turnbull?
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:
22	Commissioner May, he is here in spirit.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, he's here.

I'm going to try to act in his behalf tonight.

Maybe I'll sit on that end.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just have a couple. I think this is, obviously, a very exciting project. I think it's something that we have all been looking forward to for a long time and I think there is -- you know, it's one of those as M r. Troy said, it's a legacy project.

And I guess just going over some of the things. I guess I wanted to find out a little bit more about the co -generation aspect. Is that -- it's in its infancy, I know, you are looking at it, but where abouts would that be located? How would that be tied in?

MR. HOFFMAN: Yo u are correct. The -- it is in its infancy. We actually have a lot of intent with Washington Gas. We are working with them. The location wou ld be in the north and we st of the project over near

Parcel 2. It could be Parcel 1. It's in that general zone in that area.

And our goal is to pro vide -- not only generate the electricity, but the real efficiency -- the efficiency of the system is about 35 percent. It's not that much different than a coal generated system.

The difference is the off-gasing and you are reproducing that or you are utilizing that, I should say, for your heating and even your cooling.

And so what we would like to do is create a manifold along Maine Avenue that goes into the buildings, providing the hot water and cold water feature to those buildings and then we simply only need fans and pumps to move that energy around. And so that's where of it will go.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

Thank you. We didn't really -- I think Mr.

VanPelt kind of just glossed over the traffic entry and loading. I wonder if from just, you

NEAL R. GROSS

1	know, like a 200 foot, could you gi ve us a
2	brief idea of how we would access the loading
3	on a lot of the buildings? Is that I mean,
4	you are, obviously, coming off of Maine
5	Avenue, but and you have got these small
6	little roads for some vehicular traffic, but
7	how are we coordinating that?
8	I'm just again, I know we are
9	First-Stage, but I would like to get a macro
10	level idea of how we are going to be coming
11	in.
12	MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Turnbull, Mr.
13	Eckstut will handle that part.
14	MR. ECKSTUT: Thank you. I want
15	to use the ground level plan, if I can. So,
16	essentially, we are coming in and we would
17	have service, you can see, in blue off of this
18	alleyway. It is a right turn in and the
19	ability to service it and then out.
20	We also have coming in on t hese
21	other smaller streets where you would be able

to come in. We also can go right out again

through the square, but we have these zones servicing the buildings and you can see this throughout the entire area where we are always coming off the sides treets, alleyways, service areas as opposed to the primary parks.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What's the pedestrian impact coming in on those? Is there -- you talked about having both --

Well, it's ECKSTUT: like an urban setting where we have Georgetown, places like this, where people are walking. service area which is, you know, functioning and certain hours may be busier than others. Obviously, all screened from view, because we designed these alle yways and porte cochere entrances to buildings, the Capital very determined that Yacht Club, so we are while you can get in and out of the service, it doesn't in any way dominate the view of the service areas.

The streets themselves and the alleyways, they become places where we hope to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	have small shops or bars or cafes as well.
2	But everything is done in a way that it never
3	dominates the view. It is always accessible
4	off of the smaller street s and alleyways.
5	There are no curb cuts for service or parking
6	on Maine, of course, not on the wharf either.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: On Main e
8	Avenue, looking at how that is arranged, where
9	all those streets come off of Maine that you
10	would have vehicles going in, are there lights
11	then? Can you cross? Are you making mainly
12	right hand turns or can you make left hand
13	from the other side?
14	MR. ECKSTUT: I'll go to the
15	this is where I enjoy presenting traffic for
16	the traffic engineer. If we can go there?
17	There we go.
18	So we have traffic intersections.
19	A new one at Banneker. Obviously, at 9^{th} , at
20	7 th . We have a new one halfway here just to
21	the west of the Arena Stage and a new traffic
22	light here.

1	When we talk about a traffic
2	circle, it's really a normal intersection with
3	a traffic signal. It's just slowing down
4	cars. So these a re the places where you can
5	make left turns in and out. Whereas, these
6	smaller streets, you are basi cally doing a
7	right turn in and a right turn ou t. And
8	that's, okay, I'll just get confused with that
9	then.
10	So that's it in a nuts hell. It's
11	many streets as opposed to bundling up. If I
12	had longer blocks, then I would have bigger
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
14	MR. ECKSTUT: piles of traffic
15	and trucks, etcetera, right?
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: One of the
17	things you showed was the model. You had done
18	a model massing.
19	MR. ECKSTUT: Right. We have done
20	design models all through this.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
22	MR. ECKSTUT: Right.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Which actually looks a lot more inviting than some of the drawings that you show. The drawings at times there is -- you have one -- you had setbacks. And you mentioned setbacks, but the drawings, basically, show 13 0 foot facades, which kind of looks like it's one long sausage that has just been cut for different views.

It's a little intimidating when you see the drawings. The model actually looks more exciting than the drawings that you have got. Please, tell me that's the scope of where you are going.

MR. ECKSTUT: Well, it's definitely where we are going. The PUD has a certain process in drawings, etcetera, that I didn't do those drawings. They are done by staff, because it's not, you know, the real design, but it pointed out, I guess, coming back for the second PUD, this is definitely what we will be presenting and it will be the architecture and the design and the character.

1 But we haven't tested ourselves--2 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You know--3 MR. ECKSTUT: -- to know that even though those drawings may be dry or whatever, 4 we knew that they were still correct. 5 6 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, they 7 are cartoons right now. I mean, until we get into the actual design of the buildings. 8 MR. ECKSTUT: 9 Yes. 10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But I'm just going back to an d I'm looking 11 by the Commission of 12 comment that was made 13 Fine Arts and they talked about the porosity of the site. And they also talked that one of 14 15 the things that -- they wanted to avoid the 16 perception of a wall along the waterfront. And I think that would be one 17 οf my concerns also, that this is a legacy 18 19 project. This is very exciting. I think you 20 are on a threshold of a very -- you know, this will be a dynamic project for the city. 21

it is how we shape that.

1	And just echoing again the
2	concerns of the Commission of Fine Arts that
3	this is open. As I say, I like the model, the
4	setbacks, it sort of gives a richness that
5	really don't show up, I think, in the drawings
6	so far. I think that the model sort of makes
7	me feel more com fortable than what I see in
8	picture form.
9	Mr. Chair, I think that will be it
10	for me for now. Maybe I'll have I'm trying
11	to go through my notes as I'm talking.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I understand. W e
13	can always come back.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
15	
	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We can always
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We can always circle back around. Vice Chairman Schlater?
16 17	
	circle back around. Vice Chairman Schlater?
17	circle back around. Vice Chairman Schlater? VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Thank
17 18	circle back around. Vice Chairman Schlater? VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, just up front, I
17 18 19	circle back around. Vice Chairman Schlater? VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, just up front, I want to say to the team that it's a very

1	embraces the waterfron t. And I think will
2	vastly, vastly improve the waterfront.
3	And so with that said, I'll take
4	my questions. I just was trying to get
5	further information and make sure the project
6	is all it can be.
7	From let's see, there is a lot
8	to cover. Maybe I'll start where Mr. Turnbull
9	started in terms of the parking and loading.
10	Somewhere in the record we have a
11	discussion of a possible second Metro Station
12	entrance for L'Enfant Plaza Metro, I believe.
13	Have those discussions with WMATA begun?
14	What were the nature of those discussions?
15	MR. GLASGOW: I would rather
16	Shawn, could you answer that?
17	MR. SEAMAN: Sure. Shawn Seaman
18	with PN Hoffman, Proje ct Director for the
19	project. We had preliminary di scussions with
20	WMATA three to four years ago regarding a
21	second entrance at the Green Line, the
22	Waterfront Station. We have never discussed

1	opportunities at the L'Enfant Plaza Metro for
2	an additional stop.
3	I think th ere is a physical
4	barrier in the fact th at I-395 actually
5	bifurcates our site from the L'Enfant Plaza
6	Metro, which would make it impossible to do or
7	maybe not impossible, but virtually impossible
8	to add another station entrance.
9	And we are already served by three
10	exits from the L'Enfant Plaza . It is really
11	trying to connect those exits t o the
12	waterfront that I think should be the focus.
13	How long is the walk from the
14	Metro to the edge of the site?
15	MR. SEAMAN: It's about a 10
16	minute walk from L'Enfant Plaza Metro. And
17	five minutes from waterfront to the south end
18	of the site.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: In terms
20	of mode splits for your transportation plan,
21	did you assume that you were going to have a
22	higher percentage, because this was tr ansit-

oriented?

MR. VANPELT: Yes, w e did. I think what -- I mean, if you want to go into what the specifics were of that, I would call Rob up here and he can walk us through there, but we certainly assumed that it's high mode splits and working in conjunction with DDOT to determine what those should be.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I just wonder, you know, 8 to 10 minutes isn't exactly adjacent to a Metro Station. And how important is it to be on top of Metr o in determining those splits?

MR. VANPELT: Yes, I think that those -- the walk was taken in to consideration, but we also have -- you know, we are thinking about the circulator line that serves the site today. We're thinking about the future of the streetcar, thinking about the bike -- the multi-use trail there, the bike trail and its connection and Capital Bikeshare Station.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	So we are thinking about the whole
2	potpourri of transportation, multimode of
3	transportation options.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Maybe
5	just I don't want to waste too much time on it
6	right now, but maybe after the hearing you
7	could submit something more on how many people
8	you expect to be using Metro to access the
9	site and the different mode splits.
LO	MR. VANPELT: Sure. That's broken
11	out in our study, but we can get that to you.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Yo u
13	mentioned the streetcar. There was something
L 4	in maybe it was NCPC or CFA talking about
15	streetcar on the site and not their not
L 6	wanting overhead lines as part of those
L7	streetcar tracks. Is that something you have
18	had discussions with DDOT and something that
L 9	is going to be workable in terms of bringing
20	streetcar to the site?
21	MR. HOFFMAN: We have had
22	discussions actually with some of the

neighbors and, to be honest, we have had a lot of meetings lately. I'm not sure which group, but I think we ag reed with that that what we would like to do is not have exposed lines out onto the wharf side. So we were aligned in that opinion.

And my understanding is the technology of this continues to improve and that the span is as much as three-quarters of a mile now that -- a distance that a trolley can go without that outside line. I do not profess to be an expert on that, but that's an evolving distance is my understanding.

But the bottom line is we prefer not to have lines out on the wharf as well.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.

Great. One of the things I have noted going by Southwest Waterfront, you know, when it was occupied by H2O and all those clubs, on a Thursday, Friday and Saturday night, there are tremendous parking pressures there. There is people spilling out onto the street, parking

1	in the neighborhood. It's something having
2	lived in that neighborhood, it's definitely a
3	big problem.
4	So I think the idea of ac tually
5	adding a Metro Station, bringing the streetcar
6	line in with the amount of parking that you
7	are providing, which is relatively limited,
8	and it's something we certainly support that
9	notion, but it's very important to then have
10	these other modes of transportation serve the
11	project very, very well.
12	So one of the things I guess I'll
13	ask DDOT as well, I mean, you have made the
14	commitment to provide the infrastructure for
15	the streetcar line. You, clearly, can't bring
16	it to you site. But I think it's an important
17	part of it.
18	So I guess I'll ask DDOT when they
19	come up how likely is it that t hey are going
20	to be able to get DDOT down to your site.
21	This is a two stage PUD. Does

that mean all of the -- I understand that the

buildings are going to be coming back for design and architecture review. I have a question about the public spaces. Are those going to be fur ther developed and then resubmitted to the Commission for our review?

MR. HOFFMAN: Y es. The public

spaces as well as all of the architecture of all the buildings, we will go back -- will come back to you for your review.

We recognize that, you know, the building blocks that we are showing today are not what we are actually going to be building.

We are going to be limited, obviously, to the FAR we are asking for. There are setbacks and reliefs and the like that are going —inherent in the FAR we are asking for.

What we are concerned with though is becoming too formulaic and a ctually stunting the very creativity that the you want from us. And so we are asking for some flexibility until we can come to Phase 2 and demonstrate to you that, indeed, the model and

NEAL R. GROSS

1	the other aesthetics that we are demonstrating
2	are real and that's what we intend to be
3	coming in with on Stage Two.
4	In addition to that, the public
5	spaces will be much more granular in terms of
6	their design, the components, the programming
7	and everything else that we
8	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: So the
9	piers, the parks?
10	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: All that
12	would be in that -
13	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, that will
14	correspond with each phase that we submit
15	with.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
17	Great. Speaking of which, so some of your
18	buildings are you have put forward. I
19	guess we are are we fixing the building
20	footprints as part of our Stage One review?
21	MR. HOFFMAN: That's what we are
22	asking for. The building footprints, the

circulation, public spaces and the like. We have asked for some flexibility. I don't recall the exact number. It might be 20 feet either way, but the con cepts of what we are asking for and those view corridors and the connections, all of that, that would be the continuity and that's what we are asking for and that would remain the same.

VICE CHAIRMAN S CHLATER: Can yo u go to the slide that shows the different land uses of the various parcels? And while you are looking for it, I guess, the question there is it seems like there is a number of instances where you are talking about either office or residential building. And the building types of residential and office are clearly very different.

One has a wide -- you know, a wider footprint and goes all the way to the sky. Whereas, the residential building is a little bit more narrow and sculpted. So I'm wondering, maybe if you could point out on

NEAL R. GROSS

1	this map which buildings are seeking
2	flexibility to go office?
3	MR. HOFFMAN: Well, first, I agree
4	with you with respect to the widths and that
5	is one of the reasons we wanted that
6	flexibility 20 feet either way, because,
7	obviously, an office building, which is fatter
8	than a residential width, air and light needs
9	and all that are much different.
10	Shawn, can you from there, sinc e
11	you are closest there, maybe point to what the
12	Commissioner is looking for?
13	MR. SEAMAN: The flexibility to go
14	office in the third phase, which is Parcel 6
15	through 11, is really reserved for Parcels 6,
16	7 and 8. Parcel 9 will always be residential.
17	And then the uses are fi xed in the first
18	Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 1 being 2 through
19	5 and Phase 2 being Parcel 1 on its own. And
20	the office is identified as Parcel 3 and
21	Parcel 1 in those earlier phases.
	i 1

So it's really retained for 6, 7

1	and 8 and ju st allowing residential v ersus
2	office flexibility in the later phases.
3	MR. HOFFMAN: If I may also add to
4	this, Commissioner, you had a comment at the
5	set-down hearing with respect to flexibility.
6	And I think you will see in our amended
7	submission, we have reduced that flexi bility
8	to try to narrow that recognizing your
9	comments earlier.
10	And so what Shawn was just
11	pointing out, if you look at what is to us
12	their Phase 3, it's really zero to 500,000
13	feet of office. The m ost that that could
14	possibly be would be two office buildings and
15	a mix with residential there.
16	And then, obviously, under Phas e
17	1, which we are starting, hopefully, at the
18	end of 2012, that office space is set, which
19	is what we are calling Parcel 3.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Yes. And
21	one and it's dangerous when I start
22	talking about this. I'm not a planner or an

architect, but one concern I might have is you have a 130 feet building there. So if you had two office buildings that are 130 feet tall and they look like they are very close to one another, does that feel -- you know, is that pedestrian scale development? Is that something that is going to fe el good walking by and walking through?

MR. ECKSTUT: If I could an swer that question? The most important thing we are trying to do is guaranteeing control of the height and scale of walls on the public environments, that's number one.

Whether it is a residential or hotel or office, it's the public walls and scale of places that count. It is true that when the office buildings get next to each other, they are bul kier, so you have less space. In that case, we would have to adjust the office building use, because we also have to rent the office buildings, meaning they don't want to be right up cheek to jaw either.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	So in this case, we are s howing
2	residential. If we were doing office, we have
3	tested sites that veer away a lit tle bit from
4	each other as well. T he reality is in the
5	end, we have to guarantee the scale of the
6	walls, the wharfs, etcetera.
7	And the uses, basically, they need
8	to first defer to the sc ale of public
9	environments. And then we have the problems
10	of leasing space after th at that we have to
11	engage, but we are not going to compromise the
12	public. Thanks.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN S CHLATER: How ca n
14	we ensure that those buildings are not to o
15	close together and the scale is appropriate?
16	MR. HOFFMAN: If I may, I think we
17	are already proposing that the actual public
18	spaces are fixed. So when I say move 20 feet,
19	it's one direction or the other. It's not
20	narrowing.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Al l
22	right.

1	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, it's not
2	narrowing it.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: What's
4	the minimum distance between those office
5	towers? I guess, is my question. Because it
6	looked like in some of those cases, those
7	alleys are 25 feet wide.
8	MR. HOFFMAN: Right.
9	MR. ECKSTUT: B ut they stay
LO	they step back once they get above the second
L1	floor, so I would say they are probably
L2	anywhere from 40 to 60 feet away from each
L3	other.
L4	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
15	MR. ECKSTUT: That way the y get
16	the breathing space, but they are also not
L7	parallel walls, which would make it a lot
18	worse. So, obviously, what we need to do is
L9	get to that next level, so we can come back
20	and show you and ourselves.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: And I

design the buildings today. I just don't want to box us into a situation where we have committed to providing a cert ain amount of density and we come back and find there is not a planning architectural solution that makes it work.

One question I had at set-down was about the fish market and the approach there. I noticed there are some buildings programmed for the fish market. It's not part of the PUD. What's the relationship between Hoffman-Madison and the fish market development? And could you talk a little bit about how these two projects are going to meet and be coordinated?

MR. HOFFMAN: The relationship is that it's actually the same team. While it's not part of the PUD, it is the same ownership that will be approaching the fish market. The fish market, we see as an integral historic marker for the area. We think it is vital to the success of the waterfront.

NEAL R. GROSS

We are placing a lot of investment into the waterfront, so managing the fish market the right way and protecting it is vital to all of our interests. So it is the same ownership to answer your first question.

With respect to our plans for that, and I think Stan had mentioned this earlier, we have explored Pike's Place. We have explored The Ferry Building. We have explored several different marketplaces to look at best practices.

To take the fish market for what it is today, not process it, not change it, but add to it and make it more into -- not more, but add to that farmer's market, artisan ware and other certain things, I would say that that whole culture, if I had to characterize it, would be more Bohemian in nature. It would be a little bit more fun and raw. We would take the certain DNA and characteristics that it is today and just add to it.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And then that would blend into what we are calling our Parcel 1, Parcel 2 of the PUD that you are reviewing.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Is there a grade difference between t he two? Do I recall that?

MR. HOFFMAN: There is. And that also makes it interesting. We are at 13 feet on the wharf, which is r ight at the flood level. And we will be dr opping down to 7 feet, which is where the existing wharf is today. And again, we are not trying to change that or over-process it.

So it's kind of coo 1, I think.

Actually, the Wharf will actually bend down, will incline downward into what the existing elevations are. And we have actually talked with some of the neighborhoods, Harbor Square, in particular, with respect to the pedestrian flow of enabling people to walk from the Titanic Memorial on one end and all the way to the fish market on the other.

NEAL R. GROSS

So we do have a continuous flow without obstruction there of pedest rian moving. And that pedestrian movement from the fish market aga in into our city square or market square and our city square are vital to all of us.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: So are we going to have the same t enant? Are those existing tenants going to be there? It's very popular now, that's the only reason why I ask.

MR. HOFFMAN: There is actually two main tenants. There are three tenants that are there now and e veryone else is sort of rolled up into that. We a re working with them, so they would remain.

Our approach to the tenants there are much like with the slipholders and, frankly, everybody else we have come in contact with. It has not been to threaten their business, but to work with them and find win/win solutions, you know, and integrate that into our plans.

NEAL R. GROSS

So we expect those tenants to remain and working with them. So again, we can add on with the pieces that I mentioned earlier.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.

Thank you. With respect to open space, I saw somewhere an open space exhibit in our package that seemed to count all of the driveways and, you know, your porte-cochere, loading, all of that stuff towards open space.

One thing I note from the plan, I can't differentiate what is green space and what is not green space. And one thing I would like to better understan d is the greening of the site and just make sure there is enough trees, enough green space on the site.

I realize it is an urban proj ect,
too. You are talking about 130 feet
buildings, lots of people. It can't be
greened everywhere. But I would like some
more details on the g reening of the site

NEAL R. GROSS

exactly.

And I wouldn't count, you know, some of those streets and driveways towards the open space.

MR. HOFFMAN: Commissioner, if I may, the first point of your commentary before the question, as Stan had mentioned earlier, we have worked very hard to make the -- some of those service areas on the inside of the buildings and those, of course, have not been counted.

There are parking garages, entering the parking garages, we have actually added side streets that parallel. You can see it more towards the rig ht if you could spot that, Shawn? That would be the left, right. We added that street as well as the one over on the left, so that p eople can go to signalized intersections without that right hand turn issue.

I mean, you know, obviously, you can't make a left hand turn on some of these

NEAL R. GROSS

streets where there is no traffic. So that allows those nodes to work. We have steered the service areas that are mostly on the inside of the buildings.

One thing in the characteristic of our development that I think does make it distinctive and I cer tainly would like consideration of this, is that there is public spaces surrounding these buildings. They are four-sided buildings and much est, and it's development that is in southw very nice, but it is more of a campus-style and those are private areas. Those are private squares, so there may be open space around it, but it's not public.

And so, you know, we do want recognition, I suppose, of t hat. And certainly, there are certain drive entrances and the like.

With respect to green, I would like to ask Shawn to respond to that in terms of I don't know if you have percentages or

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	where that is. Maybe you can point that out.
2	MR. SEAMAN: Sure. I don't have
3	specific percentages, bu t the major green
4	spaces are the Waterfront Park at th south end
5	of the site.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN S CHLATER: How bi g
7	is that?
8	MR. SEAMAN: That's about 5 acres.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: That's
10	pretty big.
11	MR. SEAMAN: And then the 7
12	Street Park is abou t three-quarters of an
13	acre. The intent is
14	VICE CHAIRMAN S CHLATER: Is tha t
15	the porte-cochere is going around that?
16	MR. SEAMAN: This has porte -
17	cochere for the hotel, yes, on the sidewalk.
18	And then this is office and residential on
19	this side. But I'm not sure what the exact
20	size of the centerpiece is, but the real
21	intent with the wharf and I had hoped some of
22	this were conveyed in the drawing, was

1	actually that there would be a signi ficant
2	amount of trees along the wharf, the grove for
3	example in front of the Gangplank Marina was
4	an opportunity to do, you kno w, either trees
5	and sort of a bosque or trellises.
6	And then along Maine Avenue, we
7	actually purposefully set the buildings back
8	12 feet off the Maine Aven ue right-of-way so
9	that we could tr y to maintain the oaks that
10	are out there for the length of Maine Avenue.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: That's
12	great.
13	MR. SEAMAN: We talked to the
14	community about maintaining the trees between
15	Tiber Island and Parcel 1 1 and the East End
16	Park, there is a nice allay of trees down
17	there. So I think a lot more will be defined
18	in the Second-Stage and it's not showing up
19	right now, but the surgical addition of trees
20	into the wharf and Maine Avenue.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: And I
22	think the preservation of those t rees is

1	pretty important. One of the nicest aspects
2	of southwest right now is the development of
3	those trees that have built up over the past
4	50 years.
5	Mr. Chairman, I'm almo st done. I
6	have like two more questions. One has to do
7	with the, it's fairly technical, time periods
8	for what we are approv ing. So I he ard Mr.
9	Glasgow talk about only needing a y ear to get
10	to the Second-Stage submission.
11	I'm wondering if does that mean
12	that this PUD will be in existence in
13	perpetuity once that deadline is met?
14	MR. GLASGOW: Well, I guess,
15	technically, under the regulations you can say
16	that, but we do h ave phasing and we can come
17	back with specific time lines for phasing as
18	those come back as Second-Stage PUDs.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I mean, I
20	think it would be good. I understand the
21	market drives a lot of this stuff and there is
22	a heavy up front investment that nee ds to be

1	repaid. But I don't think having open-ended
2	PUDs like that is a generally good idea.
3	I didn't see anywhere i n the
4	package, there was some talk about work force
5	housing. What does that mean in terms of area
6	median income?
7	MR. HOFFMAN: With respect to area
8	median income, the work force ho using
9	component just to w here that begins is, I
10	think it was stated earlier, after 500 units.
11	We have an affordable housing component up to
12	500 units. And it's basically about 30
13	percent of the unit count s, which is,
14	approximately, 160,000 square feet.
15	And of that affordable, 30 percent
16	or half of that is 30 per cent AMI and the
17	other half is 60 per cent AMI. On t he work
18	force components, after you pass tha t
19	threshold, it is 20 percent work force housing
20	and that is at 100 percent AMI. And the other
21	half of that is at 120 percent AMI.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER:

22

And this

is all mixed throughout all the residential buildings?

MR. HOFFMAN: It's all mixed throughout. It will have affordable and work force throughout. We do have, I think, two provisions in buildings and it is limited in its square feet that we can have all market rate and that has certainly made sense, because in certain market rate units where you will have high-end services, high-condo fees and it's just really a mismatch on that.

That means that what otherwise would go in that one particular building is going to be concentrated in all the other buildings. But it allows for different experiences, residential and likewise, but it also ensures that there are affordable and work force housing throughout.

VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Great.

The last question, a technical question. The

Transportation Impact Analysis, we have had a

NEAL R. GROSS

1	problem in some of our cases recently where we
2	have actually had the delay consideration of
3	these cases, because the Traffic I mpact
4	Analysis is submitted late to DDOT.
5	And this one was submitted when to
6	DDOT?
7	MR. VANPELT: It was submitted. I
8	have the exact date here. It was submitted to
9	DDOT on the 24 th of June.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I t hink,
11	you know, this is for future reference and
12	clearly not applicable to this case right now,
13	but I think we need mor e time for some of
14	these issues to be vetted, both w ith DDOT and
15	the community, because too often DDOT comes
16	back and says we need more analysis. We can't
17	even speak to the topic on this particular
18	night.
19	And so, p articularly with Mr.
20	Glasgow here tonight, who w e see a lot, I
21	would just like to say let's see if we can get

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

these things in a little bit earlier.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chairman. And let me just piggyback on that. I think someone in here, I think DDOT has already asked for a request. I can't remember the time frame. Was it three mon ths? But we will get to that. I know that there is a time frame that DDOT is now asking that the traffic consultants get their information in. And we will talk more on that when we get to DDOT.

I'm going to go back and forth some between Peter May's questions, Commissioner May's questions, and my own. I don't want to say an ything bad about Commissioner May, because he is going to read the transcript.

So let me ask this, Mr. Glasgow, we have an exhibit, which is Exhibit No. 40, and it comes from someone who has the masses on urban and regional planning and it struck me because I look at some of the ideas.

NEAL R. GROSS

For example, one of the points it has on the environment "As sea level rises and the incidents of coastal storms increase in frequency and severity, the waterfront area will become more susceptible to flooding. The development should have sufficient setback to accommodate this."

Has that been thought through

Has that been thought through already or did we already take that under consideration or where are we with that statement?

MR. GLASGOW: Well, as we go through the building permit process, we will be coordinating with DDOE and all the other agencies that review.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I will tell you this. Exhibit 40 is the letter from her. She has transportation and affordable housing. She talks ab out the mixture of housing units, environment and everything. If you could just, for me, E xhibit No. 40, I would like to have a quick snapshot response

NEAL R. GROSS

1	to what she has here.
2	MR. GLASGOW: This here
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And she is also a
4	resident in the area, Exhibit 40.
5	MR. GLASGOW: Okay. As of r ight
6	now or post to
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, no, n o, not
8	right now, post. And it doesn't have to be no
9	more than a page, just kind of like what she
10	has. Just a snapshot, just talking about each
11	one of these issues and how you are going to
12	deal with them.
13	Okay. I have a letter also from
14	they call themselves well, this particular
15	letter says "The Boating Community." And it
16	goes on to talk about, and some of this I'm
17	not too familiar with, the mooring ball and
18	not having enough space and the Wash ington
19	Challenge is an excellent spot for this and it
20	would truly be sad this opportunity was lost.
21	And I read that in a number of
22	other places how I don't know whether the

1	boaters feel like there is not enough space to
2	anchor at. I don't know. What is that issue
3	all about?
4	MR. HOFFMAN: I would li ke to ask
5	our marine expert to co me up and respond to
6	that perhaps.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: This is a person
8	from maritime?
9	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That w ould
11	be good.
12	MR. SLOOP: My name is Rob S loop
13	with Moffatt & Nichol Engineers. I'm a marine
14	and waterfront engineer in the area. And the
15	could I get the exhibit?
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are you, let me
17	ask this, familiar with some of the responses
18	that we have in the
19	MR. SLOOP: Yes, sir.
	MR. 51001. 165, 511.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good.
20	

1 the Federal Navigation Channel. I think it's 2 It's not in the record. And what we are 3 proposing instead of the open anchorage, are proposing putting in a mooring field in 4 this area. 5 So what we have done is we have 6 7 brought the channel in. We have a turning basin. This is the existing fish market. And 8 what we have done is we have brought the basin 9 10 in here. And instead of a mooring field or instead of anchoring, we are proposing a tw o-11 point mooring to help control the traffic. 12 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm not really understanding that, but maybe -- you're not 14 15 nervous, are you? I'm n ervous all the time. 16 Every time I come up here, I'm nervous. I'm sorry, sir. 17 MR. SLOOP: That's all right. 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 19 Don't get nervous, because I'm nervous all 20 the time and I do this a lot. But I'm just

NEAL R. GROSS

trying to understand what is written here in

the submission versus what -- maybe I just

21

1	need to go take a maritime class.
2	But what it says here is h e is
3	talking about not having enough space. And I
4	read this in more than one area. T hey are
5	talking about anchorin g, not bei ng able to
6	anchor? Let me just read it.
7	MR. SLOOP: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. Ye s, if you
9	could.
10	MR. HOFFMAN: Give him the mike.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Take the
12	microphone. You probably understand this much
13	more than I do.
14	MR. SLOOP: I don't know if it's
15	on. Can you go to the maritime plans?
16	MR. HOFFMAN: That's not on, Rob.
17	MR. GLASGOW: Turn the mike on.
18	MR. SLOOP: It's very hard to see
19	in here, but we have reduced the width of the
20	channel here to accommodate the larger piers.
21	And in this area, we have a 500 foot turning
22	basin. And in order t o make this s afe for

1	navigation, we propose putting a mooring field
2	in here in an area that is a traditional
3	anchorage.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: What is a
5	mooring field?
6	MR. SLOOP: A mooring field has a
7	fixed ball or a fixed weight at the bottom
8	with a float at the top that you attach the
9	boat to, so that you don't have to anchor.
LO	VICE CHAIRMAN S CHLATER: And yo u
11	leave your boat there?
12	MR. SLOOP: Yes.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Will you
L 4	be able to anchor your boats anywhere?
15	MR. SLOOP: You will be able to
L 6	anchor your boats from here all the way down
L7	outside the navigation channel.
L 8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And this
L 9	particular boater said that he fears that this
20	proposed development will end up like National
21	Harbor. And that's wh at he is basically
22	alluding to, according to this boater. And

actually, there is a couple from the boating community.

The boating community felt as though they were left out, Mr. Hoffm an. And when I looked on your la undry list of everybody you met with, I didn't see -- I don't know, maybe there is another name for it. The boating community, do they have another name?

MR. HOFFMAN: Well, we have met with Gangplank Marina and the Capital Yacht Club and Slipholders and probably a variety of others. Maybe you can add to that, Shawn?

MR. SEAMAN: Sure. We have really met with all of the commer cial interests for the commercial boats at the Sout hwest Waterfront well as the live as -aboard community, the recreational boaters a t the Gangplank, the folks at the Capital Yacht Club, so I think we have talked with virtually all of the interests, water interest at the Southwest Waterfront pro per and even

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	beyond that are interested in running water
2	taxi service, bringing tall ships to the
3	waterfront and getting in that tradition.
4	I think the variety and the t ypes
5	of slips, moorings and tie -ups for different
6	shapes and sizes of vessels will be
7	significantly better in the new develo pment.
8	And, you know, the creation of the large body
9	of water at the northwest end of the channel
10	actually creates a harbor similar to
11	Baltimore's Inner Harbor, some place where you
12	can actually have tall ship festivals,
13	actually draw significant, you know, v essels
14	from outside of the area, as well as balancing
15	that with the recreational boaters, the live-
16	aboards and the commercial intere sts that we
17	have there today.
18	So it is really trying to enh ance
19	and not take away any of the specific
20	interests.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you .

Thank you both. I appreciate it.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
2	just following up on y our question. Who
3	controls then the mooring fields?
4	MR. SEAMAN: Right now, we have
5	drawn the mooring field on the core
6	application. It is certainly something that
7	is of interest to Hoffman-Madison Waterfront.
8	It is of interest to the Capital Yacht Club.
9	It is a function that they have been doing
10	for those folks anchoring in the chann el. So
11	there is plenty of interested parties at the
12	waterfront.
13	I'm not sure who is going to run
14	it at the end of the day, but there is
15	certainly people that are capable of doing it
16	that exist there today.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. How
18	many boats could po ssibly be accommodated
19	there? Do you know?
20	MR. SEAMAN: It's about 50
21	identified on the core application. 5 0
22	moorings.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
2	MR. SEAMAN: The moorings, they
3	basically allow the boats to park parallel to
4	one another, rather than throwing over
5	individual anchors. So it makes them a little
6	bit more orderly.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, okay.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Sher,
9	I'm going to ask you this. We asked R-5-B.
10	Why not R-5-A?
11	MR. SHER: Well, in terms of
12	consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, the
13	Future Land Use Map shows that site as
14	moderate density commercial, which almost
15	would suggest something other than a
16	residential category in the first place.
17	But the pl an designates moderate
18	density commercial districts as C-2-A, C-2-B
19	or C-3-A. The more rough equiv alent of a
20	residential district at that density is R-5-B,
21	not R-5-A. R-5-A is only a 40 foot height and

a 0.9 FAR. C -2-A is 2.5 FAR. C-2-B is 3.5

1	FAR. C-3-A is 4 FAR. R-5-B is 1.8, but 3.01
2	to the PUD. So it is a rough equivalent to
3	the zones that are identified in the Comp Plan
4	as being moderate density commercial zones.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And, Mr.
6	Sher, help me. In the W-1 Zone, the Zoning
7	Commission you were here when the Zoning
8	Commission put in the W-1 and W-2 and O- or
9	0-, whatever you want to call it, 3.
10	What was the height for W-1?
11	MR. SHER: I believe W -1 was
12	originally 40 feet and was amended, at some
13	point, to 45.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And
15	MR. SHER: As a matter-of-right.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. And the
17	reason they did W-1 was why, so you can see
18	the water and, you know, it wasn't blocked.
19	Wasn't that I mean, I think you and I were
20	together around that time.
21	MR. SHER: I fear it's a little
22	before your time. Not b efore mine, but a

little before your time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, is it? Okay.

MR. SHER: It was 19 73 and 1974 and the W Districts were pretty much designed to accommodate the Georgetown Waterfront. The W-1, W-2 and W-3 with, as you said, W-1 at 40 feet, W-2 at 60 and W-3 at 90. And if you go back and look at the way that was mapped on the Georgetown Waterfront in the first place, the Wisconsin Avenue Corridor coming down the hill from M Street was W-1. The area along the C&O Canal, both north and south, was W-1.

The area to the east end of the Georgetown Waterfront was primarily W-3 and everything else was W-2.

And we wrote the zones as potentially having greater applicability than just Georgetown, but, frankly, all of the studies and all of the designs of that went into trying to figure o ut how we would deal with what was perceived, at that point, to be a traffic capacity issue and trying to change

1 the industrial zones that were there over to 2 mixed-use. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, tha t 4 was right after something when we did W-1. Maybe it was another part of the city, but I 5 6 remember doing something. W-0, that's what --7 okay. I know it was a W. MR. SHER: Yes. W-1 is now mapped 8 in part -- W-2 is mapped along Capitol Gateway 9 10 and it has been expanded some, but started in '73 in Georgetown. 11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I quess 12 13 what I'm -- we are getting closer to the I have always thought we are trying to 14 15 lower the height, but I also see this being 16 again like Atlantic City where you are making it less dense and giving it more height. 17 18 I don't know how much more height we can do in 130 feet. 19 20 And this goes back to a quest ion, I think, one of my colleagues had was about 21 22 the 130 feet in that area. Again, I'm just --

you know, and I know this is the First-Stage.

I don't want us to get to the Second-Stage
and then we have a maj or problem with 130
feet.

MR. SHER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: How --

MR. GLASGOW: Mr. C hairman, with respect to the Comprehensive Plan Land U se Map, if you look at where there is high density commercial/high density residential mapped, you will see that it is generally in the DD area, which is Zo ned DD/C-3-C and DD/C-2-C, both of which all ow the height as permitted under th 1910 Height Act in all of those areas.

With FAR set, much in excess of this site and so we hav e -- what has been done, as it has been explained by Mr. Eckstut, is to then provide these podium setbacks, open spaces and then go up to 130 feet as was shown in the photograph of the model.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. And that's

NEAL R. GROSS

1	what puzzles me. He mentioned the height and
2	the open spaces. Again, when I look at that,
3	I look at how Atlantic City is done as far as
4	the open space. I don 't see that opening
5	happening or maybe, you know, I'm just
6	maybe it's just the First-Stage of Parcel 1, 2
7	and 3.
8	I don't see that opening happening
9	when I look at to me, we are ge tting the
10	height and the density, the way I look at it.
11	MR. GLASGOW: I think that when
12	you have the 3.87 FAR, beca use that's
13	something that we Mr. Hoffman also
14	indicated. You know, we underst and it and we
15	will live within the 3.87 FAR. And we do have
16	a 5 acre park. And we have some other open
17	spaces and we have some taller buildings set
18	on podiums.
19	And Mr. Eckstut can go back into
20	that in more detail, if you would like?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. I just wanted
22	to pose the question, unless he wanted to

1	comment on it? Mr. Eckstut, did you want to
2	comment?
3	MR. ECKSTUT: F irst of all, my
4	grandparents resided in Atlantic City and I
5	spent all my summers there, so it's one of the
6	few cities that I actuall y know extremely
7	well.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I f igured you
9	might say that. No, I'm just joking.
10	MR. ECKSTUT: And I have that
11	Philadelphia accent, right? And the truth is
12	that almost all the tall buildings in Atlantic
13	City are at the boardwalk. And the reason is
14	very similar to what we do in many waterfronts
15	and what we a re proposing here, which is we
16	get the most light and air, there fore we cast
17	the least shadows and we are not in the middle
18	of other neighborhoods with many smaller
19	buildings.
20	So like Atlantic City, and many
21	other waterfront cities, they would tend to
22	put the tallest and most dense environments at

the water's edge. There is also a very large tradition of the largest stru ctures in the city, particular examples in historic cities like Baltimore, where we recently got approvals for taller buildings there, too, because the buildings were generally bulkier at the water's edge and therefore had a least impact on the adjac ent neighborhoods like Fells Point and things like that.

But it is clearly where we have light and air, it's clear we are doing the least impact. Four story buildings block views and cast shadows as well as taller and we are able to cover less land, so we can make more public space. And with that, more views and more access.

So I'm happy to spend more time on it, because it is something that is one of the first things we do in laying out a waterfront is think about where is the most appropriate height? And we are not doing walls, we are stepping down. It's only in places we think

1	are most appropriate.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you .
3	Mr. Hoffman, let's go back to your and I
4	will tell you that I am very pleased with the
5	community outreach from what I see here. The
6	many, many meetings you have had, I believe,
7	since 2007, I think was the latest date I saw.
8	But let me ask you, you menti oned
9	about the ANC, you were meeting with the ANC
10	up until yesterday, I believe?
11	MR. HOFFMAN: Well, yesterday was
12	Sunday. Friday.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh.
14	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, we met Friday.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I thought
16	you all worked on the weekend. But you
17	mentioned that there was a number of items,
18	because they have quite a few, I'm not going
19	to say, opposition, but they were concerned
20	because this is a letter of support.
21	But they had the concerns and yo u
22	were able to, and I'm sure I'll be able to

1	hear from Mr. Litsky and Mr. McBee when they
2	come up, but you were able to minimize this.
3	What are one or two sticking points that
4	where you were not able to reach agreement?
5	MR. HOFFMAN: T here was one
6	good example would be Pier 4. And the preface
7	that because we were having lots of
8	discussions with lots of groups and interests,
9	it was really a dynamic process. So sometimes
10	I think the concerns when they were put
11	together, they are already dated by the time
12	of the meeting with the ANC because we had
13	already resolved it, but, you know, that was
14	unbeknownst to the Commissioners.
15	So there was nothing intentional
16	about that. That's the process is working
17	that quickly. But to serve up one example for
18	you, it would be Pier 4.
19	In the 27 listed concerns, I think
20	it starts by, I know because this is seared in
	l I
21	my memory, that the ANC prefers that no

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

on if development must oc cur and there is a list of items on there of setbacks of 10 feet and 45 feet in height. And I think there are some other provisions in there.

Prior to that, we had already worked out a solution with Harbor Square

Association that we would reduce the height of Pier 4 to 45 feet and that the setbacks on the pier, and we are talking about either side, would be 8 feet. And that's simply -- that wasn't a negotiation. That was simply a correction on our part, because the structure the way it is today is 8 feet back and we needed that inside, so that we could park.

And here, we are aligned. We want to put the cars inside that pier away from view and that's what the neighbors want as well. So anyway, it took a lot of communication and back and forth, but that evolved while, I think, the ANC adopted those concerns.

And so there was a c ase where I

NEAL R. GROSS

1	think, you know, that remains, but I believe
2	the issue is resolved.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All ri ght.
4	I think that will be sufficient for me.
5	Let me a sk a few questions for
6	Commissioner May. Actually, I'm going to ask
7	all of his questions. I would like to do a
8	few, but I'll ask all of them.
9	Okay. And here is another thing,
10	Mr. Glasgow. If you could maybe some of
11	them you may be able to respond to in other
12	submissions, so you get exactl y what he is
13	asking for.
14	Can you describe (or submit)
15	information which describes the current and
16	planned numbers of marina spaces and channel
17	moorings, you might have answered this, broken
18	down by type? Leased, d ay use, size,
19	etcetera?
20	I do not know the d ifferent types
21	of use, so, please, break down the numbers in
22	whatever way makes sense.

1	MR. GLASGOW: All right. We will
2	provide that post-hearing.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Can you
4	provide a better diagram that describes the
5	vehicle access to the s ite? The diagram on
6	page 3.7 is a bit confusing. Also, can you
7	describe what you mean by limited vehicle
8	access, as indicated on the drawings? Okay?
9	MR. GLASGOW: Correct.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The next one is,
11	please, provide a large and better q uality
12	aerial photo of the existing conditions.
13	Okay. Will the M Street/Maine
14	Avenue Circle be included in the Stage Two PUD
15	application, so that we can see i t in greater
16	detail? The same question for the waterfront
17	parking.
18	MR. GLASGOW: Right. Well, yes.
	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
19	Both of those the answer will be yes.
19 20	
	Both of those the answer will be yes.

1	the tracks (electrical substations, power
2	poles, etcetera) will the segment along the
3	waterfront be capable of running without
4	overhead wires?
5	Was that answered?
6	MR. GLASGOW: We answered there
7	would be no overhead wires.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So the answer is
9	yes, there will be cables running without
10	overhead wires?
11	MR. GLASGOW: Correct.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Can you
13	describe the changes made to Parcels 1 and 2
14	in response, and I know that was mentioned
15	earlier, but let me read the question, to NCPC
16	and CFA questions? It is difficult to discern
17	by comparing the original PUD submission
18	drawings to the current drawings. Perhaps a
19	simple drawing could be made which overlays
20	original and current plans.
21	Do we have that already? If we
22	do, just point us to it. If not, we would

like to see that.

MR. ECKSTUT: We could provide the comparison, because we had it i n the presentation with NCPC. It doesn't show what we had before, but we -- their consultant find we narrowed down -- the biggest problem we had was they could not make up their mind what they were going to do at Banneker, so they are going through a planning process, so we had to arrive at what we could do to make sure there was as much of an opening.

So we made the market square wider. They allowed us to do s ome things in the square for retailing and then we provided, I believe it was, was it a 75 foot, Shawn, or 80 foot wide youth corridor?

MR. SEAMAN: 80 feet.

MR. ECKSTUT: Down the center line of L'Enfant Plaza and I think they -- we all agreed that this was giving them much more flexibility, so that they could go forward and plan. And we were creating which was their

NEAL R. GROSS

1	main objective was two things, no wall and a
2	much more welcoming openin g towards the fish
3	market.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Okay.
5	MR. ECKSTUT: But we could
6	provide, I'm sure, the overlay of what we had
7	originally and what came out of the process.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That will
9	be fine. Let me also ask this question and I
10	think you alluded to this. Can you provide a
11	perspective view from the Banneke r Park into
12	the site looking more towards Parcel 2 than
13	the view provided on Sheet 5.12?
14	I would like to see the view
15	between Parcel 1 and 2 and also through the
16	gap in the Parcel 2 towers. Okay.?
17	MR. GLASGOW: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The last question.
19	What is the status o f the potential
20	additional interest to the Waterfront M etro?
21	Is the applicant willing or able to contribute
22	to its construction? And I think you have

1	responded, but if somebody wants to respond?
2	You might want to turn your mike on.
3	MR. HOFFMAN: This is the
4	extension of the Metro Tunnel . Is that what
5	we are asking?
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
7	MR. HOFFMAN: We certainly will
8	cooperate with Office of Planning and DDOT.
9	We have nothing in our coffers for
10	contribution towards that. We have got
11	tremendous public amenities and areas
12	committed to, so we don't have funds committed
13	for that.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just
15	say my point of view. I think this is a very
16	exciting project. There may be some tweaks
17	and stuff that we might need to massage or
18	turn around and twist, but I think and
19	especially I'm happy to see the outreach.
20	And I know that everybody is not
21	100 percent there, but I th ink with the way
22	that when I see a sheet like this of community

1 meetings, I'll tell yo u I don't often 2 this, I want to applaud this applicant presenters and Office of Planning as well for 3 4 at least having a dialogue with the community. You might not have reached it, but 5 6 I think through further -- as we further go 7 along, we may be able to close some of those gaps where the community may still stand or 8 still have issues. 9 10 So I think this is very exciting for this area and for the city. 11 And looking forward to, hopefully, seeing how far 12 13 we get after the tweaks and the massaging that we may have to do. 14 15 other questions? So any 16 Commissioner Turnbull? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, 17 I just had two questions to follow-up on. 18 19 it goes back to the Vice Chair where we were 20 talking about Segment C. We talked about the office residential, Parcels 6, 7, 8, 9. 21 22 we looked at -- I think, Mr. Hoffman, you had

1	said that based upon the chart you looked at,
2	there would probably only be two bui ldings
3	that would be office.
4	Would that be primarily 7 and 8
5	then? And having 6 and 9 as the residential?
6	MR. HOFFMAN: It de finitely will
7	not be 9. We are committing 9 as residential.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 9 i s
9	right.
LO	MR. HOFFMAN: It could be 7 and 8.
11	It could be 6 and 7.
	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well,
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, right now, you have 6, sort of shows two
12	
L2 L3	right now, you have 6, sort of shows two
L2 L3 L4	right now, you have 6, sort of shows two buildings split on the site.
12 13 14	right now, you have 6, sort of shows two buildings split on the site. MR. HOFFMAN: Right. Where and
L2 L3 L4 L5	right now, you have 6, sort of shows two buildings split on the site. MR. HOFFMAN: Right. Where and we like that massing broken do wn in two. So
12 13 14 15 16	right now, you have 6, sort of shows two buildings split on the site. MR. HOFFMAN: Right. Where and we like that massing broken do wn in two. So even if we were to go office, we would have
12 13 14 15 16 17	right now, you have 6, sort of shows two buildings split on the site. MR. HOFFMAN: Right. Where and we like that massing broken do wn in two. So even if we were to go office, we would have two parcels or two buildings there. The
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	right now, you have 6, sort of shows two buildings split on the site. MR. HOFFMAN: Right. Where and we like that massing broken do wn in two. So even if we were to go office, we would have two parcels or two buildings there. The commitment we are making is that it won't be

1	the residential, I think, com poses
2	approximately anywhere from 50 percent to 88
3	percent of the site. Yo u know, from it's
4	minimum to it's max, and the balance, I think,
5	is retail. It's probably 12 percent retail.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
7	MR. HOFFMAN: All the floor plates
8	are you know, have retail, strong retail
9	components in them. So we are just leaving
10	some flexibility appreciating that, you know,
11	this may be a few years out before we are
12	ready to develop that.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
14	MR. HOFFMAN: And we just can't
15	you know, there is only so much predictability
16	in the markets.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But
18	basically, you are saying that at least two of
19	the parcels would be residential you are
20	feeling?
21	MR. HOFFMAN: That is correct. I
22	am saying that at least two of those parcels

1	will be residential.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. And
3	my last question is there has been different
4	talk about the it sort of shows that as far
5	as the Wharf, the width between the waters and
6	the building, you are t rying to get near 60
7	feet?
8	MR. HOFFMAN: That's correct.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is that
10	fairly consistent? I know y ou one of the
11	sheets says it varies when you get to
12	MR. HOFFMAN: There are a couple
13	of unique situations that we have ac tually
14	talked with some of the neighbors. If you
15	look at P arcel 1, and this was actually
16	discussed a little bit ago, it is a little bit
17	of a pinch point there
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
19	MR. HOFFMAN: to get vehicles
20	out. And so there that is just a littl e bit
21	closer. That is approximately , I think it
	1

might be, 35 feet or in that ra nge, maybe 40

1	and not 60 in that area.
2	Actually, it is probably I
3	don't want to guess. Shawn, can you tell me
4	what it is in Parcel 1? We have a terrace and
5	we have 20 feet f or traffic and then we only
6	have 10 feet in that one area for pedestrian
7	flow.
8	MR. SEAMAN: I believe it is 40
9	feet and we h ave identified 10 feet that is
10	dedicated pedestrian in that zone, so there is
11	no shared space there. It's a 10 foot
12	pedestrian only.
13	MR. HOFFMAN: T hat is the area
14	where we transition down to the ex isting fish
15	market.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The
17	market, yes.
18	MR. HOFFMAN: As you go along t he
19	waterfront, one of our concer ns was h aving
20	this relentless march of open space. And so
21	interruptions and interest along the way are
22	an enhancement, we think, to that experience.

So it is interrupting in two places.

One is where the Gangplank M arina is and that's off to the right. You can see a box that's more to the right, if you've got a pointer. And then the other is Capital Yacht Club and that's over to the left.

And those are important, too, because what we want to do is get rid of those cages out there and all that security drab.

As Stan has pointed out, the majority of the piers here are open to the public. They are not secured off or privatized.

And so what these buildings or these structures allow is that you can go through the structure and then go onto the private piers for Capital Yacht Club and Gangplank Marina. But anyway it's a long explanation to let you know there are interruptions in that area.

And then there is a gr ove that we put off to the right in front of Gangplank where we have actually set the building back

NEAL R. GROSS

1	further than 60 feet in that area. And also,
2	there is an area in front of the Capital Yacht
3	Club. There are two and we have set the
4	buildings back.
5	And what that allows us to do in
6	addition to causing t he interruptions and
7	making new experiences, it allows access to
8	those areas for veh icles so they can turn
9	around and leave. So you could access Capital
10	Yacht Club without hav ing to drive on the
11	Wharf. You can go into that lane, come in,
12	drop off supplies or whatever, turn around and
13	go back, go in the parking lot or wherever.
14	And the same thing with holds true
15	with Gangplank Marina. So those two pieces.
16	And then when you drop down again, you drop a
17	little bit lower as you go to the right to the
18	existing in with the existing elevations.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
20	Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
22	questions? Okay. Let's move right on. The

1	goal is to try to finish tonight. That is our
2	goal.
3	Does the applic ant ANC-6D, do
4	you have any cross-examination? Does the ANC-
5	6D have any cross -examination? Okay. Mr.
6	Litsky, if you can come to the table? Turn
7	your microphone on, Mr. Litsky. It's on?
8	MR. LITSKY: Now it's on. I do
9	have a question for th e transportation
10	planner. How many vehicles does your traffic
11	plan indicate that you anticipate on the
12	shared use street over the course of an hour?
13	MR. VANPELT: Really, our traffic
14	analysis doesn't really make any assignmen t
15	for that shared use street. The street from a
16	functionality standpoint really isn't a
17	necessary street. It's more of a convenience
18	street. But if there i s but, yes, the
19	assignment really all the access is
20	oriented towards Maine Avenue.
21	MR. LITSKY: Okay. And I was also
22	wondering also on the traffic plan, the shared

1	use street is also going to have a streetcar.
2	What is your understanding about how often
3	the streetcar will be going down the Wharf?
4	MR. VANPELT: I thin k it I
5	mean, there is things that will have to be
6	determined about when the streetc ar would go
7	down the Wharf. I thi nk we would t hink it
8	would be off-peak times when off-peak being
9	when the pedestrian volumes aren't at thei r
10	heaviest. But I think during the headways
11	that are expected are about 10 minutes, so
12	that you could expect one about every 10
13	minutes.
14	MR. LITSKY: Okay. That's a
15	question I'll ask to DDOT as well. I do have
16	another one, if you will hang on just one
17	second. This is a question from the building
18	community. And the concerns are safety and
19	use.
20	While public access to the wate r
21	is great, has the team con sidered the safety
22	of the marine traffic with ka yaks along side

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	large dinner boats in a much narrower channel?
2	And so I would li ke to ask that question to
3	Mr. Sloop, I suppose.
4	MR. SLOOP: We have done a boat
5	traffic analysis in this area to look at the
6	traffic. And we have tried to create, at the
7	recreational pier, a small harbor. We have
8	moved the smaller boats away from where they
9	are today from the commercial docks into this
10	area.
11	MR. LITSKY: Okay. One more
12	follow-up on that as well. As for the mooring
13	fields, which is something about, which I know
14	nothing, it does put the boats, however,
15	pretty close to the wall. And what kind of
16	issues do you see might impact the manner in
17	which the Wharf is going to be used?
18	MR. SLOOP: In the mooring fields,
19	there is adequate depth near the wall for the

there is adequate depth near the wall for the smaller boats. And the dual point moorings allow them to be lined up parallel, so that they won't be swinging and they won't -- a

20

21

1	larger boat wouldn't be s winging into the
2	shallow, so it's all a m atter of control and
3	safety with the mooring fields.
4	MR. LITSKY: Great. Thank you. I
5	had a number of o ther questions, but I must
6	say that the Commis sioners actually asked
7	those questions yourselves. So thank you very
8	much for asking my cross for me on this one.
9	Those are the only questions I
10	have of the applicant.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
12	much. Let's go with, I'm not sure who is
13	going to cross -examine for Vestry of St.
14	Augustine. Mr. DePuy, no cross-examination?
15	Okay. Tiber Island? Mr. Hitchcock?
16	MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr.
17	Chairman. I have a couple questions for
18	clarification and it might be helpful to turn
19	back to the slide towards the end with a view
20	of 6 th Street South towards the waterfront
21	that shows Tiber Island o n one side and the
I	

proposed building for Parcel 11 on the other

1	side.
2	Commissioners, the analogue is
3	Sheet 5.19 in the supplemental filing.
4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Before or
5	after?
6	MR. HITCHCOCK: The after, please.
7	My first question is the sectional of the
8	proposed new structure shown on the right, is
9	that the sectional earlier on says it is to
10	be 45 feet. Is that what this is intended to
11	show here, a 45 foot structure?
12	MR. SEAMAN: The building height?
13	MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes.
14	MR. SEAMAN: Yes, 45 feet.
15	MR. HITCHCOCK: Now, in there
16	is a sheet towards the front, She et 2.2, that
17	indicated that there was g oing to be a
18	partially occupiable penthouse on the top that
19	would extend it up to 57 feet. What exactly
20	is that?
21	MR. HOFFMAN: I'll answer that.
22	There is a penthouse on it for accessibility

onto the roof. It is limited to -- in size just like any kind of mechanical penthouse would be. I think it is .37 for the zone. And so it is set way back.

And if we didn't say anything on that, it would be as high as 18 feet. We committed to only 12 feet and the total height of that structure. So, yes, we did mention that. We have mentioned that to the community and it is for roof access. And there is some living space up there.

MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. So in other words, the total in terms of the 45 foot residential building plus the penthouse will come in under the 60 feet that you are proposing? Is that correct?

MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, as in any standard conventional format when we are talking with roof heights, there are penthouses up and we were very careful to make sure that we explained our intentions all along.

MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. Thank you .

A question was raised by the Office of

Planning report dealing with lot occupancy for

Parcel 11. Would the lot occupancy, including

the donut hole so-called in the middle with

respect to where the garage will b e, and the

question that I have wa s in respect to this

drawing which shows fo r the building, the

considerable setback along 6th Street.

My question is is that designed to match the setback on Tiber Island?

I don't t MR. HOFFMAN: No. it is intended to match the setback on Tiber It is intended to provide Island. as much possibly could having green space as we listened to the community and them wanting more green space out there. In addition, to saving the trees that we are seeing there now as well. So we committed to hiring an arborist for that to save those trees the best we can and, in fact, put another tree planting out there.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	The reason the other reason
2	that the road is narrower is we have made it
3	into one-way traffic, so that we can real ly
4	reduce the amount of traffic coming in there.
5	So there is no through tra ffic pattern that
6	benefits anybody and we were doing that in an
7	effort for keeping that as calm as we possibly
8	could.
9	The only way you can enter that
10	street really is to come in where we are
11	putting in the circle and exit. So it really
12	only serves the neighborhood now.
13	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. Do you
14	recall offhand what the setback would be along
15	the building here on Parcel 11?
16	MR. HOFFMAN: I d on't understand
17	the question.
18	MR. HITCHCOCK: The reason I'm
19	asking you how many feet would there be
20	from the curb back to where the building
21	starts?
22	MR. HOFFMAN: Oh, um, Shawn, can

1	you, please, answer that? Because I think we
2	had a diagram
3	MR. SEAMAN: We have a diagram.
4	MR. HOFFMAN: to give you the
5	dimensions.
6	MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes.
7	MR. HOFFMAN: Can we find t hat?
8	There we go.
9	MR. SEAMAN: There you go.
10	MR. HITCHCOCK: Okay. Yes, we
11	hadn't seen that one b efore. I mea n, as I
12	understand it, it looks like 12 feet from the
13	curb to where the sidewalk ends and then 18
14	feet to the property. Okay. Thank you. That
15	answers the question.
16	MR. HOFFMAN: You're welcome.
17	MR. HITCHCOCK: I have nothing
18	further, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr.
20	Hitchcock. We are going to take a four minute
21	break and we will be right back. So if
22	everybody can just hold tight.

1	(Whereupon, at 9:01 p.m. a recess
2	until 9:04 p.m.)
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go
4	back on the record. The issue is that we have
5	to have three Commissioners in the room at the
6	same time and we only have three
7	Commissioners. So we are at a d isadvantage
8	tonight, but we're going to try to go ahead
9	and get through this. We don't want to keep
10	you all here until 12:00.
11	Okay. Let's go back with
12	Gangplank Slipholders, do you have any cross -
13	examination? Excuse me, please, come to
14	order. If you have a conversation you want to
15	continue, you can take it outside and then you
16	can rejoin us, but we want to continue.
17	Yes, sir?
18	MR. KOPP: Yes, we have
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Turn your
20	microphone on.
21	MR. KOPP: We just have one quick
22	question for clarification. We were curious

1	to know, the issue was b rought up about some
2	of the specifics with how marine traffic is
3	handled in the channel and how the narrowing
4	the channel might affect that traffic. And we
5	just want to know if that is actually part of
6	this zoning conversation right now or if that
7	was our details that actually should be dealt
8	with at a later time, pe rhaps in the next
9	stage, because we were not clear on how that
10	process works.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think
12	considering that some of that question h as
13	already come from here, Mr. Glasgow, if you
14	want to direct somebody to answer that
15	question?
16	MR. GLASGOW: Can you rephrase the
17	question again?
18	MR. KOPP: Yes. We just wanted to
19	try to clarify whether some of the details
20	regarding marine traffic and some of the

specifics with design in terms of the marinas

will be dealt with in the next phase of the

21

1	PUD as
2	MR. GLASGOW: Yes.
3	MR. KOPP: opposed to this
4	phase?
5	MR. GLASGOW: Yes. There will be
6	further detail on that.
7	MR. KOPP: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: More of the
9	specifics in the Secon d-Stage, okay. All
LO	right.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I
12	actually have a follow-up question on that.
13	To what extent does the Army Corps get
L 4	involved in those discussions on how the
15	channel is managed?
L 6	MR. HOFFMAN: To my knowledge, i t
L7	does not. It really is going to hopefully
18	grant the reduction of the channel, because it
L9	really serves the Corps no purpose, at this
20	time, much like an alley closing or the like.
21	But the regulation of it beyond that, they

would not be part of that.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Then
2	there is a legislative process that is
3	underway in terms of
4	MR. HOFFMAN: There is. There is
5	a current legislative process that is being
6	handled by Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes
7	Norton. I have met wi th her for tw o hours
8	last week. She is optimistic. We hope that
9	by the end of this year, that legislation will
10	be behind us. We recognize there are some
11	other tensions going on right now, having
12	nothing to do with us, but we do believe that
13	and we have a lobbyist involved to help the
14	process, so we feel comfortable that this is
15	going to happen.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to
17	the 6 th Street Homeowners.
18	MS. RANDOLPH: Thank you. The 6 th
19	Street Homeowners would like to know why was
20	it not possible to zone Parcel 11 as a 5-A.
21	I'm sorry, a B-5-A, which is a lower density
22	than a B R-5-B.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's simil ar to
2	the question I asked. And actually, I took it
3	from your I got the question exactly from
4	you, so we will go to Mr. Sher. Why instead
5	of R-5-A as opposed to R-5-B? I mean, R-5-B
6	as opposed to R-5-A.
7	MR. SHER: Well, the Comprehensive
8	Plan Future Land Use Map designates this site
9	for moderate density commerci al. That would
10	suggest that under the framework element of
11	the plan, the zones that are roughly
12	equivalent or fall within that mod erate
13	density commercial designation are C-2-A, C-2-
14	B and C-3-A.
15	We have we are asking for
16	residential. We are not asking for commercial
17	on that site. But the zone that is closer to
18	the density and height permitted under $C-2-A$,
19	C-2-B and C-3-A is R-5-B, not R-5-A.
20	R-5-A permits .9 FAR and 40 feet
21	in height. R-5-B permits 1.8 FAR and 50 feet

The zones that are there are

in height.

1	roughly 2.5 and 50 feet, 3.5 and 65 feet and
2	4.0 and 65 feet.
3	MS. RANDOLPH: But isn't it
4	correct that currently the church is Zoned R-3
5	and was zoned as such under the original 1960
6	Development Plan?
7	MR. SHER: Not quite.
8	MS. RANDOLPH: I have a copy
9	MR. SHER: It is
10	MS. RANDOLPH: of the zoning
11	report dated July 12 th . It says it is Zoned
12	R-3 for Square 473.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Randolph, you
14	asked him a question. Let him answer it.
15	MS. RANDOLPH: I'm sorry.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If you have
17	something else to
18	MS. RANDOLPH: I will.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: then you can
20	MS. RANDOLPH: I will.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
22	MS. RANDOLPH: I will apologize.
	1

1	MR. SHER: It is correct that the
2	property is Zoned R-3 from 1958 until 1998, it
3	was not zoned at all. It was designated on
4	the Zoning Map as UR or urban renewal. Zoning
5	did not apply to that site.
6	When the Southwest Urban Renewal
7	Plans expired 40 years after their adoption in
8	the mid 1950s, the District went around and
9	put zoning on those properties. The zoning
10	that was applied to the St. Augustine's church
11	site was R-3.
12	The Comp Plan land use designation
13	followed that. It did not comport,
14	necessarily, with R-3, but that's the zoning
15	that was applied when zoning was put there.
16	MS. RANDOLPH: Isn't it true tha t
17	really what you are seeking through using a
18	PUD is a variance of the R -3, even though you
19	are not pursuing a matter -of-right process?
20	And that you are attempting to destroy
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Randolph? Ms.
22	Randolph?

1	MS. RANDOLPH: I will pause.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, thank you. I
3	just need you to ask a question. I mean, not
4	the long
5	MS. RANDOLPH: Okay.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know, you ge t
7	your point across. Just ask him a question.
8	MS. RANDOLPH: Isn't it correct
9	that you are actually, in substance, pursuing
LO	a variance of the church's R-3 designation?
11	MR. SHER: No.
12	MS. RANDOLPH: I don't have any
13	other questions.
L 4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms.
15	Randolph. Let me ask, Ms. Randolph, I have a
L6	question for you. Wh ich church are we
L7	referring to?
18	MS. RANDOLPH: We are referring to
L 9	St. Augustine's.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: St. Augustine's,
21	okay.
22	MS. RANDOLPH: And may I j ust show

1	where it sits for a moment
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No.
3	MS. RANDOLPH: so that you
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No.
5	MS. RANDOLPH: No?
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, I'm fine.
7	MS. RANDOLPH: Okay. Do I have
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because I know we
9	have
10	MS. RANDOLPH: an opportunity
11	later to do that?
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You will have an
13	opportunity later
14	MS. RANDOLPH: Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Randolph.
16	Actually, you're going to have 60 mi nutes.
17	Okay. Let's go to the Office of Planning's
18	report. Did I mi sspeak? Huh? Yes, there's
19	only one party in opposition.
20	MS. TREGONING: Thank you very
21	much, Chairman Hood, Commissioner Schlater,
22	Commissioner Turnbull. It's a pleasure to be

here this evening. I have to say that it was very important to me to be here at this hearing and to support this particular project.

I think it's very rare in the city to have a sin gle project help to realize so very many of the city's aspirations. So, you know, I could -- our report covers a lot of this material, but I will just say that it really begins for us with the waterfront.

You know, this is a project, as many people have said, that has been decades in the making. You know, when you talk about the type of development that is happening here at the site, one of the important pieces of context is why are we developing this property along the riverfront to begin with?

You know, the Anacostia Waterfront
Plan is an important part of the city's
future, an important part of the fiscal
stability of the city. We are a city that
survives with much less than 50 percent of our

land on our tax rolls. Other capital cities around the country, other state capitals, have 85 percent of their land, 90 percent of their land on their tax rolls. 10, 15 percent that is Government land or for nonprofits.

For us, you know, that number is, you know, between 40 and 50 percent and every year nonprofit users can buy land and take that land off the tax roll. So i t becomes very important to us to not just make good use of the land that we have for the purposes of our fiscal stability, but also to take the lessons we have learned from the rest of the city about how to create really wonderful places, incredible wealth of amenities in a neighborhood, how to bring enormous diversity of transportation choices to a community and to mix the uses, so that you have activity all times of the day and night.

And I think this project really does a lot of that. In addition, it creates one of the most accessible multimodal points

NEAL R. GROSS

in the cit y, a real destination that has access to three transit lines within 10 minutes, plus commuter rail that is going to be able to be accessed by streetcar and circulator.

It is going to be a bikes haring hub, but you will also be able to access it through a mode that we hardly ever see in the city and that's by water. Whether that is kayaking or water taxi, s o it brings all of those modes together.

We have 16 million tourists that to visit the city every year. And for all intents and purposes, you know, this is a part of the city that they never see and can never get to. And the spending that they might want to do, the enjoyment of the city that they might want to have, you know, rarely goes to the waterfront, rarely comes off the Mall.

So one of the things that this project does is make a vit al connection from the L'Enfant Promenade and Banneker Ov erlook

NEAL R. GROSS

directly down to Maine Avenue. So it becomes a real pip eline, if you will, between the waterfront, you know, and the Mall for both the benefit of the res idents, but also as a place where visitors will be able to find and enjoy.

Matt Troy at DMPED already t alked about the affordable housing, so I won't go into that, but it's a very important part of the project, that it has an enormous amount of affordable housing.

It is also important to us that this is a project that grows a constituency for a clean Potomac and a clean Anacostia River. So many more people are going to have access to the river because of this project and be able to experience it every day and support the moves that the city wants to make toward a cleaner, more sustainable river and a cleaner, more sustainable city.

And I guess what I'll finally close with is that we fully expect this to be

NEAL R. GROSS

one of the great public places in the city.

And we -- I'll say again that we hardly ever have the opportunity to realize so many of our aspirations, but that is primary among those aspirations that we create a beaut iful, accessible, amazing waterfront.

And I think the amount of land that is devoted to public space, I'm not calling it green space, because I think some of the great public spaces in the world are, indeed, hardscape. You know, they are not all just grass and verdant, although there is a lot of that in this project as well.

But really amazing places where Washingtonians of every ilk can gather and enjoy this newly accessible waterfront with a wealth of new amenities that will add to the neighborhood and add to the vitality of the city.

Thank you for the o pportunity to express how important this project is to us.

MR. JESICK: Okay. Thank you, Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

Chairman and Members of the Commission. I'll take over now and I thank Ms. Tregoning for the overview of the br oad themes and the context which are guiding this development.

I would like to just very bri efly get into a little bit more finer grain detail about some of the changes that we feel have -- are important and that have been made since the time of set-down. These are issues that were raised by the Comm ission, by OP and by the neighborhood.

I think many of them have been spoken about already. One major change that would like to highlight is the added specificity in the uses in Parcels 1 through 5, as well as 9 and 11. We now know exactly what those uses will be and that gives us a better sense of what the build -out of the project will look like.

Also, as has been mentioned, some of the floor area ranges, the minimums and maximums have been narrowed, that will also

NEAL R. GROSS

help in our evaluation.

We also worked with the ap plicant over the last few months on the issue of phasing. And the applicant has committed at this time to construct the Waterfront Park as part of Phase 1 of the development. And that will be an important amenity fo r the neighborhood.

Also, we worked with the applicant to clarify their commitment to the continuation of utility service to the liveaboard community during the time of construction and transition of a new Gangplank Marina.

One thing that I don't think has been mentioned yet is the vastly improved commitment to bicycle parking on the property. The applicant has provided a range of somewhere between 1,500 and 2,200 bicycle parking spaces on -site, based on what the final mix of uses would be, so we appreciate that commitment.

NEAL R. GROSS

The applicant has also provided view studies that the Office of Planning has asked for, some of wh ich you saw in the PowerPoint and the rest of which are contained in the applicant's submission package. And the view studies show that the devel opment would meet Comprehensive Plan goals of maintaining views, including along major accesses such as M Street, 7 th Street and 9th Street.

As well, there would be a more fine-grained matter of buildings superior even to what was shown in the Southwest Waterfront Plan, which had a few larger buildings. With the proposal before us, there are many smaller blocks, which allow, as the Commission noted, more porosity through the site.

The applicant has also continue d discussions with NCPC and CFA about the views from Banneker Overlook and those renderings are shown in the package. And those organizations are supportive of the changes

NEAL R. GROSS

made to widen the fish market plaza.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Some building heights have also been changed since set-down. As the applicant mentioned, the residential building on Pier 4 has been lowered from 60 feet to 45 feet. The building on Parcel 10, which was initially shown as 70 feet in the original application materials, is now shown as 60 feet.

And for a more detailed view on the relationship of Parcels 10, 11 and Tiber Island, the Commission can refer to Sheet 5.8, which shows a cross-section of those developments.

benefits and of In terms amenities, the application has also updated with additional details, things like Intermediary Program, t.he Work Force streetscape improvements and affordable housing.

Phase 1 of the de velopment would far exceed IZ requirements, both in terms of the level of affordability and the quantity of

NEAL R. GROSS

the affordable units. And Office of Planning will review future phases of development for compliance with IZ as well.

A potentially significant ame nity is the affordable retail space. We think this would be a great amenity for the project and for the neighborhood. Ho wever, this item requires much more detail, we feel, prior to approval. There are many questions, such a s what is the level of subsidy, how long or what is the duration of the pro gram? Is it 10 years, 20 years or is it in perpetuity?

Where is the space located? How would the tenants be selected? These are the questions that we have about that potential amenity item.

Overall, however, the Office of Planning does feel that the level of benefits and amenities are commensurate with the amount of relief being sought through the application.

And overall in the application, OP

NEAL R. GROSS

1	feels that it would not be inconsistent with
2	the Comprehensive Plan, including the
3	Southwest Waterfront Plan, and we recommend
4	approval of the application.
5	I'm happy to take a ny questions.
6	I would also like to note that in addition to
7	the DDOT staff, which you previously
8	recognized, we are also joined by Ms. Nina
9	Albert from the Department of the Environment,
10	who would like to supplement her tes timony
11	with a verbal presentation and is also welcome
12	to take any questions.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
14	Mr. Jesick. Doe s she want to also present?
15	Okay. Let's hear from Ms. Albert and then we
	I control of the cont

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jesick. Does she want to also present? Okay. Let's hear from Ms. Albert and then we will go to DDOT. Can we do it that way? Because we are going to hear from everybody and then that way we will ask our questions on the back end. And we will do the same format, if there is any cross-examination.

Okay. Ms. Albert, welcome.

MS. ALBERT: Thank you very m uch.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think that this might be one of the first times that DDOE has joined this PUD process and we are very happy to participate in this very important project.

DDOE does not typically opine on density of uses in many of the requests that are made here at this Stage One PUD, and so it's not really our role. Really, we look at these early stage design opportunities as an opportunity to discuss water quality issues and also take a look at opportunities to design exemplary sustainable sites.

And I think that this project, in particular, because of its waterfront location and then also be cause of its size and scale and also because of the applicant's commitment to sustainable design, could be a very high quality sustainable project.

And we have heard that a little bit through their exploration of central heating plants and then also thoug htful integration of water site planning.

I did want to go through because I know that there have been some questions about stormwater management from the ANC and just to put on the applicant's radar. We did meet briefly, recently on July 5th to discuss some of the questions that they had about stormwater management, so I just wanted to touch on that for the benefit of the group here.

And also we work, as many of you know, very closely with the Army Corps of Engineers and so to the extent that there may be some questions about their process, maybe I can assist with those questions.

First of all, the Southwest Waterfront is located within the Anac ostia Waterfront Development Zone, which has certain special or unique stormwater manage ment requirements, well as green bui lding as It is also located within, and requirements. is very wonky, but, the municipal separate storm sewer system, the MS4 area,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

which is subject to an EPA permit.

And we are in the process of getting a new permit from the EPA which is mandating a much higher level of stormwater management for all District of Colu mbia properties within the MS4 permit area.

And it means that you have to manage a 1.2 inch stormwater runoff fall and you have to not only retain it, but then you also have to reuse it on-site. So that is a new type of requirement that the city has not faced before. It is quite controversial across the city and it's something that our Department, the EPA and private developers are wrestling with.

The permit has not been issued, but it is imminent. Once it is issued by the EPA, the DDOE's requirement is to very quickly turn around our comments, release regulations for public comment and go through that negotiation and then finalize regulations.

So that time period is somewhat

NEAL R. GROSS

unknown, but it may very significantly impact this project if it takes effect before building permits are submitted. And so we flag that very significant set of regulations for this development.

The second general comment that DDOE would like to make is with regard to the Waterside Development. So the increase in the size of the marina and the proposed pierhead line changes. This is sort of a first type of process that we have had to deal with like this, I think, in this c ity, which is expanding or changing the pierhead line.

And we are seeking right now -the applicant is going through a federal
legislative process to de-authorize the
Washington Channel, but then there is a
separate process for actually changin g the
dimensions of the pierhead line. And we are
seeking clarification from the Army Corps of
Engineers to do that.

And I guess I would just say that,

NEAL R. GROSS

again, without opining or speculating on the merits of an expanded marina and the piers which just personally I think would be -- is a very exciting proposition. The evaluation to water quality and to wildlife within the water is a separate evaluation that both the Army Corps of Engineers and DDO E would do at a later time.

finally, the green And then building standards, I believe that the applicant may be intereste d or may need to apply for an exemption from the Anacostia Waterfront Organization Act and that there may be a number of competing or different mandates between the Green Building Act what applicant has proposed and the Reorganization Act that we just need to discuss and that has been flagged for the applicant and I think that there will be follow -on conversations about that.

So those are so rt of the three areas of focus and comment and we think that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	this is really a prime project to exemplify
2	what a site of this s cope and size could
3	accomplish from a sustainability perspective.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
5	very much, Ms. Albe rt. We appreciate the
6	report. And if you could stick around, we
7	might have some questions for you along with
8	the Office of Planning.
9	Let's go to Mr. Parker or is the
10	presenter going to be Mr. Hansen? Mr. Hansen?
11	MR. HANSEN: Thank you,
12	Commissioners. My name i s Jamie Hansen. I
13	represent DDOT and I'l l be delivering our
14	testimony this evening.
15	Before I get into the details of
16	the testimony, I would lik e to give you a
17	little bit of background on the process,
18	according to DDOT.
19	DDOT has bee n engaged with the
20	applicant for at least a year going to
21	multiple meetings with the attendance of our
22	Associate Director, going to plannin g

meetings, going to design meetings, as well as meetings specifically around the scope of the impact assessment that we received and has been a part of this process for a very long time, much longer than is typical.

And so with that, I would like to commend again the applicant. Also, I would like to commend the application on the completeness of the impact assessment tonight. I think it would even be within reason to say that this type of analysis is somewhat unprecedented.

We don't get applicants that the evaluate 32 intersections, quite frankly. And so we are very grateful that the applicant has, indeed, gone the extra mile to make a complete study. They have also attempted to evaluate the modal splits, how people will get to transit, how they will, indeed, be sustainable from a transportation perspective and, quite frankly, that is not an easy thing to do. So they are very much to be commended

NEAL R. GROSS

for that effort.

I would also li ke to take this opportunity to attempt to explain how DDOT reviewed this project. Since this is a Stage One submission and not Stage One and Stage Two concurrently, the analysis or I'm sorry, the evaluation was slightly different than normal.

Normally, we would very much get down into the details of the project looking very closely at traffic impacts, how the loading works and how the signalization would work, that is not the case for this Stage One PUD.

This was what we tend to cons ider a planning level evaluation which means it did not go through the typical rigor of a DDOT evaluation going to other ad ministrations within our Agency.

Basically, what happened is we circulated it internally to get fatal flaws.

And none were returned to us from other administrations. And so what you are seeing

NEAL R. GROSS

tonight is the planning level analysis.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And I'll be glad to go into any detail if guestions come on that later.

We are also very pleased that the relatively conservative applicant took а approach to evaluating the impacts. applicant assumed that Maine Avenue and the vicinity of the project would be shrunk from lanes, t hereby potentially three to two increasing their imp acts or what would be perceived as their impacts by reducing the capacity analyzing a lower cap and facility.

Frankly again, this is a breath of fresh air. It is nice to see that an applicant is understanding the urban context and the city that we are trying to build and the mobility that we are trying to ensure for people in the District of Columbia whether they are residents or visitors.

We are very pleased with the aggressive mode splits. On the order of a

NEAL R. GROSS

third of residents, patrons, work ers will -are proposed to arrive by transit. Again,
this is -- these are things that we hope to
see.

They proposed a ped-friendly site that has a trail. It is lively and it is likely safer from a pedestrian perspective by increasing, and this may sound like a contradiction, but, allowing a level of vehicular traffic that will actually calm traffic and make it go slo wer. This is a relatively high-speed corridor and it has the potential to make it safe and then provide bicycle facilities as well.

And so in summing up our position, the way we see this su bmission is that it opens the door to approva l. What the applicant has demonstrated to DD OT is that this project can be approvable. Now, that being said, we would like to work with the applicant further.

There are some issues that I would

NEAL R. GROSS

like to take the opportunity to clarify tonight and I'm actually going to read a couple of statements that we have put in our report just to make sure that I explain what we meant when we put them in the report.

And so I'm reading from actuall y

And so I'm reading from actuall y page 4. I don't know if you have it, if you would like to read along.

But we have said "The study area of the applicant's analysis is not adequate to determine if the proposed changes are acceptable."

Now, that comes across as a very harsh statement, but that's DDOT language for while this applicant has done a lot of work, it is not necessarily the level of work that DDOT needs to seek to change an entire facility such as M/Maine Corridor. They have demonstrated that it will -- that it is likely to work, but there is still work to be done.

In addition, we discussed the need to or the po tential need for a station

NEAL R. GROSS

1	entrance at the sound end to L'Enfant.
2	I'll read again, "To reduce the
3	walking travel time, an additional st ation
4	entrance on the south end of L'Enfant Station
5	should be considered."
6	While this doesn't nec essarily
7	come as this is not necessarily a
8	requirement, but it is demonstrating the need
9	to provide for the mode split assumed. The
10	applicant needs to demonstrate that t he
11	residents and patrons will, indeed, u se
12	transit and part of that is to provide the
13	facilities necessary.
14	Does there have to be a s tation
15	entrance? No. That's something that seems
16	like it may work, but there is a pa llet of
17	opportunities that might work.
18	So at this point, I would like to
19	outline some of the areas for future
20	interaction that DDOT sees as necessary to
21	work with the applicant.

NEAL R. GROSS

DDOT will be initiating a study of

the southeast/southwest communities that encompasses all of the inner southeast a nd southwest neighborhoods, that will addres s largely the M Street/ Maine Corridor to determine what that facility should look like in the future, to address mobility needs fo r that area and we would hope to have that initiated in the not too distant future, but I do not have a time frame to guarantee tonight.

We look forward to working with the applicant on a variety of TDM measures to meet their very aggressive mo de split that they have assumed. We look forward to working with the applicant on the streetscapes that they have proposed, as well as the circle element that they have proposed along or at the intersection of M and Maine.

We look fo rward to working with them on the parking and loading requirements to determine what the parking should be and how the loading should work. We look forward to working with the applicant to determine if

NEAL R. GROSS

what -- if the shared use facility along the wharf, how that will work.

We look forward to seeing research to demonstrate how that can be a workable solution. We look forward to working with the applicant to address curb management in the neighborhood, so that potential parking spillover will not impact area residents.

We look forward to seeing how there might be -- how the proposed mitigations and potential additional mitigations will be outlined in the process.

And finally, we look forward, a s we have over the previ ous year, to being integrated into the applicant's process. So with that, I'll pause and then try to address a question that came up earlier about the DDOT process.

DDOT is now requesting that applicants submit final reports 45 days prior to the hearing, so that we can evaluate it agency-wide and get comments back to the

NEAL R. GROSS

1	applicant, an effort that things are much more
2	firm when we come to the Zoning Commission.
3	And so with that, I'll pause and
4	be glad to take your questions.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So,
6	Commissioners, 45 days DDOT is looking for
7	reports, so that's good. Thank you for
8	putting a time frame.
9	Let me thank the Office of
10	Planning, also District Department of the
11	Environment and DDOT for your very fine and I
12	think well-done presentations.
13	I only have one question and it
14	goes to Mr. Jesick. M r. Jesick, I want to
15	commend you, as I always do. You get reports
16	from certain Government agencies that I don't
17	see often, but you've g ot a report from the
18	Police Department. But I didn't understand it
19	when I read it.
20	So if you could help me understand
21	the email that was sent to you, that the
22	Police Department sent. I t may be a DDOT

issue, but I'm just curious, are we still in the same position that the former Commander Porter, I believe, wrote to you in this email back in May?

MR. JESICK: Yes. We received an email in response to our request for comments on this application from MPD. And the commander of the reviewing agency had questions about the potential for traffic impacts along M Street and, apparently, Maine Avenue. They mentioned Water Street, which is being, of course, removed.

So they were wondering about the etraffic on those streets, as well as access points to garages and, I believe, loading as well. But of course, we deferred to DDOT for analysis of traffic concerns and I'm sure that they will be able to provide further analysis as more detailed studies are submitted.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I th ink I got the commander's name wrong. It's Commander Kemprin, is the commander. So thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Commissioners, any quest ions of
2	either Office of Planning, DDOT or DDOE? Vice
3	Chairman?
4	VICE CHAIRMAN S CHLATER: Maybe a
5	question for DDOT and the applicant. It has
6	to do with these mode splits and I asked about
7	it before.
8	Is it possib le maybe you could
9	provide a comparison of this project to some
10	other projects that have been, large -scale
11	projects that have been, put before DDOT just
12	comparing the different mode splits, so that
13	we can understand how aggressive they are in
14	this case?
15	MR. HANSEN: Sure. We can do our
16	best to put that together a nd invite the
17	applicant to do that, too.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
19	Thank you. And then, I guess, one sort of
20	technical zoning question for the Office of
21	Planning.
22	Looking at the Future Land Use

1	Map, I look on the area around St. Augustine's
2	church and it shows it as a land use change
3	area, but the hatched area is green and white.
4	What am I supposed to make of that?
5	MR. JESICK: That is a mix of
6	parks, recreation and open space and low
7	density commercial. So I think what the plan
8	envisions is, of course, a great amount of
9	access to the waterfront there and I think
10	that is being realized in the Waterfront Park
11	that is being proposed with this application.
12	But it also doesn't rule out the
13	possibility that there would be some sort of
14	light retail there as well. I think the
15	applicant has also proposed some sort of
16	retail pavilion in tha t location, which I
17	think would has the potential to supplement
18	and even enhance the park experience.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: And does
20	the Pier 4 come out of that area?
21	MR. JESICK: Pier 4, I be lieve,
22	does connect to that hatched area and the

1	commercial pier as well, which would be just
2	to the north of Pier 4.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: What does
4	the Office of Planning think about that Pier 4
5	proposal?
6	MR. JESICK: We do not object to
7	the residential uses on the pier, as long as
8	the applicant works wi th the community to
9	attempt to address their concerns. I think
10	they have reached out to impacted neighbors,
11	but we do not object to the location of the
12	residential structure on the pier.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN S CHLATER: And yo u
14	think it is consistent with the Comprehensive
15	Plan?
16	MR. JESICK: Yes. Commercial in
17	the Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Map
18	does not necessarily rule out residential. As
19	noted earlier, I believe, the Comprehensiv e
20	Plan framework element says that certain zones
21	will be compatible with certain land use
22	designations. Those zones, such as the C

1	Zones also permit and, in fact, incentivize
2	residential uses.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Okay.
4	Great. Thank you very much.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
6	Turnbull?
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. I
8	have two questions. One for DDOT. You
9	mentioned you wanted reports 45 days, but I
10	think we only advertise 40 days out, so I
11	don't know, how do we coordinate that?
12	I mean, there is a t iming and a
13	schedule. I mean, if w e don't set up our
14	schedules for 40 days, how do you how are
15	we going to I guess the applicant has got
16	to read minds or
17	MS. STEINGASSER: I think what you
18	are referring to is the ANC notice of 40 days,
19	which is a little bit different than the
20	actual filing, because the filings come in and
21	then the notice is made . So, typically, we
22	see a little bit more than the 40 days. And I

1	think having the ap plication the
2	information filed with DDOT for 45 days
3	doesn't conflict with that.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Are you
5	sure?
6	MS. STEINGASSER: Pretty sure.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Ms.
8	Schellin, do you agree with that?
9	MS. SCHELLIN: If we fac tor in
10	it's about well, yes, I guess it would be.
11	It's about 65 days from the time. If they
12	file a prehearing statement, not all of them
13	file a prehearing statement. But if they do,
14	then there would be more like 65 days.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, it
16	sounds like we can muddle through it, I guess.
17	And my question for Ms. Alberts.
18	MS. ALBERT: Albert.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Albert.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Like Neil Albert,
21	Albert. Last name Albert.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Didn't I

1	say that? Okay.
2	MS. ALBERT: Like the man's f irst
3	name.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The
5	MS. ALBERT: Or Neil Albert's last
6	name.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What ar e
8	the sewers in this area now?
9	MS. ALBERT: Where do they run?
LO	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What type
11	of sewers are in this part of the city here?
12	MS. ALBERT: Well, there is just
13	regular sewers.
L 4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
15	thought you were talking about sep arate
16	sewers?
L7	MS. ALBERT: Oh, right. There is
18	this well, this is a little bit
L 9	complicated, but this is outside so in the
20	news, there is a lot of discussion of a plan
21	that DC Water is implementing to reduce or
22	eliminate the combined sewer

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.

MS. ALBERT: -- stormwater system.

So that is one part of the city. It covers about a third of the city. It goes, you know, right through, you know, sort of -- anyway.

Anyway, there is a geogra phic boundary. This falls outside of that. And so the way that the sewer system is setup in the city, is that DC Water regulates the combined sewer system and then everything that falls outside of that area is regulated by the District of Columbia and DDOE, and that's what they call the MS4 area.

And so it's just the municipal stormwater and sewer system. All the sewer lines actually run to DC Water and Blue Plains. And the storm system, so everything that handles all the rain and stormwater runoff from the streets goes into a separate stormwater system and typically falls directly into the river.

So all of your runoff from the

NEAL R. GROSS

1	streets in this MS4 area, you know, will, you
2	know, dump into the rivers. So we are trying
3	to mitigate that, that's all the news that you
4	hear about, the trash bill and other things.
5	But, you know, there are sort of filtration
6	process that we are trying to implement
7	throughout the city to reduce that kind of
8	runoff into the rivers.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So then
10	this development falls under that?
11	MS. ALBERT: Right. As does two -
12	thirds of the city. A majority of the city
13	falls under this area.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just had
15	a strange feeling we were maybe going to jump
16	through hoops and then still tie into a
17	combined sewer. I was just
18	MS. ALBERT: Yes, it's a sepa rate
19	stormwater/sewer system.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. All
21	right. Thank you.
22	MS. ALBERT: Sure.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: So is i t
2	your understanding that this project is going
3	to meet the inch and a quarter retention and
4	treatment standard?
5	MS. ALBERT: Well, they will be
6	subject to meeting that if the regulations are
7	in place prior to their submitting building
8	permits, yes. So it's sort of a timing
9	question. I would say it's possible that
10	their early stage building permits may or may
11	not. It sounds like the timing of the project
12	is very close to having to meet the new MS4
13	permit requirements.
14	I would almost bet that the second
15	half of the project, because of t iming, and I
16	don't know yo ur development time sche dule,
17	that it will most likely have to meet the 1.2
18	inch standard.
19	So I think right now, the
20	Anacostia Waterfront D evelopment Zone
21	requirements requires a 1 inch stormwater
22	management. It has a 1 inch stormwater

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	requirement and the applic ant has presented
2	some calculations. We just frankly need some
3	more time and the applicant needs more time to
4	do further design for us to really assess what
5	those calculated management goals are.
6	I don't know if that's clear.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: Perfect.
8	Thank you.
9	MS. ALBERT: Okay.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
11	questions? Okay. Let's go to cross -
12	examination. Does the app licant have any
13	cross-examination?
14	MR. GLASGOW: Just one
15	clarification question for DDOT, for Mr.
16	Hansen. With respect to the TDM measures and
17	streetscape and the circle and par king/
18	loading requirements, and those type of
19	mitigations, would you anticipate all of those
20	would take place as part of the Phase 2, Stage
21	Two process in the PUD?
22	MR. HANSEN: That is exactly how

1	we had anticipated it.
2	MR. GLASGOW: Okay. Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. ANC
4	Commissioner Litsky, do you have any cross-
5	examination?
6	MR. HITCHCOCK: No questions.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vestry of
8	St. Augustine, any cross-examination? Tiber
9	Island, Mr. Hitchcock, any cross-examination?
10	Okay. Gangpl ank Slipholders, Jason K opp?
11	Kopp? I'm sorry. Is it Kopp or Kopp? Kopp,
12	okay. Jason, no cross -examination? Okay.
13	6 th Street Homeowners, Ms. Randolph?
14	MS. RANDOLPH: No.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No cross -
16	examination. Okay.
17	All right. Let's move right on.
18	Let's go to organizations and persons in
19	support. ANC, I'm sorry. I must really be
20	trying to move. Let's go to the ANC, report
21	of ANC-6D, that's going to be C ommissioner
22	Litsky and Commissioner McBee.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LITSKY: Thank you, 2 Commissioner Hood. My name is Andy Litsky and 3 I live at 423 N Street, S.W. I have lived 4 there for the past 31 years on the same block for 34. I'm the elected ANC Commissioner for 5 6 ANC-6D04 and represent each of the land side 7 residential communities situated directl y adjacent to the Washington Channel, as well as 8 the Gangplank Slipholders Association, the 9 10 residential live-aboards, who will be 11 testifying later, who are the only residents living completely within the boundari es of 12 this PUD. 13

Tonight along with Commissioner McBee, I represent and speak for the Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6D on which I have served since 1998, seven of those as Chairman or Vice Chair.

The PUD under discussion falls completely within the boundaries of ANC-6D. I ask that you give our comments great weight as you deliberate this case.

NEAL R. GROSS

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The residents of southwest have long awaited for a plan that will adequately address the redevelopment of our waterfront and other areas in southwest. So serious have we been that in the beginning of the mid 1990s, the residents of southwest put our money where our mouths were raising more than \$110,000 of our own money for the Urban Land Institute to undertake a study determining the best use of this incredibly valuable resource for our neighborhood, for the city and for the Greater Washington Metropolitan area.

Now, nearly a decade and a half since, we have had four Mayors, three Council Members, the creation and dissolution of the Anacostia Waterfront Development Corporation, the passage of the Southwest Waterfront Small Area Plan and its incorporation within the Comp Plan, the absorption of NCRC into the Deputy Mayor's office and dra matic fluctuations in D.C. real estate and capital markets.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Today, we are ready to conclude this portion of the discussion, this conversation in which southwest residents and this ANC have been long a part and been a part since the very beginning. It has been a long time in coming.

The waterfront is the predominant reason why many of us live in southwest. This confluence of sea and sky along with our tree canopy, it's our primary resource. We wish to see it preserved to the extent that it can be and developed though tfully as it must be, acknowledging that it will adjoin an existing community of 10,000 residents.

Madison Hoffman-Madison Marquette has put for ward an am bitious envisionary proposal to construct a waterfront project where boats, public p pedestrians, cyclists, retail users, cultural come together in a programs comprehensive mixed-use and mixed-income development that reconnects the Southwest Waterfront to the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

adjacent residential areas of the Nat ional Mall.

And reclaims what we believe is our proud maritime her itage. As such, Monday, the 11 th of July, at our regularly scheduled meeting a quorum was present. Our Commissioners voted by unanimous votes 7-0 in Madison Hoffman-Madison support of Marquette Southwest Waterfront First-Stage PUD Case No. 11-03 with a number of concerns and conditions.

During the past week, my fellow Commissioners and I have met with HMW every day for at least two hours, as Monty had said, to discuss our concerns and conditions.

Toward that end, we are submitting a signed document, that Mr. Hoffman had signed, that addresses each of our 28 concerns on behalf of the -- we signed it on behalf of the partners on July 15th, this past Friday. I believe that you have a copy of that, that's an Attachment 1 to my testimony.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

This document shows that th e applicant complete agreement is in significant number of points for which we had concerns. We urge t he Commission incorporate or memorialize within your order those documents -- those items where suc h agreement has been reached.

items reference concerns These regarding the specifically bolded section s within our resolution and they include items traffic, the Gangplank Marina, bus walkway dedicated along the Washington Channel, the Waterfront Park construction staging, streetcars, parking south of M Street 6th. east of transportation and embellishments, maintaining existing tre e canopy, prohibition on Internet gaming, liquor licenses, official office space, parks within the development and the Titanic Memorial.

Three final items in our July 11th resolution also reflect ideas brought forward by our Near Southeast/Southwest Community

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Benefits Coordinating Council. We appreciate developer has addressed that the these concerns as well in this document you have before you in At tachment 1 and ask that the applicant's responses in the attached document under the topics Ward 6, Implementing and Monitoring Benefits and District Developed Community Partnerships be given great w eight as well.

There are a number of issues where we are closer to agree ment than not, but timing, as has been stated a couple of times, really precludes us from altering the content of our existing ANC resolution to reflect the progress, I believe, that we have made in the past couple of weeks.

I request that the Zoning

Commission provide ANC-6D with additional time

for us to schedule a formal meeting that will

enable us an opportunity to revise our

concerns and conditions, specifically related

to Pier 4 re sidential structures, the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 commercial pier, Parcel 11, massing, 2 Parcel 7 setback and the M Street landing. 3 As such, I would request that the record be kept open for a period of time that 4 you could specify. 5 6 The ANC does, however, have 7 ongoing concerns over a num ber of other issues, including transportation, what we call 8 Plan B, environmental issues, which I think 9 10 Albert adequately addressed to our satisfaction earlier on, and Parcel 6, 7 and 11 8. 12 13 Transportation. Those of us wh live in southwest know the challenges that 14 15 increase traffic alo ng Maine Avenue 16 Street has brought over the past several years with a tremendous a mount of construction, 17 certainly east of South Capitol Street, much 18 19 of which isn't yet populated and there is much more to be constructed. 20 fall af ter 21 This 10 years of

lobbying by this ANC, DDOT finally set aside

in this year's budget money to undertake a comprehensive traffic st udy from the fish market to the 11th Street Bridge. No time like the present. Everything is just about built.

that the District Department of Transportation on this matter, I think, unfortunately, they said that this was going to be something that they would choose to address in a larger context, in a more directed context in Phase 2. And we believe, unfort unately, that that was a poor decision. It should have been addressed now.

We are talking about the m assing.

We are talking about the streets. We are talking about a number of things that we think they could have, in greater depth, addressed, which they did not.

Specifically, we asked DDOT to express their opinion on a very busy mixed vehicle/pedestrian 60 foot walkway, which is

NEAL R. GROSS

1 really a critical element to this proposal. 2 And again, we didn't get much out of them. 3 another transportation matter though that didn't arise until 4 we heard it last Monday, that relates to the number of 5 6 people who will be accommodated at the theater 7 north of the project, at the north end of the project in Sections 1 and 2, I think. 8 We have been told all along that 9 10 this building could accommodate 2,500 people. Monday night at our ANC meeting, we heard 11 would now hold potentially 4,200 12 it 13 people, which is a significant difference. Greater clarification on the site 14 15 well as anticipated access/egress, 16 alternative transportation options and parking for that facility is really necessary. 17 On Plan B, ANC-6D is keenly aware 18 19 that the ultimate approval of this project, as

NEAL R. GROSS

dependent upon the Zoning Commission, but upon

it is presently before you, is

the United States Congress.

20

21

22

not solely

1	Presently, HR-723 will allow for
2	reconfiguration of the Washington Channel,
3	expansion of docks and will, if adopted,
4	provide the kind of vib rant Southwest
5	Waterfront that our n eighborhood has long
6	wanted and that we believe the Wharf is
7	promising and hopefully will be able to
8	deliver.
9	We further would hope that this
10	legislation will pass. However, A NC-6D
11	requests that the Zoning Commission ensure
12	that should an alternate Waterfront Plan be
13	necessary, that the needs of our com munity
14	will be fully considered by ensuring that the
15	ANC will be involved in discussions going
16	forward regarding the matter.
17	On Parcel 6, 7 and 8 , I'll skip
18	the environmental issues, because they have
19	been addressed specifically.
20	Parcel 6, 7 and 8, as the
21	Commission has also had questions , we

understand that there -- why there is a need

from the developer's standpoint to have flexibility pertaining to the use on those separate parcels.

However, this proceeding is height and massing. determine We fully support a mixed-use development and clearly understand that developers de sire to maximize the capital and future real estate m arkets going forward. We also acknowledge, upon further discussion with the applicant, these parcels may actually be closer to 50 percent residential and 50 pe rcent commercial retail.

And as such, there will not be an inconsiderable amount of parking at that location emptying onto Maine Avenue at rush hour and one might assume from a commercial building. Also in the evening serving Arena Stage or some of the other portions of the Wharf with that recently dedicated, recently vacated parking space.

We feel that th e plan needs to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

more adequately address this prospect and that's something I would hope that the applicant will address and DDOT will address as well.

The Wharf is a project that has excited the residents of sout hwest and our city since this applic ant was selected to develop the site five years ago. Since it has developed -- since then, it has developed, a sall good de velopments do, taking int o consideration a full range of neighborhood and District concerns.

Hoffman-Madison Marquette have sought our input at eve ry step of the way. They have held scores and scores of -- no, I guess, hundreds of me etings, 300, hey, engaging virtually every segment of our community. They really have do ne an outstanding job in this nature.

No developer, no city agency has ever made such thorough outrea ch to my community and I have lived in the community

NEAL R. GROSS

for 34 years. The team of Madison Marquette is to be commended for this.

The concerns and conditions that we put forward in our ANC resolution have been our opportunity to clarify and put things on the record. Some of these things are yet to be resolved, that's our job. We trust, but we verify.

Accordingly, on behalf of the ANC, I ask this Commission to move expeditiously to allow us to address and clarify our remaining concerns at which time I urge you to adopt this First-Stage PUD as clarified. Than k you for the opportunity to testify.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner. Let's see, Commissioner McBee? McBEE: O h, thank you very MR. I think Andy did a much. great doj summarizing some of our issues and some of the things and I appreciate Monty meeting with us this past Friday and hammering out some of final details. these certainly And

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

appreciating everybody who has participated in this. I couldn't say things better.

But I am asking you to leave the record open. This has to go back to our ANC for a vote for you to give great weight. And so I'm asking you to 1 eave this open. I'm afraid that our next scheduled meeting is on September 12th, but we wil 1 hold a special meeting to resolve this and get back to you.

I don't see any difficulties here, but I think the formality here is that we do have to take a vote and get this back to you to be able to have great weight considered here by the Commission.

understanding of our issue. We appreciate

Monty being so generous a nd I think that he

went out of his way to work with us, to hear

our concerns and I think that, you know, we

are working towards making this the project

that I think we all have a vision for and such

that it will work for everybody in our

NEAL R. GROSS

community. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner

Litsky, did you want to add something?

MR. LITSKY: I did want to add something. First of all, we did submit to you a resolution that we passed. And as part of that, we would hope that you will provide great weight to the comments that we have already provided you.

I think the -- those areas where we need clarification, that's where we would like great weight further refined. And it is to that extent that we are going to need our additional meeting. However, wh at we have done is we have presented you with our ideas and our concerns and really I would like you to consider those as you go forward with your deliberations.

But certainly, once we wind up having that second meeting, which hopefully will be very soon, we will be able to address some of those outstanding areas and we will

1	have an opportunity up until that time to meet
2	with the applicant to try to smooth down some
3	of the rougher points.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I believe
5	MR. McBEE: Yes. I don't think
6	I just want to make it clear that, you know,
7	we have sat down. Andy is correct. You know,
8	we are in approval. I think it's just ironing
9	out and making sure that we go through the
LO	legal process here of making this appropriate
11	for everybody, so that there are no issues
12	left out for questioning.
L3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think
L 4	that you all we will be able to accommodate
15	the ANC. I'm not sure of our time frame, but
L6	if hopefully this will be the only hearing
L7	that we have. I have already asked Ms.
18	Schellin to give me a date for September, but
L 9	hopefully we won't have to com e in on a
20	Wednesday, that's the goal.
21	So I think that you all will be

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

accommodated with the extra time and maybe to

1	be able to bring closer together some of those
2	issues you said still stand outstanding on and
3	I think we will be able to allow you an d Mr.
4	McBee the time to get the great weight.
5	So I th ink all that is doable.
6	All that is doable and we can do that. Okay.
7	Let's see, Commissioners, any questions?
8	Let me just say this, Commissioner
9	Litsky and McBee, your report was very
10	thorough, especially the one we haven't had
11	a whole lot of time to read the one w e got
12	tonight, but we appreciate your comments. And
13	when you say you agree, that really helps us
14	out. We can get to the points where we still
15	have some separation. But I appreciate your
16	testimony. Very well done, both of you.
17	Let's do cross-examination. Does
18	the applicant have any cross-examination?
19	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vestry of St.
21	Augustine? Okay. Tiber Island? Gangplank
22	Slipholders? 6 th Street Homeowners?

1	MS. RANDOLPH: No.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, we might a s
3	well cancel that Wednesday date. Let me see.
4	Okay. Let's go to the thank you, thank
5	you again. Appreciate it.
6	Let's go to the parties in
7	support. You know, this is so seldom that we
8	do parties in support. After the parties in
9	support, we do persons in support. And then
10	we go to parties in opposition and persons in
11	opposition.
12	All right. Well, who is are
13	you going to? Okay.
14	MR. DePUY: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You may begin.
16	Oh, okay, Mr. DePuy.
17	MR. DePUY: Jacques DePuy,
18	attorney with Greenstein DeLorme & Luchs
19	representing the Vestry of St. Augustine's.
20	It is my pleasure and privilege to introduce
21	Kwasi Holman, who is n o stranger to you,
22	Chairman Hood, since he served with you on

1	this Commission in 1999, 2000, 2001, I
2	believe.
3	He also has a distinguished career
4	with the Executive Branch of the Dis trict of
5	Columbia Government going back many years and
6	in the private side as well. But he appears
7	tonight in his capacity on behalf of the
8	church. And again, it's my pleasure to
9	introduce Kwasi Holman.
10	MR. HOLMAN: Thank yo u, Chairman
11	Hood and Members of the Commission. I think
12	my five minutes are up, but I am the Junior
13	Warden of St. Augustine's, not Augustine's,
14	St. Augustine's Episcopal Church and we are
15	pleased to appear in support of the
16	application of Hoffman-Madison Marquette.
17	This is a critic I am a long-
18	time southwest resident. I'm pleased to say I
19	have been a resident since 1963 and a member
20	of the church since it s inception in the
21	basement of Hogate's right around that time.

NEAL R. GROSS

And

I am excited about

22

the

potential of this PUD a nd what it means for our church in particular and our con tinued growth.

As you know, St. Augustine's owns the property at 600 M Street, also known as Lots 83 and 816 in Square 473.

We, in conjunction with this application, are requesting that what is now known as Parcel 11 in the PUD submission be rezoned from R-3 to R-5-B.

We went through a three-year, what we call, discernment process in the church and that is also known as soul searching where you think about critical issues like are we going to remain a church? Are we going to remain in this location? Are we going to just go out of business?

That was not an option. We decided to stay. We decided to commit to this development. And for over 20 years, we have been providing service to the community in southwest. We have a 20-year commitment of

NEAL R. GROSS

providing food to the homeles s through our Bread for Life Program. We have worked very closely by providing low cost meeting space to groups, nonprofits and other groups like the ANC, the Southwest Neighborhood Assembly, Alcoholics Anonymous and we are truly a committed church.

We believe that this parcel and the mid-rise development proposed by Hoffman-Madison Marquette on this property represents our best opportunity to continue to serve this community. The lot coverage, height of building, design and mix of u ses proposed by this development will provide a balanced solution.

And I should parenthetically mention that I'm a former president of the Tiber Island Condo Association, so I'm -- I know what I'm talking about when I'm concerned about both sides of the street.

And we understand that some of our neighbors may prefer that the existing church

NEAL R. GROSS

remain forever. It was built in 1965 and I wish it could remain forever, but the roof is in bad disrepair, the plumbing is atrocious and it is really time f or us to make that commitment to the next generation and generations to come in southwest.

So for that reason, you know, we realized that 45 feet is a footprint that we can live in, but I'm concerned that anyt hing less than that would, bas ically, dash our hopes. And there are very few churches left in southwest and we are the only church on the waterfront, so that completes my testimony and I will be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. All right. Let's see if there is any cross-examination. Any questions, Commissioners? Any questions? Let's do cross-examination. Applicant? Okay. ANC-6D? Tiber Island? Gangplank Slipholders? And 6th Street Homeowners?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MS. RANDOLPH: One question. I'll
2	go to the tab le. Are you presently the
3	president of the Tiber Island Condominiums?
4	MR. HOLMAN: No. I ne ver said I
5	was.
6	MS. RANDOLPH: Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you .
8	Thank you both.
9	MR. HOLMAN: Thank you.
LO	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good seeing you ,
L1	Mr. Holman.
12	MR. HOLMAN: Always a pleasure.
L3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go
L4	next with Tiber Island, Mr. Hitchcock?
L 5	MR. HITCHCOCK: Thank you, Mr.
L 6	Chairman. For the record, Conrad Hitchcock on
L7	behalf of the Tiber Island Cooperative Homes.
L 8	We have submitted already for the
L 9	record a detailed prepared statement and also
20	a shorter PowerPoint presentation. In t he
21	interest of time, we won't put it up on the
22	screen, but I would like to introduce Paul

Greenberg, who is the immediate past-president of the association, who will run through the points that are in the PowerPoint deck.

One point I would like to make at the beginning, we understand that this is, of course, a Phase 1 PUD. However, we are looking at phasing, which could last for 10 years, which may mean that at the Tiber Island end of the program, we wouldn't be revisiting these issues until 2019 or 2020. And that's a long time from now.

So if I could leave the Commission with one thought, it would be important from Tiber Island's perspective to try to nail down as many points as possible in any order that the Commission may adopt here, so that the Commission, the applicant, neighbors do not have to relitigate issues, you know, at some point down the road when the more specific proposals come in for Parcels 10 and 11.

And with that, I would like to introduce Mr. Greenberg. We are pleased to be

NEAL R. GROSS

1	here as a party in support. There are some
2	specific concerns. They are all laid out in
3	the papers.
4	In addition, we would like to
5	submit a letter tha t we received from Mr.
6	Hoffman, which summa rizes a number of the
7	points as to which there is agreement from the
8	applicant, which will help shorten the
9	presentation here. Mr. Greenberg?
10	MR. GREENBERG: Yes.
11	Commissioners, am I on? That's better.
12	Commissioners, Paul Greenberg. It is good to
13	see you again, Chairman Hood. It has been a
14	while.
15	And actually I'm not
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good to see you,
17	too.
18	MR. GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm
19	actually not goin g to go throug h the
20	PowerPoint presentation, because I think that
21	the prepared statement and the PowerPoint
22	presentation are really self-explanatory.

Our concerns have been fa irly straightforward. First, we would say that we have also appreciated the exemplary efforts on the part of the developer to work with us. And we acknowledge that they have gone a long way toward meeting many of the concerns that we were -- that we expressed with earlier iterations of the plan.

In addition, I will acknowledge that some of the concerns that we have raised in our statement have already been addressed and I'm not going to apologize for perhaps being a litt le out of sync with the development as it currently is being presented to you.

Issues about the height and the massing of some of the buildings closest to our property at 6th and M have been a bit of a moving target. And as I think you have heard from other witnesses, even in recent weeks, there have been -- there has been movement on the part of the developer to meet some of the

NEAL R. GROSS

concerns of the community and some of those concerns are the same concerns that we have expressed.

So with that in mind, let me just say that we have had ongoing concerns about the height and the massing and the setbacks of the buildings at certainly Parcel 11, which is immediately adjacent to us, also at Parcel 10 and Parcel 9.

The building at Parcel 9, which is proposed to be one of the 130 foot tall buildings, which is very close to Arena Stage, we think probably should be a lower building.

The building at Parcel 10, which is actually closer to the river than the Parcel 11 building, is proposed to be a taller building. We think that actually the size —the heights of the building probably should be the same.

We are not opposed to the residential properties proposed at Pier 4, but we would like to spend j ust a moment talking

NEAL R. GROSS

about some of the problems that are associated with that.

That is to say that, you know, 6 th Street, the streets end f ar short of Pier 4 under all of these plans. There have been various versions of the plan that have suggested that there would be a full public roadway going all the way down to the Harbor Patrol Headquarters.

And we early on, you know, expressed reservations to the developer that we thought that that was simply going to be a roadway that large num bers of people were going to be cruisin g around looking for a place to park.

And there has been an indication that there would continue to be a roadway of some sort down there, but that it would be marked as being authorized access only.

In addition, it is our understanding that the developer is talking about some reserve parking, essentially, on

NEAL R. GROSS

1 the promenade or in public park area for the 2 quests of residents at Pier 4. 3 let me j ust say that, you And 4 know, we recognize that certainly in terms of the Harbor Patrol, as well as Pier 4, there is 5 6 a need to have a paved surface of some sort 7 that can ac commodate heavy, you know vehicles. 8 9 Now, however, we are oppos ed to 10 anything that looks like a public street going down that way. And we also are o prosed to 11 reservation of any of the space, quest parking 12 13 for residents on the pier. Now, our view if that if there is 14 15 going to be reserved parking for 16 residents, it probably should be in underground parking lot 10 17 at the Pier structure -- at the Parcel 10 structure, 18 19 excuse me. 20 Thank you both for CHAIRMAN HOOD: your testimony. Commissioners, any questions? 21

Okay. Any cross-examination,

Any questions?

1	Mr. Glasgow?
2	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
4	Commissioner Litsky or McBee, any cross-
5	examination? Mr. DePuy or Mr. Holman, any
6	cross? Mr. K opp, any cross? Ms. Randolph,
7	any cross?
8	MS. RANDOLPH: No, thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Al l right.
10	Thank you very much. We appreciate your
11	testimony.
12	MR. GREENBERG: No problem.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
14	let me just say so after your final meetings,
15	so your prepared statement that you sent has
16	changed a bit. Is the re a revised statement
17	that you are going to submit regarding the
18	issues you feel are still outstanding or is
19	there nothing outstanding so far for you?
20	MR. GREENBERG: We certainly could
21	submit a revised statement . It's not a
22	problem.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I was just
2	curious. We sort of left hanging this to you
3	feel comfortable, but it sounded like there
4	were still a few points that you just wanted
5	to reiterate.
6	MR. GREENBERG: The issues that
7	seemed to have been addressed t o our
8	satisfaction involve the height and the
9	setbacks on the Parcel 11 building, that's the
10	St. Augustine's church building.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
12	MR. GREENBERG: We think that what
13	the current plan, at least as it has been
14	described this evening, goes much of the way
15	towards resolving whatever concern we have
16	had.
17	Additionally, the information that
18	we received about t he lower height of the
19	proposed buildings on Pier 4 re ally addresses
20	our concerns there. There are outst anding
21	concerns about the height of the Parcel 10

building and the Parcel 9 building, as well as

1	the roadway access and parking access to the
2	Harbor Patrol
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
4	MR. GREENBERG: and to the Pier
5	4 structure.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
7	Well, I didn't know if you wanted to submit
8	something for the record.
9	MR. GREENBERG: Well, I think
10	actually with that clarification
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
12	MR. GREENBERG: we probably
13	don't need to.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. All
15	right. Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Great .
17	Thank you very much. We appreciate your
18	testimony.
19	MR. GREENBERG: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's go right t o
21	Gangplank Slipholders, Mr. Kopp.
22	MR. KOPP: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You can begin.

MR. KOPP: Good evening, Chairman Hood and the Zoning Commission. Thank you for your time tonight. My name is Jason Kopp.

I'm the elect ed-President of the Gangplank Slipholders Association.

As our name suggests, GPSA slipholders represents all within Gangplank Marina. Ou r members include property owners who live or work year-round on their boats, as well as those who commute to D.C. and spend time on their boats and those who use the marina for recreational boating.

With 94 live-aboard residences in the marina, we represent the l argest live-aboard community on the east coast of the United States. We are a vibrant and unique community with historic ties to the Southwest Waterfront. And we live within the proposed area to be developed and the project will clearly directly affect our homes and places of work. And we are the only people living in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that area, as Commissioner Litsky stated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

We have been working for over 10 years to secure a place for our community in this new development. And we are thankful to the support we have g otten from community groups, from the ANC-6D, Southwest Neighborhood Assembly, Near South Southwest Community Benefits Coordinating Council, as well as the D.C. Government and the Office of Planning and the Offic e of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development, as well as the applicant and the amazing outreach the y have done in the community and to try to understand our concerns and our needs in this case.

We are happy with the comm itments that the applicant has made in their current PUD. The applicant has committed to working in partnership with GPSA to ass ure a successful transition plan, including continuity of existing services and amenities for all slipholders.

NEAL R. GROSS

And the applicant has also committed to creating live-aboard slips in the new marina for the purpose of retaining the existing 94 live-aboard slipholders in the new development.

We note there are still a number of outstanding issue s that we haven't yet reached resolution on. We don't expect to reach resolution, at this time, but these issues, for the record, are: Policies associated with transfer of live -aboard status, which constitutes a signifi cant portion of equity with the vessels it is associated with, the details of how essential services will be provided throughout transition, details on pricing of slip keys in the new marina and the lack of a backup plan should complications in the proposed plan arise or the required Congressional Bill fail to be passed.

However, we support, at this spoint, this First-Stage of the PUD process,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	based on the understanding that the applicant
2	will continue to work with us to address these
3	issues and trusting that all parties involved
4	will act with our community's best interest in
5	mind.
6	We are enthusiastic about this
7	project and we are excited to work with the
8	applicant to help create a world class vibrant
9	waterfront that we think D.C. residents will
10	want to visit, live in and support.
11	And we also want to commend the
12	developers for includi ng us i n interim u se
13	plans as well as long -term development
14	discussions in terms of what the Wharf will
15	eventually look like.
16	We think this is a good plan for
17	Gangplank, for South west D.C. and for the
18	District as a w hole and we are happy to
19	support it.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
21	very much. Commiss ioners, any questions?

Okay. Does the applicant have any

None.

1	cross-examination? ANC -6D, any cross-
2	examination? Vestry, any cross-examination?
3	Tiber Island, any cross -examination? 6 th
4	Street, any cross-examination?
5	MS. RANDOLPH: No, thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
7	very much. Let me go to my list of support
8	and I'm going to try to get as many people up
9	as possible. We have five seats. Fredrica
10	Kramer, Marcia Bachman, hopefully I d idn't
11	pronounce that you can pronounce it when
12	you come up. Let's see, Kay Wi lliams,
13	Reverend Ruth Hamilton and Eve Brooks. I
14	think that's five.
15	MS. KRAMER: Who do I give this
16	to?
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm going
18	to start on my right, the young lad y to my
19	right. From my right to my left. We'll start
20	with you to m y right. Turn your microphone
21	on.

KRAMER:

MS.

22

is

Sorry. My name

Fredrica Kramer. I live in River Park, 387 O Street, S.W. I have been a resident of Near Southwest since 1975 and I support the redevelopment of the Wharf with great concern on specific aspects of the plan.

I'm not sure I'm in the right panel, but I'll go ahead and give you my statement. I want to only address two issues today, but I think ha ve not been well -addressed and I hope to provide additional input for the record.

The first is traffic, ingress/
egress and density. There has been to my
observation no credible and indepen dent
traffic study that addresses the huge increase
in residents, visitors and commuters to
southwest offices and the Southeast N avy Yard
development.

Maine Avenue cannot now handle traffic during rush hour, special events, ball games or inclement wea ther. The proposed traffic design, including 20 rail parking that

NEAL R. GROSS

would effectively remove a lane from Maine Avenue, many new crosswalks and traffic lights to service new foot traffic from the north and the proposed traffic circle at 6th Street will further slow the traffic.

The combined effect of perhaps doubling the number of new docks of 4,000 to 5,000 entertainment spaces running 200 events a year and an exponential increase in FAR from new residences, hote 1s and offices at 130 feet, which I hope is not the n ew normal for D.C., is a massive increase to the population and transient use of southwest and the current transportation and traffic systems will absolutely be unequipped to handle it.

Secondly, the pedest rian-only preserve along the water. The planned pedestrian-only pathway along the waterside of the site, which many of us asked for and I'm happy is in there, is raised f rom the current 8 foot level to the same level as the rest of the 60 foot width from building line to the

water.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

There is no reason to make this dedicated space level with the rest. The current path is a serene protected space, very heavily used from at least 6:30 in the morning, which I can attest to, to evening by Army Cadets, neighborhood running and walking exercises, fishermen, idle strollers. uninterrupted, not just li near passage, but isolated from the activities that go on above exponentially will increase in the and proposed development.

yards development gets it The right with boardwalk footpaths and its boulders that are low and close to the water preserving immediate and intimate an connection with the river. The pede strian uses start low in some p laces at the water's edge and gradually rise to building heights, one or two blocks away from the river.

Major structures within the river cite the new law of residences and so forth

NEAL R. GROSS

1	are dotted throughout the site. This is a
2	very different vision of how to use the river.
3	The new footpath could be
4	narrower, perhaps only 12 feet and that would
5	add more space for the res taurants and other
6	activities above, but it would be protected
7	from them.
8	On a related point, buildin g
9	massing at the yards is primarily on the
10	commercial M Street Corridor.
11	We have heard different
12	justifications for raising the path. At last
13	week's ANC meeting, the developer mentioned in
14	passing they wanted to close off the whole
15	space with special events and on occasion
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Excuse me, e xcuse
17	me. Here is what we're going to have to do.
18	MS. KRAMER: I'm almost done.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's usually th e
20	first we are going to have to stop. If we
21	don't have your testimony, yo u're going to
22	have to provide it to us.

1	MS. KRAMER: I do . It's right in
2	front of me. I'm sorry, I didn't
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Okay.
4	MS. KRAMER: I'm sorry.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's all right.
6	MS. KRAMER: Excuse me.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We will just
8	hold tight. We will read your testimony. We
9	are going to have to kee p it unless everyone
10	wants to go to another hearing.
11	MS. KRAMER: No, that's fine.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So what I'm trying
13	to do is no, I'm not m aking you the
14	example. I'm just saying for everyone from
15	this point on, we need to make sure we watch
16	the clock and when the time stops, let's stop.
17	And we pretty much will have your testimony
18	if you provide it to us in writing and if not,
19	we will work something out s o you can get it
20	to us. But we will take your testimony now
21	and next we will go with you.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You can hold you r
2	seat.
3	MS. KRAMER: Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
5	MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening. My
6	name is Kay W illiams and I am a current
7	resident of Harbor Square. I'm also the
8	current President of the Harbor Square
9	Homeowners Cooperative Board of Directors.
10	We have spent a lot of t ime as a
11	board and collectively working with t he
12	developer on this project. We have chosen and
13	decided to support this project through the
14	majority of the board members and many of our
15	residents.
16	I'm not going to bore you or take
17	up time saying how many things we have gone
18	through, how many meetings to try and mitigate
19	and make things work for our residents.
20	It has been an enormous amount o f
21	meetings, an enormous amount of coming to us,
22	us going to the developer and we all

appreciate that.

The most difficult issue for us is one of balance. And it is the one that we are struggling the most with and it is all about Pier 4.

We have worked with the developer.

They have mitigated the height. They have mitigated the footprint and we appreciate that. I have been very honest with everyone on the team. Harbor Square would prefer that there was no building on Pier 4. We like not having a building on Pier 4.

But we saw it for the first time, the first week of June, and we have been working with them ever since then to try and mitigate that impact.

We do not oppose what ANC says about wishing that we had more work to do with that, but we have to sa y, as a board, the majority of the board and as many of our residents, we are excited about what this is doing to the sou thwest. We think they have

1	done a tremendous amount of work to make this
2	happen.
3	And we want to continue to be able
4	to work with the developer on this, but that's
5	our biggest issue and I would be remiss in our
6	responsibilities if I didn't brin g it before
7	the Commission. Thank you, sir.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
9	much. Next?
10	MS. BACHMAN: Y es, hello. I'm
11	Marcia Bachman. I' m the President of the
12	Waterside Towers Residents Association.
13	Our association is incorporated to
14	act as a neighborhood improvement organization
15	dedicated to promote the common good and
16	general welfare of all the residents in
17	Waterside Towers residential complex and the
18	civic betterment of the residents of the wider
19	neighborhood of Southwest Washington and of
20	the entire District of Columbia.
21	So in t hat light, we very much
22	appreciate the opportuni ty to express our

views.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the Waterside Towers i s Now, directly across the street from what, Ι believe, is Parcel 6 and Parcel 7. So we are very much affected by this and our ANC Commissioner has offered to set up a meeting for us with the developer. We haven't had the opportunity to do that yet, but we do have -so I wanted to say that we, in general, are very, very supportive of the eco development.

We do have a few concerns a bout Maine Avenue between 6th and 7th Street and the Parcel 6 and 7, because that's, you know, right next to us and affects our members so much.

Our members occupy res idential units that are low-level townhouses. And the WTRA recently won a court ruling from the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to enforce the rights of tenants to acquire that property. So as prospective landowners,

NEAL R. GROSS

the WTRA and its members are particularly interested in the value and how to value that property.

And, you know, I have to just say it's really intimidating to think about 130 story or a 130 foot office building looking down into somebody's backyard on to their patio and into their r bedroom window. And that's what we are talking about with Parcel 6 and 7.

And also, we have three hi-rise buildings on our property, our complex. And the Parcel 6 and 7 by being 130 foot, even if you angle them, when you angle them this way and that, but you are back at o ur towers, it creates a solid wall of concrete that covers up the horizon.

Right now, the people in our towers pay premium prices as you go higher up in those buildings. And I have been up in those apartments in the past few weeks, they are going to lose their view entirely and they

NEAL R. GROSS

are paying premium for it.

So it's very important for us to work with the developer and maybe think about, you know, the density, the massing, the height of those buildings on Parcel 6 and 7.

Then with regard to buses and traffic, I want to second what the lady -- two ladies over next to me just said in terms of traffic and congestion. We see there -- we watch the baseball traffic and the tennis tournaments and Arena Stag e and it is very congested. It's not just commuters going back and forth, but all these events that go on.

Where are they going to divert to?

That traffic is going to continu e. We are talking about people w ho come down for the fish market on the weekends. Where are they-how are they -- are they going to divert and go up 6 th and 7th Streets and then out I Street?

I mean, this is -- we are not going to stop the traffic. We want traffic.

NEAL R. GROSS

We want people to come to southwest and enjoy what we are offering here.

So turning Main e Avenue into on e lane of traffic, I don't think is the right solution.

And then the buses, we would request, please, we can't tell what is planned for city buses. We saw that they were going to have them or the to ur buses, rather, park down at Pier 4. And then we heard now they are going to move them some place else.

Currently, they park on M aine Avenue between 6th and 7th Streets. And that's again, they are 35 from just feet somebody's living room. You go out on your patio and you get bus fumes and noi We would ask the developer to work with DDOT and with us in whatever we can do to put a stop to that.

There is plenty of other places in southwest. They could go two blocks over to Buzzards Point and park over there. I don't

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

know why they have to -- Maine Avenue ought to be this beaut iful lovely boulevard, t hat's what we want for this de velopment. So let's get rid of th ose tour buses on Maine Avenue between 6th and 7th.

The setback on the -- on Maine Avenue, we think it ought to be the same green space on both sides. They are on Parcel 6 and 7. You know, I heard a lot of really positive things and I thank the Hoffman -Madison for thinking that through. Maybe take another look at how much greenery they are going to put there and possibly maintain the same 37 foot setback on both sides of Maine Avenue.

Again, this particular block of Maine Avenue between 6th and 7th is residential. It's heavily treed. I loved what the people said about the trees. That is the charm of southwest. And so let's, please, retain those trees.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MS. BACHMAN: So thank you very
2	much
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.
4	MS. BACHMAN: for this
5	opportunity. And could I actually
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Next?
7	MS. BACHMAN: be able to revise
8	the comments?
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Yes,
LO	you can give that to us.
L1	MS. BACHMAN: No, I mean to revise
12	them to keep the record open?
L3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Revise your
L 4	comments? Let's see if we are we are going
L 5	to probably leave the record open, so, yes.
L 6	MS. BACHMAN: Okay.
L7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You would be abl e
L 8	to do that.
L 9	MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Next?
21	REV. HAMILTON: Hi. M y name is
22	Ruth Hamilton and I'm C hair of the Board of

the Near Southeast/Southwest Community
Benefits Coordinating Council and I want to
thank you for your service to the public,
which is a great service.

Our Council be gan in 2005 with public meetings, also done on the waterfront to organize our community in the face of all the redevelopment that was coming into Near Southeast/Southwest ANC-6D and out of that came this not-for-profit CBCC that is the most diverse, economically diverse, board in our neighborhood. And so it has a unique perspective.

joined our ANC We have -6D Commissioners and SWNA, Southwest Neighborhood Assembly, whose testimony you will hear, supporting the applicant. And like our neighborhood's elected leaders, we h specific requests of you, the Zoning Commission.

And we particularly ask you to affirm and memorialize in your definitive

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ruling certain agreements that now are going to be scattered across to the agencies.

Particularly, most of the testimony that we have heard tonight is related to massing, site line, circulation, etcetera. CBCC limits its testimony to matters that relate to our urban and national issues of poverty, unemployment, affor dable housing and opportunities for growth.

So we would ask you, first, to memorialize this whole notion of Ward 6 and southwest preferences. As ci tizens of the District, we're grateful that the city negotiated a really strong community benefits in the LDA. And that our District wards with the highest rate of unemployment were named specifically.

But as residents of Ward 6, and specifically ANC-6D, we are aware that within blocks of this wonderful development, we have neighbors who have been living in generation and generations of poverty and who are wary of

NEAL R. GROSS

promises that development is going to deliver benefits and not just remove them eventually.

Southwesters see any new redevelopment as the change to right the wrongs that were done in the urba n renewal of the '50s and '60s. And if this is to be a legacy project, as it has been named, unless the current residents of this neighborhood and specifically -- are specifically targeted for services and preferences, it is as memory that first remo val has been of forgotten.

And we ask that your ruling help that be remembered. ask So we you highlight in the ruling the language from the 2008 First Source Agre ement that has That the applicant shall use good signed: faith, diligent efforts to hire residents of Southwest Washington for such new jobs; that you will include in your ruling that the Work Force Intermediary Program will, at a minimum have a satellite location in southwest; that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you will include in yo ur ruling that the affordable housing plan make provisio n for reasonable preferences for residents of and workers who provide services in Ward 6 for all of the affordable categories that have been outlined; and that you will include in your ruling that 5 percent of the 35 percent CBE requirement be procured from Ward 6.

This is currently nowhere that can be enforced.

Memorializing, secondly, a process for implementing and monitoring these benefits as they are related to sou thwest, others can speak to their wards. We speak to our neighborhood. CBCC commends the applicant, as others have said, for significant outreach to the southwest community and other wards as they are related to the project.

We also understand that when it comes to monitoring enforcing, the devil is in the details and we are p repared to work with your Zoning PUD Enforcement Officer related to

our areas of concern.

And so it is so critical that at this Stage One that you spell out the process by which the community will have a role in implementing and monitoring benefits. It is not enough to have one on the shelf.

So in this response that you have in your record that the applicant made the ANC-6D resolution, particularly in those last three sections of that, p age 11 and 12, the applicant has stated "That outrea ch with the community has been ongoing and is anticipated to continue through Stage Two PUD process and through construction of the project.

HMW will con tinue to work with ANC-6D and other southwest neighborhood-oriented committees that are acknowledged by the ANC in the areas of work force development, certified business, enterprise hiring and affordable housing."

 $\label{eq:would ask that the Commission} % \begin{tabular}{lll} \textbf{We would ask that the Commission} \\ \textbf{In its ruling name CBCC as one of those} \\ \end{tabular}$

NEAL R. GROSS

entities. We have been ac knowledged both by the ANC and by SW NA in its testimony that we are the group in the neighborhood acknowledged to provide leadership in these areas. We would like to be named as such.

And we also ask that the Commission's ruling specify a time frame for community engagement that goes beyond through construction of the project, because this is a long lease and enforcement needs to be long-term.

Finally, we want to have you memorialize a partnership for community enrichment and services. We are extremely grateful to Mr. Hoffman that he has signed a statement, again noted earlier, to forge an ongoing relationship with the ANC-6D and the community to realize the vision for a long needed community center.

Mr. Hoffman's support, he understand that it's not enough to invest in buildings, piers, streets, we have to invest

NEAL R. GROSS

in people. And so we ask that you would be the keeper of our memory.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

REV. HAMILTON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next?

MS. BROOKS: I'm Eve Brooks. I'm a member of CBCC's Board and Executive Committee. And I want to just talk a little bit more about the community, the need for community development and for community planning and social planning that goes along with the kind of development the Wharf has —will provide.

The Wharf is going to attract ne w residents, particularly young families who will need child care and they will need a quality education and seniors who will want to age in place. Subsidized facilities and proactive social planning will translate into a stable, engaged and safe community where low-income and middle -income families can thrive.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

The need for a facility or campus of sites for social enrichment and support is great. In southwest, it need not be on the waterfront, but it must be in southwest.

There is a wasteland when it comes to children, youth and family services despite the fact that we have four public housing projects.

We have in the last decade lost all of our social agencies. There are lost a Boys & Girls Club, a small settlement local Child house and the Welfare Collaborative that targeted our most families at great est need. They have all closed.

And there is nothing in -- with the city that is going on at this point or the developer or the community agencies. All of us need to be engaged together to fill these gaps. And we have to start with subsidized facilities to attract the kind of nonprofit programming that will enrich our neighborhood.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So we ask now that -- we think more broadly than simply the facilities to the whole community and that we need your support on this facilities piece, so that we can all together do the kind of planning that needs to be in place.

My testimony also speaks to the serious problems in our public schooling, which will mean, basically, that we are now at 25 percent of the kids working at proficiency in our neighborhood school and that means that all these new residents will be searching for an alternative.

We have right before us now, because our community has asked for the Apple Tree Early Learning, which can make it possible for all our kids to come in ready to learn to school, to put a bid forward as they have to the Graduate School for a facility that is there.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. BROOKS: We certainly need

NEAL R. GROSS

1	your support
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
3	much.
4	MS. BROOKS: in moving forward
5	with this kind of social planning.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
7	much. Commissioners, any questions? Any
8	questions? Okay. Let me just
9	VICE CHAIRMAN SCHLATER: I have
LO	one question, Mr. C hairman. Just for the
L1	community benefit coordinating committee. Is
12	there, I didn't see it yet, a n agreement
13	between your organization and the development
L 4	team as to what benefits will be provided for
L 5	southwest specifically?
L 6	REV. HAMILTON: No. The re was
L7	basically, our understanding is the developer
L 8	has generally believed that most of the
L 9	community benefits have been laid out in the
20	LDA. They have worked throughout this process
21	since we managed to get some of our requests
1	

into the ANC-6D resolution. They have also

been working. And there is no question that the applicant has a strong interest in doing this.

They have signed, you know, the CBE agreements. They have signed other things. We just want to make sure that it is — but it's not signed with us. And the only thing that we have seen signed now is what Mr. Hoffman signed recently, just last week, when he signed the ANC-6 — you know, his response to it.

I have no idea how e nforce -- I have no idea what that means legally, but I am grateful that he did it. And I appreciate the ongoing conversations, but we feel like we need something in this PUD ruling that will clarify.

VICE CHAIRMAN S CHLATER: Most o f
the items in the ANC agreement will eventually
be memorialized into the PUD order, so I
wouldn't worry about that. I just wanted to
get your sense of whether the issues of, you

NEAL R. GROSS

1 know, Ward 6 specific community benefits have 2 been addressed to your satisfaction w ithin 3 that ANC order -- I mean, that ANC agreement. 4 REV. HAMILTON: Well, as long as you think it is going to be in your final 5 6 ruling, if it will be in cluded there, we are 7 satisfied. HOOD: Any other 8 CHAIRMAN questions? Okay. I'm going to do it this 9 10 way. I'm going to ask is there a ny crossexamination? If it is, just rais e your hand. 11 I don't want to have to go through that. 12 13 will do that from this point on to try to save time. 14 15 cross-examination? Okay. Any 16 Thank you. I want to thank this panel. We appreciate it. Also, I have noticed that we 17 18 have a representative from Council 19 Wells' office and I just -- my sight was 20 blocked the whole -- and then I just noticed it about 20 minutes ago. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

So I don't want the Council Member

1	to think that I slighted his office, but did
2	you have something you wanted to come up and
3	say? Okay. Okay. I just wanted to
4	acknowledge that we do have a representative
5	of Council Member Wells' office.
6	And again, I apologize for not
7	doing that a lot, maybe three or four hours
8	earlier.
9	Okay. The next panel: J uanita
10	Jones, Debra Frazier, Melissa Rohan and Judith
11	Claire. Is that okay, and we can get one
12	more, Tom Des Jardins. Tom Des Jardins.
13	Okay. And we're going to do th e same thing.
14	I'm going to start from my right and we'll go
15	to my left. Ms. Randolph, I would like for
16	you maybe to just let Ms. Schellin know about
17	how much time you are going to need for your
18	presentation in opposition, so that will help
19	me figure out where we are.
20	MS. RANDOLPH: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
22	We're going to start from my right. This

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	young lady just sitting there, I'm going to
2	start with you and we'll go from my right to
3	my left. You may begin . The green light
4	shows it's on.
5	MS. CLAIRE: Ye s, okay. Thank
6	you. My name is Judith Claire. I have lived
7	in Washington since 19 63 and I discovered
8	southwest and Harbor Square Co-op in 1967.

Did you kno w that as one walks from the rear of St. Augus tine's church, the Church of Thurgood Marshall you see down the sidewalk past Tiber I sland, Harbor Square toward the Titanic, one has the comfort and shelter of 40 willow oak trees as one views the channel at the end of the walk.

I'm with you, Mr. Schlater, for trees. The willow oak was Thomas Jefferson's favorite tree. Blu ejays, gray squirrels, crows and mallards love the acorns from the willow oak. It is tall, strong and has a delicate weeping willow like foliage.

In 1963, Lady Bird Johnson and LBJ

NEAL R. GROSS

1	planted a willow oak outside the oval office.
2	The <u>Washington Daily News</u> reported that
3	during the ceremony, LBJ said that it was
4	fitting for an occupant of the Wh ite House to
5	plant trees, not for today, but fo r the
6	future.
7	These trees will say there live d
8	those who loved this land.
9	I believe al l of us love this
10	land. We must remember to plant trees in and
11	around the new development especially for all
12	the residents who follow behind.
13	I'm excited about the new
14	development. I don't have a car. I can walk
15	and skip over to the Wharf and enjoy the new
16	development and then go back home to the quiet
17	part of Harbor Square, which is still and will
18	be really a scenic scene of nature that we all
19	love.
20	Getting hopefully a free kayak
21	space to celebrate the waterfront for my 80 $^{\rm th}$
22	birthday and I can hang out in the kayak with

1	the egrets and the herons. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
3	much. Next?
4	MS. FRAZIER: Hello. My name is
5	Debra Frazier and I'm
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Frazier, is
7	your microphone on?
8	MS. FRAZIER: Let me see a minute.
9	The green light, oh.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The green light .
11	There we go.
12	MS. FRAZIER: Okay. Hi. I'm
13	Debra Frazier, a native Washingto nian whose
14	activism was reignited when my community was
15	summarily dismissed from Capper Carrollsburg
16	in Near Southeast Washington. S o I am
17	uniquely complied to talk about community
18	involvement.
19	I'm urging this Commission to have
20	community involvement and that the developers
21	involve the community in all aspects of this
22	plan. What's community invol vement? That

means actively listening to and just having residents participate in decisions and decision making that comes from this body.

There are some examples of what happens when there is a lack of community involvement. For example, the properties at Henson Ridge, which is a Housing Aut hority development, were engaged in a battle between homeowners and tenants, because they created different associations.

So those different groups went at each other, because they had di fferent concerns. That wasn't addressed by the developers, it created tension, community dissent and public disarray.

I want to talk also about when you move residents. When our residents were moved from Cappers, Arthur Cappers Carrollsburg to southeast and to Berry Farms, the resulting lack of community engagement, the resulting lack of involvement created dissention from those people just moving in and those people

NEAL R. GROSS

who were there.

There were territory issues, increases in youth violence and youth truancy.

When you don't involve the community in planning and development, you get these kinds of results.

Some positive aspects of community involvement include buy-in and participation. Residents who feel like they have a stake in the community who are asked to participate and know about meetings the at happen, are more likely to keep up their communities, to form neighborhood watches, to engage the period officers as community policers as opposed to an invading force.

I just want to just continue to urge you to have community involvement. In Capper Carrollsburg, we were disenfranchised by our elected officials, but we came to a point at the now Capitol Quarters meeting where we organized and we involved and we helped to develop that committee.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	That community included such
2	structures as a tenant b oard. We were
3	involved in the development now that includes
4	Canal Park. So those are the types of things
5	that you want to involve your residents.
6	A community is an evolving piece.
7	It is a wonderful landscape. It's got to
8	grow and evolve from participation with all
9	the residents. We can make this a beautiful
10	thing, but without resident involvement, it's
11	not going to be.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
13	very much. Good timing. Next?
14	MS. JONES: Hi. My name is
15	good evening. My name is Juanita Jones and
16	I'm here represent the CBC, Community Benefit
17	Coalition.
18	I'm a little nervous. I grew up
19	on Arthur Capper community and also when
20	Sharon Pratt Kelly was the Mayor, she divided
21	us up and br oke that community up into
22	Carrollsburg community.

I want to say that I w as able to grow up in that community and was able to found a home in that community, which my husband and myself and my two children, we was able to live in that community.

Now, I was able to move out of that community and move into the first whole TANF development here in the city. With that to say, I'm saying that it was so hard and it was a struggle because withou t having your credit straight and being financially stable and being ready to move out of these communities, if you are not educated enough and have a balance and have yours elf ready to be moved for quality assurance, then you are not going to make it out here.

Our community needs the support services. We need the CBC because the CBC will be able to establi sh work and help our TANF moms get off of TANF and help our fathers that are struggling out h ere in the city to find jobs and employment.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I'm asking that you take this
2	legislation and build it into your agreement,
3	so I do support the CBC and ask you tha t you
4	do do this for us, because the community needs
5	the support. Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
7	very much. Next?
8	MS. ROHAN: Hi, goo d evening,
9	Commissioners.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is your microphone
11	on?
12	MS. ROHAN: Hi, goo d evening,
13	Commissioners. My name is Melissa Rohan. I'm
14	a resident in southwest. But in addition to
15	that, I am a small business owner in its
16	start-up year.
17	And one of my most just so you
18	know, it's MT Rohan Communications. I might
19	as well do the plug while I'm here.
20	But I did want to say that one of
21	my clients is the CBCC and their consultant,
22	and proudly so. And I do want to while I

support the development strongly, I also strongly encourage you to adopt all of their recommendation as part of the PUD order.

And I want to spe ak specifically to the CBE portion of it, of the community benefits amenities package. And the reason that one speaks to me, as you understand, as I am a small business owner, start-up year, I I think I am fairly have applied for my CBE. savvy and sophisticated. And even so, it took about a week of my time away from all o f the duties of one person operation, а include everything from being boss, s janitor, etcetera.

And I'm saying that as a sophisticated person and/or as I look at myself, but I can't say that that is going to be the same for others . And so w hen other small businesses are looking at the cost benefit ratio, they may not see the benefit of getting a CBE and won't be able to come after some of these benefits.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And so I think that we, one, should have a program to bring our budding entrepreneurs and our small businesses in the community to come to a CBE certification.

In addition to that, the developers have made a few commitments and I think that in order to -- as some of the ladies here have said, in order to get our small businesses to get at these opportunities, there is going to have to be a lot of ways in messaging so that it is communicated and that folks can have enough time to respond to these opportunities.

And I also want to strongly encourage that there is a preference for southwest or Ward 6. The CBCC is requesting 5 percent. I think it should be larger, that's just me. I also want to make sure that there is oversight, significant oversight. I do believe that everyone is acting earnestly, but just to make sure that everybody continues to do so.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	And the outreach, oversight
2	outreach and preference. Thank you very much.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you .
4	Next?
5	MR. DES JARDINS: Hi, I'm Tom Des
6	Jardins. I'm a D.C. r esident and both my
7	parents went to high school here and I had a
8	boat at Buzzard Point in the early '80s, so I
9	have been boating in the D.C. area for a long
10	time.
11	I'm currently the Chairman of the
12	Board of Trustees of the Capital Yacht Club
13	and I have a statement from our Commodore,
14	which I have submitted into the record and
15	I'll just read real quick for everyone here in
16	support of PN Hoffman and Shawn a nd the team
17	here.
18	"Dear Mr. Hood, the Capital Yacht
19	Club has been a key component of the District
20	of Columbia Waterfront since its founding in
21	October 19 1892 and for the past four
22	years, the Capital Yacht Club has been working

1	cooperative and very cooperatively, I would
2	say, with the Hoffman -Madison team on the
3	efforts to redevelop the waterfront.
4	We have worked diligently t o
5	ensure that the needs of all user communities,
6	including transient cruisers visiting our city
7	are accommodated. As part of this effort, our
8	facilities will be more aligned with the
9	entire community, both ashore and afloat.
10	The Capital Yacht Club, as
11	proposed, will be a focal point in drawing
12	visitors to the Wharf.
13	The proposed rezoning is in
14	perfect alignment with the vision for the
15	future that our of our city's unique and
16	distinctive waterfront and we fully support
17	the redevelopment plan as proposed in the PUD
18	and are anxious to move forward with the next
19	steps of redevelopment, so that we can begin
20	our next 100 years here.
21	Respectfully, Dan Waldrop,
22	Commodore of Capital Yacht Club. Thank you."

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
2	all. Let's see if we have any questions. Any
3	cross-examination? Okay. I want to thank
4	this panel. We appreciate it.
5	Mr. Glasgow, Mr. Hoffman, we're
6	going to use those two seats there, so we want
7	to use that seat also.
8	Okay. Ms. S chellin, could you
9	consult with MS. Randolph? Ms. Randolph, can
10	you go over and let Ms. Schellin know about
11	how much time you are going to need?
12	Okay. Let's go with Cara
13	Shockley, Zev Feder, Jo C hang, Richard
14	Westbrook, Elinor Bacon, David Sobelsohn. I'm
15	sure you can help me. I know who you are, but
16	you can help me when you come forward. I just
17	can't make it out. Desiree Urquhart.
18	Urquhart. Okay. Let's see how many people I
19	have called up thus far.
20	MS. SHOCKLEY: Mr. Sobelsohn ha s
21	left.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sorry?

1	MS. SHOCKLEY: Mr. Sobelsohn left.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Sobelsohn
3	left? Oh, okay. Thank you very much. Okay.
4	Let me see, yes, we're still in support. Mr.
5	Sobelsohn left, okay. Okay. Ms. Bacon is not
6	testifying, okay.
7	Then let me ask, Ms. Schellin, No.
8	32 No. 36? No, what about 36? I can't
9	make that out. Mark is that? Mark Grobosky
10	from GPSA.
11	MS. SHOCKLEY: I think he th ought
12	it was a sign -in. He didn't have anything
13	prepared.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So he is
15	okay. Well, I will tell you this, you might
16	as well come up now, because that was the last
17	name. That was the last name tha t I was
18	calling except for, I'm sor ry, Rhonda
19	Hamilton.
20	MS. SHOCKLEY: Mark and I di d a
21	little flip.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. It's

1	getting late, let's not confuse us. Okay.
2	MS. SHOCKLEY: Sorry.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So it's
4	Mark. Do you want to testify?
5	MS. SHOCKLEY: No.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mark is not g oing
7	to testify. What about Rhonda Hamilton?
8	Okay. ANC-6D or 6. Is there anyone else
9	present that would like to a person that's
10	here that would like to testify in support?
11	Anyone else? Okay. We will end and the
12	reason I'm pushing a little bit is because I'm
13	trying to save everybody from having to come
14	back. We would like to see you, but come back
15	on a Wednesday night with us, so that's why
16	I'm kind of pushing.
17	Okay. Let's start to my ri ght.
18	This young lady here.
19	MS. URQUHART: Good evening ,
20	Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission.
21	My name is Desiree Urquhart and I'm the
22	Director of Government and Community Relations

at Arena Stage.

I am pleas ed to offer Arena

Stage's full support for the Hoffman -Madison

Waterfront Development Team's Planned Uni t

Development.

Monty Hoffman and his entire team have been ardent supporters of Arena Stage in our newly completed \$130 million redevelopment known as the Meade Center for American Theater at the corner of 6th and Maine.

They have met with Arena and our architect, Bing Tom, on numerous occasions to discuss and review their project design plans, always with a focused commitment to identify and pursue synergies with our redevelopmen t project.

They have been willing to consider a broad range of topics. When we expressed concerns about protecting and enhancing our views of the waterfront from our grand public lobby, the developer responded with changes to

NEAL R. GROSS

their plans, not once, not twice, but three times to accommodate our concerns. And M onty was always there.

Since we reoccupied our amazing new complex last August, we have engaged in productive discussions to ensure mutual success, compatibility and interaction between Arena and the Waterfront Redevelopment.

Issues of great importance to Arena include view corridors, the size and locations of open space and public areas, prescribed uses and amenities, scale and location of buildings, water features and safe pedestrian movement across Maine Avenue.

We hope that the Co mmission will mindful of the contribution of these synergistic relationship elements to the between the waterfront redevelopment and We have expressed to the developer and arena. to the Commission our strong desire that the public benefits you approve as part of the PUD include access for our patrons to off-street

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

parking within the project; a set aside of a portion of the proposed affordable housing for Arena Stage artists, fellows and interns; provisions for convenient dining options; a bus lay-by; and potential periodic programming in public space, all in a safe and welcoming environment.

The developer has expressed a commitment to work with us on all of these benefits. We consider these fea tures particularly the parking and artist housing to be critical to achieving the highest degree of success for a project of this size and importance in D.C.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our support for this innovative and ambitious project. We believe that the developers plans will enhance Arena Stage's visibility and prominence as the very best in performing arts and will create the kind of lively attractive waterfront that will benefit not only Arena, but the entire city.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you .
2	Next?
3	MS. SHOCKLEY: My name is Cara Lee
4	Shockley. I am the Commissioner for 6D02. I
5	would like to clarify that I did vote in favor
6	of the thing we were 7 to none, but I do have
7	two issues that I would like to bring forward.
8	Commissioner Litsky was kind
9	enough to mention them earlier. And I would
10	also say and beg your in dulgence if I may
11	change my written testimony before I submit it
12	to you, as Ms. Albert speaking from DDOE, made
13	a difference to what I have to say.
14	On page 10 of the original PUD
15	application dated February 10, 2011, Hoffman-
16	Madison Marquette included the fo llowing
17	statement: "The PUD Building Program will
18	also include a 2,500 seat multi -use musical
19	that will provide a venue for live events,
20	staged theatrical productions, sporting events
21	and meeting and conventions.

Imagine my

22

surprise when th e

regularly scheduled business meeting held on July 11, 2011, Monty Hoffman said and I paraphrase, 2,500 for sporting events, 4,500 for music events.

I love the theater and music.

When I was a kid, the money I e arned from my

Washington Star paper route was spent on

tickets to Ford's Thea ter and the Kennedy

Center. I even follo w some sports and

recognize that the District needs more spaces

for mid-range sporting events to be held.

My issue with the music hall, as described in the PU D, has always been the parking burden I feel w ill be placed on the residents in the neighborhood.

Well, I would hope that most patrons would use public transportation. I don't find it realistic to expect a site with only 2,883 parking spaces of which 610 are dedicated to the cultural activities to support an attendance of 2,500 people, much less one of 4,500.

Mr. Hoffman's statement that we can always drive down another level if we find the parking to be inadequate, again, that's a paraphrase, is also a little iffy.

This project is at the con fluence of two rivers going deeper may simply not be an option. The forensic's lab that is being built in our neighborhood has al ready discovered that. The area has a high water table with many underground creeks.

I would also li ke to point out that one of the arguments in favor of the large music hall, that the existing options in the District are either out-moded or have terrible acoustics. It's not mitigated by a more -- music hall that accepts sporting events.

Excellent acoustics would make a tennis game unbearable to listen to and the dampened acoustics appropriate for sporting events are not conducive for good music.

Thank you very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
2	much. Next? Hi, my name is Eve Bratman and
3	I'm delivering this te stimony as the Vice
4	President of the Gangplank Slipholders
5	Association or GPSA, which hopefu lly, as you
6	already know by now, is a community
7	organization comprised of the slipholders of
8	the Gangplank Marina, which includes, but is
9	not just limited to, the 100 live-aboard boats
10	that are docked at the marina and these boats
11	have live-aboard permits, which give us 1 egal
12	license, as we understand it, to live aboard
13	our boats full-time, year-round.
14	Our mission is to work to create a
15	clean, attractive and healthy marina ,
16	waterfront and river system throu gh our many
17	community events.

And I would just like to briefly explain why we are currently so supportive of the PUD and the developer's vision for our community within this testimony.

As a community, we have been

NEAL R. GROSS

18

19

20

21

engaged for over five years in helping to plan for a successful development and also to help assure our place within that development, both as live-aboard boaters, as well as for work-aboard and transient boaters.

During this time, PN Hoff man-Madison Marquette has continued to dialogue with us and we are very thankful for the many fruitful conversations we have had with them. Admittedly though, at first, we approached these discussions with a lot of all of trepidation. Since many of the boaters at the Gangplank live on their boats full -time and year-round, we are really the only community that explicitly woul in southwest potentially displaced by this development.

Our entire existence was threatened and in the past few months, we have worked very closely with the development team to guarantee that that won't happen. And as such, we currently are supportive, because the developers have so explicitly prioritized

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

maintaining our abil ity to stay at the existing marina or within the Washington Channel along with a transition plan in place that allows us to remain an integral part of the development process.

It's worth also mentioning, at this point, that when I'm not living on my boat, I'm a professor at American University and I teach a class on urban development. And so I'm not unfamiliar to the problems that have plagued the southwest as redevelopments in the past ensured.

So we are continuing to iron out the finer points of the transition plan and are cognizant that there are still s everal issues that n eed smoothing over, smoo thing out, including the transference of live-aboard permits, the affordability of slips and also the logistical fine points that we need to mutually agree upon with those developers.

We remain uneasy that the development team has design p lans that a re

NEAL R. GROSS

1	highly contingent upon legislation and
2	permitting processes from outside agencies.
3	There is no articulated Plan B, as other
4	people have put it.
5	However, our support is predicated
6	upon the development team's good faith
7	commitment to our community and by the ongoing
8	communication that we have as a community with
9	that team.
10	And so I thank you a ll for your
11	attention and we continue to working together
12	to build this world class waterfront.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you .
14	Next? Mr. Westbrook?
15	MR. WESTBROOK: I'm Richard
16	Westbrook. I reside at 505 H Street, S.W.
17	I've been a resident of southwest since 1964.
18	And I have been an ANC Commission er for this
19	area seven terms. The first two terms of the
20	ANC and then five during the 1990s and up
21	until we were transferred to Ward 6.
22	The materials that I have

distributed to you that first two pages with the checkmarks, that was my response to the presentation of the Sm all Area Develo pment Plan for this area that the City Council reviewed and approved as a guide.

The third page is t he amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that was approved by the City Council in '98 and is in an enrolled version of February 19, 1999. Those comments really came from our review of the Sasaki Plan of 1991. And then more on — as this whole thing started developing and from the Anacostia Initiative then to the Small Area Plan.

I would just like to, you k now, kind of comment about a few of those ones that got checked about th Τ have е Banneker Overlook, one of the memorial sites that, of course, would be the Federal Government. now by this is under review Southwest Ecodistrict, which is -- the name came from -they first called it 12 th Street Corridor,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	which goes from 7 th over to 12 th , Independence
2	Avenue to the Banneker Overlook overlookin g
3	Maine Avenue.
4	And this picture, I don't know i f
5	you can see it, will demonstrate that is
6	the south end of the Ecodistrict. And we are
7	in a review process right now and various
8	proposals have already been made.
9	I always thought that would be a
10	good place for the African -American Museum,
11	but that hasn't gained much traction, as you
12	all know.
13	One thing we I did like ab out
14	the Small Area Plan was that having market
15	rate condos, that was a really change from
16	straight commercial water-oriented restaurants
17	and so on with some affordable housing and so
18	on.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Westbrook?
20	MR. WESTBROOK: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to have
22	to cut you off. We have it. We h ave the

1	checkmark list.
2	MR. WESTBROOK: Okay.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We got it, so
4	we're good. Okay. Next, Commissioner
5	Hamilton?
6	MS. HAMILTON: Hello. M y name is
7	Rhonda Hamilton. I'm Advisory Neighborhoo d
8	Commissioner for 6D. My Single Member
9	District is 6D06.
10	While I support the development on
11	the Southwest Waterfront, I am concerned that
12	the redevelopment be done right for everyone
13	and not just for those who live and work in
14	the new redevelopment.
15	We have heard how this will be a
16	world class developmen t that will lead a nd
17	become a model for other waterfront c ities
18	around the world.
19	Slowly, it seems this phrase is
20	being used less and now we are being
21	confronted by requests for exemptions from not
22	only the applicant, but also their p artner

city agency.

This joint public/private project will probably be the largest I will see in my lifetime and certainly the largest this city has undertaken to date.

As Council Member Wells for Ward 6 stated in his presentation of the project, we have one chance to get this -- we get one chance to do this right. The Southwest Waterfront has a wonderful history of being inclusive regardless of the racial makeup or economics.

I want to see the waterfront become the best that it can be and continue to be the special dest ination for residents, community members and visitors.

Under the First-Stage PUD process,

I am concerned with the current to scale site

plan and public benefits, although I am

supportive of the red evelopment of our

Southwest Waterfront.

The overall priority is looking at

NEAL R. GROSS

this project with 130 foot tall buildings and another 18 feet for mechanicals, which will be a monolithic wall that will bear little resemblance to the 2003 Waterfront Plan put forward to the community with a stepdown comparison of the buildings heights to the south from the Freeway Bridge, which makes many think it's still in the plans.

I'm very concer ned with the vie w corridors of the waterfront at M Street, 7th and 9th and Banneker Park view and the water to Washington Channel. The placement of the pavilion makes them look like ticket booths for the entrance fee and the trees look nice, but will soon grow to block views.

I am not against trees, but feel they are needed as other plants to counter the massive amount of hard surface currently proposed, but respectful of the vistas.

I feel these rules are esp ecially for everyone and should be respected. The new front of St. Augustine's church will be

NEAL R. GROSS

setback several feet toward the south, so that it fits with the setback of Tiber Island to the east, but most importantly it does not pinch the view off at this point/nexus of two great streets, Maine Avenue and M Street, with the Washington Canal as grandly proposed.

St. Augustine's townhouses are to be approximately 45 feet high in Parcel 11.

Parcel 10 should mirror the height, except in the church steeple to ope n what wonderful civil plaza sight a nd keep the project in contextual relationship at the south end of the project with a possible building on the pier and other residents.

Such a reduction in height is very minor, it's not less than 1 percent of the total square footage proposed. This special relationship of the vista and water should not be missed to make such a view statement for the community, our Di strict residents and visitors to the waterfront.

The same holds true for the view

NEAL R. GROSS

1	from 10 th Street Overlook to the water and
2	will become a major entry.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
4	Hamilton, we have your submission and we will
5	finish reading it.
6	MS. HAMILTON: Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thanks. Is there
8	any questions, Commissioners? Any questions?
9	Okay. Is there any cross-examination? Okay.
10	We want to th ank this panel. I appreciate
11	it.
12	Now, this is what I'm going to try
13	to do, Ms. Randolph, is that
14	MS. RANDOLPH: We have asked for
15	30, but probably won't use 30.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You probably won't
17	use 30? Because I'm b eing told we are not
18	going to make it from a time frame stand. I
19	don't know if anybody is on the subway or how
20	they got here, but I'm being told that we are
21	not going to make it.
22	So what I was going to propose to

1	you this coming Thursday
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Next Thursday.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Next Thursday?
4	Oh. One week from
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Next week.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, next week?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: The 28 th .
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have a case in
9	front of us and that way we can give to you a
10	full presentation. But what I would like to
11	do tonight, if you don't m ind, Ms. Randolph,
12	is go for the persons who are here in
13	opposition. Let me hear from them, so that
14	will cut back on
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Them having to come
16	back.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: having to come
18	back one week from Thursday. Ms. Randolph, is
19	that okay?
20	that okay? MS. RANDOLPH: That's fine.

1	MS. RANDOLPH: N o. So next
2	Thursday we are invited to return?
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You are invited to
4	return and you can have 60 minutes.
5	MS. RANDOLPH: Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You can have 60
7	minutes and you will be it. You will be the
8	only besides rebuttal.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Well, rebuttal and
10	closing, yes.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Besides rebutta l
12	and closing. Okay. Is that okay?
13	MS. RANDOLPH: Thank you very
14	much.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
16	very much, Ms. Randolph. On behalf of the
17	Commission, we appreciate that. You stayed
18	all night and we got to that and we appreciate
19	it.
20	MS. RANDOLPH: No problem.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
22	Let's go to t hose who the few I have in

1	opposition: Phil Johnson, Susan Humphreys.
2	MS. RANDOLPH: She is part of
3	mine.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. Okay.
5	Ms. Randolph, your name is on it. Okay.
6	Alice Wender.
7	MS. RANDOLPH: She is part of
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: She is part of,
9	okay. William McLin.
10	MS. RANDOLPH: Part of
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Part of 6 th Street.
12	Okay. Mr. Solon, Gene Solon, Benisse Lester,
13	Catherine Herradge, John Hayes, Diane S chulz
14	and B.K. Lunde. Okay. We're g oing to start
15	on my right and work to my left. You ma y
16	begin, sir.
17	MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. I would
18	like to thank the Commission for allowing me
19	to speak this evening. My name is Philip Ed
20	Johnson. My address is 411 Walnut Street,
21	Green Cove Springs, Florida. And the reason
2.2	I'm here today is because I believe that the

1	PUD, as currently advertised, will adv ersely
2	affect mine and other visiting vessels ability
3	to anchor in the upper r eaches of the
4	Washington Channel.
5	As currently proposed the
6	developer's plan will essentially end all
7	anchoring in the upper Washington Cha nnel.
8	Furthermore, the proposed for anchoring
9	system is inconsistent with that use by east
10	coast boaters and the general boating public,
11	who are accustomed to bow-on mooring systems.
12	Additionally, the mooring spa cing
13	of 30 feet by 100 feet does not support the
14	size of vessel that is currently anchoring in
15	the Washington Channel, which is a vessel that
16	normally ranges from 40 to 60 feet. And it's
17	not sufficient to moor 12 to 15 boats, given a
18	bow-on mooring.
19	These concerns should be addressed
20	and vetted with the larger boating community.
21	Areas north and west reaches of
	i 1

the Washington Channel presently occupy about

12 to 15 anchored vessels of 40 to 60 feet. These vessels are predominantly home -ported outside the District of Columbia in states and districts that have loading Congressional interests.

And also, often from -- boats that are from ot her countries. Addit ional verifiable statistics, I believe are available from D.C. Harbor Patrol who requires all vessels anchored in the channel to register with them. But on an estimate, it is over 100 annually that anchor there.

I believe that with regard to the e boating side of the plan, the developer's PUD reflects a very local perspective and ignores the national/international aspects of visiting cruisers. These boaters traditionally anchor in the Washington Channel when visiting our nation's capital and the world class museums that are located in the District.

The plan also does not seem to have slips for the ever increasing number of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	catamaran cruising boats who visit the area.
2	Currently, the installed docks on
3	the east side of the channel consume about 250
4	feet of width. As a result, the upper reaches
5	of the channel are now, approximately, 4 50
6	feet wide, reducing the channel from 400 feet
7	to 200 feet and exten ding the docks an
8	additional 200 feet will leave only 50 feet of
9	anchoring next to East Potomac Park.
10	This is simply not enough room and
11	too close to shore, as I personally witnessed
12	by getting lures lobbed on my boat.
13	Taking approximately 8 acres of
14	navigable water in existing federally-
15	controlled channel is fine for those living
16	in D.C. who wish to live -aboard and stay, but
17	the cruising visitors will not have a place in
18	D.C. Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
20	much. Next?
21	MR. SOLON: I don't have time to
22	say good evening, Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just press and when it lights up, it's on. There you go.

MR. SOLON: I don't have time to say good evening, Commissioners. You asked some great questions, so I'll begin. I'm Southwest D.C. Waterfront homeowner, Gene Solon, and enthusiastically welcome redevelopment of our waterfront.

in good conscience, But straightforwardly without convolution oppose what Hoffman-Madison has submitted as St age One of its interconnected stage redevelopment plan, because that plan admitted to be in flux is much too f luid for me to consider it adequately defined, because the contains way too many serious flaws and because our community has never been given the chance to analyze any comprehensi ve traffic impact study.

The Gorove/Slade study contains no safety analysis and DDOT still "expects" to initiate its own study.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Commissioners, I took this same straightforward approach a few years ago at a hearing on the 4th Street development project and southwest residents are now gratified that your Commission decided to instruct the developers to improve design of their rubuildings.

My hope is that you will like wise see fit to withhold your acceptance of the Hoffman Water -- Madison submittal until you obtain the resolution of what is widely seen as way too many unresolved issues.

Among them, lack of Cor ps approval; threate ning Engineers waterway traffic safety and attacking space for sailboats; inadequate detail on Waterside Promenade elevations aff ect on access egress for live-aboards; inadequate detail on Pier 4 townhouses and on underwater g arage space for townhouse owners; a sudden ANC jolt entertainment size increase and admittedly less than optimal tourist bus drop-off points.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I hope you withhold acceptance of the submittal until you are able to obtain cancellation of the water's edge unsafe and add mixtures of cars, trolleys and pedestrians, the trimming back of over extended piers, lowering of 130 foot buildings heights and reduced blockage of views of water and sky, including views adve rtised by the very Mandarin-Oriental Hotel at which recent so-called project workshop was held.

I'm deeply sadd ened that our AN C is listed as an endorser of the inadequate detail submittal you received and I just cannot understand how anybody without h aving the chance to thoroughly assess traffic impact would approve a submittal from developers who have been so vague about so many things, but who have refused to trim project mass and density.

I hope you withhold acceptance of the submittal until y ou actually allow yourselves and our community enough time to

NEAL R. GROSS

1	analyze truly informative traffic i mpact
2	studies showing that this projects addition to
3	already growing volume of traffic will be a
4	livable with addition.
5	I stress the interconnectivity of
6	project stages and the danger of initiating
7	momentum that would prevent needed plan
8	improvement.
9	Commissioners, projects are not
10	balloons and retail can thrive in nine story
11	buildings. I hope you w ill accept only that
12	set of submittals that describe a project of
13	humane scale, that truly respect the existing
14	community and will protect
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.
16	MR. SOLON: and enhance
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Tha nk you very
18	much.
19	MR. SOLON: rather than destroy
20	what
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Solon, than k
22	you very much.

MR. SOLON: -- is good in current Southwest D.C. life.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. Next?

MS. LESTER: Go od evening. My name is Benisse Lester. I'm a resident at Harbor Square and a Washington taxpayer. I'm opposed to the proposed development, as written, as long as it includes building structures on Pier 4, directly in front of Harbor Square.

The proposed townhouses whether 45 feet, 35 feet or 20 feet will have a disastrous effect on our property. They will block our water views completely from the lower units, views of the sun set and passing boats. If the park in front of Harbor Square is converted into a parking lot and if any of the trees are destroyed or cut back, this will further compromise our property value and quality of life, especially because of the configuration of Pier 4, which is a diagonal.

NEAL R. GROSS

Our grounds and many of our u nits will face a wall. No more water v iews, no more sunset, no light with the proposed development casting a long broad shadow on our grounds where a sun set and water view now exist.

The water and sunset view from our grounds to the north will be obliterated. Most of the west view will be obliterated as well. And no more cooling north winds, they will be blocked. The adverse effect on our property cannot be overstated.

Harbor Square is a beautifu l property with over 440 units, many of which were designed by a pre mier mid-century architect to maximize water views from as many units as possible. Our grounds face the water, boats docked and sailing by, the sunset and foliage including National Park land greenery and trees that are over a century old.

Most of us, including myself,

NEAL R. GROSS

moved here specifically for the open views and paid a premium for this. Our windows are large to maximize view and light. There are great varieties of exp osures and views at Harbor Square, which I became familiar with during my three years on the Board of Directors of Harbor Square when we embarked on a multi-million dollar window replacement project.

Some of us, like myself, chose a lower floor to be close to the water, the foliage and just from personal preference. looking at many artist and afte r am an properties, chose to buy a homestead at Harbor Square for the beautiful -- for the open north and west light, water and marine views, dynamism of boats coming and going and the beautiful panoramic sunlight -- sunsets.

The light and exposure is essential and inspirational for my paintings.

If the proposed construction on Pier 4 proceeds, I will instead be facing a wall. No

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

more light. No more sunsets. No more water view and the situation will be even worse if the parkland and tr ees in front of Harbor Square are destroyed and replaced with a parking lot.

And I invite anybody who wishes to see what the impact would be of Harbor Square to contact me. I will be glad to show this to you. I implore the Zoning Commission to preserve our historic propert y now 50 years-old and soon to be eligible for historic classification.

Please, do not destroy my inspiration, my light or water and marine and sunset views, our property value and quality of life. The proposed development is mammoth in size. There is plenty of projects. Please, do not obliterate the vista from Harbor Square property.

I would say to the development people from the city, it will break our hearts if this goes up on Pier 4. It will really

NEAL R. GROSS

1	destroy our views and o ur vista and I can't
2	emphasize that enough. Thank you for your
3	time.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
5	much. Next? Turn your mike on. There you
6	go.
7	MS. LUNDE: Hi, I'm Barbara Lunde.
8	I'm glad to see development plans for the
9	Wharf. Two t hings are wrong with the Wharf
10	plans: Water and vacancies.
11	Water. Hains Point has flooded .
12	Washington Harbor just up the Potomac in
13	Georgetown has flooded this spring. The 1936
14	Flood Marker is much higher than the level
15	this spring. This spring, the flood cost
16	millions of dollars and more t han a week
17	without electricity.
18	They have flood gates, but I guess
19	there was a new manager or somebody didn't
20	know how to put them in place. They leaked or
21	for some other reason they didn't work.
22	The Potomac is one of the wil dest

rivers there is. The necessary political will has not been present to install dams to develop -- whether they had taken place.

Water levels will be rising with g lobal warming.

I was a professional engineer with the largest architect engineering firm in Iowa. We designed a 15,000 foot sea arena for Iowa State University. It was built in a flood plain, because that was where the space was and, of course, designed not to flood. But of course, it did flood resulting in months of down time and hundreds of thousands of dollars of repair.

So I find the underground parking a rather humorous plan for this development.

Vacancies. The building on the block between D and E Street on 7th Street is still virtually vacant after being finished for more than a year. There are vacancies in new buildings around Waterfront Station and I'll -- and other older buildings there are

1	vacant, as well as the buildings in the
2	southeast.
3	A much more modest smaller
4	development at any of the Wharf would be
5	appropriate now. Also, the businesses t hat
6	have been there recently have not succeeded.
7	If the build ings were under 95
8	feet, they would not bl ock my view from 700
9	7 th Street, S.W. At least the development
10	should be done in stages to see how things go.
11	Other things are noise and odor .
12	The tennis tournament is about as loud as fire
13	trucks going by my apartment, but it goes on
14	for hours. Also, the odor of dead fish is
15	noticeable on some days five blocks away from
16	the fish market, especially this time of year.
17	So those are some t hings that
18	could be taken into consideration. Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
20	much. Next?
21	MS. SCHULZ: I would like to thank
22	the my name is Diane Schulz. And I would

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

like to thank the Zoning Board for this opportunity to testify in opposition to the proposed development on the Southwes t Waterfront.

I'm not anti -development. I'm just against this development, as it is stated in the currently proposed PUD-1.

I'm a resident of Harbor Square Cooperative, Incorporated. I moved here three years ago from Columbia Heights, another area of the city that has been developed beyond its capacity to handle the number of people, buildings and traffic that have been dropped there.

In the beginning, we we re hopeful and trusted the developers to do the right thing, to build great buildings, move traffic and make living t here great experience. We were naiv e and sorely The area is an urban nightmare disappointed. with high crime, horrible tra ffic and ugly buildings.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I moved to southwest and Harbor Square because of the serenity and beauty of the mid-century architecture and landscaping. Chloethiel Woodard Smith designed Harbor Square. She was also the architect for Capitol Park 1 and 2 and Waterside Apartments and Townhomes.

integrating past forte was historical settings with large ap artment blocks and townhomes focused on bodies of She was always drawn to the water and water. in conjunction with landscape architects, Dan Kiley and Hideo Sasaki, designed award-winning gardens like Harbor Square's Reflecting Pool Waterside Park along the Washi Channel, that the developer w ants to cover with a parking lot.

Views were also important to CWS.

There is a picture of the current waterfront from my apartment included in your packet.

And it is vibrant with activity every hour of the day and n ight. I think it's beautiful.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It was designed by the firm of Smith & Associates.

The current developer has referred to it as ugly and under-utilized. Perhaps if all the plans that Chloethiel had designed had been carried out, i t wouldn't be quite as stark today as it has become.

She designed a place to gather, to shop. She even designed a ponte vecchio type of bridge that was begun in the 1950s and intended to house restaurants and shops, but never came to fruition.

What we are left with is the base of that bridge, brutal and plain.

Now, the new developers come in and make grand pronouncements about huge buildings and what the neighborhood needs, but once again, they don't even live her e. They barely even visited here. They s ay they have had hundreds of meetings, but with whom? Is it like -- it's like Columbia Heights all over again.

1	They talked to people who were
2	going to agree with the m or people who want
3	something from them, but do they want to talk
4	to the 16,000 or so regular people who live
5	and work and fight the traffic and walk to the
6	fish market or run by the water or want
7	another grocery store?
8	Do they consider our elderly women
9	who love to sit in the breeze at the
10	aforementioned Waterside Park or how great it
11	is to be able to walk on the lower promenade
12	with your child on a t rike and not have to
13	worry about being run over by a car?
14	Alleys of 25 feet do not a g rand
15	vista make. And there are too many unanswered
16	questions in this submission to make m e
17	comfortable for endorsing this.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
19	very much.
20	MS. SCHULZ: Th ank you. Thank
21	you.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hold tight. We

	might have some questions for you. Any
2	questions? Commissioner Turnbull?
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just had
4	a question for Mr. Johnson. Are you currently
5	moored in the channel now?
6	MR. JOHNSON: I have a dock. It's
7	on dock side right at this point.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But hav e
9	you moored in the channel before?
10	MR. JOHNSON: Absolutely, yes.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Did you
12	come up like every year or what?
13	MR. JOHNSON: I have been cruising
14	for about 21 ye ars, so I have been here
15	probably 25 to 40 percent, in that range of my
16	cruising over the 21 years.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And how
18	long a boat do you have?
19	MR. JOHNSON: I have a 40 foot
20	boat. 40 foot. I'm also a professional
21	mariner and have had th e boat from Maine to
22	Mississippi and down the Caribbean three

1	times.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
3	Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
5	questions? Is there any cross -examination?
6	Okay. Not seeing anyone, then this is our
7	final panel for those in opposition.
8	I want to thank you all for your
9	testimony. We have a correction that we need
10	to make.
11	We are going to hea r the
12	opposition's testimony, the 60 m inutes
13	possibly, on this coming Thursday at
14	MS. SCHELLIN: This Thursday . I
15	have been informed tha t this week this
16	Thursday's hearing is going to be much shorter
17	than next week, so it will be m uch better to
18	hear it this week than next week.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So if you get here
20	at 7:00, we normally don't give a time, but I
21	figure 7:00 is a safe bet, if you can get here

at 7:00.

1	MS. SCHELLIN: No later than 7:00.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No later than
3	7:00, unless you just want to sit through and
4	see whatever we are do ing at 6:30. But no
5	later than 7:00 we will start this case.
6	Okay. Are we all on the same
7	page? Any problems? Yes, the person who
8	Mrs. Randolph was
9	MS. SCHELLIN: She was
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: She was called.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: She is aw are. She
12	will be here
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin ha s
14	made her aware.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: on Thursday.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to
17	thank everyone for their participation
18	tonight. We did our best to finish it, but we
19	are close to it. Appreciate everyone and have
20	a safe trip home.
21	And this is recessed until this
22	coming Thursday.

L	(Whereupon, the Public Hearing wa	a s
2	adjourned to reconvene Thursday, July 2	1,
3	2011, at 7:00 p.m.)	