

1 GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
2 Office of Zoning
3
4
5
6
7
8

9 PUBLIC HEARING OF THE OFFICE OF ZONING
10
11
12

13 6:30 P.M. to 9:56 P.M.
14 Thursday, April 2, 2015
15

16 441 4th Street, N.W.
17 Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Room
18 Second Floor Hearing Room, Suite 220-South
19 Washington, D.C. 20001
20
21
22
23
24

1

2 Board Members:

3 ANTHONY HOOD, Chairman

4 MARCIE COHEN

5 PETER MAY

6 ROBERT MILLER

7 MICHAEL TURNBULL

8

9

10 Office of Planning:

11 JOEL LAWSON

12 MATT JESICK

13 TRACY GABRIEL

14

15

16 Office of Zoning:

17 SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary to the Board

18

19

20 DDOT:

21 Anna Chamberlin

22

23

24 OTHER:

1 Jason Cross
2 Martine Combal
3 Stephen A. Whatley
4 Chapman Todd
5 Ed Atkins
6 Andrew R. Carley
7 Vicki Davis
8 Juanita Hardy
9 Blaise Rastello
10 Brandon Todd
11 Faith Wheeler
12 Sara Green
13 Wendy Blake Coleman
14 Wanda Oates

15

16 C O N T E N T S

17

18 PAGE

19

20 Introductory Remarks 4

21 Conclusion of Meeting 160

22

23

24

25

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

2

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good evening, ladies and
4 gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning
5 Commission for the District of Columbia. Today's
6 date is April 2, 2015. We are located in the
7 Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room. My name
8 is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chair Marcie
9 Cohen, Commissioner Miller, and Commissioner May.
10 It is possible, I think, that Commissioner
11 Turnbull will be reading the record.

12 We are also joined by the Office of Zoning
13 staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, and the Office of
14 Planning staff, Mr. Lawson and Mr. Jesick, Ms.
15 Gabriel, and Ms. Chamberlin from -- are you both
16 from the District Department -- no, I'm sorry.
17 Ms. Gabriel is the Office of Planning's Associate
18 Director for Neighborhood Planning, and Ms.
19 Chamberlin is from the District Department of
20 Transportation.

21 Do we expect to be joined by Ms.
22 Steingasser?

23 MR. LAWSON: Not tonight.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you, Mr.

1 Lawson. Okay, we are also joined by the office --
2 okay.

3 This proceeding is being recorded by a
4 court reporter and is also Webcast live.

5 Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain
6 from any disruptive noise or actions in the
7 hearing room, including display of any signs or
8 objects. Notice of today's hearing was published
9 in the D.C. Register, and copies of that
10 announcement are available to my left on the wall
11 near the door.

12 The hearing will be conducted in
13 accordance with Provisions of 11 DCMR 3021 as
14 follows: preliminary matters, presentations
15 tonight will be the Office of Planning, and, I
16 think, will be assisted by Deputy Mayor for
17 Planning and Economic Development Office, I
18 believe, the report of the ANC Organizations and
19 Persons in support, organizations and persons in
20 opposition.

21 The petitioner has up to -- Office of
22 Planning, has up to 60 minutes. Organizations 5
23 minutes. Individuals 3 minutes. The Commission
24 intends to adhere to the time limits as strictly

1 as possible in order to hear the case in a
2 reasonable period of time.

3 All persons appearing before the
4 Commission are to fill out two witness cards.
5 These cards are located to my left on the table
6 near the door. Upon coming forward to speak to
7 the Commission, please give both cards to the
8 reporter sitting to my right before taking a seat
9 at the table. When presenting information to the
10 Commission, please turn on the speaker to the
11 microphone, first stating your name and home
12 address. When you are finished speaking, please
13 turn your microphone off so that your microphone
14 is no longer picking up sound and background
15 noise.

16 The decision of the Commission in this
17 case must be based exclusively on the public
18 record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary,
19 the Commission requests that persons present not
20 engage with the members of the Commission in
21 conversation during any recess at any time.

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

1 At this time, the Commission will consider
2 any preliminary matters. Does the staff have any
3 preliminary matters?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I am going to ask the two
6 folks we have sitting at the table to introduce
7 themselves for the record. I actually know your
8 names, but I want you to introduce yourself for
9 the record and tell us who you are with.

10 MS. COMBAL: Thank you very much. I am
11 Martine Combal and the Deputy Director of Real
12 Estate in the Office of the Deputy Mayor for
13 Planning and Economic Development, and for the
14 last three years, I have been the local
15 Redevelopment Authority Director for Walter Reed.

16 MR. CROSS: Good evening Chairman Hood and
17 Commissioners. Jason Cross. I am the Project
18 Manager for the Walter Reed Local Redevelopment
19 Authority, and that has been for the last two-and-
20 a-half years.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, now, are you going
22 to go first, or is the Office of Planning going to
23 go first?

24 MS. COMBAL: I believe the Office of

1 Planning is going first, and they we are going to
2 speak after.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, okay, great. Okay,
4 so Mr. Jesick, we will turn it over to you.

5 MR. JESICK: Great, thank you Mr. Chairman
6 and members of the Commission. As you noted, I am
7 joined this evening by Ms. Tracy Gabriel from the
8 Office of Planning, who can address any questions,
9 if there are any, related to the Small Area Plan
10 Process, and, of course, Ms. Chamberlin from DDOT,
11 if there are any transportation-related questions,
12 and Ms. Combal and Mr. Cross from DMPED, who will
13 speak after OP has concluded.

14 The Office of Planning proposes Text and
15 Map Amendments to create a new Walter Reed zone
16 for the District portion of the former Walter Reed
17 Campus -- Walter Reed Army Hospital Campus. Since
18 the time of set down, we have worked with other
19 city agencies, including DDOT, DMPED, and OAG, to
20 make some refinements to the text, though the text
21 you have before you this evening is largely the
22 same that you saw at set down, and, in a moment, I
23 will address some of the changes that we have
24 made.

1 But, I wanted to begin by emphasizing what
2 was discussed at set down, and that is that the
3 zoning that is being proposed is completely
4 derived from the guidance contained in the Walter
5 Reed Small Area Plan, which was adopted by City
6 Council in 2013, and which supplements the
7 Comprehensive Plan, and because the Small Area
8 Plan, or SAP, carries the same weight as the
9 Comprehensive Plan, OP cannot propose zoning that
10 is inconsistent with the SAP, or Small Area Plan.

11 On the screen right now, and the
12 Commission has hard copies in front of you, is the
13 Future Land Use Map contained in the Small Area
14 Plan, and this is one of the tools contained in
15 the SAP that provides guidance for us, and we are
16 lucky in that the Walter Reed Small Area Plan is
17 very specific for all the different areas
18 throughout the campus about what it wants to see,
19 both on the Future Land Use Map, in the policies
20 of the plan, the text of the plan, other graphics
21 contained with the Plan. So it does make the
22 creation of new zoning somewhat easier because it
23 is so specific.

24 So OP used the Future Land Use Map that

1 you see to help create proposed zone boundaries,
2 which are on the screen now. There are eight
3 subzones within the Walter Reed zone, and what I
4 wanted to do quickly was just go through each zone
5 to explain what the plan and the zoning envisioned
6 for that area.

7 Of course, up at the north, you have Fern
8 Street. To the east, of course, is Georgia
9 Avenue, and then Aspen Street along the bottom.

10 I will begin up at the north with WR-1.
11 This is intended to be a residential zone for row
12 houses and flats with 3-4 stories or in the
13 alternative 4-5 stories.

14 WR-2, just to the south of that, this
15 would be the heart of the new construction on the
16 site. It would include medium-density, mixed-use
17 development, with a major retail component.

18 WR-3, which is located along Georgia
19 Avenue, is also a mixed-use zone, and it would not
20 be quite as dense or tall as WR-2. The WR-3 zone
21 also preserves an important green space along
22 Georgia Avenue between Dahlia and Elder Streets
23 that is of great importance both in the plan and,
24 of course, to the community which developed the

1 plan.

2 The WR-4 zone is the site of the original
3 Walter Reed Hospital, and the SAP and the zoning
4 intend to preserve the campus-like atmosphere
5 around the original hospital, and there could be
6 new construction, but at relatively low heights
7 and densities. Because the entire Walter Reed
8 Campus is a historic district, any new
9 construction would also need to not only meet the
10 zoning, of course, but would be reviewed by HPRB,
11 both for compatibility with historic buildings and
12 the historic landscapes around the buildings,
13 which are also important aspects of the historic
14 district.

15 WR-5, at the more southern end of the
16 site, is also a mixed-use zone, and this is the
17 site of the existing steam plant, which is a
18 rather large building, but it also has smaller
19 historic buildings, and that is really the intent
20 of the WR-5, is to have any new construction have
21 a rather modest footprint with fairly low height
22 and density.

23 WR-6 is an open-space zone. It is the
24 site of the Great Lawn and other nearby open

1 spaces. Someone could do a temporary use such as
2 a farmer's market or holiday market, something
3 along those lines, but the only permanent
4 structure that the zoning makes an allowance for
5 is at the very southern end, where the zoning
6 would allow a DPR facility to be located, and that
7 is something that has been discussed in the
8 community for some time.

9 WR-7 would also allow a mix of uses, and,
10 like WR-4, it also intends to maintain a very
11 campus-like setting, so any new construction would
12 be limited to a low-density and height.

13 WR-8, at the corner of 16th and Aspen,
14 would moderate-to-medium density residential, and
15 it also includes a provision for step back in
16 height, away from Aspen Street, to better relate
17 to the homes on the south side of the street,
18 because the topography slopes up fairly steeply
19 from Aspen and from 16th.

20 So that is a quick rundown of the zones.
21 As I mentioned earlier, the major framework of the
22 zoning has not changed since set down -- FARs have
23 not changed, lot occupancy has not change, the
24 zone boundaries have not changed. Parking is the

1 same. There has only been one minor change to
2 height allowance, and that is in the number of
3 stories in one location in WR-5, and that was done
4 in response to HP's, Historic Preservation,
5 comments about a potential infill building on that
6 site.

7 We did make a few other changes. I would
8 characterize them as small but important, and
9 those are summarized beginning on Page 8 of the OP
10 report, and I would like to just highlight a few
11 of those, and several of these changes were made
12 in response to community comments. We met with
13 the Walter Reed Citizen's Advisory Committee after
14 set down. This is also ANC 4A, and that is where
15 the Walter Reed site actually sits, and then ANC
16 4B, which is right across the street -- right
17 across Georgia Avenue from Walter Reed, so they
18 would certainly be impacted as well.

19 So one change we made -- the original text
20 has proposed a limited-density transfer provision,
21 and in response to comments we received from the
22 CAC, the Citizens Advisory Committee, we have
23 expanded that density transfer provision so
24 density can be moved from among a few different

1 parcels within the Walter Reed zone.

2 The community also emphasized, I mentioned
3 the green space between Dahlia and Elder Streets,
4 again, that is right here in the WR-3 zone. To
5 better protect that area, which is very important
6 to the community, we modified the text so that any
7 deviation from the zoning guidelines establishing
8 that plaza would require a variance rather than
9 special exception. In addition to that specific
10 green space, I think neighbors are generally
11 concerned about tree preservation, and while the
12 plan seeks to create a streetscape along Georgia
13 Avenue, a real building presence. The zoning
14 would now allow a setback from Georgia if doing so
15 would preserve mature trees on the site.

16 Another change we are proposing from the
17 time of set down is to allow additional
18 flexibility in the build-to line in WR-2. Similar
19 to along Georgia Avenue, the WR-2 zone is meant to
20 have a strong street wall for any new construction
21 there. But we also envision the possibility of
22 ground-floor residential units, and it has been
23 shown that those types of units that open directly
24 onto the street function better when there is some

1 sort of green buffer between the actual sidewalk
2 and the front door and windows of the residential
3 unit, so we built in some flexibility in that
4 street wall provision. So, those are just a few
5 of the changes that we have proposed, and I would
6 be happy to answer any more questions about those.

7 In response to the Commissions request at
8 set down, we have also provided cross-sections
9 showing the relationships of building that could
10 be built in the Walter Reed zone to existing
11 nearby buildings. Those drawings were attached to
12 your reports, and you have the hard copies in
13 front of you, and they are on the screen as well.

14 Since the report was published, we did
15 notice some small errors in the cross-sections.
16 Those have been corrected in the version you have
17 this evening, and we will be uploading this Power
18 Point to the Office of Zoning website for
19 inclusion in the record. I am happy to discuss
20 the cross-sections in more detail if the
21 Commission has any questions. I did want to
22 emphasize the building envelopes that are shown
23 are just conceptual theoretical building
24 envelopes; they are not meant to represent a

1 specific project or proposal. They are very
2 theoretical as to what the zoning could
3 potentially allow.

4 So, in conclusion, the Small Area Plan,
5 which was adopted by City Council set out a vision
6 for the Walter Reed site. It instructs the Office
7 of Planning to propose zoning to achieve the
8 vision of the plan, and the proposed zoning is
9 consistent with the Small Area Plan and would also
10 allow implementation of the plan and realization
11 of the plan's goals. So, OP therefore recommends
12 that the Commission approve the Proposed Text and
13 Map Amendments.

14 I would like to now turn over to Ms.
15 Combal from the Deputy Mayor's Office, who will
16 speak in more detail about the BRAC and land
17 disposition process as well as opportunities the
18 Walter Reed site presents for the city including
19 affordable housing.

20 MS. COMBAL: Great, thank you very much.
21 Thank you, Commissioners and Chairman Hood.
22 Again, for the record, my names is Martine Combal.
23 I am the Deputy Director of Real Estate in the
24 Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and

1 Economic Development.

2 As I said before, I have the Local
3 Redevelopment Authority Director for the last
4 three years, working on this project. I
5 appreciate the opportunity to provide you with
6 important context and background regarding the
7 former Walter Reed Army Medical Center Project on
8 behalf of the Deputy Mayor's Office.

9 For today's testimony, I would like to
10 provide the Commission with first, an overview of
11 the BRAC process, including the incorporation of
12 what we call Homeless Assistance Providers, as
13 well as the challenge and risks of developing the
14 site, and the District site-specific approach to
15 affordable housing, and finally the overall
16 community benefits that will be incorporated into
17 the project.

18 The redevelopment of Walter Reed
19 represents a unique and critical economic
20 development project for not only Ward 4 and the
21 District, but the region. The redevelopment of
22 Walter Reed, I have to say, is an exercise in
23 balance. The site has many amazing features such
24 as the Great Lawn, the historic structures, a

1 varied topography, but many of these site
2 amenities are also constraints that help to inform
3 the Final Land Use Program that is outlined in the
4 Small Area Plan.

5 This development will create essentially a
6 new neighborhood with approximately 2,000 units of
7 housing, and a new neighborhood town center for
8 the District, while providing surrounding
9 residents, neighborhood-serving retail, and new
10 public amenities. Over the last six years,
11 the District has conducted more than 75 community
12 meetings representing over 110 hours of direct
13 community engagement, and countless staff and
14 consultant hours to shepherd this project.

15 It is important to share that this
16 development opportunity presents itself to the
17 District because of the 2005 Base Realignment and
18 Closure Act, as we generally call BRAC. So we
19 will probably be referring to that several times
20 during our testimony, BRAC, whereby the land was
21 first offered to other Federal users, in 2009, the
22 US Army declared a portion of the Walter Reed
23 Campus surplus.

24 The District subsequently had to negotiate

1 new boundaries with the Army and the Department of
2 State in 2011, which resulted in approximately 67
3 acres and allowed the District's Local
4 Redevelopment Authority to complete a Reuse Plan
5 and a concurrent Small Area Plan.

6 These plans identified community goals,
7 evaluated site and market conditions, and
8 established an overall development program for the
9 site including densities and land uses.
10 (Indiscernible) by the LRA with critical community
11 input, the planning process conducted for the
12 Walter Reed Campus produced what is called a Reuse
13 Plan to comply with Federal requirements prior to
14 the land disposition. Additionally, because the
15 site is being acquired from the Army through the
16 BRAC process, the LRA is required to create a plan
17 for homeless assistance for the US Department of
18 Housing and Urban Development for their review and
19 approval.

20 The LRA accomplished this through what is
21 called the Notice of Interest, or NOI process,
22 through which organizations were selected by the
23 then active LRA Committee, which included agency
24 directors and 10 community members. The selected

1 NOI users included Help USA and So Others Might
2 Eat, aka as SOME, and the Transitional Housing
3 Corporation, which is also known as THC. These
4 NOI users were selected to develop 114 very low
5 income housing units and supportive services for
6 the homeless including seniors and veterans, and
7 have been assigned specific properties on the
8 Walter Reed Campus as part of the Master Plan.

9 The Reuse Plan was informed by the NOI
10 Process, and selected users have been included in
11 the District's BRAC required Homeless Assistance
12 Plan submission, which was submitted to HUD, and I
13 have to say after 18 months of review, we finally
14 received HUD approval in January of 2014.

15 Concurrently, the Small Area Plan was
16 developed by the D.C. Office of Planning in
17 conjunction with LRA and community to satisfy
18 local requirements for land use and zoning,
19 including urban design guidelines that complement
20 the vision laid out in the Reuse Plan.

21 The Commission has received background,
22 obviously, on the Small Area Plan process from the
23 Office of Planning, so I am not going to focus my
24 testimony further on this process. Instead, I

1 would like to share that the LRA has held
2 productive negotiations with our 2013
3 competitively selected Master Developer and the
4 Army regarding the terms of the acquisition and
5 the disposition.

6 It is important to note that under the
7 conveyance terms from the Army, which is through
8 what is called an Economic Development Conveyance,
9 an EDC, and again I have to say for BRAC projects,
10 there are tons of acronyms, so if I need to repeat
11 these, I am happy to do so.

12 The District, through an EDC, must show an
13 overall economic benefit to the area in exchange
14 for the possibility of a transfer for below-
15 market-rate terms. What this does not imply is
16 that the transfer will be at no cost, and the
17 District will, in fact, be obligated to pay the
18 Army for the property. Because the terms are not
19 yet finalized, the District, unfortunately as of
20 today, is not in a position to disclose that
21 information at this time.

22 Along these lines, I would like to further
23 identify some of the additional challenges that I
24 mentioned earlier in my testimony, which are

1 unique to the site and overall acquisition and
2 development.

3 As I stated before, there is a market land
4 payment that is required to the Army as well as a
5 payment guarantee that must be made in order to
6 acquire it. There is also a need for constructing
7 major infrastructure to support all the new uses
8 including both roadways and utilities. The number
9 of historic buildings and historic landscapes
10 featuring varying degrees of structural and
11 architectural soundness also add to the complexity
12 as well as the demolition of building 2, which is
13 the large hospital that you can see from Georgia
14 Avenue is approximately 2.6 million square feet;
15 it is the equivalent of a 12-story building, and I
16 do not remember the cubic square footage of
17 concrete that is in the building, but it is
18 incredibly massive with generally 3-foot wide
19 concrete walls, and the concern also has to do
20 with its proximity to surrounding uses and
21 existing homes across the street.

22 There is also the potential for
23 environmental remediation. There is a challenging
24 topography, which OP alluded to in their testimony

1 before, including major grades in changes, not
2 only north-south, but east-west across the site,
3 and then finally managing the development of such
4 a large multi-use site through multiple market
5 shifts over 20 years, which is what we are
6 anticipating the project to take.

7 In light of these constraints, the
8 redevelopment of Walter Reed is slated to include
9 a significant amount of affordable housing at very
10 AMI levels and serving a variety of unique
11 populations, as I said before, including veterans,
12 seniors, and homeless. The District is committed
13 to achieving very deep affordable housing within
14 the project through the District's Land
15 Disposition Agreement, or LDA, the mixed-income
16 affordable housing in Walter Reed will be more
17 than double the Inclusionary Zoning requirements
18 set forth in the proposed zoning and provides for
19 units serving households at very low income
20 levels, 30% AMI and below, which otherwise could
21 not be achieved through zoning or private
22 development.

23 The property is not owned by the District
24 currently. It is currently in the custody of the

1 US Army, so both the acquisition and disposition
2 of the property will need Council authority that
3 is not provided for under our current disposition
4 authority, which we also call D.C. Code 10-801.

5 The project will exceed the proportion of
6 very low income units that would be required by
7 new affordable housing provisions in the D.C. Code
8 10-801, but also much of the housing will be
9 provided by experience affordable housing managers
10 and service providers. These service providers
11 will not only address the housing needs of very
12 low income seniors, veterans, and homeless
13 households, but also address other important needs
14 by providing crucial support services to help them
15 continue to progress the housing spectrum.

16 Further, it is contemplated that the
17 housing serving these most vulnerable populations
18 will be built early in the development in support
19 of the District strategy to end homelessness.
20 Site-wide, 20% of the total units will be reserved
21 as affordable housing, going beyond the IZ
22 requirements to provide additional affordable
23 dwelling units as proffered through the 2013
24 Master Developer RFP Process that our office

1 completed.

2 Specifically, the project is projected to
3 create 432 affordable housing units, and of those
4 units, as I stated before, 114 are targeted to
5 very low income households. We have about 139 --
6 approximately 109 would be rental, 30 would be for
7 sale for low-income units targeted for AMIs
8 between 31% and 50%, and then 179 units, 149
9 rental and 30 for sale moderate-income unit to
10 households between 51% and 80% AMI.

11 Combining the site constraints along with
12 the Affordable Housing Program creates intense
13 economic pressures to the project, and, as I
14 stated before, the project really is an exercise
15 in balance, and that obviously impacts the site's
16 ability to generate public benefits over and above
17 the significant additional benefits identified
18 through the community process.

19 And, I just want to highlight some of them
20 here, and they include the enhancement of open
21 space, about 14 acres of public open space is
22 planned. There is the inclusion and preservation
23 and care of hundreds of trees across the site,
24 additional recreational, cultural, and historic

Another benefit includes adding vibrancy to the Georgia Avenue corridor. The creation and connection between Georgia Avenue frontage and the new town center as well as the redevelopment's expected to generate approximately 2300 construction jobs, almost 3500 annual employees

1 when the project is stabilized, and about \$4
2 million in tax revenues during construction,
3 approximately \$30 million in cumulative annual
4 revenue when the project is stabilized.

5 As the project has progressed, I would
6 like to just take a couple more minutes to
7 acknowledge several large milestones that have
8 been achieved, including the selection of a Master
9 Developer. It is the Heintz Urban Atlantic Triton
10 Development Team in the fall of 2013, as well as
11 the approval of the Reuse Plan by the US
12 Department of Housing and Urban Development, as I
13 said, in January 2014, the execution of an
14 Exclusive Rights Agreement with the development
15 team of last May 2014, and an agreement with the
16 Army in a preliminary draft term sheet just this
17 past month.

18 There are many steps that need to occur
19 before the property can be transferred from the
20 Army to the District and the Master Development
21 Team. Additional reviews will be required for
22 this project to move forward including, which is
23 required by District law, once the specific terms
24 have been negotiated. The Mayor is anticipated to

1 seek Council authority to execute the transaction
2 upon the terms and conditions previously
3 negotiated. Prior to the Council action, the
4 Council will hold at least one public hearing
5 which will include opportunities for interested
6 stakeholders to provide their input and testimony
7 on the proposed acquisition and disposition.

8 Due to the historic nature of the site,
9 and I think that it was mentioned by the Office of
10 Planning, there are multiple buildings on the
11 campus that are on the National Historic Register,
12 the site plans will be required to be submitted to
13 the Historic Preservation Review Board, and, again
14 this process will provide a forum for individuals
15 and groups to express their perspectives.

16 The District is seeking zoning consistent
17 with the Small Area Plan that will provide
18 certainty to all project stakeholders while also
19 responding to market realities. I hope that I
20 have helped to convey the opportunity that the
21 District believes the Walter Reed redevelopment
22 presents to the residents of Ward 4, the city, and
23 the region. Thank you, again, and I am available
24 to answer any questions. Jason Cross, my

1 colleague here, is also available for questions.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I want to thank you
3 Mr. Jesick, thank you Ms. Combal; hopefully I
4 pronounced your name correctly.

5 MS. COMBAL: Combal, yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I know that the District
7 Department of Transportation, Ms. Chamberlin, is
8 here if we have any questions as we move through
9 this process and also Mr. Cross also from the
10 Deputy Mayor's office is here if we have any
11 questions. I think are at that point, right, Mr.
12 Lawson and Mr. Jesick? You ready for our
13 questions?

14 MR. LAWSON: Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right,
16 colleagues, let's open it up and see if we have
17 any questions. Are we still tired from the other
18 night? Any questions?

19 [Laughter.]

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think all of us... Vice
21 Chair, you can start us off.

22 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, I appreciate
23 the presentations that have been made. They were
24 very informative. I was pleased to hear that DDOE

1 is involved, and that there is commitment to
2 sustainable features because now is the time to do
3 it. There seems to be a number, of course, of
4 unknowns. You don't know the price the city has
5 to pay for the land, and, therefore, I really
6 don't know how you could even select a developer
7 without having that basic knowledge and come up
8 with a plan to implement not even having that
9 basic knowledge of that remediation issues that
10 you mentioned. You have historic buildings that
11 are on the site that you have to retain, and, of
12 course, the cost of those are extremely high. So,
13 I don't know if you've done some type of financial
14 modeling on this. I would assume so, if you took
15 the next step of selecting a developer. Can you
16 just kind of comment on that.

17 MS. COMBAL: Yes, I can comment on that.
18 So, as part of what is called an Economic
19 Development Conveyance, there are EDC-specific
20 regulations under BRAC that we have to follow, and
21 one of them requires the development of a business
22 plan and financial model.

23 So that we developed, at this point, I
24 think it was over a year and a half ago, and we've

1 done several iterations of it, and we have
2 submitted that to the US Army. So there is a
3 narrative and financial plan that is required to
4 be submitted and reviewed by them, and part of the
5 idea in selecting a Master Developer while we were
6 going through that process was to make sure that
7 our assumptions, our market assumptions, were in
8 fact correct, that we were in line with the
9 research that we had done as part of the Reuse
10 Plan. We did a market study as part of the Reuse
11 and Small Area Plan, and then we actually did a
12 further update as part of our Economic Development
13 Conveyance Application that was submitted to the
14 Army, and then we worked with the development team
15 to further refine some of the economics of that in
16 crafting the offer.

17 We needed to make sure, because the
18 District is anticipating that at the time of the
19 acquisition there will be a simultaneous closing
20 with the development team that the economics are,
21 in fact, in line with market realities.

22 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Because this plan was
23 adopted in 2013, and I guess my question to you is
24 based upon today's demographics. Did that, in any

1 way, change some of your assumptions? Today's
2 demographics and issues.

3 MS. COMBAL: When we did our last update
4 to the market study, we did not find that there
5 was a dramatic deviation. Obviously, that can
6 shift. Markets can change fairly dramatically,
7 but, to date, we have not found there has been a
8 dramatic shift.

9 VICE CHAIR COHEN: What informed your
10 decision on the percentage of affordable housing?
11 In other words, you are very pleased at achieving
12 20%, of which a number of those units will be
13 available to veterans and seniors. I'm assuming
14 the homeless population will be mostly veterans or
15 with some households -- this is almost a 2-part
16 question -- now that I'm stating it. Are most of
17 the veterans the homeless or are you going to be
18 able to house some of the families from the city's
19 shelter that -- what is the big huge shelter...

20 MS. COMBAL: D.C. General.

21 VICE CHAIR COHEN: General, yeah.

22 MS. COMBAL: That is a great question.
23 Actually when the NOIs were selected several years
24 ago, and as part of the incorporation into the

1 Reuse Plan and the Small Area Plan, there was a
2 strong discussion from the community about the
3 type of permanent supportive housing that would be
4 put in place, so Help USA will be developing, I
5 believe, it is 75 units of veteran housing, and
6 there is a waterfall in terms of the populations
7 that would be served, but the primary target would
8 be veterans, and the for So Others Might Eat, the
9 focus is on seniors, and then again, there is a
10 different waterfall for those units. So, that's
11 the main focus, and then actually THC, they are
12 getting about 6000 square feet of office space
13 that would be providing some supportive services,
14 but it is mostly for their office location.

15 VICE CHAIR COHEN: So, residents in D.C.
16 General will not likely have units on site.

17 MS. COMBAL: I personally don't know the
18 population of D.C. General, so I can't say whether
19 or not those individuals would, in fact, be
20 eligible for the housing. But, I'm sure there
21 will be a coordinated strategy by SOME and Help
22 USA. I think that would be the expectation by our
23 office.

24 VICE CHAIR COHEN: There are families in

1 D.C. General, and what I was trying to get at is...

2 MS. COMBAL: Family.

3 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Its families, and I
4 don't think the plan incorporates that slice of
5 the population.

6 MS. COMBAL: Okay.

7 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Again, I don't want to
8 take away from the efforts, and again this is 66
9 acres, and in the crisis that we're in of
10 affordability, I know you're doing -- making your
11 best efforts; however, again, when you have a
12 mixed-income community and people are making
13 minimum wage, many of our workers make minimum
14 wage, they are likely also at 30% of median income
15 or even less, 20%, and when I say minimum-wage
16 workers, I'm talking about retail, a lot of the
17 hotel workers, and that is a large part of our
18 population that we're still unable to serve in the
19 city.

20 So, again, I don't want to detract from
21 the 20%, but when you talk about mixed income,
22 mixed income could be even a higher percentage of
23 one-third of the population when you have 2000
24 people or households that you're expecting to come

1 live there. So it would be remiss of me to not
2 make that as part of my usual efforts to pay
3 attention to the people who cannot remain in the
4 city, and there are probably many people in Ward 4
5 that couldn't even move to that site because
6 they're not making the income of units that will
7 be available, especially if they are not a veteran
8 or a senior. So, I just throw that out for -- you
9 know, I know that there has been a lot of
10 inclusion of the community that will probably
11 speak on behalf of this projection, but the city
12 is in dire straits, and I always make a plea for
13 more.

14 I guess, maybe this is a question that I
15 have for the Office of Planning with regard to the
16 sectional drawings, and I did not quite understand
17 Section -- oh, I'm sorry -- on each of the
18 sections, you seem to have dotted lines, sometimes
19 -- oh it is really north, the north, Section 1
20 north. The dotted lines that appear, there is
21 like a word up there, but its so tiny, I couldn't
22 even read it with a magnifying glass. Can you
23 kind of describe that so I understand it
24 completely?

1 MR. JESICK: Sure, I apologize.

2 VICE CHAIR COHEN: More thoroughly.

3 MR. JESICK: Yeah, sure, I apologize about
4 the small font. That is just the dashed line on
5 the north part of Section 1 is the outline of the
6 existing hospital building, Building #2. It is
7 the big white hospital that is at the center of
8 the site now.

9 VICE CHAIR COHEN: So does this
10 demonstrate that we're going to create lower
11 heights?

12 MR. JESICK: Yes, the existing hospital...

13 VICE CHAIR COHEN: And replace...

14 MR. JESICK: The existing hospital is 130
15 feet. The maximum in the WR-2 zone would be 85
16 feet.

17 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Why are we reducing the
18 amount of footage, the height?

19 MR. JESICK: The Small Area Plan called
20 for lower heights there, medium-density
21 development, so we feel that the zoning that is
22 proposed is in line with what was set forth in the
23 Small Area Plan.

24 VICE CHAIR COHEN: I see, thank you for

1 explaining that. What's north of Fern Street,
2 what type of housing is north of Fern?

3 MR. JESICK: It's mostly single-family
4 detached, I believe.

5 VICE CHAIR COHEN: That's what I thought,
6 okay. How many buildings -- do we know how many
7 buildings there are that are historic in that
8 area, and have there been analyses made of these
9 buildings as far as the structural soundness?

10 MR. JESICK: The number of buildings -- I
11 mean, quite a few historic buildings are on site
12 that are being retained. I believe they have been
13 studied to a great extent, and I don't have the
14 number, you know, of buildings, but we can get
15 that.

16 COMMISSIONER MAY: Can I just ask -- are
17 any of them vacant?

18 MS. COMBAL: They are all currently
19 vacant.

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: And, how long have they
21 been vacant?

22 MS. COMBAL: Since September of 2011, and
23 if I can just add, the Army did go through a
24 Section 106 process, so there is fairly extensive

1 documentation around the buildings. I will say,
2 in terms of structural soundness, there has --
3 we've done some structural studies for our
4 purposes, but that was not part of the Army
5 analysis.

6 VICE CHAIR COHEN: But, if they did a 106,
7 wouldn't that be part of it?

8 MS. COMBAL: I don't believe, but we can
9 double-check on that.

10 VICE CHAIR COHEN: In my recollection from
11 way back, on a 106, that's a long time ago...

12 MS. COMBAL: We'll double-check on that.

13 MR. CROSS: Commissioner Cohen, if you
14 refer to Page 3 of the OP report, there is what I
15 call the red map, and it shows the historic
16 buildings; that would give you a sense of which
17 ones are being kept and are deemed historic.

18 VICE CHAIR COHEN: The deep red ones are
19 being kept?

20 MR. CROSS: Correct.

21 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay. Alright, I think
22 I have one other issue -- oh, two issues or
23 questions. Institutional WR-7, what are you
24 anticipating, some type of uses for that?

1 MS. COMBAL: As part of the NOI process,
2 the process was open essentially to public benefit
3 conveyance users, nonprofits. So, there are two
4 charter schools that are slated to go into
5 Building 11, which is part of WR-7, I believe is
6 the zone.

7 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay, and as far as
8 economic development, though, what type of uses
9 would you be looking for to create permanent jobs,
10 although I personally think housing is an economic
11 tool, but if you could elaborate a little bit on
12 that, I would appreciate it.

13 MS. COMBAL: For WR-7, so it's the charter
14 schools and then So Others Might Eat are included
15 in that particular zone, and then there is also a
16 piece of that that is slated to be multi-family
17 housing. So, that is the intent for that
18 particular zone. And then, I believe, Building 1
19 is -- I'm not remember the zone offhand -- that is
20 slated for institutional or commercial uses, and
21 the program right now is some office space as well
22 as a hotel.

23 VICE CHAIR COHEN: What would be the draw
24 for a hotel? Just the entire site, are you

1 thinking?

2 MS. COMBAL: I'm sorry, would you repeat
3 the question?

4 VICE CHAIR COHEN: What's the draw for the
5 hotel use?

6 MS. COMBAL: The draw for the hotel use --
7 so, on the other side of the campus is the
8 Department of State. They will be -- they are
9 currently slated to be taking about 43 acres for
10 Foreign Embassies as well as Chanceries, so there
11 could be some synergistic, I guess, activity that
12 could happen between those sites.

13 VICE CHAIR COHEN: This is finally - the
14 steam plant -- is that going to be retained or is
15 that going to be demolished?

16 MS. COMBAL: The boiler plant toward the
17 south of the site off of Aspen Street, it's a
18 historic building and was actually one of the
19 first buildings that was built on the campus, and
20 that is going to be retained. I think the idea is
21 that that area would have arts and cultural uses,
22 possibly restaurants, some retail aspect, but the
23 idea is to have an arts and cultural focus.

24 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Alright, because my

1 other question would have been, would you
2 consider, you know, like a Geothermal plant or co-
3 generation plant, but I guess not.

4 MS. COMBAL: Well, we are looking at that,
5 actually. We're working on that in conjunction
6 with the development team to explore what would be
7 3-4 energy districts that would be co-generation.
8 We're still exploring the possibility of tri-
9 generation with the production of electricity, and
10 I think the idea is as the development is phased
11 and constructed that those energy centers would
12 come on line as opposed to one central plant that
13 you have a lot of capital upfront costs that you
14 can actually phase that out over time.

15 VICE CHAIR COHEN: I presume this area
16 could be TIFF'd as it is built out so that you
17 could even pay for that over the long term. Is
18 that being considered?

19 MS. COMBAL: That is a possibility;
20 however, we have limitations currently with our
21 debt cap. I believe there is some room available
22 with the debt cap; however, some of the issue is
23 the amount of revenue that is coming in to cover
24 the debt cap payments. So, there's -- at the

1 moment, I think there is limited flexibility in
2 issuing any further TIFFs.

3 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Too bad. And, how many
4 years is the build out? Can you remind me? I
5 know that I think we heard that before, but I
6 don't remember.

7 MS. COMBAL: We, through our office
8 analysis, we're looking at about 20 years for the
9 total build out. That would include all of the
10 infrastructure as well as the completion of the
11 vertical components, the structures themselves.

12 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay, and if OP can
13 remind me, what is -- where did I -- did we have a
14 phasing plan? Didn't we have a phasing plan
15 somewhere? I just don't -- I couldn't find it.

16 MR. JESICK: There's no phasing plan
17 included with the zoning. I don't know if the LDA
18 includes any sort of requirement for phasing or...

19 MS. COMBAL: We're working through a
20 phasing concept currently, but you may have seen
21 an earlier phasing plan from the development team.
22 We have our own website that is walterreedLRA.com
23 where we post a lot of material, and then the
24 development team also has walterreedtomorrow.com.

1 They may have a copy of their phasing plan up
2 there.

3 VICE CHAIR COHEN: I thought I saw it, I
4 just thought I saw it in our documents, which I
5 have to base my decision on.

6 MS. COMBAL: Okay, thank you.

7 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you Vice
9 Chair. Who would like to go next? Okay,
10 Commissioner Miller.

11 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr.
12 Chairman, and thank you Mr. Jesick and Ms. Combal
13 on your presentations, and I have a question for
14 Ms. Chamberlin from the Department of
15 Transportation. This is a very, another one of
16 these incredible transformational projects that,
17 as you said, Ms. Combal, will create a new
18 neighborhood, and I think there has been an
19 incredible amount of community engagement in
20 creating the Reuse Plan and Small Area Plan in
21 getting to where we are today. I remember being
22 at some of those 74 meetings in the community and
23 seeing a lot of the same people, some of the
24 people who were there as well.

1 So, I mean, it means 2 million, almost 2
2 million square feet of residential use, 2000
3 units, as you said, 767,000 square feet of office,
4 212,000 square feet of retail, 176,000 square feet
5 of other creative uses, off street parking places,
6 the public open space, which includes a lot of
7 green space in the plaza, and other spaces open to
8 the public. The whole opening up the grid, the
9 street grid, I mean, maybe there is an energy grid
10 that will be opened up too, but integrating it
11 with the neighborhood as opposed to being a
12 property hid behind a fence that doesn't relate to
13 the neighborhood. All that is very important, and
14 it has been incorporated in what I have seen in
15 the Reuse Plan and the Small Area Plan.

16 On the affordable housing, so it's a total
17 of 432 units that are called for in the ERA or the
18 LDA or...

19 MS. COMBAL: Excuse me, currently, it's in
20 our Exclusive Rights Agreement, but we're
21 negotiating our Land Disposition Agreement, our
22 LDA, so that will be a condition in the LDA.

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay, I may have
24 seen this somewhere before, but I would like to

1 have in our record, if we don't already, the
2 Exclusive Rights Agreement, just to see what the
3 parameters are for the affordable housing and for
4 the other uses. I guess my question to Office of
5 Planning or to DMPED is since the Exclusive Rights
6 Agreement does call for nearly, about 20%
7 affordable housing, ranging from very low, below
8 30%, at 114 units to 109 units between 31% and 50%
9 and 149 units between 51% and 80%. Since it is
10 double what the Inclusionary Zoning requires,
11 which would only have been approximately 8% of the
12 total of 2000 units, why wouldn't we want to put
13 in the zoning regulation something that calls for
14 the higher percentage of units that is planned,
15 that is called for in the Small Area Plan as well?

16

17 MR. JESICK: Given the parameters of the
18 LDA, we knew that it was requiring a higher
19 percentage. We felt that in the zoning, we didn't
20 feel that it would be -- we felt comfortable
21 presenting the standard IZ requirements. We
22 didn't feel that at this -- with our -- I'm not
23 explaining this very well, I apologize -- that we
24 shouldn't be proposing a new standard for IZ kind

1 of out-of-the-blue on the zoning side. With the
2 backup of the LDA, we knew that those units were
3 going to be provided, so we felt comfortable with
4 just the standard IZ requirements.

5 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, I think I said
6 this at set down. I would, for one, feel more
7 comfortable if we recognized the reality of what's
8 being planned for this Walter Reed specifically
9 planned and proposed, specifically zoned site, and
10 have the higher percentage reflected somehow in
11 the zoning. I would be interested, if my other
12 colleagues are, in seeing whether that -- you
13 know, what kind of text we would get as a result
14 of that. I think it just reflects the reality. I
15 don't want to somehow give an impression that it's
16 ever -- that it's going to be 8% when we are
17 planning for 20%. So, that's where I am on that.

18 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Excuse me for
19 interrupting. I would concur with you.

20 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you Madam Vice
21 Chair. On the sectional drawings, I have a little
22 -- I appreciate you providing them, but I had a
23 little trouble reading them. I think the
24 community, or at least one thing I saw from one of

1 the ANCs, asked for a 3D model that shows the
2 height, bulk, massing of the possible proposed
3 development, and how it relates to the surrounding
4 community. I don't know if we need a 3D model,
5 but we often do -- and I know this is a Zoning
6 Text and Map Amendment, not a specific project,
7 but I think -- I don't want the District to have
8 to go through a lot of expense, but I think it
9 would be helpful to the community and to us to see
10 some illustrative renderings that show how these
11 buildings, how the possible total maximum massing
12 or arrangement with massing and heights and
13 densities would relate to the surrounding
14 community.

15 I think that would give comfort to the
16 community. I think it would give comfort to us.
17 I mean, it's a large site, and there is a lot --
18 you mentioned the set backs that you are doing in
19 one area, and I think if you could show that, how
20 it's being sensitive to the neighbors across the
21 street and elsewhere, it would be helpful to us.
22 As it is, you are getting testimony and opposition
23 to anything above 65 feet, when I think if they
24 saw something that showed how something higher

1 could be set back or so far away that it's not
2 going to matter as much -- would that be possible
3 to get some kind of illustrative rendering, or do
4 we have that somewhere, or do you have that
5 somewhere already?

6 MS. COMBAL: Unfortunately, we don't have
7 that. We would have to procure it. So, we would
8 have to look into procuring those additional
9 services.

10 [SPEAKING OFF MIC.]

11 MS. COMBAL: Oh, excuse me, I'm corrected.

12 COMMISSIONER MILLER: That's on the
13 walterreedtomorrow.com website?

14 MS. COMBAL: We have sections, so I -- why
15 don't you just let our office get back to you on
16 that and clarify exactly what we have and whether
17 or not we need to find or amend our current
18 contract with our architecture and planning team.

19 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay, that would be
20 great, thank you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me also add since we
22 are agreeing tonight, I would agree, whatever we
23 can do to try to help us show how this is in
24 relationship to the neighborhood, I would agree

1 with that. We could perspective, not a whole
2 lot of money, not a 3D as was requested, but just
3 something so we can kind of see the relationships.

4 Okay? Thank you.

5 MS. COMBAL: Okay, thank you.

6 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I'm pleased to be in
7 agreement with you tonight, Mr. Chairman.

8 [Laughter.]

9 COMMISSIONER MILLER: You mentioned --
10 somebody mentioned -- the retail, that a major
11 retail component, I think, in the WR-2 zone. I
12 think you mentioned that, Mr. Jesick. Is that the
13 grocery store that people are looking for?

14 MR. JESICK: It's been reported in the
15 press that there are talks with grocery stores,
16 yes.

17 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Does the plan or the
18 ERA call specifically for a grocery store? Is it
19 required or is it just encouraged, or is it --
20 what's it -- I know that people have been on tours
21 there, which is great.

22 MS. COMBAL: The Small Area Plan does
23 refer to the opportunity in the WR-2 zone, I think
24 it is noted as Land Bay E, where the current

1 former hospital sits, Building 2, as an
2 opportunity for a large-format retailer, so it
3 doesn't specifically call out a grocer. We know
4 that there is market demand. There is interest
5 from grocers in the community to have someone
6 occupy that space, but the language that is in the
7 Small Area Plan specifically refers to a large-
8 format retailer.

9 MR. LAWSON: And if I might, since we are
10 talking about zoning tonight as opposed to a
11 development plan, we want to make sure that the
12 zoning would accommodate those uses, so in terms
13 of permitted uses in terms of heights of
14 buildings, in terms of all those kinds of things,
15 in terms of parking, we want to make sure that the
16 zoning reflected the Small Area Plan, which
17 reflected a desire for those kinds of uses.

18 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Right, and we
19 typically would not require that specific use in a
20 Zoning Text Amendment.

21 MR. LAWSON: We have never done that
22 before.

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay.

24 MR. LAWSON: I'm sorry, you know, unless

1 the Small Area Plan had specifically said, "There
2 shall be a grocery store at this site", in which
3 case we could have incorporated that, you know,
4 into the zoning. The Small Area Plan did not get
5 into that level of specificity, but it did
6 definitely call for locations for retail, and that
7 is clearly acknowledged and accommodated in the
8 zoning that Mr. Jesick crafted.

9 COMMISSIONER MILLER: And, is that the
10 case for the other large parcels, the yards
11 project at southeast -- the old Southeast Federal
12 Center zoning that we did there, and then
13 MacMillan, and -- was it true there too, or was it
14 required in those cases that a grocery store would
15 be...

16 MR. LAWSON: I can't make...

17 COMMISSIONER MILLER: MacMillan was a
18 specific project, so that is a little different.
19 We are doing zoning.

20 MR. LAWSON: Sure, each one of those
21 projects that you mentioned was a little bit
22 different in terms of how the planning was done
23 and how the zoning was created to implement those
24 plans. But, unless Ms. Gabriel can think of one,

1 I can't think of a plan or zoning which
2 specifically says you must do a particular form of
3 retail at a particular location. There certainly
4 are some plans and some zones kind of throughout
5 the city that have preferences for certain kinds
6 of retail. You know, 8th Street, Georgia Avenue,
7 Southeast Federal Center, all have areas where
8 particular forms of retail are preferred, but not
9 one specific retailer, I guess.

10 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Right. Thank you
11 for that response. Finally, Ms. Chamberlin, thank
12 you for your very comprehensive report, and I
13 would direct those that are interested in seeing
14 all of the transportation recommendations of DDOT
15 to go to our website for this case and look at
16 that report. You have a lot of mitigations in
17 there, as are appropriate. At this juncture, are
18 any of them planned in the Capitol budget or
19 anything like that?

20 MS. CHAMBERLIN: You mean by the District
21 budget? They're not. So, our expectation is that
22 this would be conveyed on the future developer of
23 the site or future developers.

24 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I wanted to give you

1 an opportunity, if you wanted to take it, just to
2 take a couple minutes maybe to summarize your very
3 comprehensive report for the benefit of the
4 public, if you want to, otherwise, they can enjoy
5 reading it like I did.

6 MS. CHAMBERLIN: Sure, I mean, overall,
7 the comprehensive transportation report, the study
8 was done as part of the Small Area Plan back in
9 2012, and we scoped it out with the traffic
10 consultant, and we did a very thorough analysis
11 that showed that we expect some significant
12 traffic to be coming to the site, but it is less
13 than what the traffic was when Walter Reed was
14 fully operational. With that, we found -- I mean,
15 it's 6 pages of mitigations, but they are common
16 mitigations that we see for development projects
17 across the District, which include robust
18 transportation demand measures for implementation
19 of Capitol bike share, providing transit
20 subsidies, doing some turn lanes, upgrades on some
21 signals, putting in some new traffic signals, are
22 some of the main, I guess, items along with a lot
23 of other smaller items, and our expectation is
24 that is going to be transferred in, I guess, this

1 Land Disposition Agreement, so the future
2 developer of the site will be responsible to put
3 these items in. So, these items are not the
4 responsibility of the District right now.

5 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you for that
6 response, and thank you all for your presentation.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Commissioner May.
8 Do we need to start the clock?

9 COMMISSIONER MAY: No, not at all. I will
10 take less time than Vice Chair; how about that?

11 [Laughter.]

12 So, on the IZ question and what's in what
13 we are proposing for the regulations versus
14 what's, I believe, being required under the LDA,
15 what is the Office of Deputy Mayor's view on that?

16 I mean, how do you feel about it being required
17 in code versus what you're negotiating in the LDA?

18 MS. COMBAL: The way our office has
19 historically dealt with that is to -- we have our
20 own set of verbal housing covenants, and the
21 benefit there is crafting it so that it fits the
22 project specifically and provides the development
23 some flexibility. We have general standards in
24 terms of the allocation, the types of units. We

1 want to make sure that they are similar size and
2 type, and so forth, but it does give our office
3 some flexibility, and projects that do receive
4 affordable housing subsidy, so those projects can
5 apply for an IZ waiver in terms of the
6 administration and so forth because there are some
7 challenges with having multiple covenants recorded
8 against the property, so that has been allowed
9 for. But, our office does feel that it's
10 important to have some of that flexibility.

11 COMMISSIONER MAY: So, if I add all that
12 together, what you're saying is that you would
13 rather have it defined the way the Office of
14 Planning is, and then you have the flexibility to
15 go up to 20% or to vary things as you see
16 appropriate in order to develop the property?

17 MS. COMBAL: As I said before, the goal is
18 to have 20%, and we want to make sure that those
19 units get constructed, but there are other
20 economic constraints, including the infrastructure
21 that needs to be developed across the site. There
22 is existing infrastructure, but it is over 100
23 years old, and it has to be replaced. There is a
24 balance in what public amenities can be, I would

1 say, extracted from the project.

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand all that
3 stuff. I am just trying to get you to tell me yes
4 or no, do you support the Office of Planning the
5 way they have drafted it?

6 MS. COMBAL: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER MAY: And, you want it that
8 way definitively because that is what you need?

9 MS. COMBAL: Yes, that's what we're
10 requesting, and that's what the Office of Planning
11 has provided.

12 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, because I mean
13 their answer on that was not as definitive about
14 how much you need.

15 MS. COMBAL: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so for the Office
17 of Planning, I see that the only density being
18 allowed in the green space zone, what is that WR-
19 6, is .5 FAR for Parks and Recreation Type Use,
20 right?

21 MR. JESICK: Correct.

22 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so that's some
23 minor Parks and Rec shelter kind of thing or
24 whatever, and did you look at whether any portion

1 of the green space would be appropriate for
2 another kind of amenity, you know the sort of
3 coffee shop sort of thing or kiosk that sells some
4 food or whatever? Did you look at those sorts of
5 uses as part of the green space, or are you simply
6 relying on the surrounding retail to provide that?

7 MR. JESICK: Primarily relying on the
8 surrounding retail. You could do a temporary
9 structure in the WR-6 the way the zoning is
10 crafted now. That landscape is also considered
11 historic, so any changes to that landscape with
12 permanent structures would need to go before HPRB.

13 COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand that's a
14 complications, but it's not a prevention. I am
15 going to ask this question because, you know,
16 certainly the Park Service relies on parks and the
17 businesses that surround parks to provide those
18 kinds of amenities, but very often that's not
19 enough, and we're looking at the city about
20 putting a coffee shop kind of thing into Franklin
21 Park, so it's just something I thought you ought
22 to consider in terms of the allowed uses, not that
23 I'm suggesting that what it really needs; I have
24 no idea what it really needs or whether anything

1 fits. I just think that it's a question that we
2 run into, and I wouldn't want to see you bound by
3 something that prevents you from providing what
4 people might regard as an amenity.

5 MR. JESICK: Sure, we can follow up on
6 that with the Historic Preservation Office. My
7 understanding is that they did not wish to see
8 additional permanent structures within that open
9 green space. That is one of the reasons why we
10 kept it fairly restrictive.

11 COMMISSIONER MAY: Sure.

12 MR. JESICK: And, because there will be
13 retail around it, we were comfortable with that.
14 But, we'll follow up with them.

15 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I mean there are
16 some fingers of space that sort of spread out from
17 the Great Lawn, and I mean, I don't know what
18 makes sense there, and I certainly understand the
19 Historic Preservation issues there. So, I'm not
20 advocating, I'm just asking a question.

21 I understand, I think, pretty much the
22 bulk and height of the structures as they are
23 being proposed. I do note that the highest -- the
24 zone with the greatest height, WR-2, which goes to

1 85, you could go to 95 with a PUD, right? Isn't
2 that what the regulations say?

3 MR. JESICK: That's correct.

4 COMMISSIONER MAY: And, another 20%, is
5 that right, 20% increase in FAR?

6 MR. JESICK: That's correct.

7 COMMISSIONER MAY: So, we're really not
8 talking about an 85-foot maximum, we're talking
9 about a 95-foot maximum, but even so, I think your
10 sections show why that height is not an onerous
11 height, particularly compared to what's there now.

12

13 Just the last question, explain to me the
14 alternate language for WR-1, I mean, what's your
15 intention there, and is that something that we
16 have to make a decision on, which language that
17 we're going to support in terms of the height and
18 so on?

19 MR. JESICK: Yes, the Commission would
20 need to decide between those two alternatives.

21 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So, I don't see
22 a lot of discussion of one versus the other, so it
23 makes it kind of hard to decide other than hearing
24 from the public.

1 MR. JESICK: Well, I can explain a little
2 more. The plan does give guidance on the height
3 of the row houses in that area, and specific
4 pages, if you wish to reference them, Page 76
5 talks about how new buildings in the WR-1 area
6 should provide a transition from the single-family
7 on the north side of Fern to taller buildings in
8 the WR-2. Page 78 says that, and this is a quote,
9 "Proposed building heights should range from 3-4
10 stories with a garage and basement beneath", so
11 that implies even more than 3 or 4 stories if you
12 are talking about a garage underneath the actual
13 living space. On Page 79, the site section
14 actually...

15 COMMISSIONER MAY: Can I clarify? I mean,
16 isn't this a sloped site?

17 MR. JESICK: It is sloped down from Fern
18 toward Elder.

19 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, so I mean,
20 couldn't you interpret that as meaning 4 stories
21 from the street with a garage that, you know,
22 would be entered at grade, but that grade would be
23 below the measuring point, so in the cellar space.

24 MR. JESICK: I think certainly with alley

1 access, you could -- that would be the case on
2 houses fronting on Fern. On Elder, and this is
3 the next citation I was going to pass along, on
4 Page 79, it does show a 5-story structure, and you
5 know, I think like you, when we think of a 5-story
6 row house, that is certainly out of the norm for
7 D.C., but the policies and the language in the
8 drawings and the plan are actually somewhat
9 clearer on this point that you could potentially
10 have a 5-story building fronting on Elder, so that
11 is why we proposed the 3 to 4 stories but also
12 gave you the alternative, which is also in
13 conformance with the Plan of 4 or 5 stories.

14 COMMISSIONER MAY: So, before I forget, do
15 you, does the language now specify numbers of
16 units in those 5-story townhouses or 4-story
17 townhouses?

18 MR. JESICK: The zoning would only allow
19 single-family or flats.

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: Or flats, right. Okay.
21 I mean, 5 stories would be really unusual for
22 flats. I mean a 3-story flat on top of a 2-story
23 flat. I mean, I've seen 2 on 2, and typically one
24 of them is actually a cellar level, but I guess

1 occasionally it is at 4 stories.

2 MR. JESICK: In Fort Lincoln, we have seen
3 some 2 over 2s, all above grade. That is one
4 example that comes to mind.

5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, I appreciate that
6 example. Now, the last question on that subject
7 is that, what I see in this section seems to imply
8 that these are back-to-back townhouses, you know,
9 with garages underneath accessed from the alley,
10 that housing type that some of us love so much.
11 But, the zone requirements in terms of rear yard,
12 I mean, on the one hand it's no -- one alternate
13 is no rear yard, and another alternate is a 20-
14 foot rear yard, and then, of course, there is the
15 requirement that says 70% maximum lot occupancy,
16 and you can't count private alley toward your lot,
17 so I'm not sure how that actually comes together
18 in what you're imagining. Can you try to explain
19 that to me? Are we expecting actually to have
20 rear yards there? Is there enough depth to have
21 rear yards? If there is enough -- if there is not
22 enough depth for rear yards, how do we get to 70%
23 lot occupancy?

24 MR. JESICK: I think there is enough space

1 for rear yards. We scaled it out, and I forget
2 exactly how it works out, but right now what is
3 being proposed, or what is shown in the section, I
4 should say, is a set back from Elder Street. The
5 plan does talk about significant green space in
6 front of units, but I think there is also a desire
7 to have useable rear yards. So, the zoning text
8 just did not require a rear yard, but it also had
9 the alternative of 20-foot rear yard. Now, to
10 make that actually useable, if that is a direction
11 the Commission wants to go in, I think we would
12 need to look at further requirements about
13 pervious surface or somehow requiring the parking
14 to be at the alley with the yard in between the
15 parking and the house.

16 COMMISSIONER MAY: So, I think in my mind,
17 and you know, there are just a lot of variables
18 there that are floating around, and I'm not sure
19 how they come together. Maybe it's just needing
20 some examples of how it light lay out on lots
21 would help, or otherwise some further -- something
22 else that helps us figure it out. I mean, I would
23 think that being an architect I would be able to
24 figure that out, but, you know, it's soft enough

1 here, I mean, I could certainly figure out lots of
2 permeations of it, but I don't think you want me
3 up here sort of sketching these things out and
4 trying to figure it out, and handing you the
5 sketch. So, if you can give a little bit more
6 information on that, I think it would help me
7 understand what those units are going to be.
8 That's it, thanks.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner
10 May. Ms. Combal and Mr. Cross, let me ask the
11 community participation. I have kind of stayed
12 out if it. you know, I live in the city too, so I
13 hear about all these meetings that are going on
14 with Walter Reed, and this has been going on for a
15 while, but the community input, I notice you say
16 50 to I think the report says 50-100 people mostly
17 participated in every meeting you had, is that
18 correct? Did I read that correct?

19 MS. COMBAL: That was as part of the Reuse
20 Plan and it was a concurrent process for the Small
21 Area Plan that took place with the Reuse Plan, but
22 most of those were early on in the process as the
23 plan was being formed.

24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: But, typically throughout

1 this whole process, you had a great number of
2 folks who provided input and gave their
3 suggestions and input. It was a well-vetted
4 process. Is that safe to say that?

5 MS. COMBAL: That is definitely safe to
6 say, and we have our Community Advisory Committee
7 that is legislated that has been meeting, I think,
8 for the last year or so, and I think just at the
9 last meeting in February where we did discuss the
10 proposed zoning, I think we had between 40 and 50
11 individuals that showed up, so sometimes it ranges
12 closer to 20, but we do generally get a fairly
13 good turnout for our Community Advisory Committee
14 meetings and other community meetings that we
15 participate in.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me ask you this, the
17 other acreage, other than the 66 the District is
18 going to take control eventually of, what is going
19 on on the other side in the other area? What are
20 your plans for that, or what is going on over
21 there?

22 MS. COMBAL: The Department of State has
23 issued a Draft Environmental Impact Statement
24 that, I think, was issued maybe about a year or

1 year and a half ago. We would have to check on
2 the exact date. They worked through a planning
3 process. I will say that there has been some
4 interest that you may have heard about from the
5 news for a public health use for the northern
6 portion of the site. The building in particular
7 is Building 54. It is a former lab space, I think
8 it's the Armed Forces Pathology Institute, and
9 there was language actually inserted in the
10 National Defense Authorization Act just this past
11 summer that would give the Secretary of Defense
12 the ability to transfer that for public health
13 use, although the Army and the Department of State
14 are currently in talks about that. So, the
15 current plan is that the Department of State would
16 be getting the remaining 43 acres for a former
17 Chancery, although there is sort of this caveat, I
18 have to throw out there.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I'm not sure who
20 this next question will go to, as everyone who is
21 here most of the time knows I always talk about
22 jobs. Again, this is another one of those
23 situations where I think we don't want to have a
24 missed opportunity. I'm not sure what the

1 proposal is to make sure that our pool is ready.
2 Could somebody answer that or help me understand.
3 What are we doing now to get our pool ready when
4 we get ready to start moving forward? Mr. Cross,
5 can you help me?

6 MR. CROSS: Absolutely, Chairman Hood, and
7 we too, share the need to have local D.C. resident
8 participation for this property. We have been
9 very proactive in working with the development
10 team. Our agency partners, of course, through the
11 Land Disposition Agreement, the developer team
12 will be bound to first source, of course, with
13 DOES, Department of Employment Services, the
14 Certified Business Enterprise Statute for making
15 sure that our small businesses are participating,
16 and we've been proactive to make sure that we're
17 aligning the training opportunities and
18 understanding what jobs are going to be coming
19 online and being proactive so that we see more
20 D.C. tags at the construction sites.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I used that the other
22 night. Were you here the other night when I said
23 Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania tags? You said D.C.
24 tags.

1 MR. CROSS: That's right.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's a good answer.

3 Thank you. Ms. Chamberlin, let me ask a question,
4 and I have looked at a lot of reports, and I
5 notice the list of things you mention, some
6 mitigation factors. One of the things that I saw
7 that popped out at me that maybe has probably been
8 in reports previously that I may have missed is
9 not backing in, no back-in movement. Typically,
10 the PUDs we've done most of the time, that's what
11 we do. What's the difference here? Is that the
12 way we're going to start moving in the city or
13 just for the Walter Reed site?

14 MS. CHAMBERLIN: No, no, that's actually -
15 - that's a District DDOT standard, so we don't
16 want the trucks backing through the sidewalks.
17 So, it's a safety issue, and it's a DDOT
18 requirement for all projects. There are some
19 projects that due to site constraints are unable
20 to accommodate. We want them to go head in and
21 head out, so do the turning movements on private
22 property, but if it's through an alley, that's
23 what alleys are for, but we don't want people then
24 backing out of an alley onto the sidewalk.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, backing out, okay,
2 I've got you. Okay, I misunderstood that. I
3 thought it was something different. Because I
4 know some of the turning radius and stuff, we have
5 to do some backing up, and I'm thinking -- well,
6 anyway. Bike stations. How do we get to -- I'm
7 not against it pro or con, but I'm just curious.
8 How do we get to three bike stations, or at least
9 that's what we're proposing, three bike stations -
10 - how do we get to three, why not four or two?

11

12 MS. CHAMBERLIN: Well, it's done with what
13 we expect the trip generation to be for the
14 bicycles and the size of the site. So, you take
15 into consideration it's more of how many new
16 people are they bringing in? How many cycles are
17 they bringing in? How big is the site? If it's a
18 small, I mean, if it's a small project or small
19 building, we're not going to ask for three. So,
20 it's just taking into consideration the size of
21 the site and the expected trip generation.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I didn't follow
23 this whole arrangement with movement into Walter
24 Reed, but I can tell you from reading the

1 submittals that have been given to us, I think
2 actually those who gave us stuff to read and
3 testimony I have heard here tonight, I think it is
4 very well done, and as we move forward, I think
5 this is a great opportunity and it's exciting.
6 I'm not sure what I'm going to hear from the
7 community, which will also have a toll, but I
8 think this is a good project and movement forward
9 from what I have seen. I want to comment the
10 Office of Planning, DDOT, the neighborhood
11 Director, DMPED, the community, and everyone for
12 working together and coming to where you are here
13 today. That is my comment, and I really
14 appreciate all the information that was given to
15 use, because it made it a lot easier for someone
16 who avoided getting involved and coming up to Ward
17 4 to see what was going on. So, I appreciate
18 that. Any other questions up here? Vice Chair.

19 VICE CHAIR COHEN: I just wanted to make
20 the issue of whether or not to include the IZ
21 requirement in the zoning. This project is going
22 to have a lot of pressure on it, financial
23 pressures, and the first thing that's going to go
24 is the affordable housing. So, I would highly,

1 highly recommend now that I've been thinking more
2 about Commissioner's Miller's suggestion is that
3 it would be important, because I think in
4 negotiations, the DMPED will have their hands
5 tied. They'll be pushed by the development team,
6 and this is what will be dropped out. So, I would
7 argue on behalf of including it in the zoning.

8 The other thing I just want to mention is
9 I concur with Commissioner May's suggestion about
10 adding more activities in the green space. Some
11 of the best green space in the world have that,
12 and I'm thinking Central Park and the restaurant
13 Luxembourg Gardens, and the green park in London,
14 so really it just makes more people gather and use
15 that space, and it really becomes an opportunity
16 for the surrounding neighborhoods to have many
17 activities there.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions up
19 here?

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.
21 You know, I would suggest on the subject of what
22 gets written into the regulations on IZ, I would
23 first note that we are going to be taking a look
24 at IZ and beefing that up, I assume, soon, and

1 that this would be subject to whatever those new
2 requirements are, and I don't know where they're
3 going to land. I don't know where that stands at
4 this moment.

5 The other question is that I'm actually
6 curious and maybe this is a question that can be
7 answered tonight. I'm curious about DMPED's
8 previous experience in LDAs because I know that we
9 have seen projects come before us where the 20%
10 requirement was clearly stated on other PUDs, so I
11 wonder, and maybe it's something you can research
12 and get back to us, but I think understanding your
13 success rate in negotiating 20% on other LDAs.

14 MS. COMBAL: Our office, I would say,
15 MacMillan has 20%, and that was a PUD. That is
16 another large land development deal that does have
17 significant infrastructure challenges. I would
18 say generally for projects in our office, they are
19 generally smaller in size. They are one parcel or
20 limited to a couple of buildings, and this is 66
21 acres, so we certainly have tried to balance all
22 of the pressures on the site to make sure that
23 we're getting an equitable development that can be
24 achieved given the resources available to execute.

1 But, we can certainly get back to you, the
2 Commission, on our success rate with projects.

3 COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you, I would
4 appreciate knowing that, even for general terms,
5 not just to understand what to do here, but I
6 think understanding that in general would be
7 helpful.

8 MS. COMBAL: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER MAY: Thanks.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions up
11 here? Okay, let me see. In this case, I believe,
12 I know 4B is across the street, but in this case,
13 the way I understand it, 4A. Is anyone here from
14 4A, the Chairperson from 4A? If you could come
15 forward, do you have a report? Do we have that
16 report in the record? Okay, he has it with him.
17 Let me just say, all those who are here to testify
18 in support, if you could just show me your hands.
19 Okay, in support. All those who are here in
20 opposition, if you could just show me your hands.
21 Okay, thank you.

22 MS. COMBAL: Thank you all very much. I
23 guess we'll be around for additional questions.
24 Thank you Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you both. Okay, if
2 you want to introduce yourself, you may begin.

3 MR. WHATLEY: Okay, now it's on. My name
4 is Stephen Whatley, and I'm the Chair of the
5 Advisory Neighborhood Commission 4A. Thank you
6 very much for the opportunity to speak on the
7 Proposed Zoning for Walter Reed Campus. ANC 4A
8 resolved on March 3, 2015 that upon considering
9 the foregoing at a meeting, a majority of the duly
10 named Advisory Commission 4A with a quorum present
11 voted to recommend approval of the new zoning plan
12 with certain caveats, issues, and recommendations
13 that I will be describing.

14 The site in question is located in my
15 single-member District, and I have lived across
16 the street from Walter Reed for nearly 30 years.
17 I must note that since there has been the concept
18 of a portion of Walter Reed site coming to the
19 District of Columbia, ANC 4A and the community
20 have participate in nearly 100 meetings concerning
21 the Walter Reed site. My wife, Annie Whatley, was
22 a member of the Local Redevelopment Authority.
23 Attached to my testimony are the resolutions
24 passed by ANC 4A and certain exhibits. There are

1 full community participation in the selection
2 process for the NOIs, the selection of the Master
3 Developer, and Development of the Small Area Plan.

4
5 An important concept to be discussed is
6 the question of whether or not the site should
7 become a destination site, meaning should this
8 site attempt to attract non-area residents to the
9 campus for amenities outside of work on the
10 campus. In addition, there was the question of
11 the hyperbole concerning the *Manhattanization* of
12 the site.

13 ANC 4A believes that the use of the term
14 *Manhattanization* is simply a scare tactic since
15 none of the proposed buildings go beyond the scope
16 of the existing buildings. There is no height or
17 concentration problem. The Proposed Text and Map
18 Amendments would create and implement the Walter
19 Reed zone, which would allow mixed-use development
20 on the former Walter Reed site including
21 development ranging from moderate to high density.
22 The proposed zoning is consistent with
23 Comprehensive Plan.

24 ANC 4A concurs with the four goals as

1 espoused by the SAP. The goal of ANC 4A in
2 developing this resolution was to find a fair way
3 to develop the property with the least adverse
4 impact on the neighborhood, enhancing the
5 amenities available for the residents of the
6 community and the District of Columbia, while
7 preserving the opportunity for the developer to
8 earn a reasonable rate of return on their
9 investment, while also minimizing the cost to the
10 District of Columbia government.

11 The key points are the heights of the new
12 buildings on Aspen Street, Fern Street, and
13 Georgia Avenue, and that the mirror the heights of
14 the current buildings on those streets. In
15 addition, building density was not an issue. In
16 the case of the town center, ANC 4A has noted that
17 the new building at 85 feet is nearly 35% less
18 than the current structure at 130 feet My home is
19 on Fern Street, and it faces the hospital in
20 question.

21 Now, the caveats, issues, and
22 recommendations. Zoning. ANC 4A opposes changes
23 to the zoning parameters by the Zoning Commission
24 Board after approval of the Zoning Plan without

1 consultation with Advisory Neighborhood
2 Commissions 4A and 4B, as well as the Walter Reed
3 Community Advisory Committee, and the community,
4 and will also need the establishment of clear
5 roles of all parties and participants.

6 ANC 4A is strongly opposed to development
7 that will lead to a situation similar to the
8 development of Military Road and Connecticut
9 Avenue. If you flip over to Exhibit 1, at the
10 back, not the IZIS, but the one you will see, this
11 tall blue building, and that picture was taken
12 from the front porch of a house immediately across
13 the street from it. It's too large. It's out of
14 place. The current buildings as being described
15 for the Walter Reed site, there is nothing like
16 this. We feel that it is line with the community.

17 Through traffic and new streets. ANC 4A
18 still opposes the creation of a new 13th street
19 vehicular access to the Walter Reed Campus. ANC
20 4A understands that connectivity away from Georgia
21 Avenue for pedestrians and bicycles is very
22 important to the overall community connectivity
23 and reattaching the former closed site to the
24 surrounding community. ANC 4A strongly supports

1 pedestrian and bicycle-only access on 13th Street
2 between Fern and Elder. Vehicular traffic
3 predominantly for retail and residential uses will
4 be easily served by the new 12th Street, Elder,
5 and Dahlia, while mostly avoiding cutting through
6 traffic on Fern Street. ANC 4A is deeply
7 concerned with the rush-hour commuter traffic that
8 will come through our community, coming from
9 Silver Spring heading downtown and going through
10 the proposed 12th Street gate and the 13th Street
11 gate. ANC 4A will also request additional street
12 closures during rush-hour traffic.

13 SAP siting and building sizing, heights
14 and widths. ANC 4A is very focused on ensuring
15 compatibility of the proposed zoning with the
16 zoning and particular building heights in adjacent
17 neighborhoods. The Walter Reed proposed zoning
18 limits heights to best match the rolling
19 topography of the site and the surrounding
20 neighborhood. There are three major main
21 frontages to the adjoining neighborhoods: Fern
22 Street to the north, Georgia Avenue to the east,
23 and Aspen Street to the south.

24 Fern Street. It is important to ANC 4A

1 that the townhomes reflect as much as possible the
2 heights and view corridors of the homes on the
3 north side of Fern Street. Therefore, ANC 4A
4 recommends the townhome strings be limited to more
5 than 4 units long with the minimum-sized yards as
6 defined by zoning to maintain view corridors to
7 the south. ANC 4A also recommends that the front
8 yards for the Fern Street townhomes be at a
9 minimum 20 feet. ANC 4A would further request
10 limiting the minimum size for a market-rate homes
11 on Fern Street only to 2000 square feet to be
12 consistent with the homes directly on the north
13 side of Fern Street.

14 It is important to note that townhomes,
15 rear yards, and setbacks are an issue. ANC 4A
16 recommends a minimum 15-foot yard standards for
17 rear yards and setbacks. These open space
18 requirements are missing from the OP proposal.
19 This is important to the community. Part of the
20 reason the community wants yards is to facilitate
21 sustainability measures like trees and storm water
22 management. The question is whether or not this
23 should be in the zoning regulations.

24 Georgia Avenue. The buildings in WR-3 are

1 all located along Georgia Avenue on sloped
2 terrain. ANC 4A supports the limitation setbacks
3 and designated open areas along Georgia Avenue as
4 proposed in the zoning. The height limits are
5 discussed in the attached resolution. I have
6 attached the full resolution for your review. ANC
7 4A cares deeply about protecting the mature trees
8 along Georgia Avenue and strongly supports the no-
9 build areas shown by the Office of Planning at the
10 center of Land Bay F.

11 Aspen Street. ANC 4A acknowledges that
12 the SAP provides the right to build in the Walter
13 Reed zone as a part of the overall program;
14 however, it is important to ANC 4A that the homes
15 across the street are not dwarfed or overshadowed
16 by the proposed new building. ANC 4A has heard
17 significant concerns about the open space from our
18 residents concerning the corner of 16th Street and
19 Aspen Street. These concerns are discussed in
20 detail in the attached resolution.

21 I must note, however, that there are
22 members of the community who would prefer that all
23 of the WR-8 be open space; however, this was not
24 envisioned in the SAP, which serves as a baseline

1 for the proposed development, which includes
2 significant important benefits to the community
3 and the city. Removal of the proposed buildings
4 at this portion of the site cannot be made up
5 elsewhere on the site without negatively impacting
6 the heights of building and impact on other
7 portions of the site and was not contemplated in
8 the SAP.

9 It appears that OP has listened to the
10 community concerns about the heights and setbacks
11 and the size of the building and responded by
12 significantly reducing the building that would
13 have been allowed under the SAP. For the above
14 reasons, ANC 4A supports the restrictions that the
15 proposed WR-8 zoning places on the proposed
16 building. ANC 4A supports the siting and size of
17 the 5 to 6-story building scheduled to be located
18 in WR-8.

19 Town Center. ANC 4A strongly supports
20 bringing new retail to Walter Reed and opening up
21 the inside of the campus. Central to this effort
22 is a new anchor grocery store or similar-sized
23 store at the center of the site on Land Bay E.
24 This is subject to WR-2 zoning. Only WR-2 zoning

1 allows a maximum of 85 feet and 7 stories. This
2 is driven by the grades and building configuration
3 to accommodate grocery and off street loading.
4 The grocery space must function with the loading
5 so the trucks can back in to deliver the products.
6 The entire building must also accommodate 5
7 stories of residential above the retail. ANC 4A
8 is in favor of the 85-foot limitation.

9 Topography. ANC 4A understands that
10 Walter Reed has rolling topography. All of the
11 proposed elevations are more than 30 feet lower
12 than the existing new hospital. This is the
13 hospital that is currently on the site. I am not
14 going to go into -- in my testimony I have the
15 elevations, but I will leave that for you to
16 review as you deem necessary. If considered
17 across the entire perimeter of the site, these
18 absolute heights are not only consistent with the
19 buildings across on Georgia Avenue, higher or
20 lower than the neighborhood properties by the
21 equivalent of 1 or 2 stories, but also considered
22 are the view corridors and historic buildings
23 throughout the site.

24 Zoning, time line, drawing, and models.

1 ANC 4A has worked diligently with the city and the
2 LRA and the other ANC's for over 7 years to develop
3 the SAP for Walter Reed. To better help
4 understand this complex plan, rolling site
5 topography, and development program, I have
6 attached the resolution, and I have also attached
7 illustrative sections of the neighborhood and
8 photos that were prepared by the city and myself,
9 which were presented to the community advisory
10 committee. It is important to ANC 4A that the
11 zoning be implemented to further immediate
12 activation of the site and start development in
13 accordance with the SAP as early as possible. It
14 is important to ANC 4A that the new hospital be
15 demolished to make way for the proposed town
16 center and grocery or big box stores and other
17 local and national retail for the community.

18 Affordable housing. ANC 4A acknowledges
19 that the developer has committed to 432 units of
20 affordable housing to be developed. ANC 4A
21 recommends that the developer be contractually
22 obligated through either the LRA or zoning to
23 provide a minimum of 432 affordable units on the
24 site. ANC 4A further recommends that the zoning

1 allow location and priorities for affordable
2 housing to best meet the needs and priorities of
3 the citizens of Ward 4, and that some unites be
4 targeted to seniors, veterans, teachers,
5 firefighters, police officers, and artists per
6 community priorities. Affordable housing should
7 be spread throughout Walter Reed and not limited
8 to one or two locations.

9 Transportation. ANC 4A recommends that
10 parking needs to be available for every
11 residential unit and that parking spaces on
12 private streets should not be counted toward the
13 total number of required parking places at the
14 site. Secondary, the developer should also be
15 required to provide additional services such as
16 electric car charging stations and parking for
17 car-sharing services, as well as expanded
18 handicapped parking capability.

19 In closing, ANC 4A requests that the Board
20 approve the zoning request subject to the caveats,
21 issues, and recommendations ANC 4A has made in
22 this resolution, which I have attached. ANC 4A
23 also requests that if additional requirements not
24 part of the current SAP be added, that they be

1 discounted because the time could be spent on
2 other matters.

3 I hope the Board will also look at the
4 recent development in Petworth, U Street, and Navy
5 Yard, and the impact on nearby house prices. As a
6 native Washingtonian, I request that all
7 consideration be given to mitigate any adverse
8 actions that will impact the community.

9 In closing, I would also like to mention
10 that I request that all pertinent parties give
11 great weight to the view of ANC 4A for matters
12 pertaining herein. Consistent with D.C. Code
13 Section 1-309, only actions of the full Commission
14 voting in a properly noticed public meeting will
15 have standing and carry great weight.

16 Thank you for the opportunity to allow me
17 to speak on behalf of ANC 4A on this topic. I
18 will now answer any questions you may have. I'm a
19 little winded, but...

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, thank you, Chairman
21 Whatley. I will tell you there is a lot of
22 thought and a lot of work that went into your
23 testimony, and I greatly appreciate it. Let me
24 just ask this quick question -- I don't normally

1 go first, but I am going to ask this question
2 first. Some of these issues here, have you had a
3 discussion with the Office of Planning, DMPED, so
4 they are aware of what ANC 4A's concerns are?
5 Okay, and let the record -- move up closer to the
6 mike. There you go. Is it on? There we go.

7 MR. WHATLEY: Some of them they are aware
8 of, and some of them have just been in
9 discussions. We have not made any formal
10 additional requests -- this is the resolution that
11 we passed on the zoning, but they are aware of a
12 lot of the issues we have raised.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, and you all passed
14 this resolution, okay, your resolution is in the
15 back.

16 MR. WHATLEY: Yeah, it's in the back,
17 after Page 7.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so you did this
19 March 3?

20 MR. WHATLEY: March 3.

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Alright. I'm just trying
22 to see how we, because I'm trying to make sure
23 that some of your points get across to the Office
24 of Planning and to DMPED. So, I'm trying to

1 figure the best way, as you said, they've seen
2 bits and pieces, but they haven't seen the full
3 thing like we see here tonight, correct?

4 MR. WHATLEY: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, we need to figure
6 out a way so DMPED and Office of Planning have a
7 chance to look at the ANC because I think this is
8 very well thought out. We might not get
9 everything that we have here, but I think this is
10 well thought out and very well done. I would like
11 to ask the Office of Planning to review this, and
12 we will make sure they get a copy of it.

13 MR. WHATLEY: I brought extra copies, I
14 can give them a copy.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, you already did that,
16 okay, good. Okay.

17 MR. WHATLEY: Do you have a copy?

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You have it? Okay.
19 Alright, any questions up here? Commissioner May.

20 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I would like to
21 echo the Chairman's comments about the report that
22 you have given us. A couple of things seem clear.
23 I don't think that you're a regular visitor to
24 the Zoning Commission and providing testimony on a

1 regular basis on other projects, right?

2 MR. WHATLEY: That's correct.

3 COMMISSIONER MAY: But, you've spent 7
4 years working on this one, and I mean, this is --
5 the effort that you've put into it shows in the
6 thoughtful comments that you have in the report
7 that you have. I do kind of wish that we had it
8 closer to March 3 when you had finished it,
9 because we can read these things in advance and
10 perhaps be a little bit better prepared for
11 questions. I especially appreciate the comments
12 that you made about the WR-1 zone, and I think
13 that your comments will feed into some of the
14 questions that I had for the Office of Planning
15 about what happens in that area and the transition
16 to the existing neighborhood, and I guess your
17 block, right? That's right where you are. I was
18 going to ask you something else.

19 Oh, on the parking question, so it's not
20 totally clear to me what the parking ratios are.
21 You're looking for one per residential unit,
22 right?

23 MR. WHATLEY: That's correct, one per
24 residential unit.

1 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, and we have a
2 total cap, but do we have a number specified per
3 unit?

4 MR. JESICK: No, we do not.

5 COMMISSIONER MAY: And, but has anybody
6 one the math on how it all sort of might
7 distribute between the commercial development and
8 the residential development?

9 MR. JESICK: We wanted to maximize the
10 flexibility for any future developer to allocate
11 those spaces as the market demands.

12 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, so, and I can
13 appreciate that, but some of the housing types
14 that we would expect here are typically going to
15 be, if they were other zones in other parts of the
16 city, they would be in the 1:2 or 1:3 kind of
17 range. Isn't that what I would expect? I mean
18 flats are typically 1:2, right?

19 MR. JESICK: Flats are 1:2. Single-family
20 homes would be 1:1 in other zones.

21 COMMISSIONER MAY: Single-family detached,
22 like R1?

23 MR JESICK: 1:1, yes.

24 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

1 MR. JESICK: Now in apartment buildings,
2 we would typically see a lower ratio.

3 COMMISSIONER MAY: 1:3 or 1:4, depending
4 on what the zone is, right?

5 MR. JESICK: Correct.

6 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so, are you
7 familiar with how that works in other zones?
8 Because I think that one of the things that we
9 would have trouble with is if you're suggesting in
10 a building that is 3 or 4 stories or 4 or 5
11 stories and it is apartments, having 1 parking
12 space per unit there is a lot more than we would
13 typically see.

14 MR. WHATLEY: We would be amenable to
15 adjustments made for apartment buildings, retail,
16 and so forth. The one came up because we needed a
17 filler. Because when you discuss how many,
18 whether you want 1 per 5 units, 1 per 4 units, 1
19 per 1 unit, whatever, you have to come up with a
20 starting point, and that 1 is our starting point.
21 So, we would be flexible; we would be amenable to
22 a 1:3 for apartment buildings, 1:2 for apartment
23 buildings, 1, 2, 3, you know, it would depend on
24 the facility.

1 COMMISSIONER MAY: I assume that there was
2 some sort of calculation that went into the Office
3 of Planning's overall cap or I'm sorry, I see Ms.
4 Chamberlin wanting to answer too, so...

5 MS. CHAMBERLIN: So, in the Small Area
6 Plan and the Transportation Impact Study, there
7 was a Parking Demand Study, and that, we actually
8 had a range, and the 3500 is the highest of the
9 range. We found -- well, the study found that
10 actually it could be as low as 2300, but in both
11 high and low, it was a 1:1 for the townhomes, and
12 the high was a 0.7 for the apartments, and a 0.5,
13 and then varying retail uses. Sorry.

14 COMMISSIONER MAY: No, that's okay, I
15 almost absorbed all that. So, you're looking at
16 the Transportation Impact Study that was done for
17 the Small Area Plan, which I don't -- do we have
18 that in our record? I don't think we do. I don't
19 really want to read the entire thing, but I think
20 sampling some of that information so we have a
21 picture of what the parking requirements are might
22 be helpful for us.

23 MR. LAWSON: We can provide you with a
24 summary of the assumptions from the traffic study

1 that informed those parking numbers.

2 COMMISSIONER MAY: Great, I think that
3 would be helpful because it helps us, as well, to
4 relate it to what is happening in other
5 developments across the city, which, you know, we
6 have some understanding, at least in theory, on
7 how that's working out. Thanks.

8 VICE CHAIR COHEN: And, I think the ANC
9 should see that as well.

10 MR. WHATLEY: I believe we may have a copy
11 of that, but I will request another copy. I would
12 like a copy, thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions up
14 here?

15 COMMISSIONER MAY: Any information that we
16 get from the Office of Planning or DDOT will be
17 part of the record here, and you can access that
18 online. This will all be on IZIS, right?

19 MR. WHATLEY: Thank you.

20 VICE CHAIR COHEN: I just want to concur
21 with my colleagues about the ANC's thorough review
22 of the plan and their comments, and, again, we
23 take them into consideration in our decisions, but
24 you just did, I think, an excellent job.

1 MR. WHATLEY: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anybody else want to
3 commend ANC?

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes, please, ditto.
5 [Laughter.]

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions up
7 here other than commending them? I do want to
8 say, and I probably shouldn't say this, but every
9 time I ride by Military in Connecticut, that
10 building, I look to the left. Mr. Lawson, was
11 that a PUD?

12 MR. LAWSON: It was not. It's a by-right
13 project.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, great, because I was
15 hoping that I had nothing to do with that. I'm
16 going to be frankly honest, I ride by there quite
17 a bit, and I look to the left and just say, "I
18 wonder if I did anything like that", but anyway, I
19 would concur, and I understand where ANC is coming
20 from.

21 MR. WHATLEY: Thank you. In fact, when I
22 first saw it, what happened was I couldn't believe
23 that it was happening. That's when I saw the
24 signs, and we definitely do not want that in

1 Walter Reed.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You want it to fit, and I
3 think goes back to Commissioner Miller's question
4 that we are asking, so we can kind of see how
5 things are going to possibly fit within the area,
6 so I think we are all on the same page.

7 MR. WHATLEY: Thank you, great.

8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. We appreciate
9 your testimony. Okay, let's go to -- I'm going to
10 ask for the other ANC Commission to come forward.
11 They are going to get 5 minutes because they are
12 right across the street, ANC 5B, Andre Carley.
13 Corley? Oh, Carley, I see, 5B, I must be thinking
14 about Ward 5, I'm sorry, 4B. Yeah, have a seat.
15 Some of us live in Ward 5, and we get confused.
16 Okay, let me call up my list. Ms. Oates, since
17 you're standing up, nobody minds, come right on
18 up, Ms. Oates. Let me go to Mr. Carley, ANC 4B.
19 Now, the Brightwood Community Association, Cole
20 Wood -- is Cole Wood here? I am not sure whether
21 he is in support or opposition. They left it
22 open, so, Brightwood Community Association. Let's
23 go to Ed Atkins. Come forward. We are taking
24 people, organizations, and persons in support.

1 Juanita Hardy. Did I miss somebody? Oh, I'm
2 sorry, Victoria Davis. Okay, I'm going to stop.
3 I'm going to call 8. I called Juanita Hardy,
4 okay. Chapman Todd. Okay, Ms. Oates is already
5 here. Transitional Housing Corporation, Rastello
6 Blaise. Last name Carey, is someone here named
7 Carey? Because I can't make out anything else. I
8 think this is someone from the Executive Office of
9 the Mayor. Okay. So, let me ask, are there any
10 other organizations or person who are here in
11 support who would like to come forward. We have
12 one more chair. Is there anyone else? We will
13 start to my right, your left. You may begin.
14 Turn your mike on first.

15 MR. TODD: There we go. Thank you for the
16 opportunity to testify this evening. My name is
17 Chapman Todd, and I am here to speak in support of
18 the Proposed Text and Map Amendment, which would
19 create the Walter Reed zone.

20 I have been working with Help USA, which
21 is a National not-for-profit organization with the
22 mission to empower homeless and others in need to
23 become and remain self-reliant. Help has 28 years
24 of experience in the financing, development, new

1 construction, and rehabilitation and management of
2 housing in low-income communities around the
3 country. As part of the Federal Base Relocation
4 and Closure Regulations, there is a requirement
5 that a portion of such sites be made available as
6 programming for persons that have been homeless.
7 The District's process to meet this requirement
8 was established through a competitive solicitation
9 made by the Walter Reed Local Redevelopment
10 Authority, or the LRA.

After several years of advanced planning work, Help USA initially submitted a proposal in March 2010 to be part of the District of Columbia's plan for the Walter Reed Army Medical Center Site. Help USA's proposal was successful, and we have been awarded a portion of Building 14, also known as Abram's Hall, to provide 75 units of housing for chronically homeless veterans, homeless veterans, and other homeless individuals. The project shall consist of approximately 40,000 square feet and be comprised of 75 efficiency apartments for chronically homeless veterans and other individuals. Social Services will be available on site for all who might need them.

1 Through the years of Help USA's
2 involvement at the Walter Reed site, our project
3 has been presented and improved through multiple
4 community review processes. I am here to support
5 the zoning code that has been presented because I
6 believe it is a fair outcome that reflects the
7 extensive amount of public input, dialog, and
8 planning that has taken place. Through my work on
9 Help USA project, I have been able to observe this
10 engagement first hand, as I personally have been
11 attending meetings on almost a monthly basis for
12 the past 5 years that we have been working on the
13 project.

14 In addition to supporting the Walter Reed
15 zone as it has been presented, I encourage the
16 Zoning Commission to move as expeditiously as
17 feasible to enable the plan projects at the site
18 to move forward. The Help USA project already has
19 more than \$1 million in philanthropic support
20 lined up in addition to a commitment for financing
21 through the District's Housing Production Trust
22 Fund. All of us know that there is an
23 overwhelming need for more affordable housing in
24 our city, and with this project, we are ready to

1 move forward on something that will provide 75
2 units of housing to some of our community's most
3 vulnerable residents. Thank you for opportunity
4 to present this.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Next.

6 MR. ATKINS: Good evening, I'm Ed Atkins,
7 a member of the Board of the Shepherd Park
8 Citizen's Association. I will give a condensed
9 version of my testimony tonight in order to save
10 time and move the agenda along. Shepherd Park
11 borders the Walter Reed Campus on the north. Mr.
12 Chairman, we at the Shepherd Park Citizen's
13 Association strongly support the overall vision
14 for new development proposed for the former Walter
15 Reed site. We believe that more options for
16 affordable and market-rate housing in a variety of
17 styles, including townhomes and apartments, should
18 be offered to District residents. We eagerly look
19 forward to shopping at new, high-quality retail
20 establishments, and attending new cultural and
21 recreational offerings near our neighborhood.

22 Since we are located immediately adjacent
23 to the proposed zoning classification WR-1, our
24 comments focus primarily on that area. We support

1 new residential development that, as the Small
2 Area Plan notes, complements the character of
3 nearby established residential neighborhoods.
4 Unfortunately, as Mr. Whatley has also pointed
5 out, we believe that the proposed WR-1 zoning does
6 not meet these goals.

7 First of all, the amount of townhouses
8 allowed under the proposed zoning is too dense and
9 way out of proportion to the neighborhood. The
10 proposed zoning would cram 90 townhouses on a 3-
11 acre site. This is significantly denser than a
12 comparable new development of 63 townhomes on a 5-
13 acre site a scant 2 miles away. Additionally, the
14 minimum lot size at 18 feet is too narrow, and the
15 proposed 16-foot width for affordable housing is
16 disgraceful. Why should affordable housing be
17 less wide than market rate? The height at 4
18 stories, even accounting for the gently sloping
19 site, is too tall, in our opinion. Parking
20 provisions for residents is confusing, in our
21 view, and the lack of rear yards is out of scale
22 with the existing neighborhood. Frankly, this
23 proposal at this density will allow for a tightly
24 packed island of suburban-type townhouses and

1 stacked units in a sea of lower-density residents.

2 We firmly believe that allowing up to 90
3 townhomes would negatively impact traffic,
4 parking, property values, and our overall quality
5 of life. We request that this section be
6 rewritten to allow up to 40, 3-story townhomes
7 with rear yards, front porches, and a variety of
8 creative designs compatible with our neighborhood.

9

10 WR-2. We are pleased that the District
11 Government has updated its traffic and parking
12 study for the Walter Reed Campus. We support the
13 District Government's efforts that transportation
14 demand management for the Walter Reed Campus and
15 especially provisions to encourage car-sharing,
16 bike lanes, and the goal of residential units
17 being 50% non-auto occupants; however, we believe
18 the height for the mixed-use buildings along 13th
19 Street are still too high at 85 feet and 95 feet
20 with a PUD, even with a gently sloping site. We
21 are also unclear about arrangements for upkeep of
22 the shopping plaza and the parking there. We have
23 requested this section be rewritten to allow for
24 only 5 stories maximum height and to detail

1 parking standards and upkeep arrangements more
2 clearly.

3 WR-3. Mr. Chairman, the proposed zoning
4 allows for up to a 5-story mixed-use building at
5 Fern Street and Georgia Avenue, and up to 6-story
6 buildings from Fern to Aspen Street. We believe
7 the 5-story mixed-use building at Fern and Georgia
8 is too tall for the existing neighborhood and
9 should be limited to 3 stories. We support taller
10 buildings from Dahlia to Aspen Street, since they
11 are compatible with uses already there.

12 WR-8. This site, while not immediately
13 adjacent to our neighborhood, is of key interest
14 to us, because it abuts 16th Street NW, a major
15 north-south thoroughfare for our community and the
16 entire region. Our Citizen's Association supports
17 multifamily use for this large parcel if it its
18 setback conforms to other apartment buildings
19 along 16th Street between Aspen and Military Road;
20 that is to say, roughly 1/2 block setback from
21 16th Street.

22 Generally speaking, while we strongly
23 support new restaurants, we request provisions
24 such as voluntary like agreements with restaurants

1 serving alcohol that limit hours and noise to a
2 reasonable standard. Furthermore, allowing
3 restaurants to be 25 feet from residential uses is
4 too close, in our opinion. We request this
5 provision be amended to 100 feet.

6 In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and members of
7 the Commission, we believe that proposed zones WR-
8 1 through WR-3 should be rewritten to limit the
9 number of housing units and their height and to
10 increase their size, to reduce the height of
11 mixed-use buildings near the proposed townhouses
12 along Fern, Elder, and Georgia Avenue, and to
13 clarify parking arrangements for residential and
14 retail uses.

15 We further request that the District
16 Government insure that residential home businesses
17 are prohibited in the Walter Reed Campus. Thank
18 you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next?

20 MR. CARLEY: Hello, I feel like a deer
21 caught in the headlights because on February 23,
22 the ANC 4B voted to delay zoning. Since then,
23 they received another presentation from Urban
24 Atlantic, and a lot of the Commissioners have

1 changed their minds. They want to know if they
2 can have some type of reissuance of the resolution
3 to define -- clarify their reasons for changing
4 their minds.

5 There are a couple of reasons. One is
6 that the reading or the presentation that was
7 given clarified a lot of questions that the ANC 4B
8 had about height and density. The second reason
9 is that a few of the Commissioners feel that they
10 should defer to ANC 4A's resolution. With that
11 being said, I end my testimony.

12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Could
13 you identify yourself?

14 MR. CARLEY: I'm Andre Carley. I'm ANC 4B
15 Commissioner.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Next.

17 MS. DAVIS: Good evening, Chairman Hood,
18 Honorable members of the Zoning Commission, and
19 ladies and gentlemen of the community. My name is
20 Vicki Davis, and I serve as President of Urban
21 Atlantic. I am appearing on behalf of the Hines,
22 Urban Atlantic, and Triden, Walter Reed Master
23 Development Team selected by the community and the
24 LRA. Many of my development partners are present

1 today. Our development team, itself, includes
2 eight CBEs and three D.C.-based non-profits,
3 Weingarten, Retail (indiscernible), and Toll
4 Brothers, a National Home Builder. We strongly
5 support the Walter Reed Small Area Plan and the
6 proposed zoning for WR-1 through WR-8 presented by
7 the Office of Planning, which meets all of the
8 goals of the SAP.

9 The Zoning listened to community vision
10 and goals, and we have based our entire response
11 on meeting all of the vision and requirements of
12 the SAP in the proposed zoning. The community and
13 city worked so hard to achieve the vision and
14 goals of the SAP and proposed zoning together over
15 six years through hundreds of meetings to develop
16 unprecedented and hard one consensus of hundreds
17 of active constituents. The SAP and zoning
18 address areas most important to the community, to
19 incorporate thoughtful responses and mitigate
20 development impact for major concerns over
21 heights, scale, uses, open space, and access.

22 Specifically, the site was planned by
23 listening to and internalizing community
24 priorities and concerns for reducing FAR and

1 massive buildings adjacent to neighborhoods,
2 reducing heights, honoring and enhancing open
3 spaces, preserving tree areas important to the
4 community, and providing a very high level of
5 affordable housing on the site.

6 The proposed zoning serves a triple bottom
7 line, as does our plan, social, economic, and
8 environmentally sustainable development.

9 Social. The proposed zoning opens and
10 integrates the site with the community through
11 excellent pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and
12 vehicular access, (2) it activates the site by
13 creating strong connected open space to invite
14 people into the site, and (3) it includes
15 affordable housing.

16 Number two, economic. The clarity and
17 certainty of the proposed WR-1 through WR-8 zoning
18 is the linchpin that enables the LRA to purchase
19 the site from the Army and partner with our
20 development team to create first-source jobs,
21 provide CBE business opportunities, and strengthen
22 the surrounding Georgia Avenue businesses who have
23 long struggled, provide economic activity for D.C.
24 of over \$7.3 billion over 20 years.

1 Environmental sustainability is key. The
2 proposed zoning provides 31 acres of open space
3 out of a total of 66 acres, of which 17 acres is
4 dedicated to green space. The development team is
5 working on green roofs, solar PV, cogeneration,
6 and potentially a microgrid using the existing
7 steam tunnels.

8 Affordable housing. There has been a lot
9 of discussion about that tonight. We committed to
10 432 units of affordable housing, and, by the way,
11 they are at unprecedented levels of affordability,
12 reaching the very lowest and hardest to serve of
13 citizens of the District of Columbia. However, we
14 do want to have the flexibility to present those
15 units on site that best meets the needs of the
16 individuals being served. Our development team
17 made an unprecedented, early commitment to the LRA
18 and the community for affordable housing.

19 Specifically, the Affordable Housing
20 Program includes 114 units targeted toward 30% of
21 AMI or below. They are operated by Best in Class,
22 experienced non-profit providers, who will provide
23 extensive support services targeted to homeless,
24 seniors, and veterans, to help them better

1 integrate into the community. There are 139 units
2 targeted to 50% of AMI and below, which could also
3 include some of the needs from D.C. General. The
4 179 units are targeted to 80% of AMI and below.
5 These units include both rental and for-sale
6 units. Moreover, the city has already fully
7 funded the creation of the lowest-income 30% of
8 AMI units as early in the plan development phasing
9 schedule as possible, so that has already been
10 done.

11 The Program. The proposed zoning codifies
12 strict limits on the program. The FAR in size of
13 3.1 million square feet in the SAP is compared to
14 the 4.1 million square feet there today, a
15 reduction of a million square feet in existing
16 program.

17 Heights. It reduces the maximum height
18 from today's 130 feet of existing building, which
19 has been mentioned many times, to a maximum of 85
20 feet on the heavily sloped land of WR-2. I will
21 note that this property is on a hill, and that
22 hill is over 60 feet in elevation across the site.

23

24 Based on community feedback after the SAP,

1 the zoning, itself, imposes lower heights plus
2 additional setbacks and reduction in program lower
3 than the SAP in WR-1, 3, 5, and 8, to meet
4 additional community concerns. These are zones
5 that border the existing community and are most
6 sensitive to neighbors.

7 Specifically, Fern Street, 3-4 stories,
8 40-50 feet. These are over 60 feet away from
9 existing homes on Fern Street.

10 Georgia Avenue, 5-7 stories, 50-75 feet.
11 These buildings are over 125 feet away from the
12 existing townhomes on the opposite side of Georgia
13 Avenue.

14 Aspen Street, 4-5 stories, 50-65 feet,
15 over 90 feet away from existing homes across the
16 street, and, again, this is a very steeply sloped
17 site.

18 Mix of uses. The mix of uses is limited,
19 and strictly codified in the proposed zoning and
20 includes rental, for-sale, and deeply affordable
21 housing. Grocery anchored retail in the town
22 center and along Georgia Avenue, that is about
23 200,000 square feet of retail. Office. Office
24 includes employment centers for biotech,

1 University research by GW and MIT. The
2 hospitality includes a hotel in the existing
3 historic building. The institutional is D.C.
4 Charter Schools with immersion. The plan supports
5 sustainable energy, arts, culture, and recreation
6 uses.

7 Commitment and risk. The development team
8 has made a strong, human, financial, and resource
9 commitment to early, large-scale development. It
10 is predicated on the SAP requirements and the
11 proposed zoning for the site. Because of its size
12 and complexity, this iconic important site carries
13 significant early risk and extraordinary costs
14 that must be offset by the ability to proceed with
15 certainty and timely development under the
16 proposed zoning to meet the needs of the
17 community, meet the time and financial
18 requirements of the seller of the site, the Army,
19 under strict BRAC regulations, and perform under
20 guaranteed commitments to the city by the
21 developer.

22 Extraordinary, early large-scale
23 investment in the development includes helping
24 non-profit partners implement deeply targeted

1 affordable housing early in the development
2 schedule, within 2-3 years for homeless services
3 to seniors and veterans and the Charter School.

4 Sustainable infrastructure for water,
5 sewer, energy, and storm water management.
6 Environmental remediation including removal of
7 tanks and replacement of 100-year-old infracture,
8 demolition of the existing 2 million square foot
9 hospital, implement of the sustainable energy
10 infrastructure to help achieve net zero
11 development goals.

12 In conclusion, to meet the community
13 vision and balance of the extraordinary costs and
14 risks of this ambitious plan, the timely,
15 appropriate, balanced zoning presented by the
16 Office of Planning for the site is critical to
17 being able to proceed with the development. The
18 developer has worked with the LRA and community
19 for two years and is prepared to make the
20 necessary financial commitment and resource
21 commitment to make Walter Reed the important
22 community asset it can be instead of the long-
23 term, closed-off, nonproductive, abandoned site it
24 is today.

1 We join the LRA and ANC 4A in strongly
2 supporting the proposed zoning for Walter Reed.
3 Thank you for your consideration and the
4 opportunity to testify on behalf of the Hines,
5 Urban Atlantic, and Triden Development Team.

6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I want everyone to
7 know the reason why I let Ms. Davis go on is
8 because of her dealings as being selected. I
9 thought that was very important for her to do
10 that. So, I just wanted everybody to know I was
11 not allowing her to keep going on, but I think it
12 is very important that we all heard her testimony.
13 Okay? I'm sorry.

14 MR. CARLEY: She took my time.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: She took your time? Okay,
16 good. Alright. Since we did that...

17 MS. DAVIS: I wasn't watching the clock, I
18 apologize.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's alright. Since we
20 did that, Ms. Davis, I'm going to ask you to do me
21 a favor. We have a candidate, and I'm going to
22 ask him to come forward. I'm not going to put him
23 in front of anyone, I'm just going to ask him to
24 come up forward with those who are in support.

1 So, I'm going to ask Mr. Todd to come forward, and
2 you can just sit in the next row. We are going to
3 go ahead with you, Ms. Oakes.

4 MS. OATES: Good evening. My name is
5 Wanda Oates, and I will be reading the testimony
6 for Commissioner Brenda Speaks, who is ill and
7 unable to attend.

8 Good evening, Zoning Commissioners,
9 ladies, and gentleman. My name is Brenda Speaks,
10 and I represent Advisory Neighborhood Commission
11 4B, adjacent to Proposed Walter Reed Development.
12 My neighbors and I have a very long and proud
13 history with the Walter Reed property and deeply
14 cherish this important local and national asset.
15 I was actually born at the Walter Reed Hospital
16 and know the Campus well from growing up here. I
17 view this Walter Reed Campus to be a true
18 destination for the city and to have great
19 importance to making all of Georgia Avenue a
20 wonderful, walkable, well-landscaped, great street
21 for our whole community and the city.

22 The Office of Planning has submitted to
23 you a new proposed zoning package that fully
24 reflects all of the hard work our community put

1 into planning the Walter Reed Development through
2 the SAP over a six-year process.

3 I have attended numerous community
4 meetings, and I represent ANC 4B as a part of the
5 Walter Reed Community Advisor Committee, the CAC.

6 I strongly support the proposed new zones WR-1
7 through WR-8 and the detailed direction they
8 provide for future development.

9 The resolution originally passed by my ANC
10 4B in February raised several questions about how
11 the development would fit in with our surrounding
12 neighborhood. Since then, we have seen several
13 presentations that address these concerns. I will
14 submit a revised resolution at the next ANC 4B
15 meeting to revise the original resolution. We
16 will strongly support the proposed zoning for the
17 site and ask the Zoning Commission should approve
18 the zoning as submitted by the Office of Planning.

19

20 The original concerns that my Commission
21 raised are related to three major matters, timing
22 of zoning approval, building heights, affordable
23 housing, and parking. Since the Zoning Hearing
24 was postponed from March 6 to April 2, 2015 due to

1 weather, we have seen several presentations and
2 have learned significant new information.

3 One, timing of zoning approval. We really
4 have waited a long time for this development to
5 occur, and we have worked very hard to make that
6 happen. We would like to see the zoning be put in
7 place now so that the redevelopment can begin.

8 Two, building heights. ANC 4B has been
9 concerned about the building heights and how they
10 impact the neighborhood. We have seen several
11 presentations over the past month that show that
12 the Office of Planning really listened to the
13 community. At the three edge areas of Walter Reed
14 where homes are single-family homes or townhome,
15 the zoning absolutely limits heights and setbacks
16 so that new buildings do not loom over smaller
17 ones across the street. The four zones that
18 impact the neighborhood most are WR-1 at Fern
19 Street, WR-3 between Elder and Dahlia Street, WR-8
20 along Aspen Street.

21 WR-1. We were concerned about the heights
22 of the townhomes and stacked townhouses in WR-1
23 across from Fern Street. We have since then seen
24 Sections through the site that show the maximum

1 heights of buildings, and we can see that they
2 match the existing single-family homes across Fern
3 Street. We understand that the houses will be
4 allowed to have livable attic areas with rooftop
5 decks, and therefore the townhouses count as 4
6 stories high. We also understand that the
7 proposed homes on Elder Street will be the same
8 heights with rooftop patios, resulting in a
9 maximum of 5-story heights and also match the
10 existing neighborhood because they are downhill by
11 over 10 feet from Fern Street.

12 There are many 18-foot wide townhomes in
13 our Ward 4, and we are okay with this size
14 townhomes, since they could have 3 stories and
15 rooftops.

16 WR-3. We were most concerned about the
17 buildings across Georgia Avenue and the new town
18 center being similar in height to the existing 3-
19 story townhouses and higher buildings in ANC 4B.
20 We have seen that the Office of Planning has
21 created an open area with 150 feet of open space
22 at the middle, and no buildings on Georgia Avenue
23 for almost a whole block between Elder and Dahlia.
24 The existing townhomes in our neighborhood are

1 located across the street from the new open areas,
2 so they will be over 100 feet away from the new
3 buildings and in no way be dwarfed by new
4 buildings. The new zoning further reduced the
5 community's proposed Small Area Plan building
6 heights closest to these existing townhomes. This
7 WR-3 proposed zoning addresses our concerns.

8 WR-8. The new zoning allows a new
9 building to be built on the corner of Aspen and
10 16th Street. It will have a lot of open space
11 around it with a setback from both 16th and Aspen
12 and a limit on the height of the building on Aspen
13 where it faces the single-family homes across the
14 street. It is actually lower than the existing
15 historic building next to it, which will be used a
16 Charter School. We thinks this works well with
17 the homes across the street and will not shadow
18 over them.

19 WR-2. This is the town center. We
20 strongly support a mix of retail here including a
21 large grocery store. We understand that the
22 height of the buildings proposed will be at least
23 35 feet lower than the existing hospital that will
24 be demolished. We also now understand that these

1 buildings are on a hill that is almost 30 feet
2 lower at Dahlia than at Elder Street, so based on
3 its highest height at Dahlia Street, the building
4 height could be the maximum of 85 feet, but it is
5 still at least 35 feet lower than the existing
6 hospital that will be demolished. The buildings
7 proposed are much shorter than the hospital to be
8 demolished, and we are okay with the building
9 maximum height in the zoning. We understand that
10 Walter Reed is a very rolling, sloped site, and
11 that the zoning that OP has proposed takes this
12 into account.

13 Three, affordable housing. The Local
14 Redevelopment Agency has committed to 432 units of
15 affordable housing on the Walter Reed site. The
16 value of this housing is a big commitment to the
17 neighborhood. 114 units of homeless housing have
18 been awarded funding by the city serving
19 households likely earning under \$15,000 per year
20 including veterans and seniors. 109 units of
21 housing serving incomes under 50% of the Area
22 Median Income are committed. 149 units serving
23 our workforce under 80% of Area Median Incomes are
24 committed. 30 home-ownership units serving

1 incomes under 50% of AMI are committed. 30
2 townhome-ownership units serving incomes under 80%
3 of AMI are committed. We understand that this
4 affordable housing will be supported by market
5 rate housing development or affordable housing
6 funding, and we very much appreciate the city's
7 commitment.

8
9 We agree that 432 units or 20% committed
10 to this very deeply affordable housing is a great
11 commitment, and we are happy with it. We do not
12 wish to request additional affordable housing over
13 432 units.

14 ANC 4B has worked hard and strongly
15 supported the redevelopment over the past six
16 years and still strongly supports the community's
17 Small Area Plan and the proposed WR-1 through WR-8
18 zoning. I also serve on the CAC Advisory Group
19 for the city. We would like to see the
20 recreation, employment, and economic benefits of
21 this development help enliven and improve all of
22 Georgia Avenue and our community instead of
23 continuing to be a vacant island closed off from
24 the community. We urge you to approve the

1 proposed zoning. Thank you very much,
2 Commissioner Brenda Speaks.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Next.

4 MS. HARDY: Good evening.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is your mic on?

6 MS. HARDY: Good evening, Chairman Hood,
7 Commissioners, ladies, and gentlemen. My name is
8 Juanita Hardy, and I am the Executive Director of
9 CulturalDC, a local non-profit in the District of
10 Columbia, dedicated to making space for art. We
11 strongly support the enactment of Zoning Case 1422
12 to create new zoning of the District's portion of
13 the former Walter Reed Campus. The Zoning
14 Enactment is on the critical path to unlocking one
15 of the richest cultural resources and associated
16 economic development benefits that the District of
17 Columbia offers.

18 To provide a little more background about
19 our organization, each year CulturalDC serves over
20 1000 artists and art groups and 30,000 audience
21 members through the activation of space and
22 presentation of contemporary visual and performing
23 arts at our two locations. I will jump to the
24 point of our role on this project. We have been

1 part of the Hines, Urban Atlantic, Trident Master
2 Development Team from its conception.

3 Prior to its selection as master developer
4 by the District of Columbia Local Redevelopment
5 Authority, we and George Cook of Artomatic and the
6 Center for the Creative Economy worked closely
7 with the team to develop an arts plan that builds
8 on the platform established by the Small Area
9 Plan. Together we responded to the SAP's call to
10 activate the Walter Reed site early in the
11 Redevelopment Through Arts and Culture with an
12 early emphasis on the southern portions and the
13 site, but also with an eye for integrating the
14 arts throughout the new community.

15 Following the SAP, we envision exciting
16 interim uses for the project's construction period
17 such as an International Artomatic on Cameron Glen
18 as well as seasonal events including Easter Egg
19 Rolls, outdoor concerts and movies, a kite
20 festival and scavenger hunts. We envision a large
21 tent at the corner of Aspen and Georgia, where
22 pop-up restaurants, food, and wine festivals,
23 performing arts, D.C. Photo Week, Veteran artists
24 projects, and a Jazz fish fry can be held.

1 For the long term, we envision ongoing art
2 exhibits, performances, cultural activities in
3 some of the historic buildings on site that
4 provide culture and entertainment for Ward 4 and
5 the broader city.

6 We solicited letters of interest from
7 local art businesses and non-profits around the
8 city, including Washington Glass Co., Flux
9 Studios, and Joy of Motion Dance Center, who have
10 a strong interest in permanently relocating within
11 the Walter Reed Campus. We also envision an
12 outdoor arts market for local artists and artisans
13 to sell their wares. Artist housing has been
14 contemplated as part of the early phases of
15 development, and public art and memorials
16 commemorating the sacrifice and honor of veterans
17 are planned for some of the earliest buildings to
18 be redeveloped.

19 A creative arts and historic walk is
20 planned to run throughout the site to enhance the
21 public space experience of walking or riding
22 through Walter Reed as well as iconic public art
23 initiatives that help to create a sense of place.
24 Not only does this art programming support the

1 cultural life within the District of Columbia, the
2 arts have proven to play a key role in economic
3 development, creating local jobs and local
4 business opportunities. We eagerly look forward
5 to bring this economic activity to Ward 4 and the
6 broader city.

7 We are pleased that the draft zoning that
8 the Office of Planning has developed for Walter
9 Reed is based on the SAP and supports these uses
10 and that the project is moving forward quickly.
11 With real estate prices increasing rapidly
12 throughout the District of Columbia, the need for
13 affordable arts space as well as artist housing
14 grows ever more critical. The new Walter Reed
15 will help meet these demands, contributing life,
16 vibrancy, character, culture, and economic
17 benefits to the entire city. We strongly support
18 the enactment of the Walter Reed zoning so that
19 this important cultural resource can be unlocked
20 without delay. Thank you for considering my
21 testimony.

22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Next.

23 MR. RASTELLO: Good evening. Thank you,
24 Chairman Hood and Commissioners just for the

1 opportunity to testify tonight. My name is Blaise
2 Rastello, and I serve as the Director of
3 Affordable Housing at Transitional Housing
4 Corporation, or THC. THC is a leading non-profit
5 developer of affordable housing in the District of
6 Columbia, and our headquarters are located at 16th
7 Street and Colorado Northwest. THC has been
8 actively involved in the planning and disposition
9 of the Walter Reed Campus and we were selected as
10 one of the notice of interest users or NOI users
11 to locate 6000 square feet of our programmatic and
12 office space within Building 14 on the site.

13 Tonight, I'm here to strongly support the
14 adoption of the new zoning code for the District
15 portion of the Walter Reed Campus. As a local
16 non-profit headquartered in Ward 4 and an NOI
17 user, THC has been involved in the community
18 planning process for Walter Reed since it began in
19 2005. The SAP and the Draft Zoning that is based
20 on the SAP reflect this collaborative planning
21 process that included hundreds of local
22 stakeholders, individuals, businesses, non-
23 profits, religious institutions, public agencies,
24 and elected officials. We commend the LRA and the

1 Office of Planning for involving the local
2 community and the planning process in a meaningful
3 way and for prioritizing the inclusion of deeply
4 affordable housing through the selection of
5 Nationally recognized NOI users, So Others Might
6 Eat, Help USA, and THC to provide affordable
7 housing and comprehensive support services to the
8 District's most vulnerable homeless populations.

9 As you are well aware, there is a great
10 need for affordable housing throughout the
11 District, including in Ward 4. The Urban
12 Institute's recent study on housing security in
13 the Washington region indicates that almost half
14 of all renter households in the region have
15 struggled with high housing costs, including more
16 than 150,000 households with severe housing cost
17 burden. Developed pursuant to the Small Area
18 Plan, the current plan for Walter Reed Campus
19 contemplated by the District and the Master
20 Developer delivers 432 affordable housing units or
21 20% of the planned units and more than double the
22 10% affordable residential square footage required
23 under the Inclusionary Zoning law.

24 I too would also just echo that I think

1 the most appropriate way to require the Master
2 Development Team to stick to that is through a
3 Land Disposition Agreement as opposed to the
4 zoning. I think the zoning law allowing the
5 flexibility to locate those affordable units
6 throughout the site that are appropriate to the
7 existing structures is good, and I also do not
8 think you want to set the precedent of having an
9 Inclusionary Zoning requirement in one particular
10 area of the District that is different than the
11 others, but that is just my own personal opinion,
12 and I will go back to THC's statements.

13 Not only do these units target the very
14 low income households, they are targeted to
15 homeless seniors and veterans and will provide
16 comprehensive support services, meeting the
17 housing needs of two of our city's most vulnerable
18 populations. The remaining affordable rental and
19 home-ownership units are targeted at a mix of 50%
20 and 80% of AMI, ensuring a mixed income community
21 at the new Walter Reed Campus.

22 We have been both welcomed and impressed
23 by the District and Master Developer's willingness
24 to engage and cooperate with our organization and

1 all of the affordable housing providers on the
2 site. Their recognition of the urgency for
3 prioritizing affordable housing units, as clearly
4 demonstrated within their phasing plan, which will
5 deliver more than half of all the affordable units
6 as some of the earliest development to occur
7 immediately after the property is transferred.

8 Finally, I cannot express enough my
9 respect and gratitude for the District's and
10 Master Developer's desire to work with THC to co-
11 develop senior affordable housing in addition to
12 the NOI users of Building 14. As one of the
13 leading non-profit developers in the District, we
14 are approached all the time by private for-profit
15 developers to partner with them on co-developing a
16 property to achieve their affordable housing goals
17 and to assist in the economics of the transactions
18 with our ability to obtain public financing
19 resources.

20 More often than not, these groups have
21 proposed to have us participate on a very cursory
22 level throughout the process, and this Master
23 Developer Team's approach has been more than
24 inclusive. Their value in their partnership with

1 our organization, THC, has demonstrated their
2 willingness to build the capacity of our
3 organization and other local non-profit
4 organizations during the redevelopment process in
5 a significant and meaningful way.

6 On behalf of THC, we are excited to be a
7 part of this dynamic, energetic, smart, and
8 creative team. We wholeheartedly support the
9 proposed zoning of the Walter Reed Campus and the
10 parks at Walter Reed Master Plan Design. We
11 encourage a quick enactment of the zoning, as both
12 SOME and Help USA's projects have been awarded
13 funding and are ready to go, and timely passage of
14 the zoning will allow these to continue on
15 schedule and create new affordable housing for the
16 District as soon as possible. Thank you very
17 much.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next, Mr.
19 Todd.

20 MR. TODD: Good evening Chairman Hood,
21 members of the Zoning Commission staff, and
22 members of the public. My name is Brandon Todd,
23 and I'm a resident of the District of Columbia,
24 residing in Ward 4. I serve as the President of

1 the Ward 4 Democrats and previously served as
2 Director of Community Affairs in the Ward 4
3 Council Office.

4 Over the last six years in both these
5 personal and professional capacities, I have
6 attended dozens of meetings with various
7 stakeholders representing community, government,
8 and business interests concerning the
9 redevelopment of the former Walter Reed Army
10 Medical Center. The Proposed Text and Map
11 Amendments to create and implement the Walter Reed
12 Zone represent the successful collaboration of
13 these interests, and I am here to offer my support
14 for its adoption.

15 The Proposed Text and Map Amendments will
16 create and implement the Walter Reed Zone allowing
17 the selected Master Developer, the Hines, Urban
18 Atlantic Joint Venture, to develop a mixed-use
19 development on the former Walter Reed site that
20 represents the density, height, and traffic
21 concerns expressed to me by my fellow Ward 4
22 neighbors. In fact, when compared to the context
23 in which the Army used the site, the development
24 allowed under the WR Zone would decrease and more

1 evenly distribute density, reduce the top level
2 building height from what currently exists, and
3 alleviate traffic congestion during peak times.
4 The positive impact on these three important
5 considerations has led to the endorsement of this
6 development plan by the community.

7 The WR Zone consists of 8 subzones and
8 will be mapped on the portion of the Walter Reed
9 site that is to be transferred to the District of
10 Columbia, comprised principally of the eastern and
11 southern sections along Georgia and Aspen,
12 respectively.

13 The Proposed Text and Map Amendments would
14 have a beneficial effect on the residents of the
15 District of Columbia and Ward 4, specifically,
16 because they would create a vibrant town center
17 that would spur additional economic development
18 along Georgia Avenue, contribute acres of green
19 space and cultural amenities, produce hundreds of
20 affordable housing units for seniors, veterans,
21 and families, introduce new retail opportunities
22 to the immediate and surrounding neighborhoods,
23 provide employment for District residents, and
24 create opportunities for local and small certified

1 business enterprises.

2 All this will be done while preserving the
3 unique historical architecture, landscape, and
4 character of the Walter Reed Campus. The
5 amendments would also advance green building and
6 sustainability initiatives and promote innovative
7 energy uses and storm water management.

8 Additionally, I support the testimony
9 submitted by Advisory Neighborhood Commission 4A
10 in support of the Proposed Text and Map
11 Amendments, which would create and implement the
12 WR Zone, which would allow mixed-use development
13 at the former Walter Reed site.

14 I appreciate the opportunity to present
15 testimony today on the Proposed Text and Map
16 Amendments, and I wholeheartedly offer my support.
17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. I want
19 to thank you all for your testimony. Let's see if
20 we have any questions up here. Any questions?
21 Vice Chair Cohen.

22 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yeah, three people have
23 mentioned that there is financing commitment for
24 the affordable homeless properties. Can you

1 explain that to me, since you don't have zoning,
2 there is not a development agreement in place, and
3 the infrastructure hasn't started.

4 MR. TODD: Sure, and I can speak on behalf
5 of the Help USA project. We asked for funding in
6 the previous years round, so the 2014 round of the
7 DHCD SuperNova and were identified, and we were
8 qualified
9 -- we met the threshold criteria to ask for
10 financing for the projects that had been
11 identified as the NOIs, so this was the Help USA
12 project and So Others Might Eat project. The
13 zoning on Building 14 passed threshold because of
14 the preexisting use, so we had confirmation from
15 the Zoning Administrator that we qualified for the
16 zoning criteria for Building 14 where Help USA is
17 and SOME had a similar situation with their
18 building.

19 In terms of the site control, because the
20 NOI users have a legally binding agreement with
21 the District as part of the BRAC process, that was
22 also viewed for the District's financing criteria
23 as sufficient site control for the DHCD Housing
24 Production Trust Fund financing round. So, while

1 we went through the process and were identified
2 for further underwriting, obviously the site
3 actually has to be transferred before we can begin
4 construction, but it has been through the round.

5 VICE CHAIR COHEN: So, once the transfer
6 takes place, you're shovel ready? You have your
7 plans? What I'm trying to understand is really
8 the flow of...

9 MR. TODD: There is a sense of urgency for
10 the Help USA project to move forward on the land
11 transfer as well as zoning confirmation as soon as
12 possible. We are continuing work right now, as a
13 matter of fact, meeting just today with the
14 development team, the architect, the contractor,
15 so that we can be permit and shovel ready as soon
16 as the transfer happens because we have a huge
17 need for the affordable housing in the community.
18 We're ready to do this. The building -- in fact,
19 Building 14, for those of you that have been
20 there, was used up until the day that the project
21 was closed for soldiers that were rehabbing. It's
22 almost perfectly configured for the use that we
23 have and what THC and others are doing in the
24 building. So, we plan to have the permits ready

1 to go when the transfer happens and be able to
2 turn this around in a matter of months.

3 VICE CHAIR COHEN: But, this is going to
4 be permanent housing?

5 MR. TODD: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIR COHEN: And, it doesn't have
7 asbestos or anything of that nature.

8 MR. TODD: The building -- I mean, I can't
9 speak to all the building conditions, but I'm
10 looking because others have been through that, but
11 again this building, Building 14 in particular,
12 was built in the 1970s. The Army put, I think,
13 more than \$10 million within the last ten years to
14 rehabbing the building. It was used until the day
15 the site was closed. It is ready to go.

16 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Make sure you have
17 those toilet seats. If you recall, the Army spent
18 quite a bit of money for them.

19 [Laughter.]

20 So, I just want to confirm something. It
21 is my understanding we have seniors and veterans
22 covered. Are there going to be shelter --
23 permanent housing for families as well? I just
24 want to make sure I understand.

1 MS. DAVIS: As part of the development
2 team's commitment to the LRA and the community,
3 there are a number of units that are set aside to
4 50% of median. Within 50%, it is targeted that
5 way to meet the requirements of typical funding
6 sources for 9% credits and housing production
7 trust funds. The new targets of that solicitation
8 process actually require a significant number to
9 be targeted well below that with permanent
10 services so that the families can be supported.
11 So, yes, there is housing that would qualify for
12 this. It is targeted to below 50% of median
13 because it has to be, but within that, there are
14 subsets of targeting. We should also note that as
15 a private developer, we voluntarily during the
16 selection process teamed with THC because they are
17 the foremost provider of homeless services to
18 homeless families, seniors, veterans, etc. in Ward
19 4.

20 So, we met with local community groups.
21 Ward 4, by the way, also has the largest senior
22 population of any Ward in the city. The community
23 told us that they need a place for people to go so
24 they don't have to move out to Leisure World.

1 Okay? So, they need an affordable place for those
2 folks to go when that time of life comes. So, we
3 tried to be very proactive. We have the units set
4 aside for below 50% of median. The vast majority
5 of those are rental, not home ownership. The home
6 ownership ones are part of IZ. And, by the way,
7 it is important not to be part of IZ, because IZ
8 has very particular restrictions that make it very
9 difficult to serve people at the lowest income
10 levels because of how it is dispersed.

11 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you for those
12 explanations. I have one other -- Mr. Atkins,
13 please don't give up on people who live in 16-foot
14 wide homes, mine is that wide, and it's really
15 quite beautiful, okay?

16 MR. ATKINS: Sure, I understand. My only
17 point was that by the zoning regulations, they
18 were trying to make a difference between
19 affordable and market-rate, and I just -- we just
20 felt that it could have the effect of stigmatizing
21 those who lived in affordable housing as not
22 having the same kind of housing as people who
23 lived in market housing, and that was the only --
24 there's nothing wrong with 16 feet, but if you're

1 going to have housing, it should be available to
2 everyone in our view.

3 VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you for that
4 clarification.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions up
6 here? Commissioner Carley, let me ask you, and I
7 guess Ms. Speaks. When you said you all want an
8 opportunity to be able to change your resolution
9 to the Commission, what are you going to make some
10 tweaks or have you answered some questions in your
11 presentation?

12 MR. CARLEY: Questions have been answered
13 in the presentation and some of the Commissioners
14 just wanted a chance to revisit the resolution and
15 maybe make changes.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, 4B is kind of going in
17 line with 4A?

18 MR. CARLEY: That is my understanding,
19 yes.

20 MS. OATES: In fact, Commissioners...

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is your mic on?

22 MS. OATES: Commissioner Speaks is going
23 to present another resolution before the
24 Commission at its next public meeting, you know,

1 so you will have an additional, a new resolution -
2 - let me put it that way.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, and Mr. Atkins,
4 looking at your testimony, does it kind of
5 coincide with 4A? I'm just looking at it tonight,
6 so I'm just wondering.

7 MR. ATKINS: Up to a point, yes. We
8 didn't deal with the issue of closing off 12th
9 Street to only bicycle access. I think our view
10 is not quite as detailed -- our position is not
11 quite as detailed as his on the townhouses, but if
12 you read between the lines, I think that you would
13 see that both of us would support lower-density
14 townhouses, because as Mr. Jesick pointed out, the
15 Small Area Plan speaks of the townhouses being a
16 transition area between the single-family and two-
17 family homes along Fern Street to the higher-
18 density uses in the interior of the site,
19 especially around where the grocery store or the
20 other retail and mixed-use building there where
21 the hospital is presently located. So, yes, I
22 would say in a general sense, we would be in favor
23 because we do support the plan; we would just like
24 to see a little lower density and lower heights

1 for the buildings.

2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to say that
3 all the testimony I have seen so far has been very
4 detailed, and I appreciate all of it. Any other
5 questions? Commissioner Miller.

6 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr.
7 Chairman. Ms. Oates, when is the next ANC 4B
8 meeting?

9 MS. OATES: April 27 at the 4th District
10 Police Station. Our meetings start at 7:00 sharp.
11 [Laughter.]

12 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay, well, we'll
13 look forward...

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 7:00 sharp?

15 MS. OATES: Sharp.

16 COMMISSIONER MILLER: We'll look forward
17 to getting the revised resolution, and thank each
18 of you for your very thoughtful testimony.

19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, if I come at 7:01, I'm
20 late?

21 MS. OATES: You can't get in.

22 [Laughter]

23 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. Let me thank
24 each and every one of you for your testimony. We

1 know you all are very busy, and we appreciate you
2 coming down. Thank you.

3 MS. OATES: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Those who are in
5 opposition - Ms. Wheeler and also Ms. Green.
6 Anyone else who is here in opposition? Ms.
7 Coleman, if you could come forward. Anyone else
8 who is here in opposition? Oh, before anyone
9 leaves, Mr. Todd and others, did you all fill out
10 your witness cards, everyone? Okay. Let's make
11 sure we fill out our witness cards so we can make
12 sure we have our records efficient. Thank you.
13 So, everyone has filled out their witness cards,
14 okay. Alright, we're going to start with Ms.
15 Wheeler, and we'll go from my right to your left.

16 MS. WHEELER: Thank you Chairman Hood.
17 Ms. Green and I have worked together on this
18 particular presentation, and if you don't mind, we
19 would like to have her start first and I follow.
20 Would that be all right with you?

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, that's fine.

22 MS. WHEELER: Thank you.

23 MS. GREEN: Good evening. Thank you for
24 the opportunity to speak. My name is Sara Green,

1 and you are going to hear something a little
2 different than what you've heard throughout the
3 afternoon -- throughout the evening.

4 I am not in support of several elements of
5 the proposal. There is a lot of good stuff there
6 -- there really is. But, what I'm going to talk
7 about are those things that I don't support --
8 that we don't support. And, the first thing, I
9 think, has to be stated. I do not believe the key
10 elements of this zoning proposal are consistent.
11 I think there are lots of elements that are
12 inconsistent with the Small Area Plan, and I will
13 just list a few of those in a moment. But, the
14 over-arching issue here is that the Small Area
15 Plan was endorsed by the community during at least
16 11 public meetings with hundreds of residents, and
17 it constitutes a commitment from the Office of
18 Planning. And, what we're asking is that the
19 commitment be preserved as the city adopts the
20 zoning regulations.

21 Something else that has not been noted
22 here, and that is there is a whole lot of matter-
23 of-right zoning that is ratcheted up, so instead
24 of a situation where you have, say, in the town

1 center you would have 65 feet as a matter of
2 right, and then you could do additional height
3 with a PUD. Now, what we have as the example is
4 85 feet matter of right -- I guess maybe they
5 might want to go 95, I don't know, but the point
6 is that's it. It's over. I mean, there's going
7 to be no public comment on a lot of these things.
8 You're locking in the higher heights without any
9 public comment. This is a 20-year build-out
10 project, so what you're saying is, let's get it
11 down now, and for the next build-out, maybe 20
12 years, the public is not going to have any
13 meaningful input in a lot of these decisions. The
14 world could change very significantly. A lot of
15 things could change in that community over 20
16 years.

17 So, there is a big emphasis on matter-of-
18 right development in this proposal, and not on
19 those zoning elements -- I'm not saying this well,
20 but not on those elements of our traditional
21 zoning that provide for public comment. That is a
22 concern to me.

23 The three areas, I think, that we are
24 talking about in terms of concern on density is

1 the town center, as we just said is 85. I know
2 you are saying 135, I know you are saying that it
3 is down from that. That was something the Army
4 did, the community had no input on that. I think
5 it is a very different kind of project, and
6 building. So, is my time up here? Is
7 that...okay. Anyway, there were three sites, I
8 apologize. There were three sites, the town
9 center, the Fern and Elder Street townhomes, and
10 the Dahlia and Elder section on Georgia Avenue.
11 They are detailed in the plan. Just let me have
12 one quick moment here.

13 I am calling your attention, when all of
14 this statements -- when the statements have been
15 made about 85 feet, and this is consistent with
16 the Small Area Plan and why are we even opposing
17 any of this, these people, you know, in the
18 neighborhood, please look at the attachments I
19 have given you, and it's Page 86 and 87 -- so it's
20 going to be right after the ANC Resolution -- it's
21 going to be the next attachment. And, I don't
22 know, I'm seeing a 65-foot building sketched out
23 here. This is what the Small Area Plan showed us.
24

1 You know, I was at these meetings. Nobody
2 said 85 feet. Nobody said some of these things.
3 And so if you look at these exhibits, 118, 117 on
4 the other side, I guess 120, 121 -- I mean, am I
5 wrong here? I mean, aren't these 65-foot
6 buildings that are in the Small Area Plan? That's
7 what I'm seeing. That's the basis for my comment
8 here that, you know -- so therefore, this is --
9 from 65 to 85 feet is a very large change in
10 height, and there is some other -- I've talked
11 about some other things throughout. I think you
12 need to look at the consistency with the Small
13 Area Plan and not just assume that it is
14 consistent, because I don't think it is. Thank
15 you.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

17 MS. WHEELER: [Speaking off mic.]

18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is it lit?

19 MS. WHEELER: Sorry. Faith Wheeler, also
20 a former ANC Commissioner for 12 years, 6
21 elections, recently resigned -- well retired,
22 didn't run again. Anyway, there has been much
23 said, as Ms. Green indicated, and we've heard from
24 Matt Jesick and from Vicki Davis that Matt Jesick

1 cannot propose zoning that does not conform to the
2 Small Area Plan. Vicki Davis, we strongly support
3 the Walter Reed Small Area Plan, and I do urge you
4 to please look at what, indeed, you see in the
5 Small Area Plan. The diagrams are different from
6 what is proposed in the Zoning Proposal for Text
7 and Map Amendment. They do not conform. Please
8 note, this is rather troubling.

9 I would like to actually reinforce, I
10 think, it was Mr. Miller who asked about the
11 three-dimensional model that we would like to have
12 created so that it is easily -- what is proposed
13 is easily understood by residents who are not
14 architects. When Vicki Davis came to the ANC for
15 the meeting, I think it was last month or the
16 month before, one of our residents, one of my
17 former constituents, David Hamilton, who is an
18 Urban planner and architect with NCPC for 30
19 years, said that it would really be helpful to
20 have that. In fact, NCPC does require that for
21 large-tract reviews. So, I would really
22 appreciate that that be done as well so lay people
23 can really understand what it does look like.

24 An important concern of the community is

1 that the Walter Reed Campus be redeveloped to
2 reflect the character of the community. An
3 important objective is for that Walter Reed Campus
4 to be integrated into the community, and because
5 the city has just spent some years revising the
6 zoning regulations, the question that I have had
7 and have heard from others is why isn't the new
8 zoning code robust enough to be applied to the
9 Walter Reed Campus, and does this set a precedent
10 for other parcels that will be also large tracts,
11 and will they also require then by the Zoning
12 Commission and by the city to have separate zoning
13 codes like what is being proposed today.

14 Thirdly, my third point is that I
15 understand that zoning should provide
16 predictability; however, there are some areas in
17 the Zoning Proposal that do not seem to provide
18 predictability. For example -- may I just make
19 those points? The proposal that we see -- in the
20 proposal, we see two different criteria for
21 measuring standards on Page 6 of our testimony.
22 The maximum height of buildings or structures
23 shall be as follows, this is a quote from Section
24 3508.3, Part A, "within 25 feet of the setback

1 specified in Section 3508.4, the structures should
2 be measured 50 feet above the finished grade at
3 the middle of the Aspen Street building façade"
4 and B "elsewhere 65 feet as measured from
5 whichever measuring point is chosen for the
6 building for the purpose of measuring height".
7 Well, these are two different kinds of criteria,
8 and not only that, but the one case effectively
9 gives the developer carte blanche to measure
10 however he or she wants. So, where is the
11 predictability? There is none, it seems, which is
12 rather troubling.

13 For parking, a total amount of 3400, but
14 it is not -- there is no indication of how it
15 might be distributed, and I understand that
16 parking is often distributed by use of buildings,
17 but that is -- that doesn't seem to be a factor
18 here, which again is troubling.

19 Third, private streets. There will be
20 private and public streets, which would be under
21 the -- the private streets would be under the
22 jurisdiction of the developer, but DDOT handles
23 private -- well, public streets, obviously, and
24 they have particular standards, and they handle,

1 you know, a number of different functions. It's
2 signage, it's street trees, it's sidewalks, it's
3 plowing. Where is the responsibility or
4 accountability in private streets? It's a bit
5 puzzling, frankly.

6 Lastly, I would like to just say a note
7 about affordable housing. Given the severe
8 shortage of affordable housing in this city, which
9 is critical, we would suggest -- we recommend a
10 total of 25% of affordable housing. We're
11 delighted that 20% is thought of being met by the
12 developer. We're very disturbed that the Zoning
13 proposal proposes much less than that. I'm just
14 going to say a personal note, I grew up poor. My
15 dad lost his house before I was born, so my dad
16 and my uncle and my cousins and my brothers built
17 a tiny house, which they lived in 2 years before I
18 was born with no heat in Central Massachusetts
19 where it is quite cold. And so I have a little
20 bit -- I don't read about these things just in
21 books, I have experienced something of that. By
22 the time I came along, my uncle had dug out a
23 place for a furnace underneath the house, so we
24 then had central heating. But, housing is really

1 important. We didn't have running water. I do
2 remember that. We didn't have an indoor toilet,
3 we had an outhouse. I remember that. No
4 electricity. I remember that. So, I know a
5 little bit about housing and the importance of
6 housing. It makes a difference. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

8 MS. COLEMAN: Can you hear? Okay. Hi,
9 I'm Wendy Blake Coleman. I am a 26-year resident
10 of Shepherd Park, 1410 Holly Street. I generally
11 support the proposed development and zoning for
12 the Walter Reed Campus. In most cases, the Office
13 of Planning took great care to reflect citizen
14 concerns and insure minimal impact with adjoining
15 neighborhoods. The exception is Parcel WR-8 at
16 the corner of 16th and Aspen Streets.

17 After much discussion, the Office of
18 Planning did change the WR-8 designation in the
19 Small Area Plan from medium to proposed open
20 space/medium, but the maximum proposed zoning
21 density allowed negates the pros designation. The
22 WR-8 designation allows a 5-story apartment
23 building covering up to 80% of the steeply sloped
24 lot, currently a tree-lined, open green space.

1 The developer makes clear in their presentations
2 that they intend to develop to the maximum extent
3 allowed under this WR-8 zoning despite repeated
4 concerns raised by citizens and some 4A ANC
5 Commissioners.

6 I oppose the WRS moderate-to-medium
7 density zoning because it does not reflect (1)
8 neighborhood concerns, (2) the character of the
9 entire span of the 16th Street Corridor from
10 Colesville Road to Military Road, which is all
11 designated as either R1-A or R1-B including the W-
12 8 on the Official Zoning Map.

13 The Rittenhouse Apartments at 1601 16th
14 Street have a setback of 185 feet from 16th
15 Street. The apartments on Luzon Avenue and
16 Somerset Place have setbacks of approximately 100
17 feet from 16th Street. All these setbacks are
18 zoned R-1B.

19 The topography of WR-8, a steep hill, will
20 be totally destroyed by the building proposed.
21 After their Draft Environmental Impact Assessment,
22 the Department of State has chosen not to develop
23 their part of this hill and to leave it as an open
24 space.

1 The November 21, 2014 memorandum to the
2 District of Columbia Zoning Commission from
3 Jennifer Steingasser re: Text and Map Amendments
4 states the land use and character of WR-8 is
5 residential with a significant green component. A
6 medium-density designation that allows a 5-story
7 building covering up to 80% of the lot does not
8 fit that description.

9 I request that the Zoning Board consider
10 reducing the maximum area of WR-8 that can be
11 developed from 80% to 60% to reflect Section 3541
12 green area ratio where the DRA requirement for the
13 248 is 0.4 pursuant to Chapter 34 of this title.
14 If a medium density is retained -- adhered to the
15 precedent for the apartment buildings on upper
16 16th Street of 100 feet plus setbacks to maintain
17 the character of the 16th Street Corridor and
18 assure a structure is built appropriate for the
19 amount of land available in WR-8.

20 Consider my 2012 recommendations to the
21 Office of Planning, which are attached in my
22 written testimony, on slight shifts in the design
23 and placement of WR residential units to allow the
24 developer to reach a development density necessary

1 to fund the infrastructure for WR, while allowing
2 a WR-8 zoning that is more suitable for the corner
3 of 16th and Aspen Street. Delay the WR-8 zoning
4 designation until the appropriate density zone for
5 WR-8 based on focused neighborhood input is
6 obtained, preferably through the CAC process.

7 I am always shocked about how many people
8 say to me, "Gosh, they're going to build a 5-story
9 building on this corner?" As one neighbor said,
10 "We have all been guilty of not paying attention
11 to WR-8, especially as most of the residents are
12 focused on the Georgia Avenue Corridor, commercial
13 development, and the demolition of the old Walter
14 Reed Hospital." Thanks, so much.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I want to thank the
16 three of you. Let's see if we have any questions
17 up here. Any questions? Commissioner May.

18 COMMISSIONER MAY: It's not so much a
19 question, but a comment. You know, a number of
20 the things you raised in your testimony, Ms.
21 Wheeler and Ms. Green, you're talking about things
22 that are common zoning circumstances. I mean, the
23 fact that there is a special zone for a large plot
24 like this WR-1 - WR-8 that was done in Hill East,

1 and it was done in Saint Elizabeths, and so it is
2 a common thing that we do when we're having to
3 zone an area like this, and it makes more sense
4 than simply trying to take the existing zoning
5 designations and map them onto those parcels,
6 because there are very particular requirements.
7 So, rather than this being a precedent setting, I
8 think it more precedent following.

9 The second thing that I would point out is
10 that when it comes to things like measuring point,
11 you now, what you're talking about again, it's
12 typical to have flexibility on where you establish
13 the measuring point for a building, and it is
14 unusual to set a particular requirement that is
15 driven by the needs of the sight. So, what you're
16 actually seeing is a more restrictive additional
17 requirement for measuring point as opposed to a
18 standard, which is that you can pick a site and
19 measure from it.

20 The last thing is that when it comes to,
21 you know, zoning something in a particular way and
22 then not continuing to get public comment through
23 the process, that's also normal. I mean,
24 everything starts out with some level of matter of

1 right, and we can talk about whether the matter of
2 right is appropriate or not, but it is a very,
3 very unusual circumstance for us to have, you
4 know, for us to require that every development in
5 a given zone or even within a given parcel in a
6 zone to come back for any kind of review. I mean,
7 we normally just zone it and then go from there.

8 MS. GREEN: I think, if I could comment
9 particularly on your last comment.

10 COMMISSIONER MAY: Sure, yeah.

11 MS. GREEN: Take, you know, what I'm so
12 familiar with on my side of Georgia Avenue, which
13 is the east side of Georgia Avenue -- C2-A, that's
14 where we got up and down, a large parcel of that.

15 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

16 MS. GREEN: 50 feet. That's matter of
17 right. If you want to do more than that, I guess
18 you can go to 65 feet with a PUD, but that means
19 that the community has input. It's design input.
20 It's this, it's that.

21 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, but what you're
22 talking about is zoning an existing C2-A and
23 increasing the zone, and anytime you do that, yes,
24 there would be public input. But, this is an area

1 that's otherwise unzoned.

2 MS. GREEN: Right, but...

3 COMMISSIONER MAY: And, in addition to C2-
4 A, you have C2-B, and C3-A, and all of these zones
5 that give you greater density that are mapped in
6 other parts of the city.

7 MS. GREEN: Correct, but what, you know,
8 my position, which you may disagree with, is that
9 in the Small Area Plan, what we saw on those
10 diagrams was 65 feet.

11 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

12 Ms. GREEN: What we're starting out with -
13 - it's a closed door, actually, it's done and
14 finished, it's 85 feet on that site, matter of
15 right, not 65 feet with more possible with
16 community review. But, we're starting out with 85
17 feet done.

18 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, So, I mean the
19 standard there is not inconsistent with the
20 Comprehensive Plan and the Small Area Plans are
21 considered part of that. So, you know, I looked
22 through the Small Area Plan to see where I could
23 say, you know, that nothing should be higher than
24 65 feet, because sometimes we do get that guidance

1 in Small Area Plans and in Comprehensive Plans,
2 and I didn't see it. I mean, if you can point to
3 me -- I'm not talking about interpreting diagrams,
4 because diagrams are not the norm. But, if you
5 can point to a spot in the Comprehensive Plan
6 document or Small Area Plan where it says that
7 nothing should be higher than 65 feet, then I
8 think you have an issue of inconsistency. But,
9 simply to say that you've done the math on the
10 diagram and say...

11 MS. GREEN: Why would that diagram be in
12 there at 65 feet...

13 COMMISSIONER MAY: It's just demonstrative
14 of a concept. It's not -- I mean, planning
15 documents like that are not zoning. That's what
16 we do here. It's designed, you know, the zone
17 designations and the way the area is shown on a
18 map in the planning documents are supposed to
19 guide the zoning decisions as opposed to dictating
20 them.

21 MS. GREEN: Well, it's a significant
22 difference to go from 65 feet in a drawing that,
23 you know, the public looks at and says, "Oh, okay,
24 this is what it is -- 65 feet", and then you get

1 this, it's like a 30% increase in the zone, and it
2 says...

3 COMMISSIONER MAY: And, I can appreciate
4 the difference. All I'm pointing out is that this
5 is not unusual in zoning to have something that is
6 diagrammatically shown some way but then other
7 words within the Small Area Plan may indicate
8 higher zones, and so we are left to interpret the
9 totality of that guidance.

10 MS. GREEN: I didn't see it, but if it's
11 there, then, you know, it's there. I thought I
12 went through it and didn't see it. I don't feel
13 that this was -- that element of that was
14 transparent enough, so...

15 COMMISSIONER MAY: It is murky, I'll
16 certainly give you that, sometimes. It's not
17 always clear, but again it's a matter of
18 interpreting multiple policies that are present in
19 the planning documents.

20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Commissioner Miller.

21

22 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr.
23 Chairman. Just on your point, Ms. Green, we will
24 be asking the Office of Planning to address the

1 consistency issue on the height issue. But, I
2 just want to point out something which I'm sure
3 you're fully aware of is that most of these
4 proposed buildings will be going through a public
5 review process at the Historic Preservation Review
6 Board, so there will be an opportunity for comment
7 there.

8 MS. GREEN: We do appreciate that, but
9 that is zoning. We understand the zoning and
10 historic are separate things, and I think the
11 zoning ought to provide for public input as well,
12 and that's why we're commenting at this venue.

13 COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you. I
14 appreciate your testimony.

15 MS. GREEN: Yes, thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I will say this, Ms.
17 Green. I'm a public input fan, so that's just
18 where I am on that, but I also have some
19 regulations I have to follow and how to process
20 here. So, I'm not saying you and I are not far
21 apart on that. But, I do have a questions, Ms.
22 Wheeler. You mentioned a number of times "we".
23 When you say "we", is that a group "we" or is it
24 just you and maybe Ms. Green. And, I'm just

1 trying to figure out and get a reference of how
2 things went, not that this is a popularity
3 contest, I'm just trying to figure out, is there a
4 group that comes behind that, or is it just you
5 and maybe Ms. Green.

6 MS. WHEELER: It's a group of two, sir.

7 MS. GREEN: This testimony is the two of
8 us.

9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. And, you heard
10 my question earlier about a number of residents,
11 are there more residents that feel kind of like
12 you all do?

13 MS. GREEN: I think so, I think so. I've
14 talked to neighbors, who, you know, when I say 85
15 feet, they say what? I said, okay, look at this
16 and I'll tell you what 85 feet is. You know, look
17 at, for example, what I call the Busboys and Poets
18 building in back of the 7-11 and near the Takoma
19 Metro station or the building across the street
20 with the Supergirl in it at Takoma Metro Station.
21 I said, that's 50 feet. Okay, so that's how you
22 can picture it. So, 85 feet. And, you know,
23 people can grasp that, and I think that is a very
24 tall building to plop in the middle of Shepherd

1 Park, Brightwood, Tacoma. These are, you know,
2 single-family, low -- you know, it's a scale.

3 My last thing I would ask you to think
4 about is, you know that there is a ratcheting up.

5 What one developer wants, the next wants. So, if
6 you have 85 feet, whatever you have on the west
7 side of Georgia Avenue at Walter Reed, the people
8 who are assembling parcels right now on the east
9 side of Georgia Avenue are going to be asking, you
10 know, are going to asking -- saying, "Wait a
11 minute, we have that at Walter Reed, why can't we
12 have 70 feet or 80, you know over here on the east
13 side?"

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: But, wasn't this an
15 exhaustive process? I know, well, you served as a
16 Commissioner -- wasn't this an exhaustive process
17 for community input?

18 MS. GREEN: With the Small -- yes, and
19 that's why I'm saying, we didn't think -- you
20 know, when we looked at it -- that's why we're
21 saying, we didn't think an 85-foot building was
22 going to be there. We really didn't. I think
23 that's a very important question, in fact, and the
24 fact of the matter is, you know, when David

1 Hamilton asked in, I think it was the last ANC
2 meeting, 4B meeting, who understands this. You
3 know, he said, "I'm an architect it. I understand
4 it. I understand what this language means. But,
5 who else does?" Nobody raised their hands. He
6 said, "Well, this is exactly why I think that NCPC
7 requires the models so the people can understand
8 what this means, what the heights and densities
9 mean." Otherwise, they don't. You know, people
10 sort of scratch their heads and who is going to go
11 through all of this stuff except people who are
12 really concerned with the community. Sara and I
13 have been doing this for 12 years. We've been
14 volunteering for 12 years. And, in fact, I have
15 been involved with question of Walter Reed
16 development since before the BRAC when there was a
17 question of putting a Discovery Building -- a
18 building the size of the Discovery Building on the
19 Walter Reed Campus when it was still Walter Reed
20 Military Center -- Medical Center.

21 But, it's an expectation when you go
22 through a Small Area Plan that it will -- you
23 know, that it means something, but then we find
24 that it doesn't. There are, you know, changes

1 that suddenly appear, and after a long community
2 process of listening, and thinking about, and
3 analyzing, and questioning what this all means,
4 then it changes. It's difficult.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: But, I think -- what I
6 heard from Mr. Carley, there was a presentation --
7 Commissioner Carley who is still a Commissioner in
8 4B.

9 MS. GREEN: I understand.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: A presentation was made,
11 and they are ready to, I guess, minute or bring
12 together their testimony to this Commission...

13 MS. GREEN: I understand.

14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And support in taking some
15 of the elements out, so there are obviously some
16 people in 4B who obviously understood.

17 MS. GREEN: You know, I was at some of
18 these -- I have been at all the presentations too,
19 and I'm not sure exactly, you know, what was said,
20 you know, how people -- I can't look at other
21 Commissioners and see into their thought process.
22 I don't know how people change their minds. I
23 don't know why they change their minds. I don't
24 know what kind of conversations, you know, they

1 had. It's a Commission. It's a majority vote.
2 If they want to come together a second time and
3 revise, you know, what their feelings are, that's
4 the democratic process.

5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I understand that. But,
6 I'm just trying to -- because there was mention of
7 people maybe not understanding -- and that's what
8 I was just trying to clarify. Believe me, I
9 definitely know there's a democratic process. I
10 have 5 people...

11 MS. GREEN: Yes, yes, no I know you do,
12 Sir, I know you do.

13 [Laughter.]

14 When I was at the presentations, I was
15 hearing and seeing from Commissioners that, you
16 know, they thought that the affordable housing
17 needed to be ratcheted up, that it was anything
18 with affordable housing, and in other ANC 4B
19 issues involving height, there has been a big
20 concern. I mean, I was on the Commission for 12
21 years. You know, there has been a big concern
22 about height, you know, being an issue. So, you
23 know, based on what I've -- our other earlier
24 resolutions and other -- you know, I don't know.

1 You know, you'd have to ask -- Mr. Carley is the
2 representative, and I respect very much whatever
3 they do.

4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I want to thank you
5 two both for bringing your points. Those are good
6 points that I think you bring. At least, I need
7 to continue to look at. Ms. Coleman, I also want
8 to thank you for pointing out the WR-8. I
9 appreciate it. That's something that we'll --
10 I'll continue, I'm sure we'll look at.

11 MS. COLEMAN: I truly appreciate it.
12 That's been a moving target, and the position of
13 the ANC has gone from "Oh, heck, they'll be
14 nothing to build up there" to now I was shocked
15 tonight.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, okay again. Let's
17 see. Any other questions? Vice Chair Cohen.

18 VICE CHAIR COHEN: It's not a question,
19 it's really a comment. I really also support more
20 affordable housing everywhere in every ANC area;
21 however, you have to understand the economics of
22 affordable require height and greater density. I
23 just want to share that with you.

24 MS. WHEELER: I certainly understand that,

1 and I'm not a financial analyst. I did work for
2 30 years with an International Development
3 Institution, the InterAmerican Bank. I analyzed
4 programs with the Board of Directors for
5 Development and Management Programs, and after
6 that, I trained International staff and project
7 teams. So, I understand -- I do understand
8 something about the financial requirements.

9 However, I would like to make a comment
10 about that. It's something that is very difficult
11 for the city to deal with, I understand that, but
12 yes, affordable housing does take a chunk of
13 money. It requires subsidies and one thing or
14 another. However, what is the impact of providing
15 affordable housing with programs of counseling,
16 etc. for financial management, for example, for
17 job readiness, for example, for help with
18 educational issues compared to our roughly 50%
19 dropout rate from high school in this city, which
20 is abysmal. What is the cost to that city -- to
21 this city? The affordable housing is only one
22 factor, only one factor. There are many, many,
23 many factors that can help alleviate that.

24 But, I think somehow there must be some

1 way, maybe task forces, to think about the various
2 factors and how can we address them, and the
3 various costs, rather than thinking in such silo
4 terms of well, affordable housing does cost a lot
5 of money. Yes, so does prison, so does crime, so
6 does running people through...

7 VICE CHAIR COHEN: I'm going to cut you
8 short a little bit because I couldn't agree with
9 you more.

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, any other questions
11 up here?

12 MS. WHEELER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Alright. We appreciate
14 your testimony, thank you.

15 MS. WHEELER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do we have anything else,
17 Ms. Schellin?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: I think we need to just
19 figure out a date. I think OP has taken diligent
20 notes on what the Commission has asked for, and I
21 think DMPED also is going to provide some
22 additional information, and then, other than that,
23 the record was only -- I'm assuming the record is
24 only going to be left open for ANC 4B to provide

1 their resolution. They don't meet until, if I
2 heard correctly, April 27. Correct, April 27, so
3 then, other than those, OP, DMPED, and the ANC 4B,
4 the record would be closed. I think it might take
5 DMPED and OP a while to provide that information.

6 So, maybe we should leave the record open until
7 April 30. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's give
8 them a moment to conversate, and let's see.

9 [off the record]

10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Ms. Schellin. We're
11 almost finished. Are we straight, Ms. Schellin?

12

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Well, yes, if we could just
14 announce the dates.

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can I have your attention?
16 Excuse me, can I have your attention? I probably
17 started that, so forgive me, we're almost
18 finished.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: If we could have all of the
20 submissions by 3:00 p.m. Monday, May 4th, and that
21 would be submissions only from the Office of
22 Planning, DMPED, and ANC 4B, their resolution
23 only, and that would be 3:00 p.m. May 4, 2015, and
24 then we would take that up at the May 11 meeting

1 at 6:30 p.m. Other than that, the record is
2 closed.

3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, are we all on the
4 same page? Alright. I want to thank everyone for
5 their participation today, and this hearing is
6 adjourned.

7

8 (Whereupon, at 9:56 p.m., the meeting was
9 concluded.)

10

11

12

13