

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Zoning Commission

Public Hearing

Case No 17-05 [2100 2nd Street Southwest, LLC -
Design Review at Square 613.]

6:32 p.m. to 8:41 p.m.
Monday, June 5, 2017

Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room
441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 220 South
Washington, D.C. 20001

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 Board Members:

2 ANTHONY HOOD, Chairman

3 ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chair

4 PETER MAY, Commissioner

5 MICHAEL TURNBULL, Commissioner

6 PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner

7

8 Office of Zoning:

9 SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary

10

11 Office of Planning:

12 JENNIFER STEINGASSER

13 JOEL LAWSON

14 ALISA VITALE

15

16 Department of Transportation:

17 JONATHAN ROGERS

18

19 Department of Environment and Energy:

20 BILL UPDIKE

21

22

23

24

25

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

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good evening, ladies and
3 gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning
4 Commission for the District of Columbia. Today's
5 date is June 5th, 2017. We're located in the Jerrily
6 R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room.

7 My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me this
8 evening are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Shapiro,
9 Commissioner May, and Commissioner Turnbull. We're
10 also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon
11 Schellin, as well as the Office of Planning staff,
12 Ms. Steingasser and Mr. Lawson and Ms. Vitale, the
13 District Department of Transportation, Mr. Rogers,
14 and the District Department of Energy and the
15 Environment, Mr., I want to say Updike.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. I
18 remember everybody's name. Mr. Updike. Okay. This
19 proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and
20 is also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you
21 to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in
22 the hearing room, including the display of any signs
23 or objects. Notice of today's hearing was published
24 in the D.C. Register, and copies of that announcement
25 are available to my left on the wall near the door.

1 The hearing will be conducted in accordance
2 with provisions of 11-Z DCMR Chapter 4 as follows,
3 preliminary matters, the applicant's case, report of
4 the Office of Planning, report of other government
5 agencies, report of the ANC, organizations and
6 persons in support, organizations and persons in
7 opposition, rebuttal and closing by the applicant.

8 The following time constraints will be
9 maintained in this meeting. The applicant has up to
10 go minutes. I see they have 45. Probably can do it
11 a little less than that. Organizations, five
12 minutes, individuals three minutes. And I mean, we
13 need to hit the highlights. Flood plain and other
14 issues that are there.

15 The Commission intends to adhere to the time
16 limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the
17 case in a reasonable period of time. All persons
18 wishing to testify before the Commission in this
19 evening's hearing are asked to register at the
20 witness kiosk to my left, and fill out two witness
21 cards. These cards are located to my left on the
22 table near the door.

23 Upon coming forward to speak to the
24 Commission, please give both cards to the reporter
25 sitting to my right before taking a seat at the

1 table.

2 The decision of the Commission in this case
3 must be based exclusively on the public record.

4 The staff will be available throughout the
5 hearing to discuss procedural questions. Please turn
6 off all electronic devices at this time so not to
7 disrupt these proceedings. Would all individuals
8 wishing to testify please rise to take the oath? Ms.
9 Schellin, would you please administer the oath?

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Please raise your right
11 hand.

12 [Oath administered to the participants.]

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: At this time, the
15 Commission will consider any preliminary matters.
16 Ms. Schellin, do we have any preliminary matters?

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. We have the
18 proffered expert witnesses. I see that we have a
19 total of three, well actually four, or is it just
20 Jami that's here this evening? Jami Milanovich.
21 Amelia? Okay. And I don't think she's been accepted
22 by the Commission before. So actually, then, all
23 three need to be accepted by the Commission. I don't
24 show that they've been accepted as experts before.
25 And their resumes are at Exhibit 16D.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Good evening, Ms.
2 Roddy. Let's go through the experts.

3 MS. RODDY: We have Yulia Beltikova, who we
4 are proffering as an expert in architecture, Claire
5 Agre, who we are proffering as an expert in landscape
6 architecture, and Amelia Martin, who is an expert in
7 transportation engineering. If there are specific
8 aspects of their resumes that you'd like to walk
9 through, we're happy to do so. Or, if there's
10 questions you have, we're happy to answer.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's deal with Ms.
12 Beltikova. Beltikova? I don't want to mispronounce
13 your name. Let's deal with her first. Let's do the
14 architect first.

15 Commissioners, any problems?

16 MR. MAY: I guess I don't have any problem,
17 but it is, her resume is a little lighter than we
18 would normally see for somebody qualified as an
19 expert. I mean, nine years of experience. Granted,
20 some significant projects, but I mean, we normally
21 see something more robust, but I'm not going to raise
22 a big issue on this one.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, if I don't hear any
24 objections, we will give her expert status in
25 architecture.

1 Okay. Let's go to the next person.

2 MS. RODDY: Claire Agre, being proffered as
3 an expert in landscape architecture.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any objections?
5 Okay, not hearing any, so we will give her. Let's go
6 to the next one.

7 MS. RODDY: Amelia Martin, an expert in
8 transportation engineering.

9 MR. MAY: Okay. So, this is where I have a
10 more significant issue. Three years of experience,
11 and it says right on her resume that she is an
12 engineer in training. I'm not sure that we could
13 qualify somebody who is an engineer in training as an
14 expert. I mean, I understand you know, significant
15 project experience, but it doesn't seem to rise to
16 the level of being considered an expert in my view.

17 MR. TURNBULL: I would concur, Mr. Chair. As
18 much as she's done a lot of -- I think she needs to
19 have a few more years under her belt before we would
20 qualify her as an expert.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Does she work on
22 these projects independently, or does she work with
23 others? Is there a project you can point to on your
24 resume that you did independently?

25 MS. RODDY: No, I believe most of those have

1 been working with another engineer. With Ms.
2 Milanovich.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, I would concur.
4 Any other comments? Okay. So, we will take her
5 testimony and we will listen to her. I mean, we
6 listen to everybody's testimony, but we will not just
7 give her expert status as she continues to go down
8 that road. Eventually, we'll give you expert status.
9 Okay? All right.

10 Anything else? Ms. Schellin, do we have
11 anything else?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Yes.

13 MR. TURNBULL: And we look forward to the
14 time when we can confer that.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, one more preliminary
16 matter. At Exhibit 25 the applicant filed a motion
17 to waive the 20-day rule so that they could submit
18 revisions based on response -- revisions to their
19 application based on responses from the different
20 government agencies.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Is this -- when did this
22 come in? The 2nd. When was the 2nd?

23 MS. SCHELLIN: I believe that was Friday.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And have those agencies
25 had a chance to look at -- review it?

1 MS. RODDY: I reached out to the agencies and
2 I only touched base with DDOT, who did have an
3 opportunity to review it.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Well,
5 we will proceed and see how this looks; how it goes.
6 Okay. Anything else?

7 MS. SCHELLIN: I have nothing else.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right, Ms. Roddy. You
9 may begin.

10 MS. RODDY: Thank you. As you know,
11 Christine Roddy with Goulston and Storrs and we're
12 here this evening with a design review application
13 for the former Coast Guard Headquarters in Southwest
14 Washington.

15 The property is located along the Anacostia
16 River, between 1st Street and 2nd Street Southwest,
17 just south of V Street. It's located in the CG-5
18 Zone District and it is improved with an eight-story
19 office building that has a height of 90 feet and an
20 FAR of 6.0. The proposed project will adaptively
21 reuse the existing building and convert it to a
22 residential building with ground-floor retail.

23 The project reduces the existing density from
24 a 6.0 to a 4.45, and it also reduces the level of
25 parking. There are currently over 1,000 parking

1 spaces onsite, and we are reducing that to about 360.

2 The proposed building will consist of 485
3 units and will have approximate 70,000 square feet of
4 ground-floor retail. And the ground floor is
5 dedicated to the retail space in alignment with the
6 Buzzard Point Vision framework plan, in an effort to
7 activate the streetscapes and provide these vibrant
8 spaces that attract individuals to the site, with the
9 plan that they would ultimately then be attracted
10 down to the waterfront.

11 The second floor of the building has been
12 removed to help provide the ceiling heights for the
13 retail spaces to help activate that space. And so,
14 what that means then, is that the residential units
15 are located on what is effectively the third floor of
16 the building and above. And this is important
17 because the final program really reconciles the goals
18 and objectives of the Buzzard Point Vision framework
19 plan, which is again to activate those ground-floor
20 spaces and attract people to the site, while also
21 addressing DOEE concerns with respect to the
22 floodplain. It removes those residential units so
23 that they are located well above the 500-year
24 floodplain. The residential units are at least 21
25 feet above the 500-year floodplain.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 This project also improves the Anacostia
2 waterfront by creating usable space that can be
3 enjoyed by visitors and residents. The project was
4 designed to invite the public to the waterfront
5 through a series of passive and active trails, and
6 the applicant has spent a significant amount of time
7 with DDOT, DOEE, and OP in designing these spaces to
8 ensure that they're consistent with the Buzzard Point
9 Vision framework plan.

10 And what we're presenting tonight is the
11 result of a lot of effort on a lot of peoples' part,
12 and so we appreciate the work that the agencies have
13 spent with us on this project, and we're very happy
14 with how the design has evolved.

15 In addition to coordinating with the District
16 agencies, we have reached out to the park service.
17 They own the land to the west, to the south, and to
18 the east of the property. None of the improvements
19 that we are showing this evening are on Park Service
20 land. It will be critical that we continue to
21 coordinate with the Park Service as we move forward.
22 We want to ensure that the trails have a seamless
23 transition as they move between the two properties.

24 Finally, we had discussed that there are --
25 we filed the response to the agency reports, and

1 that's a thorough response to each of the comments
2 that the agencies provided. I will just note that
3 the project will be LEED Gold. We are committing to
4 a 19-space Capital Bikeshare station, and that we are
5 working with DDOT through the Public Space process to
6 improve the area south of the 2nd Street turnaround,
7 which was an item that was requested by both DDOT and
8 the Office of Planning.

9 So, with that, I will introduce the first
10 member of our project team. We have David Orr, he is
11 a representative of the project owner, and of Orr
12 Development.

13 MR. ORR: Sorry. Good evening. My company
14 is built in 33 states, and there are two things that
15 I think have defined this project. It's a unique
16 opportunity for us to be in Buzzard's Point. And one
17 of the things I want to say is, having built in 33
18 states, we have come across all kinds of
19 jurisdictional approval processes, and I want to tell
20 you in all sincerity, we've never been through a
21 better one than the one we've been through with the
22 District of Columbia. It has been a very
23 collaborative process, I think it has been very
24 forthright, and I think that we actually got a lot of
25 really good suggestions from staff that we

1 incorporated into our plan, particularly as it
2 related to the waterfront side of things, and on the
3 streets, and the relationship of the streets to the
4 retail.

5 And so, the second thing I'd like to say in
6 stress is the involvement we've had with the
7 community, and I think Roger Moffett is here, and I
8 think that we had a unanimous ANC approval, and we
9 listened to the community.

10 What was stressed by the community was
11 neighborhood retail. They didn't want to see a bunch
12 of restaurants. We are going to have restaurants on
13 the waterfront, but they wanted to see neighborhood
14 serving retail. So, I'm here to tell you that we've
15 worked really hard and that we're going to be putting
16 a market in the facility, some craft coffee shops,
17 some maker spaces. So, we're working really hard to
18 reach out and do neighborhood serving retail as we
19 know is sorely needed in this part of Buzzard's
20 Point.

21 So, that's what I had to say this evening.
22 Thank you.

23 MS. RODDY: And now, Julia Beltikova will
24 walk through the architectural features.

25 MS. BELTIKOVA: I will try to be brief, and I

1 will walk you through location, existing building
2 details, proposed design plans, renderings, and the
3 floodplain issue will be last, and then I will turn
4 it over to landscape architect.

5 We all know this is located in Buzzard Point.
6 Thank you.

7 [Pause.]

8 MS. BELTIKOVA: We all know where the site is
9 located. It's in Buzzard Point. Immediately to the
10 west of the site across 2nd Street, we have James
11 Creek Marina. And immediately to the east of the
12 site is NPS Property proposed Buzzard Point Park.

13 On the northeast corner of the block of V
14 Street and 1st, as we all know, there is a Capitol
15 City residential project of 88 V Street.

16 Existing building is a former headquarters
17 for U.S. Coast Guard. The southern portion of the
18 site actually function as a back alley with open to
19 sky loading, large loading area with two existing
20 curb cuts.

21 A portion of the second floor is currently
22 used, a parking level. In fact, there are three curb
23 cuts and three different unconnected entry points to
24 parking levels, two below grade and one above grade
25 on second floor. Second floor is actually partially

1 exposed to sky, and if you are looking at the screen,
2 right where I'm hovering, there is a portion of that
3 second floor parking that's open to above.

4 Let's see. There is a number of security
5 features that are located in the public space, such
6 as bollards and security planters that were part of
7 U.S. Coast Guard security, which we are proposing to
8 remove. Here is another aerial shot, a little bit
9 better view of 2nd Street, and of that large loading
10 dock area at the end of 2nd Street.

11 A quick summary of existing and proposed
12 conditions, this is an office building. One of the
13 unique features of this site is actually its
14 location. There are fantastic views of the water,
15 and so we wanted to take advantage of that location
16 and create as many units -- this is predominantly a
17 residential building, as many units as possible that
18 would take advantage of the water views.

19 So, we carved out roughly 187,000 square feet
20 of courtyards. There are four courtyards in this
21 building. And we tried really hard to work with the
22 -- not only to make this building full of light, but
23 also to work with the residential typology of a
24 building.

25 As David mentioned, there are 71,000 square

1 feet of commercial space. It's roughly 13 percent of
2 the total GFA of the building. Four hundred and
3 eight-five units, which begin with level 3, roughly
4 21 feet above 500-year floodplain. Mechanical
5 systems proposed for these buildings are VRF,
6 variable refrigerant flow units, which are very
7 efficient and do not use traditional boilers if there
8 is a concern for emissions.

9 We have revised our LEED scorecard and our
10 LEED target to achieve Gold as opposed to what we
11 have submitted back in May.

12 There are 361 parking spaces. Existing
13 building had slightly over 1,000. As Christine
14 mentioned, we completely removed second floorplan,
15 second floor level to allow for a double-height space
16 for retail and commercial, as well as entries to
17 residential, and some of the ground-floor residential
18 amenities.

19 We have also added a habitable penthouse
20 level that would be a nine-story. There is some
21 residential amenity indoor and out, and the habitable
22 penthouse is completely set back at one-to-one ratio
23 per zoning regulations.

24 I will briefly walk you through plans,
25 starting on ground-floor plan. Speaking about the

1 organization of the plan, it is bifurcated into north
2 and south retail. North retail facing V Street is
3 predominantly neighborhood retail. So, those are
4 potentially grocery store, drug store, and a coffee
5 roaster. Excuse me.

6 We have provided, per comments with the
7 Public Space Committee hearing back in April and May,
8 a service corridor at the back of those retail
9 spaces, A, B, C, and D, that provides access to a
10 loading dock area accessible from 2nd Street.
11 Loading and trash.

12 There is also a retail dedicated elevator
13 located and exiting through a lobby on 2nd Street,
14 right where I'm hovering on the screen. Retail
15 elevator for access to P1 parking level, which has
16 not only residential parking spaces, but also retail
17 parking spaces.

18 We decided to go with preserving existing
19 elevator core locations. And in fact actually had to
20 add another new elevator, just how the building ended
21 up being configured.

22 So, on the west side, right where I'm
23 hovering on the screen, there is a bank of four
24 elevators. So that shaft is actually existing.
25 Those two shafts. And on the east side, a similar

1 situation. The elevator core exiting to V Street is
2 a new elevator core. All egress stairs are new as
3 well.

4 Now, going to south portion of the plan,
5 where we have three restaurants, we extended existing
6 floor slab, plus the structural column grade by 10
7 feet in the south direction, and we added a raised
8 outdoor terrace for seating for restaurants. That
9 terrace is on the same level with ground-floor for
10 ADA access, which overlooks over the Riverwalk Trail.

11 There are a few public space projections on
12 the southeast and southwest corner. Those completely
13 comply with the DCMR Chapter 32, for width, depth,
14 and height. And those are access point to restaurant
15 R3 on southwest corner there is an ADA ramp and a set
16 of steps, and a similar situation on southeast corner
17 at the end of 1st Street, access to restaurant R1.

18 Just briefly mention topography of this site.
19 The high point is actually in the middle of V Street
20 at elevation, roughly, 10. And then it slopes down
21 towards the river, down 1st Street and 2nd Street,
22 and the vertical drop is roughly three feet. So,
23 it's 10 at V Street and roughly seven and a half to
24 seven around the bottom of the raised stairs, and of
25 course it drops much lower at the river's edge.

1 There is a total of four curb cuts on the
2 site. Three on 2nd Street, two for loading, one for
3 consolidated parking access to two below-grade
4 parking levels, and one on 1st Street, which is for
5 residential loading area.

6 I will very quickly skip through parking
7 levels. We are providing some amenity within P1
8 level. Bicycle storage rooms, as well as some pet
9 spa, and enclosed space for pet relief area.

10 Here is a configuration of a typical floor.
11 All of our courtyards are completely compliant with
12 the width and area per zoning requirements. In fact,
13 they exceed them by twice the amount.

14 With the penthouse, as I mentioned before, it
15 is set back one-to-one, and we have some area that is
16 residential amenity, indoor and out, with a raised
17 pool on the southern middle residential bar.

18 Top of the penthouse roof is dedicated to
19 green roof area, which is roughly 31,000 square feet,
20 which we desperately need for storm water management.

21 There is a quick rendering of the outdoor
22 amenity area of that middle southern bar, with that
23 raised pool that cascades into a more shallower
24 wading pool for sun bathing area.

25 Page A-40 shows a pallet of exterior

1 materials. We have divided them in two families.
2 One is for retail base, and the second one is for
3 residential levels that start at three and above. We
4 thought very hard and careful about choosing durable
5 materials. Especially because of the location of the
6 site, where the air could be saturated with more
7 brackish water, and more corrosion resistant
8 materials would be desired at such a location.

9 We are using a lot of high-density fiber
10 cement boards, not to be confused with your regular
11 cementitious panel boards. And we have brought
12 samples of materials with us. We actually have our
13 basis of design, high-density fiber cement board is
14 actually Equitone. We also brought a sample of
15 Nichiha panel. And if you compare them side-by-side
16 and touch and feel, you can see that the density is
17 quite different and one product is quite a higher end
18 product than the other.

19 So, we're using that, those Equitone panels
20 throughout the base, and on select residential bars.
21 We are using a number of metal panels, as well as
22 Trespa panel for accent points or accent panels to
23 highlight some of the areas in the façade. We are
24 also using precast panel on the western portion of
25 the bar, and I'll show you through, when I go through

1 renderings of where those occur.

2 So, looking at the aerial shots of the
3 building in the foreground, we are at the southeast
4 corner of 1st Street and Waterfront. At the very
5 ground level you can see the set of stairs and ramp
6 accessing that R-1 restaurant. This bar is actually
7 Equitone panels and a combination of Trespa panels
8 that you see in kind of wood texture, and orangey
9 tone.

10 And then of course, to the south of the site
11 you can see the meandering Riverwalk trail with an
12 extended outdoor seating terrace attached to the
13 south façade.

14 View of the 1st Street from Northeast corner.
15 So, you partially see some of the façade elevation.
16 Some of the rendering of the V Street façade. And in
17 the previous package I just wanted to point out that
18 we submitted in May, we had some slanted walls right
19 in the southeast residential bar. We have since
20 revised it due to value engineering and made it a
21 little bit flatter.

22 There are some projecting balconies on 1st
23 Street, as well as on V Street. Projecting balconies
24 on southeast corner on 1st Street are within the
25 property line. Projecting balconies on V Street,

1 northern façade, actually extend above the property,
2 beyond the property line. They do not exceed four-
3 foot projection on that street.

4 These are some of the enlarged elevations of
5 the facades pointing out the materials that we are
6 using throughout the building. So, that's the
7 Equitone panel and the Trespa panel is the accented
8 panel in select locations. That's portion of the
9 residential tower that uses ACM panel with some of
10 the corrugated aluminum siding panel.

11 This rendering actually shows our southwest
12 corner of the building. This is the west bar, which
13 is treated completely differently from the rest of
14 the building. We wanted to create a feel of a
15 neighborhood, and while breaking down the massing of
16 this existing building, we wanted it to feel like
17 several separate buildings.

18 So, 2nd Street, we took advantage of the
19 columns that are 20 on 20-foot existing grade, that
20 sit right at the perimeter of the existing floor
21 slab. And we wrapped them with the precast panels.
22 We also did not want to create a completely flat look
23 of that façade, so we recessed that façade eight feet
24 to create outdoor terraces for those residential
25 units.

1 MS. BELTIKOVA: By current DOEE regulations,
2 nonresidential structures are allowed to be designed
3 and constructed to be floodproofed up to the design
4 flood elevation. Design flood elevation in this case
5 is base flood elevation plus one and a half feet of
6 freeboard, which is 100-year flood line, plus one-
7 and-a-half-feet of freeboard, which takes us to 12.1
8 and NAVD-88 north vertical datum 1988 measurement.

9 We are, however, proposing to go a little bit
10 beyond that and protect to up to six inches higher
11 than the current DOE regulation requires, and provide
12 a two-foot freeboard on top of the 100-year flood
13 line.

14 There is an issue there. Our building, by
15 FEMA regulations, is considered to be residential.
16 So, even if there was a completely commercial
17 building and just one unit existing in that building,
18 FEMA would recognize it as a residential building.

19 So, to go around that, our strategy was to
20 apply for a code modification and to change from
21 residential use to mixed use. Now, we are told that
22 in order to do that we have to have substantial
23 amount of commercial and retail space within the
24 project, in order to be approved, considered and
25 approved for a code modification.

1 We have, as I mentioned, 71,000 square feet
2 of commercial and retail space at the ground level.
3 There are no residential units at that level. We are
4 protecting to slightly high than what's required.
5 And the flood proofing strategy would involve code
6 modification approval based on 13 percent, or
7 actually slightly less than 13 percent, 12.75 percent
8 of commercial space at the ground level, with a
9 combination of a dry flood proofing method, which
10 includes constructing a substantial impermeable knee
11 wall around the perimeter of the site, up to the
12 design flood elevation with removable floodgates at
13 the entry points around the perimeter of the
14 building.

15 There are roughly 26 entry points around the
16 perimeter of the building. If we were to elevate
17 first floor to that elevation, so we would be about
18 two and a half feet higher than the sidewalk and
19 would require ADA access points at half of those
20 location. So, that's a lot of ramp.

21 If we were to elevate first floorplan to our
22 500-year flood line, that's an additional one and a
23 half to two feet. So now we are -- we would be
24 constructing a four-foot tall knee wall around the
25 perimeter of the site. That wall would be four feet

1 minimally at the highest point of the site, which is
2 V Street. This is where our majority of our retail
3 is located, neighborhood retail, and would completely
4 kill the retail.

5 Of course the side drops by about three feet
6 as we walk down 2nd and 1st Street. So, that's an
7 additional three-foot drop that will create a roughly
8 seven to eight foot tall impermeable wall. So,
9 that's a stone wall that would be resistant to flood
10 waters. That's way above your eye level. It's not
11 conducive for retail space.

12 Because we are providing manual floodgates,
13 or also called active barriers which require human
14 intervention, we will also provide a required floor
15 emergency operation plan. It states the flood
16 warning time that will be issued to all occupants of
17 the building 12 hours in advance. It will also
18 delineate chain of command and responsibility amongst
19 the staff of the building. It helps that the
20 building is rental and every effort will be made to
21 evacuate all occupants of the building.

22 There, we're also providing a flood emergency
23 ingress and egress plan. We have revised that plan
24 since we have submitted on May 16th. We have added
25 an additional area of refuge on 1st Street, and I'll

1 get to that slide next.

2 In addition to providing flood emergency
3 operation plan, we will also provide an inspection
4 and maintenance plan that will be conducted annually,
5 and that's to check on mechanical equipment for sump
6 pumps, generators, check on the flood shields
7 equipment, storage rooms, check for leaks.

8 After that and while the permitting process,
9 as well as construction, we are required and we will
10 provide FEMA certificate for -- a flood proofing
11 certificate form, as well as elevation certificate
12 form. Again, at permitting and construction.

13 Now, to jump to flood protection egress plan,
14 we were showing a refuge area within the south
15 terrace of the property. It could hold roughly 920
16 people. We do not expect 920 people to stay during a
17 flood event. It is required that the flood emergency
18 plan is posted in at least two locations throughout
19 the plan. We are proposing that it's posted in
20 three. The two loading docks and the main
21 residential lobby, lobby 1.

22 We have added refuge area 2, which is on 1st
23 Street, contained within the manual floodgates for
24 rescue for those occupants or emergency personnel
25 that has to stay back. And that area holds roughly

1 81 occupants. The calculation is based on 90 percent
2 of the area, 10 of it being designated to circulation
3 and the calculation is based on IBC standing room
4 space only, or five square feet per person.

5 I will turn it over to Claire for a landscape
6 design presentation, and I'm sure we'll come back to
7 floodproofing a little bit later.

8 MS. AGRE: Thank you, Yulia. I'm Claire
9 Agre. I'm with West 8 Urban Design and Landscape
10 Architecture.

11 We are the landscape architects for this
12 project, and as an existing project, we took a close
13 look at the existing landscape features and the
14 public realm around the site. Yulia already
15 explained the context and that we're neighbored on
16 two sides, substantially, and also in the water by
17 the National Park Service. So, we also have some
18 neighbors to consider.

19 As the landscape architects, the first thing
20 we wanted to look at was the existing trees. We do
21 have quite a few existing trees on site. None of
22 them are in wonderful health, and I saw the Casey
23 Trees letter elaborating on that as well.

24 The good news is that we have a major net
25 improvement in the number of trees, and also in the

1 quality of the landscape that those trees will sit
2 within. So, we have 59 new trees coming in as part
3 of this plan.

4 Just some more zoomed in images. These were
5 in your packet, but some of the trees that are really
6 in superior shape, we're utilizing in the courtyards.
7 These are some crepe myrtles currently along 2nd
8 Street. We're taking approximate six of these up
9 into the courtyards.

10 And then this is a look at the existing
11 streetscape. So, I would say, as a landscape
12 architect, not a lot to recommend here in terms of
13 the existing urban canopy. So, that is, there's
14 nowhere to go but up here, on the side of the
15 building. And so, we're bringing in and we've worked
16 with DDOT quite closely to look at how to bring all
17 of the best practices in terms of rain gardens and
18 soil volume to bring new street trees here.

19 Finally, a look at the existing condition on
20 the water's edge. There is a substantial canopy
21 here, but these trees that are located along the
22 riverfront are really subject to one of the most
23 brutal conditions along the rivers. You have a two-
24 mile fetch of open water going all the way down to
25 Northern Virginia. So, this part of the District is

1 really pummeled by wave action and wind action, and
2 you can see the erosion here.

3 Additionally, these trees that are there, are
4 short-lived and not in good shape, lacking soil
5 volume and are -- we don't expect them to last much
6 longer. So, we're entirely replacing the soils and
7 the landscape, and also bringing in new trees here,
8 according to the framework plan.

9 So, I'm just going to walk us around the site
10 very briefly. You know, spend the most time talking
11 about the waterfront because I think that's of
12 greatest interest to this group.

13 We had a few ideas as in collaboration with
14 the agencies that we think bring some signature
15 moments to this part of the property, but also really
16 align with the goals of the framework plan and the
17 guidelines. One of the signature ideas is this idea
18 of a floodable forest, and we're really bolstering
19 that with a look at very authentic materials to the
20 Anacostia and the Potomac region, and looking at
21 native plants and native specimens that are going to
22 bring habitat and also really perform.

23 On top of that, we really need to layer
24 places for people. We have a 10-foot active trail, a
25 10-foot passive trail, and all of the associated

1 connections and cut throughs to make, to make sure
2 that this is also a vibrant, active, happy,
3 successful urban place. This is a reference from a
4 project we did in Toronto.

5 And then finally, we wanted to bring
6 something special. This is a confluence of the two
7 rivers and one of the most visible projects coming
8 into the Buzzard Point area any time soon, and we
9 wanted to make sure that we're bringing in active
10 recreation and opportunities to do something
11 different here. Just a nice reference image here of
12 what it could be to bring kayaks and lots of
13 pedestrian activity.

14 So, those are all the goals that we were
15 looking at as part of this project. I will go in a
16 little more detail on the site plan of the waterfront
17 here. Just one by one, looking at some of the images
18 in your packet, this is on the southwest corner of
19 the building, looking at the largest of the rain
20 gardens, which is at the terminus of 2nd Street. We
21 have looked at a balance of native species, they're
22 long-lived and very durable, and very well acclimated
23 to an exposed site like this, such as Cyprus and
24 black tupelo, and a palette of native plantings that
25 are also going to capture as much storm water as

1 possible.

2 This is looking on the terrace that Yulia
3 described, looking west. You can see they're quite
4 generous, and I'm just going to take us step-by-step
5 towards the water front. You see here, the flood-
6 proofing wall to the left of the image.

7 Now we come down an ADA accessible ramp to
8 the passive trail. This passive trail could be
9 entirely comprised of pervious pavers. We're still
10 working with the working group on finalizing the
11 Riverwalk Trail material guidelines. That's
12 something we've been an active member of, and
13 everybody is very excited about optimizing storm
14 water infiltration. So, that's a material that could
15 occur here.

16 Here, we are looking at the infiltrating rain
17 garden buffer between the active and the passive
18 trail. So, passive trail on the right of the slide,
19 active trail on the left. And again, we have a
20 really wonderful native canopy that's been giving
21 maximized soil volume, and is also creating these
22 infiltrating rain gardens in between.

23 Just to look back at what the waterfront is
24 now, we're really going to turn this into something
25 that is much more people oriented. This is one of

1 two signature moments on the water front. We call
2 this the sun deck. And this is this really wonderful
3 feature where the view of that long two-mile open
4 water and views down to Northern Virginia opens all
5 the way up. And so, everyone sitting on the dining
6 terrace and cruising back and forth along the
7 Riverwalk Trail, gets those views for the first time.
8 And it's a really grand open vista, in addition to a
9 great place to meet, to stop, to sit, to fish.

10 And you can see that it's really meant to
11 seamlessly integrate into the surroundings where it
12 transitions to an area of higher canopy on the right
13 side of this image. This is what we call the
14 floodable forest.

15 So, just a little more detail and resolution
16 on these two features. The sun deck, we have cut a
17 cross-section here for you to understand all the
18 different layers that come into this part of the
19 site, from the dining terrace on the left part of the
20 slide, and then you see the passive, the
21 infiltration, the active, and then this deck is
22 really interesting because it cantilevers over the
23 open water. It's a pile supported structure, and
24 then you have the ability to place rip-rap and stones
25 and interplant with native grasses to create a place

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 where people can actually step down to the water, and
2 also creates fish habitat and really wonderful
3 substrate for crustaceans and invertebrates.

4 This is just a little more detail showing how
5 you have the cut-off wall at the southern end of what
6 is terra firma, the infiltrating rain gardens, and
7 then the active trail and the sun deck are pile
8 supported over the river itself.

9 The floodable forest is the other signature
10 element here. We heard from the agencies that
11 there's really a lack of kind of soft naturalistic
12 edges, or the idea of bringing nature to the city, or
13 experiencing nature in the city. So, small as it
14 might be, we wanted to create an area that really
15 felt like more of a kind of sanctuary at the edge of
16 the city. So this, when you cross over the active
17 trail, you have this small wetland area, which is
18 also interplanted with a major canopy of native
19 willows and a tertiary trail we call the Adventure
20 Trail here, which you can see zig-zagging in this
21 image. That goes down to about 4.5, so it's above
22 the tide level, but it would be floodable in a high
23 flood event. And those native willows can take that.
24 So, it's a really interesting landscape typology.
25 More importantly, though, I think is on the right

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 side of this image we have a natural stone beach that
2 we've created here, and it's a place for people to
3 walk. A little bit more of a kind of adventuresome
4 experience, and also a place to pull up your kayak.
5 One of the few soft shorelines on the riverfront in a
6 design sense.

7 This is just another look at that. All of
8 these sections can conform to the guidelines in terms
9 of the 25-foot natural buffer, and then the
10 recommendations for the 10-foot, 5-foot, 10-foot
11 active and passive trails.

12 As I mentioned, we're working, we're sitting
13 on the working group developing the guidelines for
14 the material palette for the Riverwalk Trail, and
15 those will be forthcoming soon, but this project
16 would align with those. And one of the most
17 important parts of the thinking there is about
18 durability and also infiltration for storm water.

19 Likewise, with the landscape palette, we're
20 looking for things that are either native, or
21 natively adapted. Or sorry, which are adapted to
22 this part of the world, and are also going to be
23 quite resilient in terms of being submerged in
24 brackish water and can really perform and create
25 quite a lot of habitat.

1 The last layer on the waterfront is really
2 about people. So, this is just a diagram that we
3 submitted on Friday, talking about opportunities for
4 seating. You have the more formal seating on the
5 terraces. But really, we also see the beach and the
6 sundeck as a more relaxed casual place to sit all
7 along the waterfront. So, we've just drawn that
8 here.

9 And finally, public art. This could be a
10 really special place to do something a little
11 different, which is more in keeping with the
12 waterfronts, more about light, water, habitat, and to
13 think about the waterfront location. So, some
14 interesting locations for art.

15 We, in conversation with the agencies, there
16 was a request to look at view sheds. So, we did an
17 analysis of the 2nd Street view shed. This is what
18 you see today. You don't actually see open water
19 when you're standing at V Street. You see the mass
20 of the sailboats from the James Creed Marina, which
21 is a really lovely sight. We plan to open that up
22 even a little bit more.

23 There is some existing emergent vegetation at
24 the end of 2nd Street. That has to be taken out as
25 part of the limit of work, but we will be framing

1 that view more strongly as part of our plan.

2 On 1st Street, you have existing trees at the
3 end of that street as well. These are sitting within
4 the National Park Service boundary, so we've made no
5 intervention there, but we've followed DDOT
6 guidelines in terms of So, some interesting locations
7 for art.

8 We, in conversation with the agencies, there
9 was a request to look at view sheds. So, we did an
10 analysis of the 2nd Street view shed. This is what
11 you see today. You don't actually see open water
12 when you're standing at V Street. You see the mass
13 of the sailboats from the James Creed Marina, which
14 is a really lovely sight. We plan to open that up
15 even a little bit more.

16 There is some existing emergent vegetation at
17 the end of 2nd Street. That has to be taken out as
18 part of the limit of work, but we will be framing
19 that view more strongly as part of our plan.

20 On 1st Street, you have existing trees at the
21 end of that street as well. These are sitting within
22 the National Park Service boundary, so we've made no
23 intervention there, but we've followed DDOT
24 guidelines in terms of street trees and framing that
25 street. So, this view that you see in the upper

1 right of the slide would remain until the National
2 Park Service makes any intervention in their
3 property.

4 Finally, I won't go through this in detail,
5 but we've worked closely with DDOT to understand and
6 follow their guidelines and this project would go
7 from building envelop to centerline, following those
8 guidelines, maximizing native grasses and
9 infiltration opportunities in the five by 10 tree
10 boxes on the first. On second, we've actually
11 lengthened those tree boxes as much as possible. So,
12 beyond the 10-foot length we've actually gone up to
13 20 in some places so that you really wrap the west
14 side of the building with a more native expression
15 and kind of more Riverwalk like expression.

16 And then finally on V Street, we follow the
17 guidelines as well with the more typical streetscape
18 guidelines.

19 I'm not going to go through courtyards, other
20 than to say there's four different courtyards, four
21 different personalities, but we've looked at creating
22 a unifying level of detail. We've carefully thought
23 about how to bring distinct programs here. We
24 utilize existing trees from the ground plain, and
25 also really think carefully about the adjacent use,

1 whether it's a more public or more private, and
2 create four really distinctive experiences, whether
3 it's more of a meditative program, more social. We
4 have a kitchen garden, a social theater. Thinking
5 about levels of privacy versus openness.

6 And then of course, critically, given that
7 it's an existing building, we have to make sure that
8 we're creating construction detailing and we can
9 accommodate the amount of top soil and robustness in
10 the detailing of the garden so that these are long
11 lasting, long lived gardens in those courtyards. So,
12 these are really beautiful, four beautiful gardens on
13 the building itself.

14 So, with that, I will turn it over to Amelia.

15 MS. RODDY: And I think that we can have
16 Amelia available for questions, and I don't know that
17 we need to go into a transportation presentation at
18 this point. I know that they're -- you were eager to
19 get into questions, so we're happy to have her
20 available to answer anything you may have with
21 respect to transportation.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, she actually has
23 five minutes. If she wants to do that, that's one
24 way she can eventually become an expert. So, let's
25 give her the time.

1 MS. RODDY: Fair enough. Fair enough.

2 MS. MARTIN: Thank you. I appreciate the
3 opportunity. Again, my name is Amelia Martin. I
4 work for Wells and Associates, and we conducted the
5 transportation study for this project.

6 I'll just briefly go over some of the items
7 from that study and sort of summarize that. We've
8 already spoken a little bit about site circulation,
9 but this just sort of reiterates the different modes
10 and how they access the site. This slide here goes
11 into more detail on the bicycle circulation and
12 calling out those elevator banks that allow people
13 to, if you're a resident or you work at one of the
14 retail shops, to park your bike more permanently down
15 in the garage.

16 In terms of parking, both vehicular and
17 bicycle, we are meeting the requirements in long-term
18 and short-term bike parking, and then also in
19 vehicular parking. I think it would be remiss to not
20 note that the applicant has agreed to provide a
21 Capitol Bikeshare station with 19 docks, and we'll be
22 providing that in conjunction with this project.

23 In terms of the proposed loading facilities,
24 the applicant has worked with the Public Space
25 Committee to get approval for three different loading

1 areas. And then on top of that, working with DDOT on
2 back-in maneuvers which are required, giving the
3 existing site configuration and structure. So, we've
4 worked through those details.

5 The study also included some trip generation
6 estimates in terms of vehicular trips to the site.
7 During the a.m. peak hour, we estimate 178 vehicular
8 trips. And during the p.m., 483 would be coming to
9 the site on auto modes.

10 Now, I'll just briefly go over some of the
11 transportation improvements that the applicant has
12 agreed to. Notably, they have agreed to a
13 transportation demand management, or a TDM plan. And
14 the elements of that plan are summarized here on this
15 slide.

16 One thing to note is the applicant has been
17 coordinating with WMATA and will continue to
18 coordinate with them on extending bus route service
19 to serve the southern Buzzard Point area. In
20 addition, we will be constructing a bus pad on V
21 Street and other elements to support a future bus
22 stop on that northeast corner of the site.

23 A loading management plan has also been
24 prepared, and again, the elements of that are
25 summarized on this slide. I would just note on the

1 final bullet point highlighted in green, that came
2 out of our exchanges with the public space committee,
3 where we agreed that for all the loading docks, a
4 flagger, not necessarily a construction certified
5 flagger, but an individual would be assigned to
6 assist in those different loading areas with in-bound
7 and out-bound truck maneuvers to ensure the back-in
8 loading doesn't have an adverse effect on any other
9 modes around the site.

10 We have also agreed to an infrastructure
11 improvement at 2nd and P Street to provide 150-foot
12 turn lane. No parking needs to be restricted or
13 taken away because of that. It's simply some
14 restriping to make the current roadway width more
15 obvious to auto users.

16 And then, this also looks at the streets that
17 would be constructed to DDOT standards, and the
18 proposed cycle track.

19 And then finally, I'll just talk a little bit
20 about DDOT's conditions of approval. The applicant
21 has agreed to most of these conditions. But one item
22 that's trickier to agree to would be providing
23 showers, changing facilities and lockers. Because
24 the project is not adding more than 25 percent gross
25 floor area, we're not necessarily required to provide

1 those facilities. However, the applicant has agreed
2 to provide lockers. But when it comes to the
3 changing rooms and the showers, given the existing
4 structure and the desired depth of retail space, we
5 simply can't commit to that. It's not easy -- it
6 can't be accommodated in the same way the lockers can
7 be.

8 And then the final item was a six-foot wide
9 sidewalk connections to satellite parking areas. And
10 the applicant has agreed, if we use the James Creek
11 Marina property to the west, which is really the only
12 property on the table right now, we would provide a
13 new crosswalk at 2nd and V Street. But other parking
14 locations aren't really known at this time. So, the
15 applicant isn't willing to commit to that sort of
16 unknown in providing those types of connections.

17 So, with that, that's all we have in terms of
18 transportation.

19 MS. RODDY: And that concludes our
20 presentation. We're happy to answer any questions.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you all very
22 much. We appreciate your presentation. Let's see if
23 we have any comments or any questions up here.
24 Anybody. Commissioner May?

25 MR. SHAPIRO: I just have a couple quick

1 questions. I'm sure there will be more when we hear
2 from the agency reports. So, I don't quite
3 understand this issue around where folks go during
4 the flood. And DOEE's concern about not having
5 people be on the river side. I mean, in a nutshell,
6 what's involved in this space? Does it have to be
7 designed in a certain way? Or is it about the size
8 of the space?

9 MS. BELTIKOVA: You mean the refuge area?

10 MR. SHAPIRO: Yes.

11 MS. BELTIKOVA: So, the refuge area has to be
12 either elevated to the design flawed elevation, or be
13 designed to be protected up to design flood
14 elevation. So, in our case we are chosen to keep it
15 at the existing first-floor elevation, and protected
16 up to design flood elevation.

17 Now, the second portion of that issue is
18 access of emergency personnel during the flood event.
19 And then at what point do they rescue these people;
20 people who chose to stay inside the building.

21 So, DOEE report is suggesting that being on
22 the south side, that's the side that's going to flood
23 the most. But, according to the cloud burst study,
24 actually, all four sides of the property would be
25 flooded. And it takes only a few inches for an SUV

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 to float. So, how would providing access on V Street
2 for a refuge area work in that case? It will work
3 the same way as is on south terrace. It would be a
4 rescue through boats.

5 MR. SHAPIRO: And you communicated this to
6 DOEE and what was their response? I'm sure I'll hear
7 it from them, but --

8 MS. BELTIKOVA: Well, we actually had several
9 meetings, interagency meetings, where we have
10 suggested that area as a refuge area. To be honest,
11 it was a surprise to read this in the report that
12 this was not acceptable as a refuge area. So, we
13 have provided a secondary on 2nd Street. I'm sorry,
14 on 1st Street, with the higher elevation, but not as
15 high as V Street.

16 MR. SHAPIRO: Okay, thank you. I'll actually
17 hold off for now. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Any other
19 questions? Commissioner May?

20 MR. MAY: Okay. So, a couple things in this
21 project that I find curious. I am interested in
22 hearing about the flooding protection issue, and I
23 think I'll wait for the DOEE report to get into that
24 in great detail. But I just, I mean, there are a
25 couple of odd things. I mean, where is the actual

1 mechanical equipment that, I mean, I know you're
2 using FRV whatever, VRF, sorry. But you have to, you
3 know, heat and chill stuff, right?

4 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes, the mechanical equipment
5 is required to be located above the design flood
6 elevation. So, we would elevate it either within the
7 ground floorplan on an elevated platform with an ADA
8 ramp or steps to it, or provide another space on the
9 third level, courtyard level space.

10 MR. MAY: So, there's going to be chillers?

11 MS. BELTIKOVA: There are --

12 MR. MAY: On the third floor? Cooling tower
13 or something? I mean, what's --

14 MS. BELTIKOVA: There is no cooling tower.

15 MR. MAY: So, I mean, how do you -- you
16 normally see a lot of equipment on the roof.

17 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes.

18 MR. MAY: We don't see any equipment on the
19 roof. So --

20 MS. BELTIKOVA: I will explain.

21 MR. MAY: Okay.

22 MS. BELTIKOVA: So, VRF units, they come in
23 many different sizes. And our strategy is to locate
24 them within each floor. The requirement is for
25 roughly 35 to 36 units, VRF units that would serve

1 roughly 485 dwelling units. It requires to have five
2 to six units of VRF on every floor. And so, we have
3 allocated those mechanical rooms throughout floor
4 plates, and they're typically close to the outside
5 wall to draw the outside air in.

6 MR. MAY: I'm sorry. They're close to the
7 outside --

8 MS. BELTIKOVA: Close. They're in close
9 proximity --

10 MR. MAY: Oh, close to. Okay.

11 MS. BELTIKOVA: -- to the --

12 MR. MAY: So where -- so, those will show up
13 on the elevation, right?

14 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes, as louvered panels.

15 MR. MAY: So, where are they now? Can you
16 show me one on the elevation now?

17 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes.

18 MR. MAY: I have to say, I believe this is
19 the first time we've ever seen that kind of an
20 approach. In Washington, it's just always on the
21 roof.

22 MS. BELTIKOVA: It's typically used for
23 commercial buildings for office buildings, but is
24 quite an efficient system that --

25 MR. MAY: You don't see them on office

1 buildings either. You know, everything was on the
2 roof.

3 MS. BELTIKOVA: They're expensive.

4 MR. MAY: Until all of a sudden, the roof
5 became more valuable.

6 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes.

7 MR. MAY: I wonder how that happened.

8 [Pause.]

9 MS. BELTIKOVA: Actually, I'm going to point
10 them out on a typical floor, so it will make a little
11 bit more sense.

12 So, we have a lot of these inside corners
13 that are not viable for a unit. There is no window
14 access. So, we are providing access to -- maybe I
15 can zoom in, actually. You see right, this closet
16 and there are two VRF units that are very close to
17 the outside wall. So, this portion of the wall would
18 be a louvered panel. And we have located them on the
19 inside interior corners around the courtyards. So,
20 here is one location. Here is another one. And here
21 is a third one, on the plan.

22 So, they are on sections, building sections,
23 shown in elevations. I'll get to it in a second.
24 So, here is a section looking south, cutting through
25 the inside courtyards that are facing V Street and

1 1st Street. And so, that's that louvered panel right
2 here.

3 MR. MAY: So, that entire vertical segment is
4 louvered panel?

5 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes, they require a lot of
6 free area.

7 MR. MAY: Oh, I'm sure they do.

8 MS. BELTIKOVA: I'm trying to get to another
9 location where -- so, here is looking the other way,
10 right? So, here is that inside corner with louvered
11 panels right there.

12 MR. MAY: Okay. Okay. I'll look at the
13 elevations more carefully.

14 So, the other thing that was puzzling is the
15 loss of 700 and some parking spaces. I mean, you
16 kept 300 on two floors, but there were three floors
17 of parking all together. So, how did -- what did you
18 do with the other -- I mean, in three floors you had
19 1,000 spaces, and now in two floors you have 370.
20 Right? Is my math right?

21 MS. BELTIKOVA: Right. So, there was 1,028
22 across three floors.

23 MR. MAY: Right.

24 MS. BELTIKOVA: That number came from the
25 certificate of occupancy for the building.

1 MR. MAY: Uh-huh.

2 MS. BELTIKOVA: From 1972. We actually did
3 not count every single --

4 MR. MAY: So it might not have actually been
5 128?

6 MS. BELTIKOVA: Might not have, yes.

7 MR. MAY: But that's still, you've lost two-
8 thirds of the spaces, but you've lost one-third of
9 the floors that were devoted to parking. So, even if
10 it was not quite 1,000. Did you do other things?
11 Did you use -- is the parking less efficient now
12 because of other stuff that's there?

13 MR. ORR: Yeah, so what we've done is on that
14 floor of parking that's now amenity space.

15 MR. MAY: Yeah.

16 MR. ORR: Lobby space for the residential,
17 and retail space. So, part of it went to uses, and
18 then part of it went away when we took the floor away
19 to create the ceiling height for the retail. So,
20 when you add all that up, so we've taken a whole
21 floor out of the building.

22 MR. MAY: I understand.

23 MR. ORR: Yeah.

24 MS. RODDY: And I'll add that in our
25 conversations with the ANC, one of their big asks was

1 they have a big concern with respect to dog relief
2 areas, and that is lacking in this community. And
3 so, one of the components that has been put into the
4 garage is a dog relief area, as well as a dog spa.
5 And that obviously takes up some space. So, that was
6 an important feature for the community, and it's
7 going to be important for the residents who are here
8 as well.

9 MR. MAY: Okay, I'm not going to go into the
10 dog relief area.

11 MR. SHAPIRO: Literally.

12 MR. MAY: Literally, no. It just seems a
13 little odd that so many parking spaces went away.
14 Okay. I'll accept that. I was just curious about
15 that.

16 So, the portion of the property that abuts
17 the Park Service land, so that chamfered end, I think
18 that it, you know, it's well and good to assume that
19 there will be some sort of agreement on how that gets
20 redeveloped, and it will get redeveloped, and it will
21 all match up beautifully with what you are proposing.
22 However, there's always the possibility that it
23 won't, or that it won't happen for another five years
24 after you've done your building or something like
25 that, because the Park Service doesn't have a whole

1 lot of money sitting around waiting for projects like
2 this.

3 So, what happens in that circumstance is that
4 retail -- that restaurant space is going to be
5 operable if nothing happens with the Park Service
6 land for foreseeable future. Are you still going to
7 be able to access it? Is it still going to be
8 functional?

9 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes, the main access to that
10 restaurant is on 1st Street. And on the secondary
11 access through outdoor terrace.

12 MR. MAY: And you can reach it from -- it's
13 just big enough to reach that outdoor terrace?

14 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes. Uh-huh.

15 MR. MAY: Okay. I just want to have that on
16 the record, because who knows when it will actually
17 get improved.

18 So, I appreciate the analysis of the elevator
19 overruns and the, you know, the actual inclusion of
20 sort of brand name elevators, so we know what you're
21 talking about, because a lot of times we'll have
22 people say, oh, it's just not possible to do an
23 elevator that size. But it's -- I didn't check to
24 make sure that all of that is correct, but I have
25 looked at elevators in the past, and I know that this

1 is taller than the usual for -- we set the 15-foot
2 height limit after a lot of debate, knowing that it
3 was going to be a push for a lot of buildings. And I
4 think it makes sense for the zone but maybe not for
5 this particular height, given that it's taller than
6 would otherwise be required in the zone. So, I think
7 I'm okay with that.

8 The statement about the inability to provide
9 showers and changing rooms, I mean, I just don't buy
10 that. I mean, you can provide a pet relief area and
11 a pet spa, and you can't provide a place for workers
12 to take a shower? I mean, it just seems not really
13 correct.

14 Now, I'm not saying that it has to have it.
15 I don't think that there's anything, you know,
16 there's nothing in the regulations that says you have
17 to have it. This isn't a PUD where we would just
18 push you to create it. But, you know, to come here
19 and say it's not possible, do it, it's clearly
20 possible to do it. So, you know, you don't want to
21 do it. That's, you know, that's your prerogative I
22 guess.

23 Last question I have is the flood barrier
24 system. And there were some images that you provided
25 in the submissions. And some of those looked you

1 know, like they were designed into the façade, and
2 some looked like they were just kind of bolted on
3 after the fact. So, I'm wondering, have you actually
4 gotten to the point of detailing those portals so
5 that it does not look bolted on? Like, that looked
6 bolted on.

7 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes, we showed some images
8 just to simplify how manual flood there is work, this
9 is bolted on, this is not very attractive, but just
10 accomplishes the job of explaining how that works.

11 MR. MAY: I understand that.

12 MS. BELTIKOVA: This one is a museum in
13 Norfolk. And actually, they have, if you can see
14 their jams that are aluminum.

15 MR. MAY: Uh-huh.

16 MS. BELTIKOVA: Right? And they're on the
17 outside, and they exist there, they are not
18 removeable. We are proposing a completely removable
19 system, and so there is another image right here.
20 Right? So, you see within that masonry wall.

21 MR. MAY: Yes.

22 MS. BELTIKOVA: Uh-huh. These stainless
23 steel bolts. They allow for those jams to be
24 removable. So, all you see are those bolts within
25 the façade.

1 MR. MAY: Okay. It's good to know how you
2 intended to install it, because again, some of them
3 look like they're just sort of slapped on.

4 That does sound like a lot of work, though,
5 bolting those things in. And I assume that your
6 annual maintenance would mean, also, you know,
7 assembling the thing.

8 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes. Uh-huh.

9 MR. MAY: At least on an annual basis.

10 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yes. Part of the maintenance
11 and inspection plan is actually also training of
12 staff and making sure that they remember how to put
13 this together, and they remember where everything is
14 located. That it's stored properly. There is a
15 specific way of labeling these gates because there
16 are so many of them.

17 MR. MAY: Okay. Yeah. It's an awful lot.
18 Yeah, we're familiar with that from the levy system
19 that we maintain downtown, where we have a post and
20 panel system. It's bigger pieces, but it's the same
21 concept. So, all right. That's it for my questions.
22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
24 Commissioner Turnbull, do you have any questions,
25 comments?

1 MR. TURNBULL: Sure, Mr. Chair, thank you.

2 Let me, and I guess I could wait for DOEE on
3 this, but let me just ask, one of the things you
4 brought up, and it's in one of your slides, is about
5 the 12-hour minimum advanced notice. Explain to me
6 how -- I mean, at some point in time we're going to --
7 -- you're going to realize, we've got a flood. It's
8 raining, it's pouring. So, when the 12 hours
9 advance, how do you do -- how are you going to
10 accomplish that? Do you have some internal speaker
11 system that Darth Vader gets on and says, get ready,
12 get out of here, or what?

13 MS. BELTIKOVA: So, these details we will
14 have to walk through to work through, and that would
15 be actually described in the flood emergency
16 operation.

17 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah, I mean, I guess and I'm
18 assuming there is a place where people would go at
19 some point in the building. Or several places other
20 than the refuge areas that you're going to have
21 something set up for people to evacuate. Either
22 vehicles will be there --

23 MR. ORR: Yeah. So, we will go door to door.

24 MR. TURNBULL: Oh, door to door.

25 MR. ORR: Our property management company

1 will go door to door and make sure everybody is
2 notified.

3 MR. TURNBULL: Oh, so you'll have either some
4 kind of an electronic tally system to make sure that
5 everybody has been notified, and that you've got
6 every occupant in the building has been notified.

7 MR. ORR: Yes, sir.

8 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. I wonder if you could
9 go back on to the landscape. You're making,
10 obviously, a lot of landscape improvements. But it
11 looks like you're also making some landscape
12 improvement not on your property?

13 MS. AGRE: So, the water front -- thanks,
14 Yulia. The waterfront, you can see we are -- keep
15 going. All the way back.

16 MR. TURNBULL: Yeah, you had a nice section
17 sort of cut through the waterfront.

18 MS. AGRE: Yeah. That's good. So, on this
19 slide you can see -- sorry. Bear with us. The
20 signature moments in the waterfront I described are
21 all within our property line. So, if you follow my
22 hand here --

23 MR. TURNBULL: Well, I wonder if you could
24 show, I think it's L21.

25 MS. AGRE: L21. Here, let me go to the --

1 oh, thank you. I'm sorry.

2 [Pause.]

3 MS. AGRE: So, this section cut here is all
4 within our property line.

5 MR. TURNBULL: It's all within your property
6 line?

7 MS. AGRE: Yup. So, the waterfront, the two
8 major moments I described on the waterfront, where we
9 go from terrace to either sundeck, or terrace down to
10 the beach area, are all within our property line.
11 The only areas outside of our property line are those
12 that, through discussion with DDOT, or OP, were about
13 connecting the cycle track up 2nd Street or about
14 improvements in the public realm on the streetscape,
15 on 1st, V, and 2nd. So those --

16 MR. TURNBULL: So, the property line right
17 there is right at the edge of that beach area then,
18 or -- whereabouts is your property line? You have a
19 little pointer you could show, or --

20 MS. AGRE: Yes. In here. On this key plan,
21 our property line actually goes out into the water.

22 MR. TURNBULL: Okay.

23 MS. AGRE: But our improvements stop at the
24 mean water line.

25 MR. TURNBULL: So, the piles, everything else

1 on your property line, and that's the end of it then?

2 MS. AGRE: Correct. And the same goes for
3 the beach section.

4 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. And then as you were
5 talking about 2nd Street?

6 MS. AGRE: Yes. So, when we go up 2nd
7 Street, in order to have connectivity -- and sorry,
8 bear with me again. I'm just going to go back to the
9 overall plan. If we were only to stay within this
10 trapezoid, which is south of the building and our
11 property line, there would be no connectivity to the
12 2nd Street cycle track. We wouldn't be making any
13 improvements on the streetscape whatsoever, which is
14 no good for retail. So, the owner's group has
15 committed to building out to the center line of
16 1st --

17 MR. TURNBULL: And that's being orchestrated
18 with who?

19 MS. AGRE: With DDOT. We've discussed with
20 DDOT, OP -

21 MR. TURNBULL: And so that's all -- everybody
22 is in synch. Okay.

23 MS. AGRE: Yes.

24 MR. TURNBULL: And the same thing is then
25 going on, on 1st Street.

1 MS. AGRE: Correct. Yeah.

2 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. Okay. All right.

3 Thank you.

4 Getting back -- going back to Commissioner
5 May's point about the VRF, and locations, they seem
6 incredibly small amount of space that you need to
7 handle what appears to be a very large building with
8 a lot of units. Do these -- are these going to --
9 how noisy will this be along that whole wall?

10 MS. BELTIKOVA: So, the advantage of VRFs is
11 that they are much smaller and don't occupy as much
12 space as a conventional cooling tower, and that they
13 are very quiet. In fact, they are so quiet that
14 you're starting to hear noises from other mechanical
15 equipment or plumbing.

16 MR. TURNBULL: Really?

17 MS. BELTIKOVA: Yeah.

18 MR. TURNBULL: Interesting.

19 MR. ORR: So, with a VRF system, stands for
20 Variable Refrigerant Flow.

21 MR. TURNBULL: Right. Yeah, I --

22 MR. ORR: And so you're varying the amount of
23 refrigerant, and not the air. The air is what
24 creates the noise.

25 MR. TURNBULL: Well, I think as Commissioner

1 May had pointed out, we haven't really seen a lot of
2 these on most of our PUDs. And it's very
3 interesting. All right. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller?

5 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
6 thank you for your presentation, and all of the
7 changes and improvements you've made as a result of
8 comments you've -- your interactions with the Office
9 of Planning and with DDOT, with DOEE, and with the
10 ANC. I think it's a very attractive project that
11 uses nice materials that really transforms what is a
12 very boring federal office building, that is not very
13 activating to anybody except those who used to work
14 there. But it really will activate the space, and
15 it's very exciting.

16 I like that all the terraces and the
17 balconies and all of the outdoor landscaping and the
18 connections that you make.

19 I wonder if you, for the record, if you could
20 just for the benefit of the public, since it wasn't
21 part of your presentation, but I've read it and just
22 briefly summarize the affordable housing component.
23 I think it's 3,200 square feet of -- at 50 percent
24 AMI, and 2,650 square feet at 60 percent AMI.

25 MS. RODDY: That's correct.

1 MR. MILLER: And the 3,200 at 50 percent AMI
2 is being triggered because of the penthouse habitable
3 space.

4 MS. RODDY: That's correct.

5 MR. MILLER: And the other -- you're just
6 providing out of the goodness of your heart, because
7 there's no inclusionary zoning requirement?

8 MS. RODDY: Right. What we did is what --
9 when Yulia testified she noted the area that was
10 being bumped out, and so we took the approach of what
11 would be consistent with the Inclusionary Zoning
12 requirements, and so that equals eight percent of
13 that space.

14 We are reducing the density on site by
15 180,000 square feet, but never the less, it's
16 something that's important, obviously, to the
17 District and the community.

18 MR. MILLER: And I see you added some larger
19 units to some of those affordable spaces. So, what's
20 the -- I know, it's the square footage that's the
21 requirement that will be in the zoning order, but
22 approximately how many affordable units out of the
23 485 will be affordable?

24 MS. RODDY: It's approximate eight units. We
25 have included it in our last submission at the

1 breakdown. And what we did was, with the market rate
2 units we actually had provided more of the larger
3 units, and that would obviously then correlate, we're
4 doing the required amount of breakdown, the
5 proportionate required amount for the IZ units, so
6 accordingly there would be larger affordable units as
7 well.

8 MR. MILLER: Right. Okay. And then I
9 appreciate also that you've upped the LEED commitment
10 to Gold as opposed to Silver. I think that's great.
11 Are you seeking certification for that, or are you
12 just making a verbal commitment to do the best --

13 MR. ORR: Certification is pretty expensive.
14 So, we're going to make the commitment to LEED Gold,
15 and we'll see if we get it certified.

16 MS. RODDY: But it is designed to the LEED
17 Gold standard, and we'll have an architect certify to
18 that as we go through the permitting process.

19 MR. MILLER: Okay. We had a former Vice
20 Chair of this commission who talked about the value
21 of being able to put the plaque on the building that
22 says, certified by whatever, Green Building Council,
23 or whatever, that that does return value to you.

24 MS. RODDY: We're not discounting it, but
25 it's just something at this point that we can't

1 officially commit to.

2 MR. MILLER: Okay. There was a question I
3 had, now I can remember what it was. But, you
4 originally were going to -- you originally had a
5 floodplain strategy of -- a flood protection strategy
6 of raising the streets. And I guess you maybe got
7 some pushback on that. Without going into a big back
8 and forth, I'll ask DOEE maybe about it, but I would
9 think it would -- might want our streets not to be
10 flooded either. But --

11 MS. BELTIKOVA: Our original application was
12 based on the assumption that the ground floorplan
13 would be raised to the design flood elevation. But
14 along with it, adjacent street grades would be raised
15 as well. Since the street grades are not allowed to
16 be raised, we discussed this during our interagency
17 meetings, and it's an unprecedented process, we were
18 told. So, we were told a no.

19 So, we redesigned the building to flood proof
20 with the existing grades.

21 MR. MILLER: Well, I'll ask the District
22 agencies maybe to just briefly address that as well.

23 I did have another question, but I can't
24 remember it now, so maybe I'll come back to it later.
25 Thank you very much for your -- oh, I wanted to thank

1 you for mentioning that this is your first project in
2 the District, or you're in 33 states, but you said
3 this was one of the better --

4 MR. ORR: This has been a more collaborative
5 process.

6 MR. MILLER: -- permitting experiences you've
7 had.

8 MR. ORR: It's been a really good process
9 with all the agencies. We've had three interagency
10 meetings and initially, it's like any other
11 relationship, right? We're on one side, they're on
12 the other, and then we meet in the middle. And I
13 thought that it was very collaborative. And
14 actually, we've employed a lot of their suggestions
15 in our design.

16 MR. MILLER: Right.

17 MR. ORR: Particularly as it relates to the
18 waterfront and the integration of the streets up 1st
19 Street and 2nd Street. Those are you know, they're
20 pretty dismal right now and we're really going to
21 change that landscape there. And it's to their
22 credit how much they helped us get there.

23 MR. MILLER: I appreciate all that
24 collaboration. That's good to hear that. And you're
25 working with the community engagement as well. Thank

1 you.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me ask this, and you
3 may have mentioned this earlier, Ms. Roddy. The ANC,
4 I was looking at some -- they have support with
5 concerns. Did you say earlier that you accepted all
6 of their issues or concerns?

7 MS. RODDY: Yes, we did address their
8 concerns. With respect, one of their concerns, as I
9 mentioned, was the dog relief area, which we are
10 providing onsite. They also requested that there
11 would be a neighborhood serving retail, which we will
12 be providing along V Street. And they also were
13 concerned with respect to affordable housing.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

15 MS. RODDY: Which we are providing onsite,
16 rather than paying into a fund.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So you all have
18 adopted and worked it out with them. Okay.

19 MS. RODDY: Correct.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: One of the things I'm
21 looking at, I'm looking at the sequence of certain
22 things, and I can ask the government agencies, I
23 understand that you went back and worked with the
24 agencies on some of the issues that were there. But
25 in particular, I'm looking at the Office of

1 Planning's report, and I'm looking at the dates of
2 when you filed things on -- that's why I was asking
3 earlier, on June the 2nd, I believe. Or at least
4 that's when you asked us to waive the rule. And that
5 was done June the 2nd, and that was Friday, and today
6 is -- when was June 2nd? Friday.

7 So, I'm just wondering, have the government
8 agencies had a chance to respond? And the reason why
9 I'm asking that, keep asking that question, because
10 when I look at the Office of Planning's first page,
11 they have something that I haven't seen in a while,
12 and it has in blue, "Note: compliance with the
13 District storm water management floodplain and
14 building code regulations would be required at the
15 time of building permit, and this report should not
16 be construed to imply conformance with other relevant
17 District regulations. Any ZC order should reflect
18 this. Furthermore, compliance could result in
19 building design changes that would necessitate a
20 modification to, or a rereview of the subject design
21 review case."

22 So, that's what I'm asking. If you've made
23 some changed with -- if they have not had an
24 opportunity to review, then we'll be back here doing
25 the exact same thing we're doing now. So, I want to

1 make sure that -- and I can ask them when we get to
2 them, have they had an opportune time to review --
3 because I'm looking at the dates. You all submitted
4 -- at least, the motion came in June the 2nd. I'm
5 looking at the dates of their report, which was the
6 last week in May, and I don't see anything. I did
7 see a supplemental from DDOT. But that even came
8 after the 2nd.

9 So, I'm just curious of how everything fell
10 in one. Or maybe my discovery is incorrect.

11 MS. RODDY: No, the Office of Planning filed
12 the report timely, and that was the Friday before we
13 filed our response. And with respect to their note,
14 this -- I think that speaks to the fact that this
15 design requires a code modification with respect to
16 the flood mitigation that we referenced earlier. So,
17 I think that that's just a comment that we are
18 continuing to work through the permit process. We
19 obviously have to go through this process before we
20 can get to the permit process, and that may result in
21 some modifications.

22 With respect to their comments on the design
23 that we're putting forward this evening, they
24 provided the chart, which we have addressed item by
25 item in our response. And I, unfortunately, was not

1 able to touch base with OP. We reached out to them
2 today but weren't able to touch base, and I believe
3 that we have responded to each of their items that
4 they provided in the chart.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, I'm sure that
6 when we get to them, I'll ask the question have they
7 had the chance to review, as well as DDOE, because
8 that concerns me because I hear what you're saying,
9 you responded, but they would be right back here
10 again doing the exact same thing. And we want to
11 make sure we continue to have applicants that come
12 down and say, what a great process we have in this
13 city, so we want to continue that fashion. We don't
14 get much of that. As a matter of fact, I don't think
15 I've heard that in a few years.

16 But anyway, we appreciate your comments. Any
17 other questions up here? Vice Chair Miller?

18 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
19 memory came back. The market. I mean, 70,000 square
20 feet of retail is a lot of retail. You're
21 envisioning the market was going to take up a lot of
22 that, I assume. Are you in discussions with various
23 retailers, but you probably can't say yet who they
24 are? You have identified a couple?

25 MR. ORR: We have, and we are in discussions,

1 and there's some very exciting things that are soon
2 to be announced for this part of the world, very,
3 very exciting retail things that I think will address
4 not only the community needs, but all of Washington's
5 needs, be very exciting things.

6 MR. MILLER: Okay. Look forward to hearing
7 about that. And on the transportation front, I'll
8 ask DDOT about this too, this whole area obviously is
9 going to need that enhanced public transportation
10 access, not just for this project, but for everything
11 that's happening, going to be happening down there.
12 You said you were coordinating or discussing with
13 WMATA. Is there any real timeline that is being put
14 forward that coincides with when your project is
15 going to be operational?

16 MS. RODDY: In terms of timing, I, myself,
17 can't speak to that. I have not been party to those
18 particular conversations, but I do know that we have
19 been having these conversations and plan on
20 continuing to do that. But in terms of timeline, I
21 am not sure.

22 MR. MILLER: Okay. I'll ask DDOT about that
23 as well. Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other questions up
25 here? Okay. Does the ANC have any cross? Okay, no

1 cross. Let's go to the Office of Planning, District
2 Department of Transportation, and District Department
3 of Energy and Environment. In that order.

4 MS. VITALE: All right. Good evening, Mr.
5 Chair and members of the Commission, Elisa Vitale
6 with the Office of Planning. While we appreciate the
7 applicant's continued willingness to work with the
8 District agencies, there are still some outstanding
9 issues. We were able to review the applicant's
10 supplemental filing from Friday, and while a lot of
11 our concerns have been addressed, I think there's
12 just a few areas where some additional information
13 would be helpful, and I'll keep my comments focused
14 on those items in the interest of keeping things
15 brief.

16 With respect to the LEED certification, I
17 think we would like to see the applicant commit to
18 certification at the LEED Gold level, rather than
19 just, you know, committing to design to that
20 standard.

21 I had one question related to the IZ units,
22 and I just wanted some additional information to
23 better understand if the eight units proposed
24 reflected the 5,850 square feet, or if it was the
25 3,200 square feet at the 50 percent. So, if they

1 could just clarify if the eight units were the full
2 amount, that would be helpful. And while we do
3 appreciate the additional two-bedroom units, it
4 really would be great to see some three-bedroom units
5 in this location.

6 OP had requested a street-level rendered view
7 from both the intersection of 1st and V and 2nd and
8 V, and I think we kind of got pieces of that, but not
9 exactly what we were looking for. The applicant
10 provided views to the water showing present day
11 conditions. I think we'd really like to see that
12 same street-level view, kind of at the corner and
13 mid-block showing, you know, the building rendered
14 and showing mature landscaping. I understand there
15 will be kind of more significant changes with respect
16 to the landscaping in the 2nd Street right of way.
17 1st Street may look, you know, a bit more like it
18 does today, but it would be helpful to have that kind
19 of future looking rendered view from those two corner
20 locations.

21 And then also with respect to the 1st and 2nd
22 Street right of ways, I think it would be helpful,
23 and this was discussed in some of the meetings, and
24 it just hasn't kind of shown up yet on the plans, to
25 see if there are ways to really minimize the paved

1 area, particularly those large round turn-arounds at
2 the terminus of 1st and 2nd. I understand there are
3 circulation needs that need to be met, but it would
4 be nice to see if there are ways to incorporate
5 permeable paving. I know, I think there's kind of
6 interest and willingness on the District agencies'
7 parts to see even permeable paving for the parking
8 areas, the street parking areas on 1st and 2nd. So,
9 just ways to get more pervious surface into both the
10 design of the building and the design of the public
11 realm, given the sensitive waterfront location of
12 this project.

13 Getting to the actual waterfront, we really
14 do appreciate all the work that's been done on the
15 Riverwalk Trail, and I think that's really come quite
16 a long way. I do have concerns with respect to just
17 strict kind of compliance with the Riverwalk
18 guidelines. I think, while it's nice to have the
19 terrace seating called out as seating, and while that
20 will help activate the riverwalk, I think that's
21 really meant to serve the restaurant uses, and I
22 think we really need to better understand what's
23 proposed in terms of, you know, just informal benches
24 or other seating opportunities in addition to the sun
25 deck. There are also, in the guidelines, there are

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 requirements for public art. I know kind of multiple
2 locations were highlighted as possibilities. I think
3 we'd like a bit more certainty with respect to the
4 location of public art, and then what that might look
5 like, as well as a commitment from the applicant to
6 even possibly work with the District Arts Council to
7 get something in place there.

8 Other items that are requirements in the
9 riverwalk guidelines include educational signage. I
10 think there were examples provided that were helpful
11 in this most recent submission. But, I'd encourage
12 the applicant to continue to work to refine that
13 design and really come to a more, you know, resolved
14 position with respect to the riverwalk.

15 And those were actually the only outstanding
16 issues that we had. So, that concludes my report.
17 I'm happy to answer any questions. I can certainly
18 speak a bit to the note. I think the applicant's
19 attorney, you know, provided a good summary. This is
20 a unique site. There are certainly things that are
21 unresolved. The request for the building code
22 modification, you heard discussions about raising
23 streets, not raising streets. You know, does the
24 ground floor get raised to a higher elevation, and
25 then what happens either within the building or

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 within public space to accommodate, you know, retail
2 visitors as well as building tenants.

3 So, I think we just wanted to raise to the
4 Commission's awareness for tonight's hearing, that
5 there are certainly, you know, issues of reliance, as
6 well as regulatory issues that we felt could result,
7 depending on how things go, could result in design
8 changes to this project. So, we did just want to
9 bring that to your attention.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. DDOT.
11 Mr. Rogers.

12 MR. ROGERS: Good evening, Mr. Chair, members
13 of the Commission. For the record, Jonathan Rogers
14 with the District Department of Transportation.

15 This project has evolved extensively with all
16 the coordination that has gone on between the
17 applicant and DDOT, as well as sister agencies.
18 There are many positive elements of the project,
19 including the extension of the Anacostia Riverwalk
20 Trail, the cycle track up 2nd Street to V Street, the
21 V Street bus stop that's being included in the
22 adjacent public space, and the Capital Bikeshare
23 station.

24 I did want to speak first to a couple of
25 questions that came up during Commissioner discussion

1 in questioning. I did want to note that the original
2 proposal did assume that the street grades were going
3 to be changing around the site. This is a very
4 involved question that you know, requires extensive
5 review by both federal and local agencies, and with
6 the timeline that the applicant was working on with
7 moving their project through this process, that was
8 one that certainly had a much shorter time frame and
9 time horizon than any final verdict on the question
10 about the street elevation.

11 So, through those discussions the applicant
12 revised their design to assume the existing grades of
13 the streets. Should there be future changes to those
14 streets which would require extensive review and
15 approval by DDOT, among others, there may be changes
16 to the building design, to the public space that
17 would be required -- that would require additional
18 review and potentially approval through the Zoning
19 Commission process, through public space permitting,
20 and others. So, I did want to note that.

21 Regarding transit growth, there is no transit
22 that's currently serving the area. With all the
23 development that is coming, soccer stadium, other
24 private developments, we know that there's a need for
25 bus service to be extended down into this

1 neighborhood and we've been coordinating, as well as
2 the applicant has been coordinating with WMATA on
3 understanding time frames, what it takes to make that
4 happen.

5 So, we've met several times with WMATA and
6 are well on track to make sure that that transit
7 comes along as the development delivers.

8 One of the things that we heard most from
9 WMATA was making sure that there are bus stops to
10 serve future bus routes, and so we've been working
11 very closely and the applicant has included, in their
12 public space plans, a bus stop on V Street. We're
13 also working with a soccer team and DGS to have
14 additional bus stops up and down 2nd Street which
15 would serve a likely extension of the 74 line.

16 DDOT has reviewed the applicant's response to
17 the DDOT agency report, and we're generally in
18 agreement with the following notes. Regarding the
19 showers that were requested as an important element
20 to encourage bicycling, the Buzzard Point area has
21 the potential to really have an excellent bicycle
22 culture, and bicycle mode split, because it's natural
23 topography, it's flat, it's just far enough away from
24 the rail stations to really encourage bicycling. And
25 it's going to have excellent in-street bicycle

1 infrastructure, as well as the Anacostia Riverwalk
2 Trail. So, the showers and changing facilities are
3 an important supportive piece of infrastructure on
4 the building side that can really help take bicycling
5 to the next level. So, we encouraged that to happen.

6 I should note that it doesn't -- that the
7 bicycling -- that the showers and changing facilities
8 don't necessarily need to be on that ground level and
9 take up retail space. We've certainly seen other
10 examples where they're on another level, the parking
11 garage, or another level.

12 Regarding the satellite parking, while the
13 parking provision for the retail does meet the
14 zoning, there's going to be a practical need for more
15 retail parking, given the location of the site, the
16 building program, and the availability of non-auto
17 modes, at least at this moment.

18 To the extent that satellite parking is
19 provided, it's important that pedestrian safe --
20 pedestrian connections be provided, to connect those
21 satellite parking locations to the site.

22 The applicant is targeting James Creek
23 Marina. There is not an agreement in place, and it's
24 also unclear how many spaces would be available and
25 would that sever the full needs of the site in terms

1 of satellite parking?

2 So, DDOT reiterates the requested condition
3 that we included in our report that, as things unfold
4 and certainty comes to what parking spaces are
5 available in the future, that the applicant make sure
6 that there are safe pedestrian connections to those
7 satellite parking locations.

8 Given the evolving and dynamic nature of the
9 Buzzard Point area, and you know, a surface parking
10 lot today might not be there tomorrow, it would be
11 acceptable for those pedestrian connections, at least
12 the sidewalks to be made out of asphalt as a more
13 temporary improvement that does provide safe
14 connections without the full investments of a
15 standard concrete sidewalk.

16 And one minor note about electric vehicle
17 charging stations, this was a recommendation in the
18 DDOT report to provide seven spaces in the parking
19 garage, and I do not believe that the applicant had
20 specifically responded to that, but as the District
21 tries to grow it's alternative energy and
22 transportation options, private side, electric
23 vehicle charging stations is an important element.
24 So, that is the nature behind that request.

25 And with that, I will take any questions that

1 you have.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Thank you, Mr.
3 Updike.

4 MR. UPDIKE: Hi, yes. Thanks. Bill Updike.
5 I'm the Chief of the Green Building and Climate
6 Branch with the D.C. Department of Energy and
7 environment. This site is perhaps the most
8 vulnerable site in the District of Columbia, or at
9 least certainly one of the most vulnerable sites.
10 Our climate adaptation plan, called Climate Ready
11 D.C. has shown that we have seen 11 inches of sea
12 level rise since the 1920s. It's some of the highest
13 in the world in this region. We've seen a 373
14 percent increase in nuisance flooding since just the
15 1950s.

16 So, this site is very important, and it's
17 very important to get right. We received the
18 comments and the responses to our comments just late
19 last Friday as Chairman Hood mentioned. And
20 unfortunately, our key experts, and in particular on
21 the floodplain, our floodplain regulator
22 administrator, as well as his staff, are out of the
23 office and have not been able to review the responses
24 that the applicants have had, since we just got them
25 late on Friday.

1 So, you know, unfortunately we haven't had a
2 chance to review, or at least the key experts haven't
3 had a chance to review. I will say that we are
4 working right now on a neighborhood wide analysis of
5 Buzzard Point, to try to figure out how to really
6 address issues of flooding, in particular, in that
7 whole neighborhood. And we're working with some of
8 the best experts in the world on the subject. The
9 applicant referenced the research, the cloud burst
10 study that we're doing. We have some preliminary
11 analysis from that research, but we certainly would
12 like to see a little bit further to help advise us
13 how to address issues like this project.

14 So, at this point, you know, you know, we'd
15 love to explore further, in particular on the flood
16 issues. I know some of the questions that came out
17 in the review there, were about flooding issues, and
18 I'm not the floodplain administrator for the city, so
19 I can't specifically address those questions. I do
20 have a colleague, Brian VanWy (phonetic) with me, who
21 has storm water expertise, so if there are questions
22 on that subject area, Brian can come to the table and
23 answer those.

24 And I'm happy to answer any questions related
25 to green building or climate if they come up as well.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So, let me --
3 before I go to any questions, let me just ask this
4 question, because we want to make sure that when we
5 do ask questions that the answers have been reviewed
6 and flushed out.

7 Now, I heard you, Ms. Vitale. I understand
8 that note, but that note was very significant for me.
9 It was very important and I appreciate the note. And
10 as you mentioned in your testimony, there are some
11 other things that I guess Office of Planning needs to
12 still work with the applicant on, the way I caught
13 it. The way I understand it.

14 And let me go to Mr. Rogers. Is that the
15 same thing? Do you all still have some things that --
16 - I mean, I'm trying to remember all what you said
17 because you said quite a bit. But you still have
18 some things you're looking for?

19 MR. ROGERS: I would say on the DDOT issues,
20 we're relatively well wrapped up at this point. As I
21 noted, though, our review responds to the existing --
22 the current proposal of the applicant, which keeps
23 the grades of the streets as they are. If that were
24 to change, that would open up another set of issues.
25 But because we're responding to the application as

1 submitted, we are largely wrapped up at this point.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, the changes
3 that came in on the 2nd, or whatever day that was,
4 didn't affect you all.

5 MR. ROGERS: Just the few small notes that I
6 noted, being the pedestrian connections to the
7 satellite parking locations, the shower facilities,
8 and the electric vehicle charging stations.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And, Mr. Updike, I
10 think you were the loudest and the clearest, and that
11 was one of my issues, the floodplain, because that's
12 what I was kind of looking for.

13 So, you all have not had an opportunity to
14 review.

15 MR. UPDIKE: No, not the key experts that
16 would need to review this document, no.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And how much time
18 would it take for them to be able to review it?

19 MR. UPDIKE: I don't think it would take that
20 long to review it. I think responding to it and
21 potentially having a meeting with the applicants
22 would be probably essential, given the complexity of
23 the issues down there in the project.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

25 MR. UPDIKE: And I'm not sure, actually, when

1 our floodplain administrator is going to be back in
2 the office. I'd need to check on his schedule as
3 well.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't know how my other
5 colleagues feel, but I think that's very important
6 for us to kind of nail that down as much as we can.
7 So, what I would suggest -- and we can move forward,
8 Ms. Roddy. I'm not saying stop the hearing right
9 here. I wouldn't do that. We're going to continue
10 to move forward. Depending upon what comes back as
11 the results of the communications, whether or not the
12 Commission -- I would suggest that whether or not we
13 decide to have a limited scope another night, and we
14 already have some because it shouldn't take us that
15 long once we see things. Or, we can just go with the
16 submissions. I don't know.

17 Let's see how it goes. We can ask a few
18 questions but I think we've heard, at least from
19 DOEE, the concerns and then the experts. You know,
20 we do have certain experts in our government. So, we
21 want to make sure that they have a chance to weigh in
22 on some of the changes as well.

23 So, that's kind of where I am, just moving
24 forward. If that's understood, if somebody has a
25 question for me, I'm willing to answer it.

1 Commissioner Shapiro.

2 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, I
3 agree with you and I would support that approach.

4 The one question would be, because I'm
5 hearing a slightly different story from DOEE than I
6 am from OP, and I feel like the applicant -- you
7 talked about how collaborative the agencies were with
8 you. And from my side, one of my concerns is, I'm
9 not quite sure where the communication is between the
10 agencies, because I'm hearing different things.

11 So, I just want to make sure that that
12 conversation involves all of them and not just DOEE.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay. So, what I
14 would definitely take that suggestion, Commissioner
15 Shapiro. I would agree also.

16 And I'm saying this now, we can still ask our
17 questions, but let's be mindful of the comments we've
18 heard from the different agencies. Especially DOEE.
19 The experts are not here. Mr. Updike will answer
20 what he can, but we don't want to put him in a realm
21 of answering something that he's not the expert on.
22 He's probably expert in all of it, but since the
23 experts are not here I want us to make sure we guide
24 our questions properly. And we may have another time
25 to guide them at the appropriate time.

1 So, let's start off. Commissioner Shapiro.

2 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you. I just want to say
3 there was a number of issues that were touched on by
4 the different agencies related to specific points
5 that, if we do move forward, if there is a limited
6 scope public hearing, these issues might not get
7 picked up again. But there were a number of points
8 the agency has touched on that sounded important to
9 me that I'd like to see the -- you know, essentially
10 with DDOT, the electronic charging stations.

11 This issue around the parking, I didn't quite
12 understand. This is a question for DDOT. It's still
13 not clear to me whether your sense is, this is in the
14 long run, whether this is under-parked, over-parked,
15 or just right. Are we just going to have a surge up
16 front and then the recommendation is, there's
17 adequate parking?

18 MR. ROGERS: So, I think one thing that
19 you'll definitely see in Buzzard Point neighborhood
20 is that there will be evolving trip making behavior
21 over time. As this would, if it were to move forward
22 on a quick course towards construction delivery,
23 probably be one of the first developments in the
24 area.

25 The idea with providing some of the

1 supportive transportation infrastructures that you
2 would grow that infrastructure over time,
3 particularly around transit. You're not going to
4 provide five minute headways of bus service when
5 there is one building with 280 units or whatever it
6 is. But as the neighborhood develops you would start
7 to see more robust transit.

8 And so, I think you can expect to see travel
9 behavior and mode choices change over time.

10 With that said, given the mix of uses and the
11 heavy program with retail and restaurants in
12 particular, and I'll let the applicant speak to their
13 vision for that type of restaurant in particular, but
14 it's our understanding that that is going to have a
15 destination type component to it, and that there are
16 longer term, more permanent off-site parking
17 locations that are under consideration.

18 And so, I think that in our estimation there
19 will be some component of off-site retail parking for
20 the long haul, and that might evolve over time as
21 parking locations come in and out of the inventory
22 and trip making behavior changes to respond to the
23 availability of transportation alternatives.

24 MR. SHAPIRO: And I don't remember seeing
25 this in there. Have they designed in a valet parking

1 station or stations for the restaurants? I mean, I
2 assume for the first months you would certainly want
3 that to be a major factor.

4 MR. ROGERS: It's been something that's been
5 communicated to us. Valet staging areas are part of
6 the public space permitting process as part of the
7 general curbside management strategy. So, I believe
8 some of the -- or, I know, some of the decisions that
9 have been made on the public space side, at least in
10 these preliminary plans that are shown in the design
11 review package, consider how there would be pick-up,
12 drop-off valet activity and utilizing those
13 turnarounds at the ends of 1st and 2nd Street to help
14 facilitate that.

15 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you. I'll stop there,
16 Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other questions of
18 either one of the three agencies? Vice Chair Miller?

19 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
20 had a question for Ms. Steingasser or Mr. Lawson. Or
21 Ms. Vitale of Office of Planning regarding
22 Inclusionary Zoning. I saw a reference somewhere
23 that the rehab of office buildings are generally
24 exempt from the Inclusionary Zoning. We didn't
25 change that in our recent IZ case? And if we didn't,

1 I think we should consider, if some of my colleagues
2 agree, I think we should consider not exempting the
3 rehab of office buildings, particularly since I think
4 that's a trend that is happening, due to the market
5 conditions. And it's just a lost opportunity to --
6 they're providing it anyway here in this case, I
7 mean, they're meeting it as if it did apply. So, I
8 think that we should -- are you looking at that
9 issue? Did we not look at that issue when we
10 revamped our IZ recently?

11 MS. VITALE: We did not, but we are happy to
12 bring that back to you.

13 MR. MILLER: Okay, I'd appreciate -- if my
14 colleagues are supportive of that, I would encourage
15 that strongly.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other questions or
17 comments up here? Commissioner Shapiro had another
18 one.

19 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you. I just had one more
20 quick question, again for DOEE.

21 This issue which has come before us a few
22 times, and I'd love to hear your comment on this, Mr.
23 Updike, when there's a conflict between the green
24 area ratio and solar panels and you know, what's the
25 priority for the use of the roof? How do you respond

1 to that?

2 MR. UPDIKE: Yeah, I mean, there actually is,
3 with the green area ratio in particular, there is a
4 multiplier for solar. So, you know, theoretically
5 there shouldn't be a conflict with the green area
6 ratio.

7 When it comes to the storm water regulations,
8 you know, that's a different question. But there's
9 certainly ways to do both. There are project teams
10 that are doing integrated solar and green roof
11 projects, and there's discussions at the agency about
12 how you would count the retention volume that would
13 be underneath the solar panel and how it would need
14 to be designed to count that retention area. So,
15 there's certainly the ability to do both. There's
16 also the ability to do rainwater collection and reuse
17 with solar, as opposed to green roof, you know, and
18 solar.

19 So, there are multiple opportunities. There
20 are multiple ways to address these issues, and you
21 know, many folks may not know, but D.C. has probably
22 the best financials for solar in the country right
23 now. They're sort of remarkable and sometimes
24 unbelievable, but it's true. And so, it's really an
25 opportunity that we need to make happen. In

1 particular because our law requires five percent of
2 our electricity to come from local solar. And if we
3 don't meet those requirements it's going to cost all
4 rate payers an incredible amount of money. Hundreds
5 of millions of dollars. So, it's crucial that, you
6 know, every building at least do their best to try to
7 figure out how to include solar projects.

8 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you very much. And I
9 would just encourage you to take that direction
10 advice and find a way to make it happen. There's
11 just so many incentives that D.C. is looking to
12 provide. It's hard to imagine that you can't find a
13 creative way to incorporate it.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Any other comments or
15 questions up here?

16 Okay, let's -- and we're probably going to
17 come back and revisit this as information that we've
18 just been provided from, especially DOEE, because we
19 may have some questions. We just need to figure out
20 how we're going to do this. And I can tell you right
21 now, I think we're looking at the date. That's what
22 I was over there talking to Ms. Schellin. We're
23 looking at the date of, what is it, July --

24 MS. SCHELLIN: [Speaking off microphone.]

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was trying to find a

1 sooner date, but believe it or not, you guys, we're
2 kind of booked. So, we'll see. We'll talk about
3 that as we go down. Let's continue the hearing.

4 Let's go to the -- and let me ask this. Any
5 cross from the applicant?

6 MS. RODDY: No.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Either one of the
8 agencies. Does the ANC have any cross?

9 Okay. All right. So, Mr. Moffett, if you
10 can come forward and give the ANC report?

11 MR. MOFFETT: Good evening, Chairman Hood and
12 distinguished members of the Zoning Commission of the
13 District of Columbia, and good evening to the fellow
14 citizens of the District of Columbia. My name is
15 Roger Moffett and I service commissioner for a single
16 member district SMD 6D-05, where this project is
17 situated.

18 I'm here tonight to speak on behalf of ANC
19 6D. As stated in its report, ANC 6D voted 600 to
20 offer support with concerns and suggestions relating
21 to the Capitol Gateway Overlay, District Design
22 Review and variance relief sought by the applicant,
23 application noted above.

24 Our reasons for that support are outlined in
25 our report. However, we also believe that the

1 applicant's positive actions deserve our presence
2 here to emphasize their demonstration of a commitment
3 to Buzzard Point, and to working with a surrounding
4 community.

5 Affordable housing, the applicant originally
6 proposed paying into the Housing Affordable Trust
7 Fund in lieu of providing affordable units in the
8 project. However, the applicant has agreed to
9 provide the affordable units on site. We are
10 heartened to see the developers, who are willing to
11 work to make their ANC 6D developments available to
12 the entire economic spectrum. We, at ANC 6D, want to
13 be here to emphasize the deserved plaudits.

14 Pet relief area, a laughing matter to some
15 and -- but it isn't whenever you think about the
16 Anacostia. The developers have identified two
17 locations to address this issue. One inside the
18 building at the garage level, and one exterior to the
19 building on 1st Street, designed to ensure pet waste
20 does not enter the Anacostia. In addition to the
21 applicant -- in addition, the applicant has committed
22 to continue to work with other Buzzard Point
23 developers with the goal of developing a coordinated
24 and comprehensive response to this issue as
25 development continues in the neighborhood. Again,

1 the applicant had demonstrated concern relating to
2 potential problems for this area.

3 Relative to retail space use, the retail
4 space along V Street are ideal for neighborhood
5 serving retail spaces and the applicant is actively
6 pursuing a number of neighborhood serving retailers,
7 such as food market, coffee shop, and a pharmacy.

8 The developers recognize that in order to
9 make this building attractive to potential tenants,
10 they need to be sure that they have convenient access
11 to day to day goods and services. On behalf of ANC
12 6D, thank you for your time and for allowing me to
13 present this testimony this evening.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner
15 Moffett. We appreciate you taking the time and
16 coming down here and presenting your testimony and
17 the ANC's position.

18 Let's open it up. Any questions or comments
19 to Commissioner Moffett?

20 Okay. Does the applicant have any cross?

21 Okay. All right. Thank you, very much. We
22 appreciate you coming down.

23 MR. MOFFETT: Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's go to persons
25 and -- organizations and persons in opposition. Is

1 there anyone here, organization or person who would
2 like to testify? I mean, what did I say?
3 Opposition? In support. You can come forward.
4 Anyone who is here, organization or person who is in
5 support, if you can come forward. Anybody else?
6 Okay.

7 Okay, you may begin.

8 MS. TADDEI: Thank you, Commissioner Hood and
9 good evening, commissioners. As you know, my name is
10 Kristin Taddei and I am the planning advocate with
11 Casey Trees. And as you also know, Casey Trees is a
12 Washington, D.C. based non-profit, with a mission to
13 restore, enhance, and protect the tree canopy of the
14 nation's capital.

15 To fulfill this mission, we plant trees,
16 monitor the city's tree canopy, and work with
17 decisionmakers, developers, and residents to
18 encourage tree planting and protection on both public
19 and private property.

20 We are dedicated to helping the District
21 reach its 40 percent tree canopy goal by 2032. As a
22 city, we will achieve this goal. When developments
23 include landscape designs that allow trees to grow
24 large and live long healthy lives.

25 We are excited to work with the development

1 team to ensure that trees are prioritized in the
2 river front development at 2100 2nd Street Southwest.
3 By prioritizing trees in the landscaping plan, the
4 development team has the opportunity to mitigate
5 flooding, improve the ecological health of the
6 Anacostia River, and create an attractive destination
7 for residents and visitors alike.

8 Though there are trees on this property
9 today, many of them are in poor condition, as you saw
10 earlier. Especially those growing along the
11 riverbank and the eastern side of the proposed
12 building. And you can see that in figure one.

13 We appreciate that the development team will
14 replace these neglected trees with carefully selected
15 urban hearty trees that will be well cared for.
16 These trees will ultimately improve the river
17 ecosystem and provide shade to passersby.

18 To continue working toward the city's
19 sustainable D.C. goal of achieving a 40 percent tree
20 canopy by 2032, and the climate ready D.C. actions to
21 reduce flooding and the urban heat island effect, we
22 recommend the following.

23 We believe there is an opportunity to plant
24 small trees in the planting strips, which we believe
25 are four-feet wide, along the eastern edge of the

1 building. We suggest ensuring that there is at least
2 three feet of soil depth in these planting strips,
3 and spacing six small trees at least 10 feet apart.
4 You can see this recommendation in Figure 2.

5 Second, we are pleased that the developer
6 plans to increase tree diversity by alternating tree
7 species along the property. We also appreciate the
8 concentration of trees near the riverbank, as these
9 trees will promote storm water retention and
10 infiltration.

11 We request that the development team refer to
12 Casey Trees Urban Tree Selection Guide. I have a few
13 copies with me tonight, but it is also available on
14 our website, and that they cross-reference this guide
15 with the Federal Aviation Administration's list of
16 trees in order to select tree species that will
17 comply with the FAA's wildlife standards and perform
18 well in this urban site.

19 Thank you for the opportunity to testify. We
20 would be happy to work directly with the development
21 team, and I'm also happy to answer any questions.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you very much. Have
23 you reached out previously to the development team?

24 MS. TADDEI: Yes. Actually, ORR Partners
25 gave us a site visit and explained some of the

1 constraints and the situation.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, this is not their
3 first time, other than saying it in the record, this
4 is not their first time hearing from you on some
5 of --

6 MS. TADDEI: That's correct.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Any
8 questions, comments? Does the applicant have any
9 cross?

10 MS. RODDY: No.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We appreciate Casey
12 Trees stepping up on all our cases. We appreciate
13 that. Thank you.

14 MS. TADDEI: Happy to.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Do we have any
16 organizations and persons who are here in opposition?
17 In opposition. Not seeing anyone.

18 Ms. Roddy, do some rebuttal and closing?

19 MS. RODDY: Thank you. I just wanted to
20 address some of the comments that we heard from the
21 agencies. I'll start with DDOT. I think that that
22 one is fairly simple. I'm sure that we can find a
23 place to provide the shower facilities that they are
24 requesting, and we will provide those. Similarly, we
25 can commit to providing the sidewalks to the off-site

1 parking areas that they have requested, as well as
2 the charging stations. So, I believe that that takes
3 care of all of the open-ended DDOT issues.

4 With respect to the Office of Planning, it's
5 the eight units is the entirety of the affordable
6 commitment. We will continue to work with DDOT with
7 respect to the design of the terminus, and we will
8 finalize that during the public space process as we
9 coordinate with the agencies.

10 We will need to study the commitment to
11 certify the building at the -- certify it. It will
12 obviously be designed to LEED Gold, but the
13 certification process, we'll study, and we can
14 provide you the additional details with respect to
15 the seating areas. We can get you that information
16 fairly easily.

17 Now, moving on to the DOEE issues --

18 MR. SHAPIRO: Public art?

19 MS. RODDY: Right. I'm sorry. That would be
20 included with the seating area. So, that analysis
21 will include the educational opportunities, the
22 public art, and the seating program within the
23 waterfront area.

24 MR. ORR: I'm married to an artist. It's
25 going to happen.

1 MS. RODDY: And so, with respect to the DOEE
2 I understand like that is a first and foremost
3 concern for the Commission, and this project, not
4 unlike the other projects in Buzzard Point that have
5 come before the Commission requires a code
6 modification.

7 And we have been working closely with a code
8 consultant and developing the flood protections that
9 we put together, and we are confident that we will
10 receive the code modification. We base this on the
11 fact that more than 10 percent, as Julia noted, 12.75
12 percent of the building is dedicated to commercial
13 use. And that, in connection with the fact that all
14 of the residential units are removed from the 500-
15 year floodplain by at least 21 feet. We think those
16 two items, we are confident in receiving that code
17 modification.

18 That modification is sought during the
19 permitting stage. And so, we obviously, in order to
20 go get to the permitting stage as I noted, we have to
21 come through this design review stage. And we think
22 that the design that we're putting together tonight
23 and presenting to you this evening, is the
24 appropriate design. It balances the objectives of
25 the Buzzard Point Framework Plan, which is to provide

1 these active ground-floor spaces to provide ground-
2 floor retail, while also addressing DOEE concerns by
3 removing residential units from the 500-year
4 floodplain.

5 The alternative, which DOEE suggested in
6 their report, which was to remove the building from
7 the 500-year floodplain, creates a number of
8 challenges. As Yulia noted, it would require a four-
9 foot perimeter wall, a knee wall. Or, in my case, a
10 shoulder wall. And that would go around the
11 perimeter of the building, which would kill the
12 retail.

13 And if that didn't kill the retail, then the
14 parking that we would have to elevate to that level,
15 would kill the retail. It would eliminate retail all
16 together because we would have parking on the ground
17 floor at that point.

18 I don't think that the Commission, I don't
19 think OP would want us to come forward with that
20 building. So, we think that the design that we've
21 proposed tonight balances the concerns of the
22 agencies, and we are going to continue to work with
23 DOEE in creating that flood egress plan, as well as
24 finalizing the dry proofing and flood proofing of the
25 building during the permitting stage. And if we

1 don't get the modification, there are going to have
2 to be changes to the design, which would put us back
3 before the Commission.

4 But as I noted, we are very confident, based
5 on our conversations with our co-consultant, who is
6 also working in connection with the other Buzzard
7 Point projects that have come before the Commission
8 that we will receive that code modification during
9 the permitting process.

10 So, we appreciate your time tonight. We
11 understand your concerns. We have thoroughly
12 analyzed this and we believe that this is the
13 appropriate plan to move forward with.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
15 Commissioners, any final comments? Anybody?

16 MR. MAY: You know, I think, I just want to
17 say, the thing that remains troubling and hopefully
18 will get more clarity when we hear more from DOEE is
19 just that the -- is that the note on the OP report,
20 and then the statement in DOEE's report that they
21 recommend that we not approve it until this is
22 resolved, until this is fixed to their satisfaction.

23 So, hopefully with a little bit more
24 information from DOEE we'll get to the point where
25 we're comfortable with whatever is being proposed at

1 that point.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other comments?

3 MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I just had -- Ms.
4 Roddy, going back to OP, Ms. Vitale had a -- I think
5 she wanted you to also maybe revisit and think about
6 the three-bedroom units if that's an option. And I
7 think she wanted some views on 1st Street and V, and
8 1st and 2nd. I think she had a couple of -- she'd
9 like to see some more renderings down that view. I
10 think we all would.

11 And then she talked about the river walk
12 guidelines, benches, and not just for the
13 restaurants. She mentioned the public art. And I
14 forget, but she had a list of about eight, eight to
15 10 things, I think.

16 MS. RODDY: Right. And so, we will -- I'll
17 be honest, it's going to be challenging to provide
18 the three-bedroom units here. We will certainly
19 study it, but we have increased the number of two-
20 bedroom units.

21 MR. TURNBULL: Two-bedrooms.

22 MS. RODDY: We will provide the renderings
23 that have been requested. As I mentioned, we will
24 provide the seating analysis which would be included
25 with the art place and the educational opportunities

1 as well, and there was one more that you mentioned.

2 MR. SHAPIRO: Permeable pavers at the turn-
3 around.

4 MR. TURNBULL: Permeable pavers, right.

5 MS. RODDY: Right. And that --

6 MR. ORR: The renderings.

7 MS. RODDY: The renderings. We'll provide
8 the renderings. The permeable paving, I had
9 mentioned that we would work with DDOT. Those are in
10 public space so we would work with DDOT to refine
11 that during the public space process.

12 MR. TURNBULL: Okay. All right. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Any other questions
14 or comments up here? Okay. I think with everything
15 we've heard, I did go over earlier and try to find a
16 date sooner. Every time we do that I mess up and we
17 wind up having problems with the other hearings. But
18 the date that we have open, which I thought was going
19 to be open, which we would have liked, is July the
20 13th, correct?

21 And by that time, I'm sure that whoever is
22 coming back from DOEE, the experts should be there
23 working out with the Office of Planning, maybe the
24 agencies and the applicant, we can get everything
25 together and we're going to come down here on the

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington, DC 20036

Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376

Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 13th. Does that work for everyone because that's
2 actually open? That was a day off for us, but guys,
3 it's not a day off anymore. All right.

4 Yes, Ms. Roddy.

5 MS. RODDY: Can I clarify? Is this limited
6 to the floodplain issue? Is it a limited scope
7 hearing?

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's going to be limited
9 scope to everything that's outstanding. I still
10 heard some -- I calculated four things from Office of
11 Planning, but I was told it was seven or eight.

12 MS. RODDY: Yes, understood. The outstanding
13 items from OP as well.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: The outstanding. Yeah,
15 it's going to be a limited scope to those things.
16 And basically, it's going to be for us, if we have
17 any comments. You all may have satisfied the
18 agencies, and we read it and we'll be fine. So, I
19 was wondering if we could just do submissions, but I
20 think we may have some questions. So, that's why I'm
21 going in that format. Okay?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: And just to clarify, it's not
23 open for any public testimony, so just --

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. I think --

25 MS. SCHELLIN: -- limit it.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't know.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: So, it's just continuing to --
3 because we closed that part of the hearing, or except
4 for the ANC to ask questions if there's any cross
5 on --

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't know if we should
7 do that because there's some new information that
8 possibly may come up. And every time we do something
9 like that, we get -- well, I get in trouble. So, I
10 don't know. What do you guys think? I'm asking my
11 colleagues this time. Mr. Shapiro?

12 MR. SHAPIRO: I mean, I'll follow your lead,
13 Mr. Chair. My view on it is that it can be limited
14 in scope and that we've closed the public portion of
15 the hearing and I'd be satisfied with that.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, no public
17 testimony, because we've done that tonight. Okay.

18 Does everybody agree with that? Okay. I got
19 everybody agreeing with that. Okay. All right. So,
20 that's what it will be. It won't be no public
21 testimony, we will limit the scope to what the
22 outstanding issues are with Office of Planning, and
23 even DDOT. All the agencies, we'll just keep all the
24 agencies out there so we won't narrow that scope.

25 Okay. Any questions from anyone? All right.

1 So, we will reconvene this meeting on the 15th, and
2 hopefully -- 13th. That's a Saturday, the 15th.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: The 13th. And actually, we
4 won't do a new public hearing notice for the limited
5 scope.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: It's no need.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: We're just basically
8 continuing this hearing --

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: -- just for that purpose.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. Just for that
12 purpose.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: So, right.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, with that, we will
17 continue this on the 13th at 6:30.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay, thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. And with that,
20 I thank everyone for their participation and this is
21 -- will be continued on the 13th, July 13th.

22 [Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 8:41
23 p.m.]

24

25