#### NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

#### COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

OPEN SESSION

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,
JUNE 4, 2009

+ + + + +

The meeting convened in Room 5115, Suite 500, 401 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004, at 12:30 p.m., John V. Cogbill, III, Chairman, presiding.

# NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

JOHN V. COGBILL, III Chairman
HERBERT F. AMES President
JOHN M. HART President
MICHAEL S. MCGILL General S
ROBERT E. MILLER Council of

PETER MAY
HARRIET TREGONING

RALPH NEWTON
ARRINGTON DIXON
STACIE TURNER
WILLIAM MILES

Presidential Appointee
Presidential Appointee
General Services Admin
Council of the District
Of Columbia
Department of Interior
Office of the Mayor of
The District of
Columbia
Department of Defense
Mayoral Appointee
Committee on Government

Mayoral Appointee
Mayoral Appointee
Committee on Government
Oversight and Reform
U.S. House of
Representatives

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

# NCPC STAFF PRESENT:

LOIS J. SCHIFFER General Counsel
Marcel Acosta Executive Director

DEBORAH B. YOUNG Secretariat

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TTEM PAGE
Report of the Chairman4
Report of the Executive Director6
Consent Calendar (No Presentation)
Installation of Wireless Antennas10 Proposed highway plan amendment
Main post infrastructure-phase one11
Action Items
Vietnam Veterans Memorial Center12
National Mall/East Potomac Park
Consolidated Planned Unit Development and Map Amendment for the Architects Headquarters
Information Presentation Metropolitan Washington Council of223 Governments 2050 Initiative

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

12:30 p.m.

## REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN

CHAIRMAN COGBILL: Welcome to the National Capital Planning Commission's June 4, 2009 meeting. Would you all please stand and join me in the pleage of allegiance?

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you. Noting the presence of a quorum, I'll call the meeting to order. If there is no objection, the open session agenda will be adopted as the order of business.

Seeing and hearing no objection, the open session agenda is adopted.

[INSERT - Open Session Agenda]

Agenda item number one is the report of the Chair. The Chair would simply like to point out too the Commissioners that this past week, on June 1st, the Federal Times ran and op ed, which was written or authored by me and by Peggy O'Dell from the Park Service, and with a lot of assistance from the Office of Public Affairs.

But we would also want to point out to you that what the subject of that was really to talk about the importance of the national mall plan and the monumental core framework plan, and how those fit together and work really in conjunction with the District of Columbia's Center City action agenda, and really provides us an opportunity to take them all, which is the center of our Federal city, link it with the Federal precincts around that and talk about how we can work together and then to link that further to the city as a whole, and I think this — that op ed piece does a lot to explain why this is so important

to us as a Federal community and I think equally as important to the city.

So, with that, that concludes my report, and I'll turn it now over to the Executive Director, Mr. Acosta.

#### REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MR. ACOSTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good afternoon. In the interest of time and given the length of today's agenda, I will keep my comments very short. You do have a written report in your packet today.

I just want to just note one thing on the Federal Capital improvement program, which will be brought to the Commission next month. In the report, it mentioned that staff is proposing revised criteria for presenting projects, recommending and strongly endorsed.

After internal review and discussion, we decided not to bring that to the Commission. So, in terms of a review that you'll see next month, we will be using those standards and criteria that you had adopted in

the past. So, I just wanted to make sure that the Commission understood that.

I'd like to spend the rest of my time just introducing a few new staff members to the Commission. First of all, Colleen Elliott started as the Executive Assistant in the Office of the Executive Director.

Colleen has previous experience in operations, board relations and also, served as an Executive Assistant at the Council of Foundations, the Association of Advanced Life Underwriting and the National Business Group on Health. She holds a Bachelor's in French and a Master's in English.

Tarick Walton joins the staff as an intern in the plan and project implementation division. Tarick, will you please stand, and will be working with our planning staff on several ongoing initiatives.

Tarick is participating in MIT's Washington internship program, has just completed a sophomore year at MIT and is a

civil engineering student.

Rachel Bland joined the staff as an intern in the urban design and plan review division. She is a student at Cornell University, majoring in urban and regional studies in the College of Architecture, Art and Planning.

Finally, Lumay Wang joined the staff as an intern in the Office of Public Affairs. She is working on a variety of activities, including public and media outreach, international briefings and research for our ongoing planning initiative.

Lumay is a student at Tufts University, where she is earning a double major in art history and international relations, with an expected graduation date of spring 2011.

So, welcome aboard to our new interns and to our new staff, and with that,

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my presentation.

I'd be happy to answer that the Commission

might have.

[INSERT - Report of the Executive Director and Delegated Actions]

CHAIR COGBILL: Are there any questions from the Commissioners at this time? If not, I'll extend my personal welcome and thank you for being with us and to our new interns and staff members. We're glad to have you on board.

All right, agenda item number three is the consent calendar. Are there any questions on the consent calendar? If not, I'd entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER AMES: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, the consent calendar consists -- do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: Second.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR - AGENDA ITEMS 3A, B AND C

CHAIR COGBILL: Second, Mr. Newton.

Consent calendar consists of three matters,

to items 3A, B and C. First, United States

Postal Service, installation of wireless

antennas, 3B, proposed highway amendment for

street dedication for Water Lilly Lane and the extension of Castle Place, North East, adjacent to Square 5040 and 3C, which is the Fort Belvoir, Fairfax County, main post infrastructure, phase one and access control point equipment. Any further discussion or questions?

All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying 'aye'.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIR COGBILL: Opposed?

Abstentions? The motion carries. Thank you.

[INSERT - Consent Items]

#### ACTION ITEMS - AGENDA ITEMS 4A, B, C AND D

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, next agenda item 4A. This is the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitors Center on the grounds of the Lincoln Memorial, bounded by Constitution Avenue and Henry Bacon Drive, Lincoln Memorial Circle and 23rs Street, Northwest.

#### VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL VISITOR CENTER

MS. SULLIVAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. The National Park Service, on behalf of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, has submitted a revised concept of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor's Center.

You saw an information presentation on the revised concept at last month's Commission meeting.

The site of the visitor's center, situated north of the Lincoln Memorial, across Lincoln Memorial Circle and west of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial across Henry Bacon Drive, and as bounded by Constitution Avenue,

Henry Bacon Drive, Lincoln Memorial Circle and 23st Street, Northwest. This site is known as site A in the environmental assessment that was completed for site selection.

Today, the site has one ball field and a park service concession kiosk. Photos from this past weekend show people using the site for both active and passive recreation.

Congress authorized the visitor's center in November 2003. The law requires that the visitor's center be built under ground, that NCPC and CFA have approval authority for site and design under the Commemorative Works Act and that final approval shall not be withheld.

The visitor's center may be sited in the reserve. The size of the visitor's center shall be limited to the minimum necessary to educate the public about the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the Vietnam War and amends the Commemorative Works Act to allow NCPC and CFA to develop site specific

design guidelines that are mutually agreed upon.

In August 2006, NCPC approved site A for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor's Center, conditioned upon the implementation of the package of mitigation set forth in the design guidelines that is necessary to reduce the otherwise significant impacts of the proposed action, as indicated by the Commission's action for site selection.

In October 2007, CFA approved the initial concept with comments and conditions, in accordance with design guidelines and in December 2007, NCPC approved comments on the initial concept, in accordance with the design guidelines as well and then mostly recently, in April 2009, CFA reviewed and commented on this most recent submission that you'll be looking at today.

So, here is the 2007 site plan that you reviewed and this is the June submission that you saw last month.

In the next set of slides, I will walk through the changes that the applicant discussed as last month's Commission meeting, then I will show you additional revisions that the applicant has made since that meeting.

Last month, applicant showed you the following changes. They raised the grade for the site by three and a half feet. They pulled the exhibit walls back from the open court yard. They made the sky lights flush with the grass. They added the grass berm to the east building face. They simplified the ramp. They re-oriented the entry stair. They moved the building north on the site and the added the guard rails at the north end of the court yard in the form of a semi-transparent screen, and I'll now walk through these in a little more detail.

The applicant has raised the elevation of the existing grade approximately 42 inches above the grade for the 2007 concept design, to reduce the ramp plane from

Constitution Avenue and Henry Bacon Drive.

So, in this site section comparison, this is where Constitution Avenue is, over here. It's at 19 feet. In 2007, the ramp needed to descend to five feet, which is where the entry way of the building is, so, all the way coming down here to five feet, and now, because of the grade change, it only needs to descend to eight feet, which has allowed applicant to shorten the length of the ramp, and this is what it looks like.

In 2007, it was slightly longer and more complicated, as you can see here. This is the simplified version right here.

The reduction in the ramp length has also allowed for the following revisions. The building has been adjusted further to the north. So, the red dotted line is the footprint from 2007 and the black dotted line is the footprint from 2009, the submission.

You can that the building is now further away from the NPS kiosk and other

parameter tree route zone and the southwest corner is also a little bit further away. So, it's been right in that edge there.

Because of the re-orientation, the building is now ax-sealed to the center point of the Lincoln Memorial and the site stairs are ax-sealed to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial flag pole, across Henry Bacon Drive. So, you can see the flag right there.

The change in the ramps has also allowed for a more substantial berm along the east face of the center. In the 2007 concept, the ramp was immediately adjacent to this wall here, it was immediately adjacent to this wall. But in the June submission, the ramp has been pulled away from the wall, which allows for a more substantial berm in its place.

Finally, the sky light exhibit walls used to extend 18 inches above the grass and now, they are flush with the grass, as you can see in this image. So, you can see the

blades of grass right up here. So, they're not extending above anymore.

The revised lower level plan includes the meditation garden in the center of the building. So, in this area right here. It has not been determined whether this court yard will be publically accessible at this time.

Adjacent to the court yard is the book store, right here, and then in this area right here with the question mark, the applicant suggest that it might be a combination of exhibit space and area for contemplation, as people leave the main exhibit on this side of the building over here.

The three exhibit walls on the north side of the building have mostly stayed the same since the first concept.

The revised upper level plan shows the lobby area, where you enter the building.

That's right here. Then you cross over a

bridge that's spans the court yard to the exhibit walls. So, here is the bridge, then you go this way.

This side has views to the court yard below. The other areas are the adjacent - the other areas adjacent to the court yard include a workroom and mechanical areas over in here.

The overall size of the building footprint, as well as the overall gross area of the building have been reduced. The initial concept in 2007 was approximately 34,100 square feet and it is now approximately 31,250 square feet.

The footprint comparison in this slide show, shows that the lower level foot print has been reduced by approximately 1,500 square feet. Highlighted in yellow is the 2007 footprint, and then in blue, you can see the June submission footprint. The reduction mostly comes from the perimeter of the building, which is located entirely

underground, largely coming from over here.

The upper level footprint has been reduced by approximately 1,350 square feet. Similarly, the reduction also comes largely from the perimeter of the building, which is completely underground. In yellow, you can see the 2007 footprint and in blue again, you can see the June submission footprint.

The court yard, which is open to the sky and visible from above ground, so it's right here and here, is still approximately 3,200 square feet.

The exhibit walls and sky lights have been pulled back in plan, so that they no longer extend into the court yard. So, if you're there, one, two, three, and there here is the June submission. You can see, they've been pulled back from the court yard.

Because the exhibit walls have been pulled back, the guard rail condition along the northern perimeter of the court yard is no longer achieved through the use of the exhibit

walls, but is now created through the use of a light weight architectural screen, which extends upward from the court yard below. So, you can sort of see it right here, coming up.

The screen wall will act as a solar shade and a privacy screen in front of the building face and then it extends upward, to create the guard rail condition around the northern side of the court yard. The material for the screen had not been selected, but these are examples of what might be used.

As a result of a consultation meeting, between NCPC and the application that occurred after the information presentation that you saw last month, a few more revisions have been made to the design.

In the next couple of slides, I will go through these revisions. They have been incorporated into staff's analysis and when I get to that part of the presentation, I'll simply refer to all of these revisions as the June submission.

Since last month's presentation, the applicant eliminated the sky light closest to the east facade wall. So, this one is now gone, raised the grade for the northeast corner of the site, over in here, and I'll show you pictures of that in a minute, and re-oriented the entry stair and added a land scape berm against the wall, as you can see in the bottom left.

And so, this shows the slightly raised grade in the northeast corner of the site. The grade has been raised one and a half feet above the existing level, to help shield the view of the center from Henry Bacon Drive.

For the next four slides, I will show you a sequence of renderings that illustrate the changes from the 2007 concept to the current submission. These renderings were submitted by the applicant.

Here is a view of the site from the corner of 23rd Street and Constitution Avenue, looking south. In the 2007 concept, you see

the center here. In the June submission, you can no longer see the center from this viewpoint because of the change in grade. The most recent revisions that the applicant made over the last month did not affect this view. So, we don't have an additional rendering for this viewpoint.

Here is a view of the site from the cross walk at 22nd Street and Constitution Avenue. In the 2007 submission, you can see here, is the south facade wall, the sky lights and a little bit of the stairs here, and then this is a rendering of the June submission. There's been -- this has been -- there's been a change -- the whole site has been raised three and a half feet. You have the walk way, or the ramp from Constitution Avenue, cutting through right here, and then you can see the south facade wall right here, and then the most recent revision was the grass berm that's been added, to help disguise this south facade wall right here, and again, this corner has

been raised also one and a half feet, but that's not as evident in this picture.

Here is a view of the center from Henry Bacon Drive, looking south. You can see the center here from 2007, and now, here is the view of the center with the June submission. You can see the south and east walls of the center.

Then finally, with the one and a half foot raise in grade with this corner, in the most recent submission, you can see it, a slight change right there.

Lastly, this is the view from the top stair of the Lincoln Memorial looking north. You can see the court yard and sky lights right here.

The applicant has suggested that the new tree canopy of elm trees, which will be planted for the historic planting plan, will one day screen the view of the center. However, it should be noted that this will be once they have matured and when they actually

have leaves. So, that's what this -- these are indicating, right here, the leaf coverage.

Here is the view of the center now, from the June submission. So, this is the open court yard right here.

NCPC staff acknowledges the significance of this project and the challenge of designing it, with this historically significant and sensitive site next to the Lincoln Memorial and on the National Mall.

The National Capital Planning Commission is guided by the Commemorative Works Act and in considering this design proposal, must ensure that as a commemorative work, the visitors center be located, so that it does not interfere with or encroach on an existing commemorative work, and that to the maximum extent practical, it protect open space, existing public use and cultural and natural resources.

At the August 2006 Commission meeting, the Commission adopted 14 design

guidelines and one additional requirement to serve as mitigation under NEPA, for the selection of the site on the national mall and to comply with the Commemorative Works Act, and I'm now going to discuss staff's analysis of the June submission, in reference to the 14 design guidelines and the one additional requirement.

Staff found, in analyzing the June submission, that it meets seven of the design guidelines. It does not meet four of the design guidelines and that there's not enough information for staff to evaluate the proposal in reference to the remaining three design guidelines and the one additional requirement.

So, first, I will go through the seven design guidelines that the submission meets, and I just want to say that staff is very appreciative of the work that the applicant has done to comply with them.

Design guideline number two is a visitor center's entrance will be only

minimally visible from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, to satisfy the project's purpose and need and will not interfere with or encroach upon the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and staff has -- concurs that the visitor center's entrance will not be minimally visible from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and it not interfere with or encroach upon the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Design guideline number three states that to maintain the character of the historic landscape, the visitor center's design concept will be based on maintaining the existing -- excuse me, will be based on maintaining the existing grade and any new slopes will be gradual.

The project will raise the existing site grade only to allow for an accessible entry ramp.

Staff concludes that the June submission has raised the grade of the site by three and a half feet to better accommodate

the approach ramp and reduce its overall length. The result is a simpler ramp configuration.

It should be noted that raising the grade and reducing the ramp length have had other consequences on the design, both positive and negative.

Positively, they have enabled the design team to adjust the building siding further north, which creates a better relationship to the existing National Park Service kiosk, as well as to the perimeter tree route zone. But the grade change has also had negative consequences on the site, and I will talk about these when I talk about design guidelines number one and five.

Design guideline number seven states that the visitor center's design will provide only the paved area necessary for visitors to enter and exit the building and which will also provide service access.

The design will not include

additional paved area for gathering space or queuing and staff concurs that the concept design includes the minimum paved area necessary for the expected number of visitors to enter and exit the building.

Design guideline number eight, the project will not include new vehicle parking areas and staff concurs that the June submission does not include new parking areas. This project has a bus passenger drop off zone on Henry Bacon Drive, or will have one.

Design guideline number nine states that the visitors center will have a single entrance for both visitors and service, and staff concurs that the June submission has a single entry for visitors and service, and that has not changed.

Design guideline number 11 states that the visitors center will be constructed only on the portion of the site that lies outside of the critical route zone of existing elm trees, that applicant will develop a tree

protection plan to protect and preserve the trees both during and after construction in accordance with standard design and construction procedures.

Staff's analysis is that the applicant has re-oriented the center further to the north and to the east, to move it away from the perimeter tree route zone. The applicant has noted that the technical survey of the critical route zone of the existing elm trees is underway.

states that the project will place new landscaping on the site in accordance with the National Park Services cultural landscape report for the Lincoln Memorial, referenced in the environmental assessment and will maintain the open grass panel on the site surrounded at the site's perimeter by elm trees, and staff concurs that the June submission incorporates a landscape design consistent with the cultural landscape report.

Now, I will briefly mention the three design guidelines and the one additional requirement, which staff has not been able to analyze because the submission does not have enough information at this time.

Design guideline number four states that the visitors center will be designed such that light emanating from the center's interior will not be visible from any portion of the Lincoln Memorial from Constitution Avenue and from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, so as not to interfere with or encroach upon the Lincoln Memorial or the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Design guideline number six states that the visitor's center site lighting for public safety will not interfere with or encroach upon views to and from the Lincoln Memorial and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Staff notes that the applicant has started thinking about the interior building and site lighting, but has not yet submitted a

lighting plan that staff can evaluate.

Design guideline number 10 states that the visitors center's associated pedestrian street crossing points will be designed to address traffic impacts effectively and to protect pedestrian safety.

That applicant has not yet designed the project's pedestrian point crossing points, even though the design for the center is moving forward. The mid-block crossing at Henry Bacon Drive is of particular importance and since the crossing points will have an impact on the design of the site, it's important that both move forward in coordination.

This is the one additional requirement that is not part of the 14 design guidelines, but also serves as mitigation for the site selection under NEPA.

It requires that the National Park
Service reconstruct softball fields lost as a
result of this project on another site within

one half mile of site A, in accordance with the Commission's action in August 2006 and the National Park Service has not yet responded to this requirement.

Finally, staff finds that the June submission did not meet four of the design guidelines and I will go through the staff analysis of each of these now.

Design guideline number one states that the visitors center will be constructed under ground with no portion of the building or related building elements visible from any portion of the Lincoln Memorial steps and podium from Constitution Avenue and from within the axial view sheds of 23rd Street and Henry Bacon Drive.

There are seven analysis slides for this guideline. The first point is that staff has found that the building is still visible from the Lincoln Memorial, which you can see here. So, this is the open court yard.

This area is the open court yard,

as I just mentioned. What is not shown here is the complex configuration of guard rails on the northern edge of the court yard, which staff believes will also be visible from this viewpoint. So, the whole system of guard rails right here is what I'm talking about.

As I just mentioned, the yellow line represents the complex configuration of guard rails on the north side of the court yard that are not shown in the previous running for Lincoln Memorial stairs.

As I showed you earlier, the guard rail which is proposed to be an architectural screen will extend upward from the bottom of the court yard. Even though the applicant has stated that one would be able to see the grass through the screen, staff believes that the guard rails on the north side of the court yard would still be visible from this view point. So, we're looking at this, this guard rail right here.

The second point of staff's

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

analysis is that while raising the grade of the site has reduced the visibility of the center from the of 23rd corner and Constitution Avenue, as you can see here, elements of the building are now more visible from other view sheds and this is evident from the view point at the cross walk at Street and Constitution Avenue.

This view is staff's greatest The soft all at the center and the entry court are now more visible from the which is actually a little bit cross walk, The combination of the raise in over here. grade and the cut in the site from the ramp from Constitution Avenue exposes the center's south entry wall, which is right here, and this is a sunken area that way, and as result, the center appears to be prominent than the Vietnam Veterans Memorial itself, which is not visible from Constitution This is the ramp that descends down 11 feet from Constitution Avenue.

Because of its impact and limited utility, staff questions the need for the ramp from Constitution Avenue. Staff views that the most critical relationship of the proposed center is to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial across Henry Bacon Drive, not to Constitution Avenue.

The majority of people will come to the center from the memorial at a mid-walk crossing and by tour buses that will unload in the parking lane along Henry Bacon Drive, near the center's entry stairs and ADA ramp. So, we're saying that a lot of people will be coming this way.

An existing desire line path at the northeast corner of the site shows that some visitors are coming to the memorial from north of Constitution Avenue. The path begins at the north -- the path begins at the northeast corner of the site where the cross walk is at Constitution and 22nd, and then people cut through site right here. So, they're coming

across this way and coming this way, and then going to the memorial right here.

The proposed ramp from Constitution Avenue will not replace this path as an alternate route to the memorial. Pedestrians would have to navigate a circuitous route, descending first into the center's entry plaza, then back up to Henry Bacon Drive, and finally, doubling back to the memorial's entry point.

Therefore, it is staff's opinion that given the ramps impact on the site and on views from Constitution Avenue and given its limited utility that it should be eliminated.

Finally, here is the view from Henry Bacon Drive. The south and east wall to the center are still visible, as you can see right here.

Design guideline number five states that the visitors center will not intrude into the landscape, no protrusions, such as sky lights, monitors, light wells or sunken

areaways will be visible from the sidewalk surrounding the site.

Staff's analysis for this design is presented over three slides. While raising the grade and making the sky lights flush with the grass have reduced the visibility of the sky lights from the side walk surrounding the site, other elements of the building are now more visible from the side walks.

The sunken entry way is now more visible from the side walk at Constitution Avenue and 22nd Street. Staff is also concerned that the potential lighting from the sky lights and the court yard will emanate and — will also emanate and be visible from the sky lights, and I just want to mention that the sky lights are approximately 130 feet long.

Here is the view from Henry Bacon Drive, looking south. Staff's analysis is that the sunken entry way is still visible from the side walk on Henry Bacon Drive, and you can

see that right here.

Design guideline number 13 states that the visitors center design will not impede the use of the site for multi-purpose recreation. The submission depicts an estimated 20 percent of the site will be available for multi-purpose recreation because the configuration of the space changes the nature of the landscape and limits the types of activities that could be accommodated on the site.

The submission indicates that a volleyball court or possibly small soccer field would fit in the space next to the food kiosk, as shown right here, but this is just a small portion of the site, compared to what is available today.

Design guideline number 14 states that the visitors center will be designed without guard rail or perimeter security elements. Staff's analysis is that the complex design of the two story court yard

will necessitate a circuitous system of guard rails on the north side of the court yard, as I mentioned earlier of this area.

With regard to perimeter security, the National Park Service has not yet responded to this requirement.

So, again, I want to reiterate that NCPC staff understands that this is an important project. The challenge here is to achieve a design that balances the creation of an underground visitors center, with respect for the Lincoln Memorial, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the National Mall and its open space and cultural and natural resources.

In 2007, the Commission requested that the applicant reduce the scale of the building openings and the protrusion building elements to meet the design quidelines. In response, the applicant has raised the grade of the site to reduce the size of the entry ramps, re-oriented building and made the sky lights flush with

the grass.

With the exception of eliminating one of the sky lights, that applicant has not reduced the scale of the building openings and the visibility of the building elements.

Concealing the center with grade changes has reduced the centers visibility from some view points, but it has increased its visibility from others.

Most importantly, the placement of the ramp through the elevated grade exposes the center's south entry wall from Constitution Avenue and as a result, the center appears to be more prominent than the Vietnam Veterans Memorial itself, which is not visible from Constitution Avenue.

The ramp also interrupts a large portion of the site that would also be available for passive recreation.

Rather than trying to conceal the building by manipulating the landscape, the applicant would be more successful in creating

a design that meets the design the guidelines if it did the following:

Eliminate the ramp from Constitution Avenue, so that the center is less visible from Constitution Avenue and from Henry Bacon Drive. This wall is to allow for multi-recreational use on the site. Eliminate the sky lights to minimize the center's intrusion on the landscape and to allow for multi-recreational use on the site and reduce the size of the open court yard and the length of needed guard rails to minimize visibility from the Lincoln Memorial.

The hatch lines and staff's rendering on the right, show the area of the site that would become available if these recommendations are implemented.

Staff realizes that there will be some modifications to the entrance and that a wall or sloped area would still be needed as the ramp from Henry Bacon Drive descends to the entry level, however, staff believes that

this would be less intrusive than the ramp from Constitution Avenue.

So, once again, looking at the proposed view of the center from Constitution Avenue and 22nd Street, eliminating the ramp and maintaining the raised grade, so, pulling this berm over, would decrease the visibility of the center. You would see very little of the south facade wall and the sunken entry way.

Finally, if the ramp from Constitution Avenue and the sky lights were removed and if the size of the court yard was reduced, approximately 60 percent of the site would be available for multi-purpose recreation, and the dotted blue line shows the additional amount of space that would become available over here.

With regard to the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Park Service provided a finding of no significant impact for the entire project, including the

design with its submission in 2007. The Commission's policies and procedures require supplemental NEPA documentation for preliminary approval of the design and staff finds that the applicant has not yet demonstrated that some of the required mitigation measures for site selection will be met.

With regard to the National Historic Preservation Act, NPS has resumed Section 106 consultation on the current submission and will proceed with consultation as design development continues.

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed and revised -- reviewed the revised concept design at its April 16, 2009 meeting. While supporting the worthy -- and this is what they had to say. While supporting the worthy purpose of the Memorial Center, the Commission reiterated its reservations about the impact of the facility on the sensitive context and required further development of

the design. They suggested that the applicant consider the following.

Implement further program reductions to minimize the visibility of what is intended to be an underground facility, simplify and reduce the architectural presence of the building, increase the earthen berms to cover or replace vertical walls, minimize or eliminate the sky lights and re-study the access walk ways leading to the entrance.

Because of the length of the Executive Director's recommendation in the report, I'm going to read an abbreviated version. You have the complete recommendation in front of you.

So, with that, we ask that the Commission acknowledge the significance of this project and the difficult challenge of designing it at this historically significant and sensitive site on the National Mall.

The Commission notes that the National Capital Planning Commission and the

Commission of Fine Arts jointly developed site specific design guidelines for the project to comply with the Commemorative Works Act requirement to ensure that the proposed work shall be so located as to prevent interference with or encroachment upon any existing commemorative work and to protect to maximum extent practical, open space and existing public use.

The design guidelines also serve as mitigation for the Executive Director's finding of no significant impact for site selection under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Confirms that the design meets the following design guidelines, design guideline number two, three, seven, eight, nine, 11 and 12, requires that with regard to the established design guidelines, that also serve as mitigation under NEPA and in concert with CFA comments dated April 24, 2009, that the design be modified to meet the following

design guidelines, those are design guidelines number one, five, 13 and 14.

Advise the applicant to focus on the following revisions to the building design, eliminate the walk from Constitution Avenue and associated berms, so that the center is less visible from Constitution Avenue and Henry Bacon Drive. This will also allow for more multi-recreational use on the site.

Eliminate the sky lights to minimize the center's intrusion on the landscape and to allow for multi-recreational use on the site, and reduce the size of the open court yard and the length of needed guard rails to minimize visibility from the Lincoln Memorial.

Note that the following design guidelines have yet to be addressed, as indicated by the applicant, design guidelines number four, six and 10, requires that the National Park Service to reconstruct softball

fields lost as a result of this project on another site within one half mile of site A, in accordance with the mitigation required in Executive Director's finding of the significant impact for the project and remind the applicant that the Commission's policies and procedures require supplemental NEPA further documentation and Section 106 consultation if the design develops begin with preliminary approval, and with that, that concludes my presentation.

[INSERT - Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor
Center]

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you, Ms. Sullivan. Are there any questions from the Commission at this time? Let me apologize for not introducing you at the beginning of this, I'm sorry. I forgot about that.

All right, I'm going to now open it up, but Mr. May, did you have -- did the applicant or the -- is there anyone from your side that wanted to add anything to this?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I believe the -- we were going to have a few words from the architect, to talk about some of these changes.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, will the representative from the Veterans Visitors Center come forward? Just identify yourself for the record.

MR. WONG: Sure, Thomas Wong with Polshek Partnership Architects. Thank you, Commissioners, for seeing our revised changes to the design, once again.

As you know, we've been working on

this for quite some time, and I know you'll believe me when I say that this has proven to be an incredibly complex design challenge. It's а very difficult problem, а technically challenged problem, by virtue of the fact that it's an underground, that we little, if any, visible want to see as typical buildings, such elements of elevator shafts, exit stairs, etcetera.

Difficult because of design guidelines. So, although they are very clear and we've tried our best to meet them, they are, in deed, something that are quite challenging to me.

On the other side of this design process, there is actually a whole other part of the design process, represented by many, many countless supporters of this center, not only the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, not only Veterans, family members, educators, etcetera, but many people who are interested in seeing an excellent experience, one that is

worthy of the context, which is to be embodied in this center.

Our job as the architects of this facility is to try and combine all those in a way that makes sense, in a way that the end result is not just a series of compliance's with guidelines, not just meeting the program, but considering all the pressures and all the needs of this building and synthesizing them into something that is very clear, that is worthwhile and is certainly appropriate for the stature of this building.

This is why through all our presentations, as well as through all our meetings with staff, we've been very clear about the intention and the ideas and the concepts behind all the moves. It is a very tightly knit facility. Every little move has been considered, with respect to all the criteria and we have created, we think, something that is actually an excellent experience.

Clearly, there are still concerns and I think we have recognized those concerns and are willing to work within the Executive Director's recommendations as we move forward. You will see changes to the design.

Specifically, we will eliminate the sky lights, all of them, on the center. We will eliminate the approach ramp from Constitution Avenue and we will do our absolute best to try and minimize the size of the court yard.

As you know, the court yard is doing a lot of work. It's not only providing us with many, many technical solutions to the underground building, it is providing a much needed emotion respite from a moving and probably very emotional experience. So, we will do our best to minimize this.

We appreciate staff's recognition that this is a difficult problem. We ask you to keep that in mind, as we move forward and we ask you -- also ask you to recognize that

this design must achieve a lot. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Any questions, Mr.

May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just wanted to add a little bit to what Mr. Wong has to say, which is that in the moves that have been made and the design effort so far, I think although they're relatively subtle in nature, have demonstrated, I think, a very significant improvement it the design, in meeting the design guidelines.

But I would also -- I reiterate the comment that the -- with regard to the complexity of this task and how much work has to go into meeting all of the design guidelines and how difficult it is to meet all those design guidelines to the letter, none the less, I think that, as I said, before we made significant progress, I think that the design team will continue to make progress.

I believe the Executive Director's report provides a roadmap that we can follow,

to bring this project to fruition. We see the path forward from here and we're eager to move ahead with that.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMES: Mr. Chairman, as everybody

on this Commission is very well aware, this

has been a long odious task.

I want to first of all, commend our staff. What a great report you made today. It gives a clear understanding of where everything is and from the other side, thank you for yours.

With that being said, Mr. Chairman, I would move that we --

CHAIR COGBILL: Before we do that, we do have a public.

COMMISSIONER AMES: Okay, I'll wait.

CHAIR COGBILL: I just wanted to make sure the applicant a chance to make a presentation. All right, thank you and we will have a public hearing on this. We have one person signed up to speak, representing an

organization, that's Dr. Judy Scott Feldman from the Coalition to Save Our Mall, and as she comes forward, I want to make sure that each of you know that you have at your place, two letters, one from the Equal Honor for All, signed by Mr. Ray Saikus, and then you have also, a letter from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, from their General Counsel and you have just been handed copies of Dr. Felman's remarks. Thank you very much for being with us.

DR. FELDMAN: Good afternoon, Chairman Cogbill and Commissioners. My name is Judy Scott Feldman. I'm the Chair of the National Coalition to Save Our Mall, a non-profit citizens group, dedicated to preservation and enhancement in the National Mall.

We commend the staff of the National Capital Planning Commission for a careful review in the Executive Director's recommendation of some of the complicated

issues around this project, which, as you are all aware, has been controversial from the beginning.

The EDR points out that the proposed design, even two years after -- after two years of revisions and changes, still does not meet the guidelines. In deed, the proposed design needs further significant changes, in order to meet those guidelines.

We concur with comments submitted by the National Trust, and we hope that you've read them, that the proposed design would create a major gash in the landscape of the Lincoln Memorial grounds, that the sloping ramps still mimic the wall itself and would detract from the power of the memorial.

We also agree with the National Trust in recommending that NCPC direct the Park Service to remove the existing food kiosk at this site, as it clearly is a major intrusion on the landscape and the views of the Lincoln Memorial.

Another topic not in the EDR that has come up several times during the Section 106 meetings, is how visitors will encounter the visitors center.

The National Park Service and the fund say that a majority the visitors will come by bus. The fact is, that when you get off a bus there, at the drop off for tour buses and tour mobile on Henry Bacon Drive, the first thing you will see is the descending ramps and walls of this visitors center.

It is not invisible. On the contrary, it's likely visitors will go there first, and after an extended visit, will forego a visit to the wall itself, a tragedy, all in all, for the wall, for the visitor and for the powerful symbolism of the mall, in which the wall plays an important part.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation also is correct in pointing out a disconnect in the NEPA and Section 106 review process, leading to decision making by Park

Service before the public consultation process has been completed. This is backwards and the opposite of the transparency and accountability that are the stated goals of the new administration.

This point is re-enforced by letters sent yesterday by the Federal Advisory Council on historic preservation to the National Park Service, and I hope you've all read those.

Moving forward by voting on the EDR recommendations without first having answers to these questions, can compromise the integrity of the public consultation process itself. It also postpones the real issue.

In our view, after more than two years of design development and revision, it is highly unlikely any design will be able to fully meet the design guidelines and avoid significant adverse impacts on the historic landscape and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial itself. The question is, what do to.

We believe this is an opportunity to step back and evaluate this project. We urge NCPC to report back to Congress, that the progress needs to be re-evaluated for three reasons, and we hope the Congressional representatives will heed our call.

Number one, Congress said that the visitor's center shall be located underground.

But the simple fact is that it is not fully underground.

Two, Congress said that, "The size of the visitor's center shall be limited to the minimum necessary." In 2007, the fund proposed a 34,000 square foot facility to tell about the memorial and the role. But new factors now at play raise questions about the interpretive need.

The American History Museum has not reopened with an exhibit, 'The Price of Freedom', that tells the story of the Vietnam War and in deed, all Wars, providing new depths of interpretation, only blocks away.

Minimum necessary now takes on new meaning. It's possible to reduce the program and the size and also, the cost.

Three, there is not urgency to provide any approvals at this time, nor probably any time in the near future. Cost estimate by the fund for the project is \$75 to \$100 million. According to a press release on the fund's website, as of December, they've raised \$18 million, not even a quarter of what's needed, now six years after the project was authorized in 2003.

Because Congress established time limits for projects under the Commemorative Works Act, and that time limit is close to approaching, this is the opportunity for NCPC to tell Congress about the intractable problems and the need for full re-evaluation.

In conclusion, there's good reason NCPC should not vote on the EDR recommendation at this time and instead, go back to Congress.

Conditions that led Congress to authorize the

visitor's center in the first place have changed substantially with the opening of the 'Price of Freedom' exhibit.

For a project as potentially destructive for Lincoln Memorial grounds and the most iconic memorial of the last half century as this one, it is incumbent on all of us to proceed with the upmost care, transparency and accountability. Thank you.

[INSERT - Dr. Feldman's written testimony follows:]

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you. All right, that concludes the list of people signed up to speak to this matter. I'll bring it back to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER AMES: Before you spoke, Dr. Feldman, I was ready to go ahead and make a motion and I am going to make a motion, but there are a couple of other things I'd like to say.

First of all, this has been the longest process of any project I've had since -- that this Commission has had since I've been on this Commission. It has been something that's been very hard to deal with from both sides. It's something that I think our staff has done an admirable job and I think that the staff of the architectural firm has done an admirable job of trying to please everybody that you possibly can.

We never started out to please everybody and we have not accomplished that today. I, one, was against this project to

begin with, not because of the significance of it. As I stated before, I lost friends in the Vietnam era. I've got friends that are permanently disabled from that era. I just didn't think that this was something that needed to be put where it is.

With that being said, we don't have a choice but to put it where it is and I think everybody involved in this, especially our staff, has made a concerted effort to do the absolute very best they could and they've done that.

I think the architects have still got some work to do and I think they will complete their work in time and with that, Mr. Chairman, although I was opposed to this project, I understand that this project is going to be there and with the work that's put in, I now move that we accept the Executive Director's recommendation presented today. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: The motion is made.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.

CHAIR COGBILL: Motion made and seconded. Back to the Commission for further discussion. Any comments?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Could the National Park Service address the -- or the staff address the recommendation from the National Trust Fund from Dr. Feldman, that the food kiosk be relocated to another nearby site, maybe?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I think the long term plan, mostly likely, will be that. That's something that's going to be addressed to some extent, in the national mall plan and what gets implemented as a result of the national mall plan.

We don't have an immediate plan to remove it and it would be a real problem for concessions, needed concessions operations, to commit right now to remove it by a date certain.

But I think in the long run, it's probably not going to be there.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: And can the -can you address or -- can you address the lack
of response to the guideline that called for
identification of --

PARTICIPANT: Can you talk in the microphone, please?

address the staff's comment that the Park Service has not responded to the requirement that a site be identified with in one half mile for relocation of the softball fields?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, in part, we haven't gotten there yet. We haven't addressed everything in turn. I'm going to ask Deputy Superintendent Steve Lorenzetti to come up and speak to that, because he has a good grasp on our various playing fields.

MR. LORENZETTI: Thank you, Peter. Steve Lorenzetti, Deputy Superintendent for the National Mall and Memorial Parks.

We have looked at this within half a mile. Obviously, everything within half a mile either has a ball field on it now or is forest. We're not looking to cut down any trees, so, we won't be doing that.

With the change in the design and the deletion of the sidewalk, we might be able to use the area we have there. It probably won't be a softball field, but it will be the type of field we're going to more and more now anyway, which is a multi-purpose field. That can be used for small pick-up games of soccer, kick ball, ultimately frisbee, etcetera.

We'll have to look at the plan without the sidewalks, to see if we can accommodate it at the site. That will be our first choice. If that doesn't work, we have been looking at seeing if we can possible rearrange fields in other areas, so we can shoehorn another field in at some other space.

But realistically, within half a mile, there is not a lot of land left. Thank

you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Other questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIR COGBILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: I have a thought that I wanted to explore with Commissioner May and staff. It occurred to me that one of the more difficult conditions we're suggesting is that the visitors center not be visible from Henry Bacon Drive and it occurs to me that what — the fact that it's visible from Henry Bacon Drive would not be so important if there were no bus drop off's on Henry Bacon Drive.

I agree with Dr. Feldman, that it is of paramount importance that anyone coming to visit this site go to the wall first and the fact that tour buses would be stopping on the opposite side of Henry Bacon Drive, immediately in front of the entrance to the visitors center, means that there will be a

compelling momentum on the part of people exiting the buses, to go in the visitors center first and go to the wall afterwards.

If, on the other hand, the buses were to drop off on Constitution Avenue, if you turn to page 22 of our report, there is an entrance to the wall on Constitution Avenue, to the east of Henry Bacon Drive, opposite, I suppose, 24th Street, and if the buses were to drop people off there, then the visitors would be quite likely to go through the wall first and then choose, if they wished and had time, to go to the visitors center.

So, perhaps, we could make it easier on the applicant, for one of the most difficult design considerations we're trying to impose on them, by having the Park Service agree, that it would prohibit tour buses from dropping off people on Henry Bacon Drive.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't think that's something that we can agree to right at this moment. I think that we want --

certainly, we don't want to have the experience that Dr. Feldman described, where people come to this center first and then go to the wall, that we want to the wall -- the experience of the wall itself to be the first experience, and whatever means that we could use to encourage that, I think we would want to explore it. I just can't say right now that, you know, absolutely, it doesn't -- you know, that we would eliminate bus drop off on Henry Bacon Drive because there may be other very practical reasons why that's necessary.

Maybe it needs to be relocated or we need to take other measures to make sure that people flow through -- get the right experience in the right order. But it's hard for me to say right now, you know, that's going to go away.

I would also clarify that the visibility issue has to do with visibility from the sidewalk, not from Henry Bacon Drive.

The views to be preserved don't talk

specifically about the view from Henry Bacon Drive. It is an axial view along Henry Bacon Drive that is specific in the design quidelines.

I think the design guidelines we're running up against there is the visibility from the sidewalk and that is still a problem and there's still a complication with then, that we're trying to address, the entirety of the design guidelines, and that's what I alluded to before, where it's very difficult to meet every single one of them, to the absolute letter.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Well, would it be useful if the Commission were willing to entertain some kind of an amendment to the EDR, that would suggest, as an alternative way of complying with the spirit of that specific design guideline, that the tour bus drop off point be moved to Constitution Avenue?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think I'd like to ask Steve Lorenzetti to speak again on the

subject, because he knows very well, the in's and out's of the bus drop off and visitation.

MR. LORENZETTI: Thank you. Remember, the drop off was originally designed for both the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the Lincoln Memorial. Almost 60 percent of our visitors come by bus, one way or the other.

A lot of that bus traffic is some of our older visitors. They're looking to be dropped off as close as possible, and it's not just going to the memorial or the proposed center. They are going to the Lincoln Memorial or they're going to the Korean War Veterans Memorial.

So, having this closer drop off really suits that purpose very well so far. As you know, we've only built that in the last three or four years and it's worked very well. The load we get from tour buses has increased. It used to all be placed on French Drive, on the south side of Lincoln.

This has served its purpose. It has

relieved the traffic there. It has made it a more friendly atmosphere for our visitors on the south side of Lincoln, and it has worked very well to get visitors to Lincoln.

So, while I understand your concern about going right into the center, it doesn't serve just that.

Also, we feel our visitors get a very good experience going to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial from the Lincoln Circle. You pass the kiosk. If you have any questions, you're able to pass the Memory Plaque, as well as the Servicemen Statue. Certainly, you can access the memorial either way, but the way that we tend to give tours ourselves, is from the entrance from Lincoln Circle.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: If I could just add one comment, as someone who loves the wall. I always approach it from the earliest date and proceed accordingly along the wall, because it shows us getting deeper and deeper

into the War, and gradually phasing out.

MR. LORENZETTI: And I would agree with you, there's no wrong way, what so ever. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR COGBILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: I just wanted to address Commissioner McGill's point, not that I wouldn't be delighted to entirely re-arrange the flow of traffic throughout the city, including on one of our major east/west corridors, in order to accommodate a design flaw in this proposal.

I would suggest that since we have lost a lot of east/west mobility in the city, with the closure of E Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Constitution has experienced a lot of additional traffic and I certainly wouldn't want to lightly suggest that the peak day visitation of 1,500 tour buses a day in the summer be re-routed to stop on Constitution

Avenue and let people on and out, without further study, particularly by the District Department of Transportation.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: And I'll assure you that I'm aware of that and what I think in terms of was that I would assume the earliest visitors come around 10:00 a.m., buses would be parked on the south side of Constitution Avenue, after the morning rush hour is over and it would not interfere with the evening rush hour. That's what I was thinking.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: I would just suggest that we not -- that we allow the District Department of Transportation to take a look at this, is really going to be a serious consideration and you know, I have concerns, just on its face, just because of how high the traffic volumes already are on Constitution.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Certainly, if we were to look at any sort of relocation that

might impact traffic, we would be -- we would consult with the Department of Transportation.

CHAIR COGBILL: Any other questions?
Mr. Hart?

COMMISSIONER HART: This is more of a comment. I want to say that at the May presentation, I expressed some serious reservations about the sky lights and the sidewalk that the architect and applicants have not removed, and I want to, you know, express my gratitude for the good listening that they must have been doing during those comments. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Mr. Dixon?

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Mr. Chairman, first, I think, all know that I'm sort of against more on the mall being the War, but that's passed us now, as has been said. Congress has sort of made this a must.

I have two questions though. One, the -- we have the plans now, the plans of the internal operations of the structure. I'm

wondering whether someone can share with me, what the percentage of sales is. Is it more like -- is it going to be more educational, which I think it was intended to be, or is it going to be a higher volume of space used for sales as a gift shop kind of an operation, and maybe that -- can someone speak to that?

MR. WONG: There is, as you saw in the floor plans, a small book store that's really a very small percentage of the overall square footage.

The entire square footage, obviously, there's a lot of material and resources on the Vietnam War, on the Vietnam War Memorial, and I believe a portion, a small fraction of those materials, are meant to be for sale in that book store.

Again, the primary and the essential mission of the center is for education.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Is there going to be any kind of solicitation, in terms of

participation or will that just be done through the literature that's offered, as far as you know?

MR. WONG: No solicitation, no.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Okay. Last question. I know when we had another underground structure at the monument, which was stopped because of funding, at least that was the last answer we got, even though the Commission had --

But we had concern about the underground problem of security, the fact that an underground structure has a capacity to build up to impact on, you know, some kind of explosive or something we're taking in there, and I wondered whether there's any -- I know -- is there any security?

I didn't see any metal detectors. I know space is at a premium, but something to deal with that, because it was a major -- I mean, we went through days of -- well, certainly, meetings of discussion, about the

possibility of an underground building at the monument, Washington Monument, and this is a smaller structure, I know, but has that been looked at and spoken to?

MR. WONG: We have had several preliminary meetings with the U.S. park police, to talk about security, specifically. It is their opinion and their assessment that this is not a high threat target.

My suspicion is, for the monument visitor center, since it was directly adjacent to the monument, that may have been different, a different scenario.

Their opinion is that perimeter security elements are not necessary assure that no one attacks or tries to drive into the center, despite the fact that it's underground.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Okay.

MR. LORENZETTI: And if I could address the concession issue just a little clearer. Like has already been pointed out,

we have a facility above ground already. The way the Park Service works in this area is we have two groups. We have a main concessioner that sells items, such as food, water, camera equipment, key fobs, that sort of thing, your basic tourist items, and then we have a cooperating agency that sells a little more of the educational material, and the cooperating agency is what we're exploring right now, to be inside of the building. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: I intend to support that Executive Director's recommendation, but I wanted to make a few comments about that first. First, as to the drop off, and I share the same concerns you do, Ms. Tregoning, about the traffic on Constitution and the impact on the east/west traffic, and I think that -- and going to your point, Mike, approach the memorial the same way you do. I start at the earliest and go through, and to me, where the bus drop off point is located now, facilitates that better.

So, while I do think it's something that needs to be looked at, I think any idea, good idea needs to be considered and I think this should be considered. I would not be in support of amending the EDR for that.

The comment was made about this being underground and actually, Mr. Saikus' letter speaks to that and talks about this being similar to what the Viet Cong did in Vietnam and I don't think that we want to hide this building completely, because I don't think that's what any of the Veterans would want, to have this -- something turned into something that would be reflective of what was done in a War, that this is really a visitors centers, to inform.

And so, I think that we have to make some accommodation and I think the designers for this have done an excellent in responding to the comments we've had an to the design guidelines, and I appreciate that.

Dr. Feldman talks about stepping

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

back and that's something that I don't think we can do, certainly, I would not support, because the Congress has told us that this site will go -- or this facility will go here.

It has given us some basic guidelines and until they change their instructions to us or change the law, then we are obligated to pursue that and I intend to do that.

With respect to the internal space,

I don't have as much concern about that. I

will say, Arrington, like you, one thing that

has gone from this project is the ability to

do some research and that was one of the

things that I thought was really important

about this, was for people to come and learn

about this the War.

I had, early on in my tenure here, had looked at the National Military Museum as a virtual museum where people could go and connect to all the different Military museums around the world, to learn about this, and I think that research and the ability for people

to come and learn about friends, family and I know that this is still part of the mission, but certainly, I think that ability to provide opportunities for people to do research and learn is important and again, to that, while I would think that's important, I am reluctant, as a Commission member, to go that, because our jurisdiction really lies to what the outside of building, the physical the structure and not with the exhibit space that goes inside and that carries back to some of discussions we the had on the portrait gallery, and what constituted interior and exterior space.

I appreciate the work that's gone into this by the staff. You have done a very thorough job. I think we are moving in the right direction and I believe the applicant, the Park Service, the memorial fund, are listening to us and carefully trying to comply with that and I think we are on the right track and I appreciate, Mr. Lorenzetti, your

comments and the difficulty you have with respect to these balls fields and how that might play into it, and I like the idea of the multi-purpose fields here, and I think removing that sidewalk and removing those sky lights has made that a lot easier for us to accept and to make this work.

By and large, I think we're on the right track. I'm very appreciative, again, what everyone has done, the thoughtful Commissioner's comments, the work of the staff, the work of the architects, the work of the memorial fund staff themselves. This is a project which I think is moving forward in a positive way, and I am prepared to support that, as I said earlier.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIR COGBILL: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: I'd like to ask, because it's always a good word, but I wanted to pick up one point you made about research.

A long time ago, I got involved in this project, not as a member of the Commission, but trying to get a replacement of the books that we used to look up where your colleagues, friends and others were located on the wall, and I think there was some technical difficulty.

They may have changed that now, I don't know. But I know there were paper books that people had to finger through on the glass, and maybe that -- one thing that would get people into the visitors center, this educational center, would be to maybe make something available online, that way, maybe they could search quicker and find things faster.

I thought that was kind of -- three or four books there, that may have changed. I know this could be done easily with computer technology and maybe this would be a minimum research kind of a 'find your friend', kind of a opportunity right there, which could be very

simple and part of a display. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: I'll add one other final comment, just to again, to thank the Park Service for working to keep the public process open, to move forward with NEPA. We realize that that's not completed at this point, in terms of the 106, and we encourage you to do that and we think you're on the right track with that.

Again, that's such an important part of this whole process and I appreciate the work that you continue to do on that.

If there's no further discussion, all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIR COGBILL: Opposed?

Abstentions? The motion carries. Thank you,
all.

# NATIONAL MALL/EAST POTOMAC PARK

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, we'll move forward at this time, as soon as I can

find my agenda, to item 4B. This is the National Mall and East Potomac Park, Washington, D.C. Wayfinding and Sign Program, pedestrian guide pylons and map kiosk.

MS. WITHERELL: Too many words.

CHAIR COGBILL: Yes, Ms. Witherell.

MS. WITHERELL: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. The National Park Service has returned for your review of a second component of their proposed program for the National Mall. These are the for wayfinding designed for signs and orientation, and are the signs that join with the Smithsonian's wayfinding signs, which we is the blue DDOT signs, and which complement the orientation maps of both the Smithsonian and the architect of the Capital.

Park Service has requested preliminary review of site development plans today and they have informed us that they would like to submit for a final review next month. So, likely, you'll see this at the

July meeting, again.

This is the project location. The sign program will be implemented and the area managed by the National Park Service, which is shown here and although I'm not including of the East Potomac Park, but that is also part of the area.

You'll recall that last month, you reviewed and approved Park Service operational and regulation signs, some examples of which are illustrated here, information about how to get -- hear a ranger talk by cell phone, information about hours for book stores and so This is sort of the back-bone of the forth. Park Services new regulatory sign system, which is a four and a half foot pylon and you actually saw a mock-up of that today at the Lincoln at that height, although today, we're going to be talking about pylons and heights. But this is meant to remove a lot of the clutter of the regulatory signs that you see, particularly around memorials.

This is the proposal, or part of the proposal, that I'll introduce today, the pedestrian guide wayfinding pylons. Again, these are intended for pedestrians, places where pedestrians walk. They're in path intersections or where a path intersects with a street and Park Service is proposing to heights, nine feet, two inches, the taller pylon, and five feet for the shorter pylon.

The is the other half component you're seeing today and these are the orientation signs. That's map kiosk at two heights, a taller map that has more -- has more information than the shorter map does. It's a little under eight feet tall, and a -what's known as a way-side, which is the shorter sign and it's slanted, like a table top, but slanted, adjacent to a path, and then this is a proposed one time installation of large signs in the area where many people come once from the escalator from up at Smithsonian metro station in the mall.

Both of these -- the wayfinding is not a -- the way side is not a two sided sign, but the vertical signs and are have information on the back about how to plan your provides destination, visit. Ιt amenity service information about many places on the mall, as well as off the mall.

This is the current situation and I show this not to show necessarily clutter, but just to show the range of signs and what this new system will replace, and so, these are examples of current signs on the mall.

On the right is the current map kiosk, which has been in place since -- not with that insert, but that form since the bicentennial and on the left, you'll see the way the -- directions to various memorials are shown now and information about food and drinks. This will also -- these will be on the new pylons.

Park Services, it's important to note that Park Services proposed sign program

will create overall wayfinding for the first time in the mall.

Currently, there is no unified wayfinding system on the mall, either as a system of coordinated content or as a visually coherent design, so that visitors can become familiar with what to look for and then to find it, when they're looking for it.

The Park Services system is designed to work for the entire mall and furthermore, will work in concert with the District's wayfinding system, to provide direction to all the mall destinations.

The District's system is the blue DDOT sign, which for years, I've always called the bid sign, which I understand now, we should refer to it as the DDOT sign and that's in use adjacent -- in adjacent areas on the mall and of course, farther around the city and it's also on the north/south streets that cross the mall, so, visitors who are first-time visitors to the mall perhaps, or even to

the city, will be begin to recognize those signs on streets and can follow them, north and south of the mall.

This is the chart you saw last month. I'm showing it again, so you can recall the overall program, which includes three basic categories of signs.

Last month, you approved removal and replacement of operational signs and today's submission considers wayfinding, which includes both the pylons and the maps, and so, 102 wayfinding signs, directional signs. As I said, there's no overall unified wayfinding system now, but signs that have directions to various destinations would be removed and 113 signs, pylons and maps combined, would be installed and I believe 34 is the number of proposed maps out of the total.

This number is still provisional, because as of our discussion last month, there will be further review of this in the field, to make sure that the number of signs and the

placement is appropriate and they has specifically asked to be consulted further on that, and we do as well, and CFA staff will also be involved at a minimum.

This is the overall strategy for placement of wayfinding and orientation signs. The pylons and maps are intended again, as I mentioned, for use at pedestrian path intersections or where paths meet street, primarily near the edges, which is -- which the Park Service considers to be undersigned or not at all signed currently.

The Park Service also hopes, I'll just add this parenthetically, that this will encourage visitors to enter the park from more locations to -- you know, to see the park, see the mall as more porous and to use many ways to enter the park, and this is a goal of the National Mall plan as well, which is currently in development.

This is the proposed plan for much of the site. Again, I've -- cutting off East

Potomac Park on this particular screen. I'm showing it at this scale, which is of course, not legible for any discussion, but just to illustrate the general distributions of pylons and maps and for example, the -- along Madison and Jefferson, the pylons on shown on the outer edges of the elm panels and then, you see a more complicated configuration and the more intimate and leafy portions of West Potomac Park, and down around the title basin, and then again, just not to leave off East Potomac Park.

Now, we'll go into a little more detail about some of the areas. I haven't shown all of the -- I'm not planning to show all of the areas in detail, although I have them in the back of the PowerPoint, if you want to see something in particular.

For color coding here, I'm just referring to the purple as dark red, to make this a little easier. But we have dark and bright shades of red for the pylon, tall and

short, and then dark and light blue for the two types of map signs, and again, there is one green dot on the map and that's for the large map, as proposed for the Smithsonian exits.

So, for example, and I'll just -Commissioners know that a site visit was
scheduled this morning and many of you were
able to come and this was one of the pylons
that you look at, as the mock-up and here was
the shorter one that you looked at.

So, this is the area around Lincoln, of course, going through Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and pylons are shown at decision point along the paths. The shorter pylons are for lesser intersections. Some would be used as C- you would enter the park from Constitution Avenue. The light blue again is the wayside, the shorter of the two maps, used in conjunction with a pylon at this location.

Then again, here is the Washington

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Monument grounds and the taller pylons used around the edges, the trees here, because a lot of people are entering the mall in this area. So, here are the maps.

Park Service is proposing the shorter, the five foot pylon at these decision points for the paths. Some of this, you know, it's hard to tell on paper, exactly what this will look like at the site, and so, we do expect to be consulting further and in fact, the SHPO, and its March letter, which by the way, found no adverse effect for the mall, one of the conditions, however, was to be able to review pylon locations, especially around memorials and Washington Monument grounds was the one site mentioned specifically.

Then to show what the installation would look like near the mall panels, you'll see again, there's the metro station.

Sometimes, the pylons are used alone. Sometimes, they're used in relation with the waysides. I will mention that the

facade of natural history, which this is, is 1,000 feet long. So, this gives you a sense. They're actually spaced out like that.

Again, this is the second location that you looked at this morning with a pylon on either side of 4th Street. This is the American Indian Museum and a wayside.

Actually, this was a -- I'm glad the Park Service selected this location to show you because you also saw two of the DDOT blue wayfinding signs there. So, a visitor for the first time would be able to coordinate with the other system, or would be able to understand the other system and follow it as well, and we also note that the pylons contain information on off-the-mall sites, many of which are keyed directly to locations that are on the blue DDOT signs, and Commissioners who took the site visit were also able to see how these signs were used in relation to some of the Smithsonian signs, which are used for identification, which do provide not

wayfinding.

These are the site conditions that led the Park Service and their design consultant to realize that wayfinding was needed, because of the beautiful lush conditions of the mall, particularly during the summer season, when more tourists come.

It is hard to see some of the signs, but also, it led to the decision to use the pylon, rather than say a sign, such as this. There are decision points, sometimes that need some clarity and in fact, some people — it's very possible that first-time visitors might be coming to see World War II memorial, for example, and be pretty close to it and not realize that they're near it or that that's the direction in which they should walk.

So, again, the proposal today includes the pylon in two heights. The -- it always starts with an arrow, in the top direction, so that it's in the direction in

which the visitor is walking. There are a total of four tiles, including pictograms or icons for major destinations and some additional text.

Below, is a granite base, again, used on four sides. The tiles can be switched in and out because of change in conditions, either new -- we're getting a new memorial and a new museum in the mall that we're aware of, and this indicates sort of destinations that are identified also with pictograms and then in this -- in the green, you notice that visitor services are also included, including refreshments in the mall and restrooms and information.

So, again, the content would be different on four sides, because it would be what you have ahead of you and the closest destination is at the top. So, it's a consistent system that visitors should become familiar with fairly quickly, as they walk around the mall, so they can begin to

intuitively use it and know when they're approaching specific destinations or feel assurance that they are continuing to move in the right direction.

The base, again, is granite and we've -- all the parties seem to agree that a simplified base would be better. So, it will look like a straight pylon.

The heights of the pictograms and the text are shown here from five, 10 and 15 feet away. So, it shows a comfortable, visual range and the pylon at nine feet, two inches is slightly shorter than the blue DDOT sign.

Originally, the pylon, when you saw it several months ago in information presentations, it was at 10 feet and it's been adjusted slightly to nine feet, two inches, as a result of conversations with various parties, specifically, the -- more specifically, the CFA staff, or CFA Commission itself.

Here is the taller pylon, there is

it. Here is a taller pylon, shown in relation to other park furnishings along the paths and staff finds it very compatible with the trees, tree trunk and in both form and height.

earlier mock-up and at this point, the pylon was still 10 feet. So, it's slightly shorter now, but this is a general range and this is shown in a range of locations. This is in the area where the museums are and here we are, at the top of the approach-way for Lincoln and then, this is at 23rd and Independence, and I'll just show that a little bit larger. This is the first site that you went to this morning and again, this pylon is slightly taller than the one you saw this morning.

From the inception of the Park Services planning, the importance of coordinating mall sign program with other sign programs has been of great importance. In deed, wayfinding can only succeed in that context.

NPS has been working with other interests, both on and around the mall, to ensure that the layers of information are provided to visitors and that visitors to the mall are sort of handed over to other areas and to the city wayfinding system in particular.

Park Services worked with Smithsonian and is continuing to work now in a very intense way, with the D.C. Office of Planning and with many partners, which include the BIDS, the D.C. Visitors Center and others, to develop both the content and the relative locations for both pylons and the maps.

Again, the Park Service is the agency that's providing the wayfinding for the first time through the entire mall, in concert with the District's wayfinding program, so that visitors will receive seamless information as they move around the city, off and on the mall.

It's important for wayfinding

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

programs to ensure that visitors feel confident, that they'll be directed from sign to sign and not be inexplicably dropped from some reason, before they reach their destination. So, that's why this coordination was so important.

So, these photos here just remind you again of the DDOT blue signs. This is one of the Smithsonian signs, which has a map for the part of the mall that contains their museums and has information about the names of the museums, the hours and so forth.

So, the Smithsonian's signs, in addition to their building identification signs, they have signs that provide some orientation and information, not overall wayfinding, and the Capital Complex has put up a map and in fact, this is a fairly clear image there, that highlights their buildings, including the House and Senate buildings and the libraries.

So, the group consulting on sign

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

content is reviewing sheets that look sort of like this. We had a meeting earlier this week and this was presented for discussion and this will -- we're learning a lot about how the pylons and maps work together and how the content will be coordinated.

So, for example, these fours sides, which -- and already, the content is changing as of the meeting this week, but it's at this location. So, if you're at 7th and Madison, the south face would be primarily providing information off the mall. If you're standing over here, then you're receiving information about how to move in this direction. If you're standing on the east side, you're receiving information about how to move west and if you're standing in the north, you're receiving information about how to move south.

So, moving on from pylons to maps, again, the maps are shown here. They show the entire mall and much of -- certainly, the monumental core and central city around the

mall. Lots of information about various destinations, including non-Park Service destinations on the mall, destinations of various types off the mall. There's some regulatory information and phone numbers, websites, certainly, the park police.

The maps are shown on two -- on two sides and again, on the back side is -- there it is, a closer range, there's the mall, there's the map, and then on the back side, there is a 'plan your visit' sheet, which provides a great deal of information about how to contact and visit various destinations that are important in Washington.

The staff's analysis included three primary issues, design issues, comprehensive plan and the master plan. Under design, the Commission of Fine Arts had earlier expressed quite a few concerns about the pylon and that their meeting last month after a site visit, they withdrew their earlier objections to the tall pylon and gave revised concept approval,

basically to the entire plan, with delegation upon a review to the staff, with one exception, and that is the colors of the pictogram tiles.

They were looking at it primarily from an esthetic issue, although they understand that sorting is important. I think the Park Service will return to see if they do — to discuss that issue in greater detail in a few weeks, and so, we'll have some benefit from that discussion as well, and we're participating in that.

Commission staff had raised various issues throughout our review, which -- our staff review, which started in January. We had reviews -- we had concerns about the form, again, we had comments on the maps, the content of the map, as well as the pylons and what you're seeing today is general resolution of most of the issues that we have.

There's still a couple of outstanding issues, content being one, and

Commissioners raised several issues this morning, in particular, suggesting that smaller pylon -- the shorter pylon might be a bit larger. The font was hard to read, and also, that the wayside map, have the map at a scale that was more easier to read than it is, a larger one.

Actually, I would appreciate hearing any further comments or discussions to that point, and we'll carry this forward as we work with the Park Service.

Comprehensive plan, the proposed project is not inconsistent with the preservation and historic features element of the comprehensive plan, since it will improve efficiency and visitor experience, as well as the appearance and image of the National Mall and the monumental core.

A comprehensive wayfinding and sign program, to improve the appearance of and visitor experience on the National Mall is included in all alternatives for the National

Mall plan currently in development.

For conformance, both NPS and NCPC reviewed this project as categorically excluded and under the National Historical Preservation Act, the DC SHPO did determine no adverse effect for the implementation of the entire program, with the condition that the Park Service continue to consult with the DC SHPO staff in the citing of signs, especially near major memorials.

Park Service concurs with that determination with the same condition and review and consultation of some components of the sign program is continuing, as you know.

Therefore, the Executive Director's recommendation is to approve preliminary site development plans for the installation of pedestrian guide wayfinding pylons in two heights and of map kiosk in two heights, as a coordinated system of providing information to visitors to the National Mall and East Potomac Park and to the monumental core and adjacent

areas.

recommend that in the We preparation of final site development plans, taller pylon form be simplified by the eliminating the base and fabricating it at a proposed revised height of nine feet, two inches, which Park Service agrees with and we also note that the National Park Service is consulting with the District of Columbia and others on the content of pedestrian guide wayfinding pylons and the maps, to provide coordinated information to visitors, finally, that the Commission has previously approved the installation of operations signs the National Mall and that monument identification signs have not yet been submitted.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer questions.

[INSERT - National Mall and East Potomac Park]

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you very much.

Are there any questions for staff at this time. Ms. Tregoning?

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: No, not questions for staff, more discussion.

CHAIR COGBILL: Okay, all right, then this is a public hearing. We do have two individuals who have signed up to speak to this matter, both representing organizations. So, we'll have five minutes.

[INSERT - List of public speakers follows:]

The clock in on the wall and we'll count down from five minutes to zero, and I also note that each Commissioner has at their place, the latest findings of the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts. It's a letter to Ms. O'Dell, dated May 29, 2009, from Mr. Luebke.

With that, I'll move forward and call our first speaker, Dr. Judy Scott Feldman, representing the coalition to save our mall.

DR. FELDMAN: Hello, Judy Scott Feldman, Chair of the National Coalition to Save our Mall. Our concern, obviously, is with the National Mall as a whole, this grand space, this nationally important place, which seems to be missing from the signage program.

I think we can all agree that the notion of unifying and creating new kinds of signage program is absolutely needed, long needed, but I think that the staff is not correct, in saying that we now have, for the first time, a comprehensive signage program

for the National Mall.

Just looking at the signs proposed,

I think the wayfinding program gets away from
the problem of jurisdiction and identifies by
destination, different areas on and off the
mall and I think that's a very, very useful
thing.

But if you look where they're located, they're going to be located only on Park Service land. Why, for instance, aren't they on Independence and Constitution? Why do we have Smithsonian signs there? Why aren't they up at the Architect of the Capitol's area, which is part of the historic national mall? Why not at the White House, which is part of the historic national mall?

This NCPC is the Federal planning authority for the Federal Government and for the public interest. This is an opportunity. Sure, we need signs. Sure, the Smithsonian wants to put signs and the Park Service wants to put up signs, but ultimately, we want to

say here, that the National Mall and everyone now is clear about this, is not a national park.

The National Mall has never been fully identified, either by Congress or an executive order and I think most of the agencies we're dealing with now have agreed that a national historic landmark nomination mall is needed, so that for the identify it, not simply as a collection of jurisdiction, but as a unified place routed in the L'Enfant concept and the McMillan plan, that includes multiple jurisdictions and has an authority and a value much higher than the Service or the Smithsonian or the Architect of the Capitol.

So, what we would like to say, coordination, I think is wonderful. I think that the whole point that the D.C. -- the District and the BID and the city are coordinating is a wonderful idea. But what we're asking here then would be, let's go the

next step.

This program, which is going to cost millions of dollars of public funding, as well as private funding raised be the trust for the national mall, is going to promulgate or is to continue in this limited jurisdictional approach to the national mall and we believe we need to go the next step.

So, what we're suggesting is that - and this was pointed out to me by George
Oberlander, who worked here for many years,
that this is a problem the national mall, as a
unified whole, the signage for the national
mall is an old program. It goes back at least
to the 1970's, until the -- most of you, of
course, will not know that, it goes back to
the 1970's and it's never been solved.

Now, the National Capital Planning Commission does have authority to do some things and we believe this could be a very productive thing for NCPC to do, that is, to establish a means by which we can create a

hierarchy of unified signage for the national mall with uniform form, shape, color, font and so on and the hierarchy would place at the highest level, the words "The National Mall", and underneath that, sure, we could have Park Service signs, Smithsonian signs, Architect of the Capitol, but the National Mall is missing, it's missing and no one is proposing a National Mall signage program.

So, we urge you take this opportunity to confront the problem and come up with, by pulling all the agencies together, a program that creates a hierarchy in which the National Mall, the people's place is priority, the jurisdictional boundaries and authorities are there, but they are subsidiary to the National -- to the larger and we would say that if the NCPC feels that it cannot do this or doesn't have the authority to do this, that they ask Congress or the President to tell the agencies to sit together and work with historians and others to come up with

that program.

I'm baffled when NCPC says it has only to do with what Congress tells it to do. I think, from my experience in Congress and in talking with members, they want you also to advise them when you realize that there are issues and problems that maybe are beyond your authority and we hope that NCPC will take the opportunity to tell Congress and the President, that this is something preeminent importance to the entire nation and should address it now, before we forward spending millions of dollars forever, mark -- or at least for the next several years, mark the mall as a collection of agency jurisdictions. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you.

DR. FELDMAN: Any questions?

CHAIR COGBILL: Any questions?

Thank you very much. All right, next, we have

Mr. Richard T. Reinhard from the Downtown

Business Improvement District.

MR. REINHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Rick Reinhard with the Downtown D.C. BID. The Downtown Business Improvement District is pleased to enthusiastically support the National Park Services wayfinding and sign program for the National Mall and East Potomac Park.

Almost a decade ago, the Downtown BID was before this body, to get feedback and ultimately, to get approval for a downtown wayfinding signage program of the DDOT signage, that have been carefully designed by the Downtown BID, DDOT, the D.C. Office of Planning and other stake holders and consultants.

Since that time, DDOT has installed these signs, not just downtown, but at key locations throughout the city.

While we need to be more vigilant about keeping the signs up to date and in deed, they've been around -- the oldest ones have been around for eight years, so, it may

be time to take a look at tuning the system up, the wayfinding signage has been a tremendous asset, to Downtown and to the city.

In general, the Downtown BID can be pretty skeptical about signage. We don't like clutter. Our safety and maintenance staff, the Downtown SAMs, each year, remove or cause to be removed, literally thousands of unnecessary -- or illegal temporary signs from the Downtown BID area.

We don't want to look like Las
Vegas or Time Square, nor even like Fairfax
nor Montgomery County. We like elegance and
simplicity and we like our built-in natural
environments to speak for themselves, when
ever possible, without signs.

But our signage has proved important for four reasons, to go through them. First, customer service. Visitors expect to be informed and guided and educated. Second, civic engagement. Citizens can discover new sites of interest and learn new

things about old sites through wayfinding signs. Third, the environment. Wayfinding makes public transit much more accessible and walking more enjoyable, and fourth, one I should probably pay a little bit more attention to, public health. More walking means more fitness and more public health.

NPS should be commended for teaming with a nationally respected consultant to design the wayfinding and sign program system and for including our organization, the Smithsonian, the Trust for the National Mall, the Office of Planning and others, in planning and troubleshooting on the signage, and we expect those meetings to continue.

For too long, the National Mall and the rest of the city have been disconnected. This wayfinding program has been purposely designed to compliment DDOT's D.C. wayfinding signage, just as the appropriate city wayfinding signs direct people to the mall, the appropriate National Park Service,

National Mall wayfinding signs will direct visitors into the city.

Just as the Downtown BID uses maps and websites and our SAMs, as a total public information system, the Park Service will be able to use its maps and websites and park rangers.

We believe that the various colors on the NPS used -- and if they're used consistently, not just on the signs, but on the signs, on maps, on websites, and the rangers understand the different meanings of the different colors, will be a real assess of the Park Services' wayfinding system.

The BID is a non-profit special tax funded organization that works to improve one square mile downtown. We value the Park Service and NCPC as great partners in improving the city's core. I'd be glad to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you. Are there any questions? We appreciate you being

with us. All right, brings back to the Commission, Mr. May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, just to start off, I wanted to clarify something in response to what Dr. Feldman had to say, which was with regard to the park -- the National Mall not being a national park, there is a subtlety in the designation that maybe is not apparent to all.

But all of the park lands, within national park lands the City Washington are national parks. It's national park land. There is a process by which things become officially designated units and many of the specific memorials and portions of what we call the mall are designated in that way, and that the -- I think what's not been done is has drawn that there -- no one specifically around the mall in a particular configuration and said, you know, this is the National Park, that is, the mall.

But there's no doubt that it's

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

national park land. It's not doubt that it contains national park units, officially designated, and I just wanted to make that absolutely clear.

CHAIR COGBILL: Other comments?

Before we begin the discussion, I'd like to at least have a motion on the floor. Anyone interested in doing it? Mr. McGill, no?

All right, motion by Mr. McGill, second by Mr. Dixon. Motion is on the floor, properly seconded. Discussion? Ms. Tregoning?

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to start out by commending the National Park Service for their effort to develop this much improved wayfinding program and particularly, to thank them for their cooperation and interest in coordinating with the city, and with the folks like the Business Downtown Improvement District and some of our other bids, to really make the whole of the city more legible to the

many visitors that come to the Park Service and I hope that cooperation will continue and that we'll continue to make good progress on including city and other non-Park Service destinations in the signage.

Along those lines, I would just also like to echo what the -- some previous comments and strongly suggest that we try to be consistent in use of colors, not just in signage, but in maps.

I realize that we're adopting a lot of very sensible conventions with the wayfinding, that the icon closest to the viewer is the monument or the destination closest to you and in physical proximity, and I think some of these other -- they don't have to be spelled out, there doesn't have to be a key, but I think if you start to see things in similar colors, you'll start to get that there's kind of a method to all of this.

I realize that there issues about ownership, but I do think that many people

looking to visit the mall or looking destinations begin looking before they actually set foot on the mall. They're coming from hotels. They're coming from transit. They're coming from all kinds of places and that Constitution and Independence Avenue in particular might be places where as part of our cooperative effort, we could work to locate Park Service signs, of the kind that you're talking about, that might also provide that wayfinding, before of people some actually step onto the mall, and that's something I'd love to start to explore.

The other issue related to our cooperation, and I did raise this in our walk with Mr. Lorenzetti, and I realize it's not an easily accomplished thing, but we do make mention of metro, that in every park, that I'm aware of, national park, the Park Service is very encouraging of sustainable means of transportation and that to the extent we now have dedicated Circulator service premium

transit service that is publically provided, that serves the National Mall, that I'd really like to strongly encourage we do whatever we can to include in the signage, the Circulator routes and destinations, that -- so that people can also know they have that way to get around that's very local, really designed to serve people who are older and tired, you know, who want to be able to see the sights in the mall, but don't necessarily want to -- or are able to walk.

Two other comments. When we went to look at the field trip today, it was apparent to me, you know, who did not have my glasses on at the time, as I often do not when I'm out of doors, that the smaller pylon wasn't big enough and that the size of the type on the pylon wasn't big enough.

So, I think it's a four and a half foot pylon now. I would say 10 to 20 percent increase in size is appropriate and the same with the type. Similar comment on the minor

map kiosk, the wayside minor map. I think you could go up 10 or 20 percent. I realize it's already a larger map, but this is a density and destinations on the mall that's really quite intense and the size of the type and how cluttered the map is really makes it difficult and what is the purpose of the map?

You know, the main purpose of that thing is to help people get from where they currently are to where they want to go and if you can't read those destinations, then why even have it? So, those are my comments.

CHAIR COGBILL: I had one comment. You'd asked Ms. Witherell about other things to be considered. One was to re-orient that time travel circle and make sure that we --where we show that distance from where the person is located, as opposed to trying to focus specifically on what -- the central point being the Washington Monument.

I just had -- I had a couple of other minor comments. Just to respond, I do

think that -- and Dr. Feldman probably hadn't seen this in the detail that we have. One of the maps actually does talk about the National Mall. That's the largest printed on the face of the map.

So, the concern that she had about that, I think, is addressed and certainly, I think one of the things that I heard from the BID, which I think is really important is the word 'complimenting each other' or the phrase 'complimenting each other', and that's what this does.

We don't have to have one color, one design. We have things that compliment each other, which the way we operate as a body, and we talked about it earlier, the cooperation between the city, the Park Service and the National Capital Planning Commission.

I mean, these are all things that we do and

We don't have to have just one

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

we talked about that in the op ed piece that

was written, where we partner together.

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

design or one standard that fits all, and certainly, what we try to do is, I think, work within the Federal guidelines, where there is a law, then I believe it's our duty and my duty, particularly, to comply with that law.

But certainly, where there is guidance, we comment on that and we have not been shy about making comments back to Federal agencies, to the Executive Branch, to all of the people with whom we work, including the Court System, on some of the projects they've brought to us.

We try to work cooperatively and we try to work in a way that facilitates working or arriving at a solution that is best for all, and I believe that we've worked -- we've done that, in this case. Mr. McGill?

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to build on a comment that Dr. Feldman made and then tie it to something that Commissioner May said.

I was looking at a -- well, first

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

of all, I must say I'm pleased that the National Park Service seems to be getting away from saying the mall extends from the Grant statute to the Washington Monument, which I used to argue with John Parsons and Sally Blumenthal about.

They now seem to be, at least willing to extend it to the Lincoln Memorial and --

COMMISSIONER MAY: The official designation actually is 3rd to 14th, but yes.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: I'm aware of that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: We know, we know.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: And I would --

COMMISSIONER MAY: We know what you

mean.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: I mean to that point. I think it would be useful, there's a master plan being prepared for the National Mall. There's a signage program for the National Mall, National Mall rit large, and I

think it would be useful for the Park Service to begin thinking about consolidating the units.

One time I looked at a map of National Park Service facilities and I began counting and there must have been at least a dozen, maybe a score of units on the mall, like the Jefferson Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, etcetera.

Now, when I go to Yellowstone, I don't want to see the old faithful unit and the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone unit and the -- of various other locations and magnificent locations in Yellowstone National Park. I want to experience it as a coherent, cohesive National Park facility with a unique collection of activities worthy of being shown off, and if the Park Service could start thinking about the National Mall and administering the National Mall in fashion, I think we would be going a long way toward achieving the goal that Dr. Feldman

seeks.

CHAIR COGBILL: Other comments?

Questions? Mr. May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that in terms of the administration and management of the different units, it is seamless and integrated.

The fact that there is this separate sort of paper designation, you know, has been a subject of significant discussion within the Park Service and I think that we're — we certainly have the common objective of making the experience of the mall as seamless as possible to a visitor. So, whatever gets us to that point or furthers us in that way.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR COGBILL: Mr. Newton?

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: I would just like to applaud the Park Services efforts on this. I feel that this system of signage in whole and in its parts, will greatly enhance the experience of the visitor and guide them

to where they want to get to. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: If there are not other comments or questions, we have a motion made and properly seconded. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIR COGBILL: Opposed?

Abstentions? The motion carries. Thank you.

We move now to agenda item 4C. There is a modification to the second stage plan unit development for Capper/Carrollsburg Hope VI Redevelopment Project by Mr. Hart.

#### CAPPER/CARROLLSBURG HOPE VI

# REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

MR. HART: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. This proposal is for the modification of a second stage plan unit development for square 769 and 882 in the Capper/Carrollsburg Hope VI redevelopment project and was referred by the Zoning Commission.

In this image is the Capper/Carrollsburg Hope VI redevelopment project outlined in the red dotted line. To orient you, north is to the top of the slide. The Department of Transportation headquarters is located here. The Washington Navy Yard is located here and the U.S. Marine -- the Marine Corp Barracks is here.

M Street is located here, M Street Southeast, excuse me, is here. L Street is here and this is 7th Street.

The two squares, square 769, 769 is here and it's actually just to the east of the future Canal Blocks Park, which will be here when it's built, and square 882 is located here, and square 882 actually has two parts. There's a northern section, a northern portion, which is the residential portion of the residential development and the southern portion, which will be a commercial or an office development.

I'd first like to give you a little

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

background on the Capper/Carrollsburg development itself. The stage PUD for the entire development was approved by the -- by NCPC in January 2004. Second stage PUD's have been submitted for several sites over the past five years.

Under the first stage PUD in 2004, the following development guidelines were approved. For square 769, it was for a residential building, 110 feet in height that included 107 units and then for square 882, for the north site, there was a residential building 45 feet in height that was approved and included 75 units.

For the south site, a commercial building was approved at 90 feet in height and was -- had ground floor retail.

You can see the proposed development for square 769 here in this image and the building that we're looking at is actually this building. This square is bounded by Second Place to the west, 3rd

Street to the east and L Street to the north, and to the south of this, all this -- of this site is an office building, which is located here, or actually a proposed office building, which is located here.

The proposal before you today for square 769 is a 110 foot 10-story residential building with approximately 4,000 square feet of retail in the ground floor. This building would include a 171 units with 20 percent of them being affordable.

The image that you see here is looking to the east, from the Canal Blocks Park, which is located here, or which will be located here.

Next, is the proposed development for square 882. This square is bounded by L Street to the north, M Street to the south and 7th Street to the east. Sixth Street will be on the western border.

In the foreground of this computer generated image, you can see the residential

development here and in the background, you can see the eight story commercial building on the southern portion of square 882.

The residential building will be 60 feet in height and include 189 units, 20 percent of which will be affordable. The building steps down from east to west, following the contours of the site. Off the site to the west -- excuse me, to the left is -- you can't see it actually, but it's the Marine Corp Barracks.

Next, we get to the commercial building on the southern portion of square 882. This image is looking actually northeast and this is M Street here and this is actually 6th Street.

This eight story building will be 92 feet in height and includes nearly 15,000 square feet of retail on the ground floor down here. A parking garage is located beneath this building and again, you don't actually -- they don't actually show the Navy Yard, but

it's actually just to the left here, or just to the right here on this slide.

The staff has reviewed a range of Federal interests, including policies and -- included in the plan for the National Capital, the Height Act and Historic Preservation, as well as safety and security of Federal interest, rated by the Navy and the U.S. Marine Corp.

Staff has identified historic preservation and safety and security of Federal facilities is a main Federal interest, requiring further analysis.

The issues that you see here were raised by the Department of the Navy and the U.S. Marine Corp in letters that they submitted to the Zoning Commission, dated April 1st and April 3rd, 2009.

In these letters, which are included in the Executive Director's report, both the Navy and the Marines have safety and security concerns for the respective personnel

and the Navy also stated that they are concerned with the integrity of the Washington Navy Yard Historic District, could be compromised by the size and scale of the commercial building in the southern portion of square 882.

Regarding historic preservation concerns, staff notes that square 882 was included in the first stage PUD for the entire Capper/Carrollsburg project that was approved by NCPC in 2004 and was reviewed by the D.C. - the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer in 2003.

The District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer reviewed a commercial building proposed for square 882 that was actually 110 feet in height at that time and found that the redevelopment of the Arthur Capper/Carrollsburg and its environs will have no adverse effect on historic resources.

NCPC approved a building height of

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

90 feet in 2004 and the current proposal is for a building that is 92 feet in height.

In 2004, staff concurred with the D.C. SHPO Office and found that the development with -- would still have no adverse impact on the Navy Yard and staff still concurs with this finding.

Next, with regard to the safety and security issues, the staff notes that all interested parties have been meeting over the past month and staff is pleased with the work and tentative agreements reached to date.

In general, the Navy and Marines have requested operational and security and architectural security measures, such as surveillance cameras and non-operational windows for the buildings. Staff has been informed that the developer has offered conditions that they would submit to the Zoning Commission, mitigating many of the Navy's concerns.

These conditions are included in

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the letter from Holland & Knight, dated June 1, 2009, that you've been provided.

The Navy has also submitted a letter to the Zoning Commission agreeing to the developer proposed conditions. This letter has been provided to you and is dated June 1, 2009 as well.

Finally, staff has received an additional letter from the Marines -- well, sorry, excuse me, staff received an additional letter the Marines submitted to the Zoning Commission requesting additional time to study and come to an agreement with the developer on the safety and security issues the Marines have identified. A copy of this letter has also been provided to you and it's dated June 3, 2009.

With that, therefore, the Executive Director recommends that the Commission advise the Zoning Commission that the modifications to the proposed second stage consolidated plan unit development for squares 882 and 769 may

have an adverse effect on the safety security of Military personnel at the Navy Yard and the Marine Corp Barracks, identified in the letters to the Zoning Commission from the Department of the Navy and the United States Marine Corp, dated April 1, 2009 and April 3, 3009, respectively, and recommend that the Zoning Commission allow additional time before taking final action on this case, to allow the Navy, the Marine Corp and the developer to continue meeting in order finalize agreements that mitigate the adverse impacts of the Navy Yard and the identified Marine Corp Barracks in the letters, and that concludes my presentation. [INSERT -Capper/Carrollsburg Hope VI Redevelopment Project]

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you. Are there questions for staff at this time?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I have a question. The action, as I understand it, is limited to an increase in height of two feet and a change in the nature of the residential building on square 882 from what where relatively tall townhouses, to a relatively short apartment building.

So, how -- what are the -- how does those specific changes exactly impact the Navy and the Marine Corp? I mean, that's just -- it's not really very clear, other than this general concern about security, because as it is right now, if there were no action what so ever, there could be a 90 foot tall building on square 882 and a probably 50 foot tall or 45 foot tall townhouses.

MR. HART: The Navy, and I think -the Navy is here and they will be speaking to
this later, but they have said that there were
some site line issues that they were concerned

about, from the building.

So, I understand what you're saying. You're saying that there is an addition of two feet on one building and about 15 feet on the other building and how is that different from the -- yes, and I understood that.

The answer -- the response that we were given was that there were just some sideline issues that they were concerned about and I think that they would be able to answer a little bit more in depth, as to what you're asking.

COMMISSIONER MAY: All right, I'll ask that question again then, thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Ms. Tregoning?

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: And just to clarify, at the time the Marine Barracks was built, there was actually a 90 foot building on the site of the proposed 60 foot building. So, they built a barracks when they were overlooked by a 90 foot building.

So, I would love to also hear what the threat is.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, we'll -- yes, I'm sorry, Mr. McGill?

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Well, the staff recommendation suggests a belief on the part of the staff, that time will heal all wounds. Do you have any anticipation that additional time would result in an agreement?

MR. HART: There is an actual -- on the Navy's part, there is an actual agreement and many of the terms, and they're also looking for some -- I think that they are actually okay. It's trying to get -- trying to understand what happens with the Marines.

I'm not sure what that -- I think that the period of time may help them. I just don't know how far along they can get in that or I think it would be helpful to understand or excuse me, I think it would be helpful for the -- all the parties to at least get a better understanding as to all the concerns,

because I think that they are still being developed.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Okay, also, from a legal perspective or a Zoning Commission schedule perspective, how much time are you talking about?

MR. HART: I think that what we're looking at is if there could be a month to have some discussion, I think that would be helpful for them to get a little farther along in their deliberations and see what actually, you know, happens in that month period, because really, they haven't been really working together that long to date and I think that extra time will help them get a little bit more solid, as to what the concerns are and the developer may be able to actually, you know, help out with some of the concerns.

I'm not saying that it's going to be all the answers, but --

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, we do

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

have a representative here on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Quin, are you speaking on behalf of the applicant?

MR. QUIN: Yes.

[INSERT - List of public speakers and written
testimony follows:]

CHAIR COGBILL: Okay, thank you. You can come forward.

MR. QUIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Can you hear me all right? Hear my voice

coming through this very well, but at any

rate.

First, I'd like to thank your staff and compliment your staff on its openness and communication, as we went through this process. I think ultimately, that's the way all cases should be handled, let people talk and to get facts and put them together.

Unfortunately, a lot of the correspondence has occurred subsequent to the start, so that other things have happened and I think you have all those -- that correspondence.

This is an extremely important case for both the city and the Federal Government. This Hope VI project is unique, to one-to-one, replacement 707 public housing units, spread throughout about 1750 market rate and

public housing projects, units.

Funding for the Hope VI has been committed, that goes back to 2002, and the Zoning Commission approved this development with your favorable recommendation, as indicated by staff in 2004.

I just want to make it very clear that this 26 acre track was master planned in detail seven to four years ago with the full involvement of the Marines and the Navy, broad participation. Large numbers of units have been built, over 300 and a number of units are under construction.

That's the project. The only question before you today and the Zoning Commission, was the change in height essentially and the only two issues that have been raised by the Army -- excuse me, the Navy and Marines, is the question of historic preservation and security, and your staff is determined, as you've indicated -- as has been indicated, that there's no problem with the

former historic preservation and regarding security matters, we have been meeting -- our principals have been meeting with the Navy and the Marines, at least four or five meetings, and we thought we had an agreement.

You'll find out letter dated June 1st, which has a series of conditions that we have said we will request the Zoning Commission to include as conditions to the order, and we had understood that to be acceptable to both the Navy and the Marines.

The Navy has filed a letter saying that with the modification to one condition, to which we agree, that it will withdraw its opposition and it does not want to delay the project.

That's not so with regard to the Marines letter. The Marines letter does not suggest any changes at all in the conditions or any additional conditions that we should add for security purposes.

However, going as far as I feel,

and I think all of us do here, far beyond the scope of the modifications, they apparently want to restudy and re-plan a portion of the Hope VI project with their own new master planning process.

That's on land they do not own, on land they have no right to acquire and contrary to prior planning decisions of this Commission, as well as the Zoning Commission.

So, the real problem here is the delay that could occur and the injury to the Hope VI project and you have a letter that we filed today. We didn't get the Marine letter until yesterday afternoon and on page two of that letter, it summarizes the injury that would occur and there's also a letter from D.C. Housing Authority that goes in more depth on the financial problems that occurred.

In short, delay would delay the implementation of a pilot financing, which fund the infrastructure for the entire project and would virtually bring the project to a

halt. The pilot financing also funds the vertical construction and those -- I know Ms. Tregoning and Mr. May are quite aware that one of the desires of the community was to make sure that the community center could be built, but the pilot funds also support and allow that addition to be added to the project.

It also delays marketing of the office that's proposed and delays the construction of approximately 356 public housing units.

So, that what we would like the Commission to do is to recommend favorably to the Zoning Commission, with no delay, so, that the Zoning Commission can take action this coming Monday, that's in accordance with the language that's in Congresswoman Norton's letter to you, which I think you also have, that was filed today.

We will, of course, and always have and always will, continue to work with both the Navy and Marines to address any further

concerns. Thank you. Any questions?

CHAIR COGBILL: Any questions for the applicant? Thank you very much.

MR. QUIN: Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, we have one individual signed up to speak on this matter, and that's Mr. Rick Owen, representing the Washington Navy Yard and you were here before our earlier discussion about the time limits.

MR. OWEN: Yes, sir, five minutes.

CHAIR COGBILL: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. OWEN: As you said, my name is Rick Owen. Thank you very much for your time, for hearing my comments today. I'm speaking on behalf of Navy Support Activity Washington, which I'll refer to as the Navy from this point forward.

The Navy issued a letter on April 1st, stating two basic concerns about the development of the office building proposed on

square 882. Basically, the concerns are two-fold, compatible historic architecture with the Washington Navy Yard historic district.

The DC SHPO has found that the project will have no adverse effect on historic resources, so at this time, the Navy has chosen to pursue this concern.

Just for your background though, the basic concern is not so much with the buildings themselves at the Washington Navy Yard, but the historic -- the activities that occur there, that are deeply routed in Military traditional.

The buildings that are visible from those areas are a back-drop for those activities and this building will be clearly visible from Leutze Park and it could detract from the ceremonial nature of what happens there.

But as I've said, we chose not to pursue this concern at this time.

Secondly and more importantly is

line of sight security issues, both in terms of ballistic attacks and surveillance. A number of very high ranking Military officers live and work on the Navy Yard, as well as foreign dignitaries and Military officers that come to these ceremonies that I described earlier. These concerns will remain valid for the foreseeable future.

The Navy has met several times with the applicant to discuss ways that the developer might mitigate specific Navy security concerns. All parties have responded proactively and the results and interaction to date has been very productive, very positive.

The Navy's letter of June 1st, which I believe you have, indicates that future progress will hopefully include a formal legally binding agreement between the applicant and the Department of the Navy to include the Marines, that includes several items.

Firstly, all nine items listed in

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

the Holland & Knight letter of June 1, 2009, which include cameras on the roof at the sole expense of the Navy and Marines. Also, various forms of communication and coordination between the land owner, the building management company and the Department of the Navy.

Additionally, language or format that will be binding for future land owners and building management companies, some of which may not even exist at this point in time. We're looking at durability of the agreement that we've come to.

Lastly, and I don't believe that the applicant has agreed to anything about this, but we hope to reach some sort of collaborative arrangement with them on window We're concerned with design. operable windows. They're concerned with LEED issues, energy efficiency and I believe that a cleaver architect can come up with a solution. going time just to take some and

collaboration.

The Navy's letter to the Zoning Commission of June 1, 2009 also indicates that the Navy does not want to delay the project while the Navy works on it to finalize the details and formalize and agreement. So, it will ask for a condition to be put on the zoning approval, which is the agreement that I just described.

This condition would be tied to the issuance of occupancy permits several years in the future, so, it would not delay the time line of construction. This allows parties the time to work out whatever agreement is necessary, whether it's memorandum understanding, memorandum of agreement, a license, easement or any other type document, without affecting the critical path of the projects, permitted in the construction schedule.

The letter also indicated that if the Zoning Commission were to add these

conditions to approval, then the Navy would withdraw opposition to the zoning request.

NCPC staff has recommended the delay in the Zoning Commission's decision. The Navy's position on this is neutral. The more important issue to the Navy is that the condition is granted, that a formal agreement is reached with the developer.

Also, the Navy has indicated to the Zoning Commission that the Navy was not properly notified of this zoning request. The GSA was notified, but not the Washington Navy Yard. This has caused a delay identifying the Navy's concerns and subsequently, our discussions with the developer.

We will be working to correct this, so that it does not occur in the future. We understand it was not intentional.

The Navy is very supportive of the Hope VI program and does not want to delay the project. The Navy has been a stabilizing force for 200 years and hopefully, will

continue to do so.

We share in the socio-economic benefits that Hope VI project will promote and we look forward to its completion. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR COGBILL: Questions from the Commission?

just repeating one question I had for staff, which is that there was already approval for a 90 foot building. This is a 92 foot building. There was already approval for residential on the north side of the block, on square 82. So, what has changed with this proposal that raises these concerns or is it just that these concerns have come up for other reasons and this is an opportunity to voice them?

MR. OWEN: As I noted earlier, the notification problems that resulted from, I guess, the D.C. Tax and Revenue database, listing the address of Washington Navy Yard, I don't think there were some protocols that go

along with it.

COMMISSIONER MAY: But the prior approval goes back many years.

MR. OWEN: Yes, sir, on the --

COMMISSIONER MAY: The 90 foot building has been approved --

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: For five years.

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- since 2004, I think.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: Two-thousand-four.

MR. OWEN: Yes, sir. The previous approval to go to 90 feet, if we had seen that back then, we may have raised objections at that time too.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I had --

MR. OWEN: But --

COMMISSIONER MAY: I thought it was -- I thought that the -- I mean, it was -- I thought the statement had been made somewhere and this was my recollection, having sat on

that zoning case in 2003 and 2004, was that there was consultation with the Marine Corp, specifically back then.

MR. OWEN: Yes, sir, and also, I'd like to add though that five years ago, Navy security professionals looked at sniper fire in a different way than they do now. It's much more of a threat than it was five years ago.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So, it has to do more with your internal security concerns than it does to this -- does with this change in height of the building?

MR. OWEN: Yes, sir. Also, we did not get to see the architectural finishes in the last round, I don't believe. I wasn't around then, but that was a major concern of the Commanding Officer.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

CHAIR COGBILL: Mr. McGill?

COMMISSIONER McGILL: I'd like to ask Mr. Quin a question.

CHAIR COGBILL: Okay, before you do that, let me ask one question. Are you saying that the Navy and the Marine Corp did not participate or talk to the applicant in 2004 or 2002, when this really started?

MR. OWEN: No, sir, I'm saying that the communication that happened was not as comprehensive as it is now and the information that was presented then was not as complete as it is now.

CHAIR COGBILL: But going back to Mr. May's point, there was a 90 foot building proposed.

MR. OWEN: Yes, sir, I believe that building was set back quite a bit more from the street than it is now, but I was not partied to those reviews at that time.

CHAIR COGBILL: That wouldn't affect the ballistic discussion.

MR. OWEN: It may, yes, sir. There are -- the position of the building now is closer to the Navy Yard and will afford a

better view of large portions of the Navy Yard than the previous building did.

CHAIR COGBILL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: I don't believe that's correct. I don't believe the position of the building has changed since the '94 approval.

CHAIR COGBILL: Well, we can ask that of Mr. Quin, but I guess to follow -- to conclude this, the letter that's been referenced as a June 1st letter from Holland & Knight to the National Capital Planning Commission, that outlines a number of things that the applicant is willing to do. Have you seen that letter?

MR. OWEN: Yes, sir.

CHAIR COGBILL: Are those terms acceptable to you, on behalf of the Navy?

MR. OWEN: Yes, the Navy's letter of June 1st --

CHAIR COGBILL: Okay.

MR. OWEN: -- has accepted those

with one requested addition.

CHAIR COGBILL: Right.

MR. OWEN: And a subsequent letter from Holland & Knight has accepted that, as additional.

CHAIR COGBILL: Okay, that concludes my questions. Thank you. All right, Mr. Quin?

All right, Mr. McGill has a question.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: I have two questions. One, per the discussion that just happened, has the building moved any closer to the Navy Yard than its original foot print?

MR. QUIN: No.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Is it possible that the building he was thinking of was the old public housing high rise?

MR. QUIN: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER McGILL: It is possible he was thinking of the old public housing building that was there before, the elderly housing high rise?

MR. QUIN: All the buildings that

we've proposed --

COMMISSIONER McGILL: No, I'm talking about, is he thinking about an older building that's now been demolished?

MR. QUIN: I don't know what he's thinking of.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Okay.

MR. QUIN: I can only say that there was the building within the 90 feet.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: All right, okay.

MR. QUIN: I can't say what he was thinking.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: And is it -- I can't quite tell from your letter of June 4th, does the applicant accept the condition the Navy requested the Zoning Commission to impose regarding the MOU?

MR. QUIN: We thought by filing the nine points, and whatever points we've developed, that that would respond and that did respond and we thought that as we go

forward, we will also - if there were other conditions that we work out, then we will work with the Navy and frankly, did not want to have a requirement in the order that would deal with the -- that we were forced to have an agreement because that leaves an open-ended situation where --

COMMISSIONER McGILL: You're financing.

MR. QUIN: We're financing as one, but the other is, there is no way to predict, what if -- what if, I'm not suggesting in any way, that the Marines or the Navy would be unreasonable.

But if there were something that just could not be done, we don't want to be held to that obligation. We're quite willing to work with them and to -- and we have, over four or five meetings, and those conditions show that.

So, our intent is to fully cooperate with the Navy and Marines.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Mr. Miller?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: So, just to clarify, you're -- you would be proposing to the Zoning Commission, reference or incorporate these conditions within the zoning order?

MR. QUIN: Yes, our letter does -give the Zoning Commission the option of
either incorporating by reference or include
the specific proviso's, as conditions.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay.

CHAIR COGBILL: The staff has suggested one month to hold this in abeyance or at the -- request the city hold this in abeyance, so we could get the MOU. That's not an open time period. That's just one month to get that MOU executed. If it doesn't happen by then, then you can certainly go ahead.

MR. QUIN: Well, our point, we've already postponed for a month. We've been

working for a month and we thought when we left the last meeting, or my principals did, that they had an agreement.

We were willing to -- and I think the position of the Navy is the one we would like to follow, which is allow the Zoning Commission to proceed with its decision and if they want to put a condition in there that we continue to work with the Navy and the Marines, we are quite willing to accept that.

I just don't want a situation where there's a condition that says, you are required to have a written agreement, no matter what it says.

CHAIR COGBILL: I don't think anybody is suggesting that. The other question -- and I do take exception to the Navy's comment that they weren't properly notified. I think your memo speaks clearly to the fact that they got legal notice.

So, the question I would have and the concern I have is, you spoke before about

broad participation, meeting with the Navy, meeting with the Marines. I don't know whether that occurred on this one, but sending notice to the GSA, you know, the United States Government, to me, I mean, I would hope that your clients, with the experience they had and with the contacts they had, would have made face-to-face contact with these people, and maybe we wouldn't even be having these discussions today.

MR. QUIN: Well, just to comment two things. One, the Navy sits on the Steering Committee of this whole project. Secondly, when you post -- when you give notice, there are all sorts of forms of notice, one of which is large orange signs that are quite unattractive, that are on both L Street and M Street, that show that something is happening. It's not a secret.

Well, I think it sort of speaks for itself. We followed precisely what the rules are. If the tax records were incorrect, we

apologize for that, but we didn't cause the problem.

CHAIR COGBILL: I'm not implying in any way, shape or form that you did not strictly comply with the law.

MR. QUIN: I understand.

CHAIR COGBILL: My issue is more of one -- as you've said, you've been dealing with these folks, or your clients have, as partners and consulting with them and to me, to have the discussion now that they did not know, given the sign was on the property --

MR. QUIN: Yes.

CHAIR COGBILL: -- that's one thing

I would think --

MR. QUIN: I think we could -- we should make certain and David Cortiella from the D.C. Housing Authority is here, plus the representative of Capper/Carrollsburg venture. There is no doubt at this point, that we will be in their laps on all of -- anything in the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

future.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: Mr.

Chairman?

CHAIR COGBILL: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: I was just going to say that I think -- what I'm really delighted to hear from the Navy and from Mr. Quin, that they have brought to this Commission, what seems to me to be a resolution and in keeping with that, I was going to propose that -- to move an amended order. I don't know, as a point of order, if we need to make a decision about moving the original Executive Director's recommendation, but I would like to propose an amendment.

CHAIR COGBILL: Well, certainly.

There is no motion on the floor. So, you --

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: May I move an amended EDR that would read, that the Commission advises the Zoning Commission that the modifications to the proposed second stage consolidated plan unit development for squares

882 and 769 would not be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan for the National Capital, nor adversely affect any other identified Federal interest, period.

CHAIR COGBILL: Without the second paragraph?

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: Correct.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, you've heard the motion. Is there a second?

MR. MILLER: I'll second it.

CHAIR COGBILL: Motion made and seconded by Mr. Miller. Mr. Ames?

COMMISSIONER AMES: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a little difference in the feeling of the Marine Corp and the Navy, and I would like to hear from the Department of Defense, since both of them come under your wing, of where the Department of Defense would stand in this issue.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: With regards to the Navy's action with the developer, I applaud their efforts. I look at this project

as one that's real important for the city, for one reason, and it's important for the Navy for a different reason and this -- the need for low cost housing in this district of the city is critical, as well as, I also applaud the redevelopment of M Street and that entire part of the city.

I must be frank, I am not in agreement with the decision that has been made of no adverse impacts on the Washington Navy Yard. If you surround the historic district with 90 foot buildings, one where the -- one of the very oldest and longest standing operating Naval yards in the country exists, and the ceremonies that occur there, along with the flag housing, all these are -- the Navy is a tradition bound entity.

If you've never been to a parade on Leutze Park and experienced the way that the Navy holds these ceremonies and the respect that is shown to the traditions, it's hard for you to say that a 90 foot tower across the

street won't have a direct impact on those parades and ceremonies.

Now, the SHPO has stated their opinion. That rides. So, I can understand that and we'll just have to move on.

The aspects of security, you have some of the very highest ranking Navy flag officers and Marine Corp General's that reside at the Washington Navy Yard. Therefore, that's where they live with their families, that's where they spend their time, when they're not busy supporting our country's defense.

There is a direct implication or threat to having a large building that overlooks that housing, to the security of those individuals and as a result, to the effective operation of our Armed Forces.

Anything that we can do to support a resolution between the developer and the Navy, to resolve those potential security risks to those personnel and to the ceremonies

that are there, I think that I would encourage us to do so.

With regards to the Marine Corp, I understand their concerns about their barracks, but their barracks are much more recent. They're not in a historic district. The Eighth and I Barracks, but they're some blocks away.

It would strike me that unless they can reach an agreement with the developer, similar or in kind with the Navy's proposed agreement, that the Marine Corp has a steeper slope to climb.

COMMISSIONER AMES: I have one more question. Do you feel like the motion that's on the floor is sufficient to cover the things you just discussed?

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: I do not.

CHAIR COGBILL: Mr. McGill?

COMMISSIONER McGILL: I'd like to ask Mr. Hart some questions, although these date back to before you were here. So, you

might need to call on your colleagues, unless you've been looking at the files.

MR. HART: Understood.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Do you recall what year it was that the Marines came before us to build their existing facility that they're now using as the reason for raising issues about this project?

MR. HART: Yes, I do, it was 2004, I think or 2005. Either 2004 or 2005.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Okay, and as I recall and as I observed, because I used to live on Capitol Hill, the Marines did a signal service to revitalizing Capitol Hill, by taking out a lot of boarded up housing that had been sitting there vacant for years, immediately adjacent to the freeway, to build a facility that had barracks and a parade ground for their marching band, and they also promised, and I assumed they've come through on their promise, to offer to out -- reach out to the community and have community based

programs.

Now, they took out a lot of boarded up, vacant housing that was up on the Hill. That's to their credit, but they did out housing.

MR. HART: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: They also did this at the same time that it was common knowledge and in fact, widely praised and discussed, that this Hope VI project, which at \$36 million, was the most -- the highest funded Hope VI project in the nation, was going to take an existing public housing project that was occupied, but in bad shape, and at lot density, and take it and rebuild it with an integrated mix of housing, shops and office space.

So, the Marines chose to locate their barracks and their parade ground in their present location after they were fully aware of the Capper/Carrollsburg development.

Now, I think given that reality,

and given the accommodations the developer has been willing to show in trying to reach agreement, that the Marines have no grounds to make these demands, and it's wrong for us to delay a project in this vulnerable financial climate, when the developer is willing to negotiate and reach agreement and has demonstrated that fact, and I therefore, support the motion.

amendment or a different motion, following up on both of what you gentlemen have said, and I think would probably, hopefully be acceptable to the maker of the original motion, that we leave the first paragraph, the 'advises' paragraph as written, because I do take very seriously, that there may in fact, and I use the word may, be an adverse effect on the safety and security of Military personnel.

But modify that second paragraph, which recommends to say, "Recommends that the Navy, Marine Corp and the developer continue

meeting, in order to finalize the agreement mitigating adverse impacts to the Navy Yard and Marine Corp barracks identified in the letters."

That does not impose a time limit. It does not do anything other than suggest as the Navy has already said, that they'll move forward and the applicant in good faith, to try to put it into writing, whatever additional issues and concerns they have, and I believe that's supportive of what we've heard from the Navy, we've heard from Congresswoman Norton, from the applicant and I note that the Marines are not here with us today.

And so, I would suggest that as an amended motion.

MR. HART: I would view that as a seconder of the motion, as a friendly amendment.

CHAIR COGBILL: Well, he's seconding it.

MR. HART: Oh, I'm sorry, okay.

CHAIR COGBILL: He's seconding my --

MR. HART: No, yes, I wouldn't -so, disregard the friendly amendment business.
I accept -- I second your amendment to the
motion.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR COGBILL: Yes.

MR. JACKSON: I'm representing the Marine Corp. If you would permit, I can make some clarifications, if this is the appropriate time, or I can wait.

CHAIR COGBILL: Well, it's not, unfortunately, because we have a process.

MR. JACKSON: Understand.

CHAIR COGBILL: And if I'd known you were here, then I could have done that for this, going back before the Commission at this point.

MR. JACKSON: Okay.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Can one of your

members ask a question, that I could answer?

CHAIR COGBILL: Does anyone have a question of the representative from the Marine Corp? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, sorry, before we proceed in voting on this, one of the things I wanted to just add to the information that we're working with here is that my understanding is that when this -- the building was first proposed for this block, as part of the PUD, it was suggested at a -- or it was in the initial PUD as 110 feet, and there was significant concern on the part of the neighbors, that that was simply too tall for that location, because there were other buildings that were adjacent, that were lower in scale, and there was significant debate at that time, about the height of that building.

As a result, the Zoning Commission, approved only 90 feet for that block and -- but I also -- I mean, I could be wrong on this, but my recollection of it, at that time,

this is five years ago, was that the concerns were coming just from the neighborhood. They weren't coming from the Marine Corp specifically at that time or the Navy, for that matter.

It was driven in part, I think, by the historic preservation concerns, but I think also, the SHPO had approved it at -- or had said that even at 110 feet, there was no adverse impact.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR COGBILL: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: I just can't the Marines chased away. Can we ask? I have a question. Why now? We've been in -- does the Marine Corp -- that will give you an opening, why now and you know, we didn't know you were here and I want to make sure.

MR. JACKSON: I appreciate that because there is a serious misunderstanding that you need to know about, in order to make the decisions.

First of all, I'm Bruce Jackson.

I'm a community planner with Headquarters

Marine Corp and I'll just get right to the point.

The security issues that the Marine Corp have are not with the height of this building. The security issues we have are with building 20, are older barracks. There are ATFP, anti-terrorism force protection issues, for that building. It's inadequate.

There is approximately 250 Marines that live there, enlisted men. We have to replace the barracks. We cannot renovate it. It's impossible. We cannot meet the regulations through renovation, therefore, we have to replace it. We have to have a replace to replace it. They only place that's available is 882 or the most convenient place for the Marine Corp.

What we are attempting to do, and I apologize for coming in so late in the process, but a lot has happened since this was

approved many years ago, particularly with anti-terrorism force protection issues. But what we're attempting to do is very unique and as mentioned earlier, that we're doing a master plan.

Well, our master plan is not conventional and this will be the first time we've done this. We are attempting to work with the Navy Yard and satisfy some requirements that they have, as well as some requirements that the Marine Corp has, such as the barracks.

We have other requirements that we that need to meet and we don't have space, on the Navy Yard or on the barrack site.

So, we have to go off site. We have to into the community, in order to satisfy these requirements. So, what we are - have proposed to do and what we're calling a master plan, is to take a look at the civilian area between the barracks and the Navy Yard, from 5th Street to 11th Street, that triangle,

and go into the community and work with the developers, work with the property owners, work with the city, work with the schools, anybody that's involved, to try to develop a plan that accommodates the Marine Corp, the Navy, the city, the Housing Authority, the developer and I'll stop right there and say that we don't want to hold up the developer. That's not our point.

We are perfectly happy with the security proposals that the Navy articulated a few minutes ago. However, like I'm trying to point out that our issues are bigger than that. Our issues are with replacement of that barracks, and we have to find a place to put it.

Now, I think the question for you all today and the city and the Housing Authority is, do you want this 882, this block, to be included in the master plan that I'm talking about for the entire area, or not? If not, then what we have to do as the Marine

Corp, is move on in the neighborhood to another location, that's probably got buildings on it, to look for a location for our new barracks.

What we are expecting to come out of this unique plan is a collaboration between the -- all of the folks that I mentioned, all of the entities, that will be a partnership between the Navy, the Marine Corp and the developers and the city, where we share facilities.

We have a requirement for child development center. The Navy has a requirement to replace their fire station. I understand the city does to and it's an opportunity to put a new fire station in the middle of this area.

So, just to cut it a little shorter, for your sake, we are looking for time to develop that plan, that master plan and we can do it with or without the developer.

What we would like to do is work with this particular developer and hopefully, find another site in the neighborhood to relocate that facility. We would buy it, the Marine Corp would buy another site and perhaps, that site would be more attractive than the existing site to the neighbors, neighborhood, as well as the developer.

But we are going to go down that road and that's our intent. That would be one option. We want to develop options, so that in the end, in terms of the long term planning, that everybody comes out ahead. The neighborhood is better for the long term.

We have a road map to follow, long term. The developer is happy. You're happy. The city is happy. The Marine Corp is happy and our enlisted Marines are housed and safe in a safe place.

With that said, I'll also add one quick thing. We also have a requirement for married family housing, which we could also

work with the developer, to do public and private ventures. But we have a long list of shared type facilities that we could develop with the community. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Mr. Chairman, thank you for that. Thank you, sir. I think I never met a developer that wasn't interested in options, and I think you're going to be able to find him. I just don't think that this particular -- it seems like to me, this could be derailed or something that is very -- or slow it down enough to hurt it, and I think this option may not be the right one, and I think that you've already made it clear, you're looked for options and I'm sure there would be people who can -- would be glad to help you with those options. We will be too, I'm sure.

MR. JACKSON: As I said, it's -- we don't want to stop this process. That's not our intent. We want to make sure you understand what we're trying to accomplish.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: I think we got it and I think that it makes it every clearer that we could -- that there may be less concern about slowing this down at all. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: You're welcome.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, we have a motion on the table.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: I would --

CHAIR COGBILL: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: The original motion we have on the table, right?

CHAIR COGBILL: My motion, amended motion.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{MILLER: Well, we have} \\ \mbox{an amendment to the original motion.}$ 

CHAIR COGBILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Is your amendment to add those paragraphs to what Ms. Tregoning offered or is substituting?

CHAIR COGBILL: Well, it's a

substitute, because what Ms. Tregoning did was to sort of change the first paragraph, right, and to eliminate the second.

So, what I did was, make a substitute motion, which accepts the first paragraph, which advises and then modifies the second paragraph, to simply say that, that, the Navy, Marine Corp and the developer continue to meet, in order to finalize the agreement, mitigating the adverse impacts to the Navy, the Marine Corp, as identified in the letter.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Can I make a suggestion, that maybe you would find acceptable, and the maker of the original motion might find acceptable, which is to continue -- to go back to Ms. Tregoning's language, which is the standard language that the Commission uses when it's commenting favorably or not in opposition to, as a Zoning Commission action, but at to her, her motion, with the inclusion of the conditions --

inclusions of or reference to the conditions that have been proposed by the applicant and in its letters to the Commission, dated June 1st and June 3rd, which have been accepted by the Navy, that they be included, you know, included in referenced in the zoning order, that would just make reference -- that addressed the safety and security concerns identified by the Navy and the Marine Corp.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: That would certainly be an acceptable amendment to me and greatly preferable to me.

CHAIR COGBILL: Mr. Newton?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: It goes right to the -- addressing this safety and security and -- have the parties agreed?

CHAIR COGBILL: That's agreeable.

Does staff understand what we're proposing here? Do you need a few minutes?

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: Do you need to re-state?

CHAIR COGBILL: What we're talking

about doing it going back to Ms. Tregoning's motion, but to incorporate the language which is set forth in the letter as of June 1st from Holland & Knight, supplemented, I think, by that one additional point, which is the Navy's letter of the same date.

COMMISSIONER AMES: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR COGBILL: June 4th, okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMES: I have a question for the attorney.

CHAIR COGBILL: Mr. Quin?

COMMISSIONER AMES: No, for our attorney.

CHAIR COGBILL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AMES: You know, words are words and we can -- I guess she's not listening to me.

CHAIR COGBILL: Yes, she is.

COMMISSIONER AMES: Are you listening to me, Ms. Schiffer?

MS. SCHIFFER: I am.

COMMISSIONER AMES: I'm asking you a question. Words are words. What requirements does the amended motion put on everybody to go back to the table?

I mean, if you just include it, just to hear it be included, it doesn't do any good.

MS. SCHIFFER: My understanding of what's being proposed is a motion that -these are now my words, not the words of the motion, that the Commissioner essentially recommends to the Zoning Commission, that is has no problem with the Zoning Commission's action and requests that the Zoning -- if the Zoning Commission adds this particular language about the conditions.

COMMISSIONER AMES: So, it does not require the Zoning Commission -- our recommendation is just -- we're giving a blanket recommendation that we agree with the Zoning Commission's action, and we'd like for them to change, and put these things in, is

that correct?

MS. SCHIFFER: Perhaps, it's helpful to go back to our statutory authority here, which is that we make recommendations to the Zoning Commission. It's not a question of being able to require the Zoning Commission to

COMMISSIONER AMES: I understand that, but what I'm saying is, you know, what we're basically sending is two recommendations to the Zoning Commission, correct?

MS. SCHIFFER: I think I would phrase it as a conditioned recommendation. We're making a recommendation on the condition of that.

COMMISSIONER AMES: One or two recommendations?

CHAIR COGBILL: One.

MS. SCHIFFER: One.

CHAIR COGBILL: What we're doing is commenting favorably, provided -- or subject to the inclusion of these additional terms and

conditions, which are agreed to by the Navy and by the applicant and which I would follow up and simply say that where we have honorable people, particularly the Navy in this case, the Holland & Knight law firm and their clients, that have said this is what they're going to do, I don't think we have any -- I don't personally have any fear that that won't be done.

I think the city would certainly look favorably upon that recommendation in that light.

COMMISSIONER AMES: I'm going to support this motion, but I want it clearly understood, and maybe I took it the wrong way, that there was some rocks thrown that some people knew that -- said they didn't know and whatever, but what I'm gathering from this is that, especially the Marine Corp, is requesting a second look, is because since 2004, things have changed drastically, and I would like for that message to be sent to the

city, but at least listen to what they've got to say. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Do we understand the motion that's been made? We're back to the motion made by Ms. Tregoning. I withdraw my substitute motion, subject to the withdraw of the second. Done, and we have now, an amendment proposed by Mr. Miller to Ms. Tregoning's motion, which is acceptable to you, Ms. Tregoning?

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: It is.

CHAIR COGBILL: It is, and to the seconder? That was you, okay. All right, we're getting it straight. Are there any questions at this point, on where we are?

All right, all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIR COGBILL: Opposed?

Abstentions? The motion carries. Thank you.

All right, we'll move now to agenda item 4D,

and let me find my -- all right, this is the

consolidated plan unit development and map amendment for the American Institute of Architects Headquarters. Mr. Hart, you're back in front of us.

# CONSOLIDATED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND MAP AMENDMENT FOR THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS HEADQUARTERS

MR. HART: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. This proposal is a consolidated planned unit development and related map amendment for the American Institute of Architects Headquarters building, located at 1735 New York Avenue, Northwest, in Washington, D.C. and was referred by the Zoning Commission.

The AIA Headquarters built in 1973 is located here and then at the northeastern corner -- excuse me, northeastern corner of the intersection of New York Avenue and 18th Street, and it sits on the same property as the historic octagon house.

The octagon house was built around

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1800 and is not included in the proposed renovations.

This project is located in the SP-2 zoning district and I should note that the special purpose-2 zoning district is, according to the zoning regulations, is designed to preserve and protect areas adjacent to commercial districts that contain a mix of row houses, apartments, offices and institutions at a medium to high density, including buildings of historic and architectural merit.

Also in this area large are commercial and Federal buildings, which are predominant building type in this area. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is just north of the site and the -- one of buildings of the Federal Reserve is actually to the east. GSA is located across 18th Street to the west. In addition, the Corcoran Gallery of Art is located here.

This project was submitted to the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Zoning Commission jointly by the American Institute of Architects and the American Architectural Foundation for the renovation of the AIA Headquarters.

As the AIA is a leading national professional organization for licensed architect, this renovation of a headquarters has several goals.

The first is to seek LEED Platinum certification for an existing office building. The second is to serve as a national demonstration model on retro-fitting and existing mid-century office building and third is to renovate the building while maintaining the existing appropriate relationship with the historic octagon house.

This consolidated PUD and related map amendment, they're being sought to allow retail use on the first floor, which will be accessible from the street, which is not allowed in the SP-2 zoning -- the underlying SP-2 zoning district.

They're also looking to -- seeking the consolidated PUD and related map amendment for the ventilation shafts to reach a total height of 20 feet above the roof. The current maximum height of the -- excuse me, under the D.C. regulations is 18 2 feet.

The program for this proposed building renovation has several components. In this slide, you can see some of them. I'll explain each of these in more detail in upcoming slides.

First, we have the ventilation shafts. There are three of them, here, here and here. There is green roof actually located here, a bioretention cell down on the plaza, here, solar thermal water collectors and you can see them actually here, and operable windows on these floors, here, here and here.

Other green building techniques are being used to reduce the overall energy consumption for the building. Following the

completion of this project, the AIA expects to consume 60 percent less energy than the building does today.

Also, you can't really see on this slide, but there is a first floor retail that will be accessed. There's a stair from -this is New York Avenue, a stair from New York
Avenue and going into the building, which is behind this tree, actually, and in addition, there is a multi-purpose room that will be located, and you can see that in the upper slide.

Here, you can see the landscape work being proposed. The bioretention cell, that you saw in the previous image is located here. Also of note, all of the existing trees are to remain and several others are being proposed, particularly here.

Several vegetated walls are also being added, right along here, another one down here. Bike racks are also being proposed here and there is a sloped walk -- excuse me,

a sloped access, ADA access here.

Many of the pavers are also going to be recycled brick, here in this area, and then here, behind the octagon building, this area, they'll have basically concrete pavers.

The plaza renovation will allow more use of the space for events or for a quiet respite and will continue to be accessible to the general public, as well as the AIA.

Here is the first floor plan. You see the book store here in orange. The front door is here and actually, there's a door leading directly to the book store, and then the multi-purpose room, which is located here.

Finally, here is a building section that shows one of the three ventilation shafts, or a section of it here. Vent shaft will not only increase air flow, when used in conjunction with operable windows, it will also bring light into the interior of the building, through the use of mirrors and this

is just a close-up of one of the windows and the operable window part is actually -- this is -- this will be able -- you can open and close this part, as well as open and close this part. This actually will be fixed. There's not going to be -- it will be open, particularly because you can be able to look through there.

The staff have identified the Federal interests, with respect to this proposal as its adherence to the policy set forth in the comprehensive plan for the National Capitol, specifically, several policies related to the historic preservation element of a comprehensive plan. These policies include protecting the settings of historic properties and preserving the horizontal character of the National Capitol through the Height Act.

Also important are the number of Federal buildings in the immediate vicinity of this project.

The comprehensive plan states that the Federal Government should protect the settings of historic properties as integral parts of the historic character of the property. Staff concurs with the D.C. State Historic Preservation Officer, who did not have any concerns regarding the proposed renovation as stated in the Office of Planning report, dated October 13, 2008.

The proposed planning development is also in keeping with the development in the local area, as large buildings are the predominant building type in this part of the District.

There is also a related map amendment to allow the building to develop under the C-3-C zoning district and not under the underlying SP-2 zoning district. This change is necessary to allow the first floor retail to be accessible directly from the street, as you can see here, there is no additional height for FAR being asked -- being

requested.

So, these are actually -- this one actually went down. This is the same as what is existing. There is no plan for retail that's available, so, that would be the biggest change and there's a little drop in GFA.

Finally, attached to the Executive Director's report is a resolution and an opposition to the proposed renovation and this is from advisory neighbor Commission 2A.

ANC 2A, opposition to the proposal includes concerns over changing the underlying SP-2 zoning district and the lack of neighborhood amenities as reasons for the Zoning Commission not to approve this zoning case. The staff finds that this issue is local and not a Federal one.

With respect to the Height Act, since New York Avenue is a 160 foot right-of-way and 18th Street is a 19 foot right-of-way, the maximum allowed height is 130 feet, as

this is a corner lot and the Height Act allows the height to be determined from the street with the greater right-of-way width, when the lot is at this location, at the intersection of two streets.

Since the building height included in proposed vent shafts is 107 feet, staff finds that the proposal is within the provisions set forth under the Height Act.

Therefore, the Executive Director recommends that the Commission advises, Zoning Commission, that the proposed consolidated planned unit development for square 170 -excuse me, for this -- for square 170 and Street 38 and 39 and a related map amendment to change the zoning from SP-2 to the C-3-C, would inconsistent with not. be the comprehensive plan for the National Capitol, nor would it adversely affect any other identified Federal interest.

I'm sorry, yes, this -- right, that's it, and that concludes my presentation.

[INSERT - American Institute of Architects Headquarters]

CHAIR COGBILL: Are there any questions of staff at this time? All right, we're going to bring it back to the Commission. We do have a public hearing scheduled for this, but before we do that, we have Mr. Paul Tummonds who is here on behalf of the applicant.

[INSERT - List of registered speakers
follows:]

MR. TUMMONDS: Good afternoon. As the Chair said, my name is Paul Tummonds with the law firm of Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw & Pittman. I'm here this afternoon on behalf of the AIA to support the Executive Director's recommendation in this case.

As was noted by Mr. Hart, this proposed renovation of the AIA Headquarters building will serve as a national demonstration project to show how the highest levels of sustainable design, a LEED platinum certification, a project that is going to seek to achieve carbon neutrality by the year 2030, can be applied to a mid 20th century office building.

I couldn't say it better than as the Executive Director of the AIA said, at the Zoning Commission hearing. This project allows the AIA to walk the walk and not just talk the talk, with regard to sustainable design.

I agree with the Executive

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

Director's report, that the only Federal interest really here are the height. The proposed ventilation shafts are certainly within the height that is permitted by the 1910 Height Act and I am here to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Ms. Tregoning?

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: It's less a question, perhaps, although you might want to comment on it. In some ways, I really -- I just wanted to commend the applicant that we have so many national associations here Washington and I would wish that every single one of them aspired to do what the AIA is doing with this building, which is to take the embodied energy of an existing building and make the whole thing really, a wonderfully high performing green building, so that every one of their members can see it as an example of what they could aspire to in their own communities around the country and like I said, I wish that every other national

association located here would do the very same thing.

So, any -- have you inspired any competitors?

MR. TRUMMONDS: The only thing I'd like to add to that is, as you've explained, it's going to further that, but explain why the AIA folks aren't able to be here.

You know, this is certainly a significant financial undertaking by the AIA to do this and this is a time that we all know is very uncertain economic times, such that the AIA is on a work furlough this week. They were not able to come today because last Friday at five o'clock, they had to turn off their servers. I could not e-mail them. They could not answer my phone calls, yet in this climate, they are still moving forward with this project, and I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of that. That's why they are not here today. They certainly want to be here today, and again, this is an exemplary

project.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you. All right, we'll now open it up to the public. We have with us, Barbara Kahlow, representing the West End Citizens Association.

MS. KAHLOW: Thank you. Are we on?

Yes. I'm Barbara Kahlow and testify on
behalf of the West End Citizens Association,
the oldest citizens organization in Foggy
Bottom West End area of Washington.

The WCA is primarily interested in maintaining and improving the quality of life for the existing residential community in Foggy Bottom West End.

We received party status from the Zoning Commission in this case. The AIA intends to maintain the current height and slightly decrease the current FAR, as already explained. The requested minor changes one, for roof structures, two, for ground floor retain accessible from the street and three, a

multi-purpose space for internal use and outside rental can all be accommodated through the flexibility provisions applicable to plan unit developments without a zoning map amendment.

In fact, you can look at the ground floor retain and SP-2 PUD at Columbia Plaza. There was no need for a map amendment.

However, the applicant proposes -proposal calls both for a PUD and a zoning map
amendment, approval of these two, in
combination, which will result in an
authorization for 44 percent increase in
height and 33 percent increase in density and
would set an undesirable precedent for our
neighborhood.

Let me look at the PUD. The comprehensive plan of 2006 provided location of PUD amenities, require that a substantial part of the amenities proposed in PUD's shall approve the community, in which the PUD would have an impact. Proposed AIA PUD would have

no amenities what so ever for our community.

Both the ANC and the West End Citizens Association so testified in front of the Zoning Commission, of this absence.

In fact, the AIA's requested modifications are designed to create financial benefits for the AIA. These include one, an increase in revenue from the multi-purpose space, floors for lease to tenants and expanded book store revenue, two, a significant decrease in utilities cost for them over the foreseeable future and three, support for expanded programs, which they intend to have.

These are benefits which directly occur to them, in terms of financial assets and should be basis of sharing their gains of our community, as required by law.

We contend that the application thus is inconsistent with D.C. law and legislative intent. I, myself, testified on this, so I know what the legislative intent

is, and we think that this approval would subject this to a legal challenge, thus the case has ramifications to Federal interest.

Now, let me talk about the upzoning. The applicant's proposal for upzoning from SP-2 to C-3-C is in the middle of a large SP-2 zone. I've attached a map, which is larger than what the staff report has and it shows that for all properties, except Federal properties south of E, from 25th to 17th, all of them are zoned SP-2 or R-5-E. There is no C zoning what so ever.

Included in the SP-2 area as the AIA, running from C to E, from 17th to 18th are notable, low scale properties, including the Corcoran, the Red Cross and DAR. These properties could be negatively affected by proposed upzoning. Thus, upzoning has ramifications for the Federal interest.

Our community, organizations have consistently opposed previous upzoning requests, which would undermine our

residential area.

For example, both the ANC and the West End Citizens Association recently opposed upzoning from R-5-D to C-3-C for a single record lot in square 101 at 2013 H Street. Upzoning the AIA site could lead to multiple upzoning requests elsewhere in our neighborhood, including to this 17th corridor, adjacent to the White House. This would result in the destruction of our residential and mixed use community, which should of the Federal interest and support of the District.

We respectfully request that you disapprove the proposed PUD, which includes no amenities for the immediately impacted neighborhood and the map amendment. Most importantly, of course, is the map amendment. Thank you for your consideration of our views. I remain available to answer questions.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Kahlow? Ms. Tregoning?

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: I just have a question for Ms. Kahlow. Thank you for coming out to testify this afternoon. You know, I'm sort of surprised to hear you say that there are absolutely no benefits to this building. Many communities would -- and you certainly have accepted as PUD amenities in other cases, the platinum building, a building that lowers the heat island effect, by providing green surfaces and reflective roofs, that provides a neighborhood amenity in this case, a book store with outdoor seating in a place that really doesn't have any of those, kinds of amenities readily you know, accessible.

You know, that's putting in bike racks that can be publically used. You know, in many other situations, those would be considered community amenities. I'm just kind of curious as to why you don't think of those as amenities.

MS. KAHLOW: Well, the legislative

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

intent, of course, was that there would be immediate benefits to the immediate community. None of these immediately benefit us.

There already is a book store. There already is outdoor seating. There are bike racks everywhere for GW. There is no benefit what so ever to our immediate community.

That's what this comprehensive statute was all about. If you're going to get extra benefits, you've got to give things that the community wants, that we ask for. They never came to us and talked to us about benefits. We have a whole string of benefits we want and we'd by happy to talk to them about them, as other developers have.

For example, people put in stop lights for us. They put in benches, where the elderly are walking from the mall, up to the metro. You know, we have a series of benefits that immediately impact our neighborhood and that's what we'd like.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: Thank you.

MS. KAHLOW: Not things that benefit them. Thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you very much.

Mr. McGill?

COMMISSIONER McGILL: I'm with EDR.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I had a question for Ms. Kahlow.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, Ms. Kahlow.

COMMISSIONER MAY: The hearing for the Zoning Commission, didn't the applicant offer to include the public use of their new multi-purpose room or whatever, under some circumstance. I don't know what the exact conditions would be. But that would be used as a community resource and isn't that the sort of thing that very often accompanies a PUD?

MS. KAHLOW: It is. We've had very bad luck the applicants. For example, the International Finance Corporation gave us that

in writing in their order, and now they have a security and won't let us in.

So, we don't want that as a benefit, since we've had bad luck.

COMMISSIONER MAY: You don't want it as a benefit?

MS. KAHLOW: No, we don't think it's a benefit because we've had bad luck with people who have included it. We have other sites. So, it's not something that benefits us.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: How are you?

MS. KAHLOW: I'm fine, Mr. Dixon, thank you.

COMMISSIONER DIXON: I'd like to have a copy of a list of your -- the amenities that you like. I'd like to just have it. Not now, necessarily, but could you supply me with that, please?

MS. KAHLOW: Sure, the ones we've recently negotiated or the ones we'd like --

the wish list?

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Well, you said you have a wish list. I'd like to see your wish list.

MS. KAHLOW: Well, we also -- I could tell you the ones that are most recent also. I can send it to you directly or send it to the NCPC?

COMMISSIONER DIXON: Here or directly, thank you.

CHAIR COGBILL: Mr. McGill?

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to praise the AIA for this civic action to upgrade their building to this status platinum LEED in an existing building, it's unbelievable. I also think that they should be recognized for the amenities they've been providing and will continue to provide.

First of all, there are not many architecture book stores in Washington, D.C. remaining and the AIA has a very fine one, and the way they're changing this plan, they're

moving the book store closer to the entrance to the building than it is now.

Secondly, they spent millions of dollars restoring and maintaining the Octagon building, which is a historic gem and the interior -- the quality of the interior restoration is absolutely stunning. provide tours on a regular basis of this building. It's very historic, the home of the Talow family, where President Madison lived during the -- after the White House was burned during the War of 1812, where the Monroe Doctrine was formulated and signed, and the AIA tried restoring it once and they overrestored it, putting large girders and caused the house to gradually deteriorate, so they realized the err of their ways, the restoration community learned new rules and procedures, and they reversed the previous restoration and did it all over again.

I think that kind of civic commitment is truly admirable, and we were

next door and we look forward to having this building as a platinum building.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you. Mr. Hart?

MR. HART: Mr. Chairman, in the interest of full disclosure, I am a member of the AIA and to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest, I'll recuse myself on this matter.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, the record will reflect that Mr. Hart has recuse himself. Any other questions? Discussion?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Just briefly,

I just wanted to concur with the staff finding
that this is a local matter.

CHAIR COGBILL: All right, that being said, all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIR COGBILL: Opposed?

Abstentions? The motion carries. Thank you.

All right, we'll move now to agenda item 5.

This is an information presentation on the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments 2050 Initiative, Ms. Koster.

# METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF

### GOVERNMENT 2050 INITIATIVE

MS. KOSTER: Thank you, Chairman Cogbill and members of the Commission. I'll wait for our speaker to come forward, but I'm pleased today to be introducing Paul DesJardin from the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, where he serves as the Director of the Community and -- Community Planning and Services Department. He's going to be providing an update on the activities of Greater Washington 2050.

NCPC and COG have a long and productive relationship as the areas two main regional planning groups and our agency is extremely pleased to be working with them on Greater Washington 2050.

In particular, NCPC co-sponsored an alternative futures workshop together with COG

and the District Office of Planning as part of this effort, and Paul, I believe will be discussing this in his presentation.

As host to the Federal Government, the National Capital Region has a unique concentration of Federal assets, facilities, operations, procurement, land holdings, research and development and employment. The Federal Government has long been and remains the regions largest corporate citizen, influencing development patterns and economic activities.

Addressing the regions challenges as well as the opportunities, including transportation mobility, affordable housing, job creation, sustain-ability and equity stands to greatly benefit the Federal presence here.

Just as COG is seeking to bring different jurisdiction in the region together to address these critical issues, we also want to work with them to ensure Federal and

regional coordination is occurring.

Once Mr. DesJardin has completed his presentation, I'll spend a minute talking about some specific ways that NCPC will continue to work with them on the Greater Washington 2050 initiative, and with that, I'll have Mr. DesJardin begin his presentation.

MR. DES JARDIN: Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you.

For 2050, obviously, COG is a regional planning organization and we've worked very closely, as Ms. Koster said, with NCPC for many, many years in planning for the future for region, but why 2050?

First and foremost, based on some of our own estimates, we're going to add almost two million people by 2050. That's the equivalent of adding the City of Philadelphia to this region, just to give you

a sense of perspective, and clearly, there are a whole host issues that are ongoing today and will continue to be issues in the future,

transportation, energy, aging infrastructure.

I was very pleased to actually hear some of your discussions today about facilities and projects in the region.

Lastly, other regions are doing it.

I'd like to say that this was a tremendous, wonderful insight and epiphany that we had, but we are not, in fact, the first to do this.

But we'd like to say that we are going to be the best.

Clearly, planning in the Washington area, the National Capitol region is not new. This is work. These are plans that the Commission obviously is extremely familiar with. More recently, there have been some seminal plans that are -- have been more regional in perspective, mid-century wedges and corridors, the policy plan for year 2000 and the metro rail system.

We like to say, you know, that the metro rail system really has been a culmination of 40 to 50 years worth of planning and implementation.

How then would we develop a plan for the future? We've built on the work and some discussions that had been occurring throughout the region for some time. What you're looking at here is our logo that we have designed.

But basically, we have established a coalition and I'm pleased to say that Mr. Acosta, Ms. Tregoning and Ms. Koster are all members of this coalition. It's three -- a three piece partnership, if you will, of the coalition, about 45 to 50 members that are steering the work.

But again, to look at just the issues that we all individually and collectively want to address comprehensively, again, you see things that, you know, any planning process would want to address,

population, transportation and so forth, and really, to be very proactive.

What are we trying to do? We're trying to seek, as you see, agreement on a whole host of these issues. We want to maintain this region's competitiveness. There is a sense that we've -- have we, in fact, done all that we can? Can we do more to raise the bar for the region and for us, as its citizens, but also and again, I heard the discussions about LEED certification, we want to be a sustainable region. We want to be a leader in many of these thoughts, and lastly, build on the visionary leadership that this region has had over so many, many years.

Very quickly, again, we've taken what's sort of a two-prong attack, if you will, or a posture at looking at, sort of what do the regions citizens think.

Back in the Fall, as Ms. Koster alluded to, we undertook a scenario thinking workshop. Ms. Tregoning was instrumental in

helping us frame that, to look at some big picture issues. You have copies of the document that summarizes that report as your place.

Also at your place, and I'll be talking briefly about both of these, you have copies of the document you'll see on the right. We commissioned a survey in February, and attitudinal survey, if you will, of 1,300 of the regions citizens.

It's one thing for us to say, we want to look forward and plan for the regions future, but we also wanted to get a sense of, you know, a pulse of the citizens of the region, what do they see as issues.

Again, picking up on the first, the November scenario thinking workshop, we brought together, I believe, it was close to 100 or so different thought leaders from the region, to look at four different scenarios that could conceivably pretend different alternative futures for the region, based upon

some research and discussions that we had with a much larger group.

The participants in that workshop then developed big moves, strategic responses. It wasn't just enough to think about, well, that's a very interesting perspective, but strategically. Again, how could we position the region? What were the steps that we would want to take, to address those alternative futures?

I'm going to skip this and go ahead. I'll come back to the previous slide, which summarizes on some of those strategies, if you will.

Very quickly, just focus in on what were those four alternative scenarios, one of which we referred to and we had a consultant help us frame this, cooperation of hard times and again, as you see, there are constraints, nationally and regionally that, you know, global recession, economic trends, debts, as you see, which would continue to constrain

both national and regional economic growth and so, it would force stronger regional cooperation to really look at things, how can we do things more cost effectively, if you will.

We have another alternative scenario that the participants were asked to think about strategically, which was a high green, a very positive alternative scenario in which the region became a leader in green collar jobs. So, there was both a national and a regional green industrial revolution, if you will, and then pivoting off that from a perspective, transit oriented land use development, to take advantage of the -- you know, the strategic need to use the metro rail system.

A less optimistic scenario that the participants were asked to address was hot and grid locked. Fossil fuels would stay cheap. Sprawl, as we know it, you know, would continue, climate change would continue to

accelerate.

So, very much a -- you know, an environmental sort of worst case continuing trend scenario, if you will.

Then lastly, and this would be of particular interest to the Commission, Federal Government dispersal, what if there had --was, you know, changes in both the presence and -- you know, both physically in the composition of the Federal Government in this region? Again, for the reasons you see there, concerns about security, the need to -- you know, diversify, relocate agencies around the country, if you will.

Let me go back very quickly, I'll go through again. In the summary report, there are, in fact, both of the results of the scenario, as well as -- you know, these were some of the strategic responses, if you will, that the participants thought about, TOD, green economic development and so forth. You can see a fairly extensive list.

Let me jump ahead then to the companion document. Again, as I said, to get a pulse of what does, you know, the citizen -- what do the citizens of the region really think, we commissioned a survey, again, of about 1,300 people look at, you know, really, connectivity and identity.

Again, people do think at both the present day and really, in many ways, as we went through the survey, getting folks to think really long term, in as many ways as an abstraction for them. But we did ask them to think both for themselves, as well as for their children and their grandchildren, if you will, what would you want to see as the long term challenges and priorities for the region?

Some very positive signs. Seventy percent of the people who responded to the survey said that they felt a very strong connection to the region. So, very strong identity as being Washingtonians and even more so, if you look at the 78 percent, nearly four

out of five of the people who responded to the survey rated this region as being good or excellent, as a place to live. So, very positive perspectives.

They're also very informed. You know, read newspapers, listen -- you know, watch TV news, we're very highly educated and engaged citizens, you know, population, if you will.

What were some of the issues though, that they identified, and again, in many ways, you know, as planners, we see these as reaffirming what we suspect in many ways, day in and day out, traffic and transportation being the largest. The economy and jobs, had we, you know, commissioned a survey, you know, a year or two ago, would that possibly have rated -- you know, not as high or lower.

Education and schools, concerns about those, affordable housing, and you can see again, the extent through that.

Something else that we saw as a

positive, as we commissioned the survey was about half of the residents saw that there was, in fact, desire for some sort of concerted regional action, some sort of regional solutions, if you will, to many of these issues.

We'd like to say, you know, it's the glass half full, arguably, you could say about half said otherwise.

In looking through the survey results, we asked our consultant and we asked you to think of this in terms of sort of a report card. We took the survey and -- you know, I have small children myself and David Robinson and my Executive Director likes to point out, it's one thing to say, you know, you think you're doing well, but you want a report card. You really want to see what the grading is.

And so, in grading the present day region, if you will, again, keeping in mind, this is sort of an A through B scale grade

point average, if you will, you can see the positives, if you will, what people saw as being the most positive aspects that were -- we respect people of all backgrounds. We have many tremendous arts and cultural opportunities, recreational opportunities, green space, a clean environment, very positive perspectives on all of those.

Some other, you know, present day positives, if you will, that we are very well prepared to deal with emergency preparedness. Interestingly enough, number seven that contrasts with the issue, if you will, of transportation. Respondents felt that we had, in fact, a tremendous number of transportation choices, a number of transportation options. So, that ranked fairly high, and then safe streets and public schools.

You have the results of these. I won't go through this fairly lengthy list.

Let's shift then to sort of the other, the companion to that. What then would the

citizens or the region see as priorities for future resources? What would they, in fact, accept higher taxes to support?

First and foremost, public schools, higher quality public schools, safer streets, again, number three, jobs for everyone who wants one, better access to health care, some fairly traditional local issues, if you will. But again, reaffirming the perspective of our citizens.

Some other priorities, if you will, help for people who need, again, reaffirming the interest in a clean and green region, a environment, affordable housing, cleaner growth that is developed -- growth development that is better planned. You know, planner, I'm actually as little disappointed that didn't come out as number one, but regardless, it's at least in the top 10, if you will, and again, you see continuing down again, there's still concern of being able to prepare for transportation choices and

emergency preparedness.

In the report are a couple of graphics like this and what we're looking at here are priorities, again, picking up on this issue of what would the citizens of the region be interested in seeing, what would they, in fact, support, additional resources for?

What we're looking at here is a grid, going up the vertical axis, if you will, is how people rated the current performance of the region and then going to the right is the intensity of focus, where they would see the need for, you know, increased focus, priority, if you will.

So, I'd really call your attention to this sort of yellow, cream colored and green squares. Those really are the areas of greatest entrance and greatest desire for additional resources. Again, you know, comparing and contrasting in the upper left corner, tremendous perception that we do have lots of arts, recreation, parks and

opportunities, but again, to the right you see the interest in safe schools -- I'm sorry, safe streets, public schools, health care, those other priority issues you saw.

So, just a graphic way, if you will, of portraying the results for the survey.

Working through the coalition, we are also working to develop -- and this really is the heart from a planning perspective, we're working to develop a series of goals, a compact and then agreements that different stake holder organizations would then, in fact, be asked to sign.

The work of the coalition is building on, as you can see here, a number of different policy documents and initiatives that COG and some of our other stake holder organizations have been involved with for many years. We have a recently published climate change report, a strategic plan, the TPB transportation vision, and then again, as I

just discussed, the results of this scenarios workshop and the survey.

The goals really sort of fall into several categories, physical development goals, land use transportation, environment, as you can see, and then social and economic development goals, addressing more human service concerns.

Just to give you some illustrative examples, the transportation goals, a broad range of public and private transportation choices, maximizing accessibility and affordability to everyone, minimizing reliance upon single occupancy use, a system that maximizes community connectivity walkability, minimizes ecological harm.

Looking at things, you know, systemically and holistically, if you will, trying to do as much for the region, for as many people as possible, you know, with minimal harm, if you will.

Environmental goals, maximize

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

protection and enhancement of the environmental resources, preservation of open space, our green space. Again, you know, environmental goals that we believe, as we will be going forward with this, that many of our member local Governments and other stake holders would support.

Lastly, another sort of example, housing goals, a variety of housing types, diverse and safe, sustainable neighborhoods at all income levels.

How will we meet these goals? Voluntary agreement. We, as I said, are drafting a compact and we -- which would frame the goals that have documents that would be commitment papers that would be signed by the stake holders that you see here, public business, civic sectors and then more importantly, I alluded before about the issue of a report card, if you will, tracking progress on achieving the goals.

We've developed a series of

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

indicators. Again, it's one thing to say that we have aspiration goals in a whole host of different program areas, but we'd like to look at some specific indicators to measure progress in the short term, in the next three to five years, ten years going forward, and this is just some illustrative examples of what those indicators might be.

importantly with But more indicators, we'd like to set targets, a land use target, for example, of could we, in fact, a region, commit to concentrating proportion of both residential and commercial construction in our regional activity center? Could we commit to a reduction in green house gas emissions? You know, an economic target, maintaining balanced again, a economy, balanced jobs to household ratio, good jobs for everyone, who would want to avail themselves of it.

What is next? We are in the initial phase. We are wrapping up the work of

developing the goals, the compact of the commitment papers. We are as -- again, I appreciate the opportunity to come to you and sort of the initial presentation, the roll out presentation, if you will, to our different stake holders.

This is actually the second presentation to a regional body. We've presented to the Northern Virginia Regional Commission last week. We're docketed to go to Arlington County, the City of Alexandria and Loudoun. We are working to schedule presentations to other local Governments.

We have a very robust website on which we are looking for public comment. There is a blog space, if you will, and we are trying to keep things very interactive.

This is sort of our schedule.

Again, we are about 18 months into this initiative. We are now in that second row, if you will, of outreach and feedback. Our goal, as an entity, is to receive the comments from

the stake holders, our member of local Governments, take them to our COG Board retreat this summer, really get a pulse of, you know, have we, in fact, raised the bar to a level that people are comfortable with? Are there issues that our member local Governments or stake holders would like to see addressed, that we aren't addressing, and then in the Fall, as you see, actually take out to different stake holders, for signature and approval to actually have this docketed for action.

That concludes my presentation, Mr. Chairman, and again, this is our website, go to Washington2050.org. There is link from the COG website and I just bring that to your attention and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIR COGBILL: Thank you very much.

We certainly do appreciate that. That's a

very, very -- you've done a lot of good work

here and I see that our staff has been very

active as partners in this and I appreciate that. I will open it up to questions from the Commission. Comments?

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: I just have a comment. I participated in this session and found it extremely interesting, besides the fact that it was room-full of fairly witty people, it was -- it was interesting to sort of visualize that future and what we can do to make it a better one. I just thought it was a great exercise.

MR. DES JARDIN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TREGONING: I would just be interested in hearing if any of my fellow Commissioners had any thoughts about this. The parties to this agreement include local Governments, conceivably, I suppose, the National Capital Planning Commission, although I don't if that's something that we're thinking about.

But obviously, the big employer in our region is the Federal Government and

whether or not there was an interest on the part of some part of the Federal Government and whether it would be GSA as the steward of so many buildings or the Park Service or maybe representing of a slue of Federal OMB agencies, if this is the kind of thing that might be consistent with an urban initiative, that one or more of the Federal agencies or the Federal Government in general is undertaking.

I don't know if people have a thought, especially, I can say, our Federal members of the Commission, I'd be interested I hearing it.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: Julia, I thought, Julia, didn't you ask us to be involved in this?

MS. KOSTER: Yes, I actually was going to do a quick wrap up, and I'll take the opportunity now.

I think one of the things that our agency has really focused on is how we can

bring the Federal presence, you know, and difference Federal agencies together with this regional initiative and I do want to thank all of the Federal agency Commissioners, when I called up and said, could you participate or get other folks here? They were great in bringing folks to the table.

I think, as Harriet noted, we've been looking actually at the compact language as it's been evolving and certainly, we want to explore with the other Federal agencies, what would be an appropriate way for us to partner and potentially endorse this?

I think the other thing that we've been looking at is they've been setting different bench marks and indicators and I think a really interesting exercise for us may be to say, how could we either have the same or similar bench marks and be measuring them to see how we're doing here with our Federal facilities, if it's -- we already have, for example, a Federal law, moving us towards the

2030 carbon neutrality goal and that's -- you know, we should be bench marking that right here in the region, as part of the efforts going on here.

So, I think those are two of the main things that we see and I think certainly here at NCPC, we see having a robust dialog, bringing the different Federal agencies together to say, hey, how would you like to participate in this, because I think it could be very valuable for the Federal Government to actually not only be a participant in this, but be tracking its progress.

COMMISSIONER McGILL: I would like to just add, I think we operate under a series of laws and executive orders that mandate a number of these goals, that we follow. So, for instance, GSA, since 2003, has required that all of our new construction and major modernization of existing owned buildings, as well as built-to-suit leases shall achieve a minimum of a silver LEED rating.

We require that our lease acquisitions be close to -- be transit proximate and the fact that the Federal Government, as you know, gives us transit subsidy, has resulted in something like 44 percent of the peek period riders on the metro being Federal employees.

So, there are a variety of ways that we're already -- we're in sync. We're not necessarily meeting all in the same room and talking about these goals, but we're in sync and all going in the same direction.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: From the Defense Department perspective, I would agree with much of what Mr. McGill said. There are some natural tensions in Department of Defense with some aspects of this, like I say, natural, maybe they're unnatural tensions.

But there are certainly tensions that exist, and some of those have to do with the not so well liked anti-terrorism standards, which came into the dialog today,

in earlier presentations and finding a way that the Federal Government promote some of these common themes without, you know -- Department of Defense might disperse out of the region essentially. I mean, that's one thing.

We don't want to promote urban sprawl, although our policies and even the recent BRAC law actually promotes urban sprawl.

So, there's a lot of conflict where things aren't coordinated at the decision making level, and that includes executive branch, as well as Congress, directing things to occur.

So, if there is anything that could be taken in hand by NCPC, maybe it's some way promoting that greater coordination and collaboration of strategic views of planning and development in the future, which seems to be a core activity that NCPC rightfully should be pursuing.

CHAIR COGBILL: Other comments from the Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I would just add that, from the Park Service point of view, again, we're, I think, already aligned with many of the goals that have been stated here and certainly, when it comes to things like energy efficiency, we do the - - you know, we're subject to the same sort of standard.

With regard to how we build our own facilities, we can't require them to be transit proximate. That's kind of problematic sometimes with parks. But we certainly like to take advantage of it when it exists.

You know, much of what is part of this program, I think brings very substantial benefit to the Park Service and our objectives. We certainly would like to see better planning within the region, that puts the development in the right places and doesn't rely on entities like the Park Service or local parks departments and things like

that, to preserve green space, because that's one of the struggles that we face all the time.

People tend to see, generally speaking, many people tend to see green space as undeveloped land and it's not. In many cases, it's very important to the overall health of our environment that we regard and see the value of green space as it is, particularly in the very developed areas within the region.

We have our eyes on the parks that we're responsible for, but we also have our eyes beyond the parks and look beyond our boundaries and what you can see from our parks and what you can breathe from the parks and so on, so, all of these things, I think, are very closely aligned with our work and we'd be very happy to be a big part of whatever action actually comes from this, because in the long run, it benefits our mission and helps us achieve our mission.

want to just comment on one thing. There's a concept I've heard, calling it -- D.C. being a -- the hole of the donut, you know, and I just hope that while you're doing your work, you'll remember that the District is the generator, in terms of it being the center, with all the Government here, we hope to continue in this right percentage, but you've got to make sure you don't overlook some special needs we have, to make sure we're brought into the regional expansion, and so, I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN COGBILL: We're trying to do that with St. Elizabeth. Any other questions or comments? Thank you, all. It's been a very good meeting and we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was concluded at 4:20 p.m.)