APPENDIX A
Public Process

APPENDIX A - Public Process

The Upper Wisconsin Avenue Corridor Study (UWACS) Strategic Framework Plan was born out of the Neighborhood Cluster 11, Strategic Neighborhood Action Plan (SNAP) process. One of the priorities identified for Cluster 11 was the need for a strategic development plan/small area plan for the Friendship Heights and Tenleytown commercial areas. In addition, citizens had indicated that they were concerned with development occurring in residential neighborhoods, such as the Albemarle Townhouses, and the need to focus future development on Wisconsin Avenue. An Advisory Steering Committee was convened in the summer of 2002 to assist the Office of Planning draft the scope of work and define the process for the development of the UWACS. The Steering Committee included representatives from each of the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANCs) in the study area as well as representatives from neighborhood and community organizations, property and business owners and several citizens.

In preparation for the start of the Upper Wisconsin planning process, the Office of Planning (OP) hosted two information sessions with the community on transit-oriented development and retail recruitment/marketing. The Consultant Team, led by HOK, conducted an analysis of existing conditions. The planning process was officially kicked-off in January 2003 with a public meeting followed by a 4-day design charrette with the community. That spring, the Consultant Team held a series of focus group meetings in each of the four planning sub-areas (Friendship Heights, Middle Wisconsin, Tenleytown, and South of Tenleytown) to gather additional information from the community on their vision for the corridor.

Comments from the charrette and the focus group meetings were used by the Consultant Team to prepare the draft Plan. In the fall of 2003, the draft Plan was completed and presented to the community at two public meetings. At the request of the citizens, the public review and comment period was extended from 30 to 90 days. At the end of the 90-day public comment period, OP hosted a public hearing at which 39 people testified. In addition to the public testimony, OP received over 100 comments from individuals as well as resolutions from each of the three ANCs in the study area and from some of the other ANC's in Ward 3 along with several resolutions from local community and neighborhood organizations. OP was committed to achieving the highest degree of consensus possible on the UWACS Strategic Framework Plan. In January 2004, OP reconvened the UWACS Advisory

Steering Committee to assist OP address the public comments and concerns that were being raised on the draft Plan and to advise OP in revising the Plan.

Use Inventory & Analysis of Physical Conditions and Informational Meetings. Prior to the design charrette, the design team completed a review and analysis of the physical conditions along the Corridor. The HOK Team reviewed the inventory data provided by OP on the existing uses, zoning, heights, vacancies, businesses, building conditions, etc., made a photographic record of conditions and conducted a 'windshield' survey. The analysis formed the basis for identifying development, preservation, and public realm improvement opportunities. In addition, the Office of Planning conducted two informational meetings in the community on relevant issues - including Transit Oriented Development (TOD), Understanding Retail Opportunities and Retailers' Needs and Green Building Design.

Market Analysis. StreetSense determined current and projected development interest along the corridor by:

1. Determining the trade areas for both regional and local demand;
2. Determining the demand by analyzing market absorption, vacancy rates, construction starts, and pending building permits as well as applying accepted industry standards for demand for each use based on population counts;
3. Determining how much of the demand is currently met; and
4. Analyzing the impediments for retail and housing growth and making recommendations to create opportunities that will attract the interest of the retail and residential development communities, as well as entrepreneurial retailers who might occupy existing space.

Historic Preservation. Historic Preservation issues were evaluated using archival and secondary information and information collected from stakeholders.

The Charrette. During the design phase of the study, the HOK Team conducted an open public work session, known as a charrette. The term "charrette" is used to describe a very focused and intensive planning workshop in an open forum. The openness allows input and feedback from interested parties that have a stake in the design and ownership of the place. For a charrette to be successful it should have the participation of multidisciplinary professionals, jurisdictional officials, local residents and citizen groups, and the client team. The Upper Wisconsin Avenue charrette was held at Chevy Chase Pavilion between February 3, 2003 and February 6, 2003. The event was well attended and productive.

The process of the charrette allows for open participation with the design team. Events were organized around several public activities:

- Listening Sessions. Public presentation, discussions and reviews of the work in progress to provide the stakeholders the opportunity to provide input, build

consensus and influence the plan as it is developed.

- Design Workshops. During the process a team of design professions generate concepts and alternative, refine those concepts based upon the direct input being received.
- Focused Interviews. Interviews are scheduled with individual stakeholders such as large institutions, merchants, property owners, agencies, etc. to gather addition information and feedback.
- Review Sessions. Drop-in sessions, walking tours, briefings, and public workshops provide opportunities of the community to review and respond the design alternatives as they are developed.

The design team began the charrette with a site visit and orientation led by members of the Steering Committee to gain their insight about the Corridor. The focus of the day was on education - for the team, learning about the site; for the charrette attendees, becoming familiar with the process and principles that will guide the design process. The first day ended with a public presentation of the information collected and analyzed on the existing conditions, the results of the market study and an introduction to some basic urban planning principles. The discussion was then opened to the audience to comment on the presentation, and discuss their aspirations for the future.

The second day of the Charrette had two tracks - with the design team beginning to generate concepts while topic focused meetings and roundtable discussions were held. The process allowed for real-time feed back to the designers of issues being raised without unnecessary filtering allowing options to be studied quickly. At the end of the second day, a "pin-up" or informal presentation solicited feedback in an informal but constructive fashion. Days three and four were the most productive design days and included open sessions for the community to participate in the design process. Information gathered from the pre-charrette research along with new information gathered through the meetings of days one and two was used to generate a variety of drawn options. The charrette was concluded with a pin-up that the community was encouraged to attend. The purpose of the pin-up was to present the final draft of the Plan prior to beginning the drafting of the Strategic Framework Plan.

Focus Group Meetings. At the conclusion of the charrette, there was a sense from the community that more opportunities were needed to review and discuss the Plan options. Four focus group meetings were held to present the Plan concepts and additional illustrations regarding the proposed urban form and zoning and to discuss their pros and con's of the concept. The meetings were organized to have a more focused discussion for each of the four sub-areas of the corridor: Friendship Heights, Middle Wisconsin, Tenleytown and South of Tenleytown.

The following is a summary of comments made during the charrette and focus group meetings, organized in the following categories: land use and market; public institutions and transportation; and urban form and design. Meeting notes from each of the focus group meetings are also included.

Land Use and Market

- New housing is desired - some suggested high-rise
- Target new residential units to senior citizens - so that current single family owners can downsize while staying in the same neighborhood
- Diversity in housing in the area with more townhouses and affordable/moderately priced housing - a percentage or guideline might be included
- New residential that becomes defacto American University housing might negatively effect the neighborhood
- American University housing is better accommodated on the corridor than in the neighborhood
- Street facing retail adds character, but more synergy of retail uses is needed
- The retail mix should include unique retail, small business, a gas station, children-oriented stores, hardware store, restaurants
- Preserve the existing businesses

Public Institutions and Transportation

- Protect parking on the residential streets from commuters and shoppers
- Provide adequate public parking; tap into current Parking Task Force to consider alternative for parking solutions
- Improve parking enforcement
- Design parking garages so they are safe and easy to use
- Protect neighborhoods from increased traffic
- Include shuttle bus options for the corridor
- Consider alternative personal transportation planning – bikes
- All the public institutions should be considered such as the schools, parks,
- DDOT, library, Wilson pool, community center, cultural center
- Improve pedestrian safety in crossing the street
- City should buy the mini-mart and expand the firehouse
- Loading should be done off street

Urban Form and Design

- Buildings should not be too high in Friendship Heights and Tenleytown, opinions varied on appropriate height
- Variation of buildings heights adds to character
- Existing zoning is preferred
- Better proffers from developers are needed with PUDs
- Like the farmers market in the parking lot near the Circle
- Historic open space at Tenley Circle should be preserved but aesthetically improved
- Although there is an existing campus master plan there remains concerns about the growth of AU onto the corridor
- Need better landscaping and parking around the Post Office
- Landscaping and maintenance improvements in park spaces needed
- Better signage control - no signs on the top of buildings
- Include green space or public space in Friendship Heights
- Add pedestrian friendly greenways
- Include green architectural practices andrecommendations
- Preserve the low scale character in middle of corridor is a good idea
- Mitigate noise and visual impact of parking garages on adjacent houses
- Public realm needs improved for pedestrians
- Consider impact on the Heritage Trail in Tenleytown area

Focus Group Meeting Notes

Friendship Heights Focus Group Meeting - April 22, 2003

- Target new residential units to senior citizens and empty nesters
- How many residential units are there now within the study boundary in FH?
- How much population loss has there been in Ward 3 since 1970?
- Larger units for condos and rentals in FH (this is the target for empty nesters)
- Discuss in more detail and in final report development on Maryland site (this can be done for office and retail but residential should be considered separately)
- Concerned about rental units becoming defacto American University housing
- What is AU's future plans for students and student housing?
- Diversity in housing for the area including more affordable and moderately priced housing
- Where should public facilities uses (like shelters) go in area if determined that Ward 3 should have more?
- Need more clarity on the future character of FH (design guidelines)
- Incorporate public parking
- Encourage public parking
- Alternative parking strategies - tap into current Parking Task Force - Park by ANC rather than Ward
- Parking Amenities from Developers as public benefits - supply parking for surrounding retail areas
- Parking for trucks and excess parking for area venues
- Design of parking garages so that they are safe and easier to use
- 6-8 Stories on the 43rd Street side of WMATA's property may be too high
- At the WMATA site 8-10 stories tapering to 4-6 is too high for the area
- At WMATA site and at Metro Station, 8-10 stories is appropriate
- Existing zoning is preferred
- HOK should determine sq. footage of various development possibilities and report back to community - this sq footage should also be connected to traffic generation
- Review heights of proposed development along the corridor
- Stepping heights of buildings along corridor
- Include green space or public space at WMATA site
- Correct walking distances from FH Metro on exhibits
- In final plan include parking strategies (also coordinate with Parking Task Force) to avoid neighborhood parking by commuters and shoppers
- 8-10 Stories at Wisconsin And Harrison Street is too high
- Include green building practices and recommendations in final plan
- Include shuttle bus options and recommendations in final plan
- Will increased parking lead to increased traffic?
- How will plan influence Development (have teeth?) - affordable housing
- Pedestrian character on Jenifer Street (west side) - outdoor cafes
- Consider Old Town Alexandria town hall as model for solving parking and public space issues - public space for neighborhood - unique for FH
- Include pictures and images of successful development to be in corridor
- Emphasize unique urban character in FH - pocket parks
- Sq ft. of zoning uses as proposed along corridor
- Street facing retail adds to good character; variation of building heights adds to character; variation of spaces adds to character
- Recommendations for building heights based on framework plan (as appropriate deemed by community)
- What is the development impact on local schools and school aged populations; fund for new and/or expansion of schools as PUD public benefits
- How can low rise buildings in middle of corridor be protected and stay low

- Alternative personal transportation planning - Jim Sebastian at DDOT - Bike Plan
- Enclosed underground pedestrian walk ways
- Underground walkways may take away needed pedestrian traffic for retail store
- Wireless computing facilities - self-employed business facilities

Middle Wisconsin Focus Group Meeting - April 23, 2003

- Down-grade zoning in lower sections to preserve character – is this a good idea?
- How will development impact life such as parking and traffic
- Keep the only gas station
- Can the gas station be relocated to another location along the corridor?
- Keep center area (Fessenden to Ellicott) as is with low heights
- Proposed heights in FH too high next to existing development such as Mazza Galleria; although the basic concept from higher at Metro to low in center is good idea - 6-8 in FH and 4-6 between Harrison and Garrison Streets is probably much more in keeping with existing community.
- Concerned with public parking garages proposed in Harrison to Garrison area - suggest parking be underground
- Parking underground does not have the same safety feel as above ground
- Row houses behind parking between Harrison to Garrison should be single family detached housing
- Parking will attract more traffic to area
- Mitigate noise and other annoyances from parking garages on surrounding neighborhoods
- Do not recreate Bethesda in this area (8-10 stories would give that feel)
- Many car accidents at Fessenden And 42nd Street
- Concerned with develop at Wisconsin and Ellicott Street - street may not be able to handle it
- Keep gas station and frame shop

Likes and dislikes about the area:

LIKES	DISLIKES
Funky retail	Noise
Small park (Fess. to Emory)	Lack of street signs
Low heights	No synergy of retail
Views	Pedestrian unfriendly
Traffic flows	Too many curb cuts
Green space (Harrison to Garrison)	Heavy traffic
Cleaner than other parts	No parking enforcement
Gas station	Bad sidewalks
Car dealerships	Confusing crosswalk at 42nd St.
New residential building	Existing zoning
Trees	No centralized parking
Sense of place	Seedy retail

Benefits and difficulties of consistent 6-8 story building heights:

BENEFIT	DIFFICULTIES
Predictability	Building heights too similar to FH and Tenleytown
Paris has consistent heights	Too much parking demand
More housing opportunity	Heavy traffic and pollution
Smart growth	Lose it uniqueness

Tenleytown Focus Group Meeting - May 14, 2003

- How does AU housing demands affect the corridor? Specifically, # of units from AU moving to corridor
- Grant Road and Heritage Trail - tourists will be coming to area; the block immediately adjacent to Grant Road going north on Wisconsin Ave., Masonic Temple building, use 1890's character to cater to tourists
- Work with other agencies (Parks, Schools, DDOT, Libraries) to develop a comprehensive plan for the area; many issues not being looked at such as Wilson High School, Wilson pool, community center, etc.
- Orient development onto River Road similar to historical pattern
- Impact of 1500 students from Wilson HS on corridor
- Parking requirement for new development
- Noise, glare from new development onto neighborhood
- Improvement of Tenley Circle and closure of part of Fort Drive

- 4500 Block: 8-10 story development and 2-4 on Street – Is that what is being proposed? That height is too high for area – need neighborhood restrictions.
- Why high-rise? Preserve community character
- Why put high buildings on high point?
- Need future parking study from development
- Exit from old Sears' site redevelopment onto school: conflict between students and cars
- Character that we like is low density; open sky; lack of building height; stable neighborhoods; eclectic, historic
- Growing AU's effect on character
- Comparison of development alternative: the current plan vs. the "ooze" plan
- Accommodate AU student housing on corridor rather than in neighborhood
- Need a variety of children oriented stories such as toy stores
- Parking structures run/built by City
- Would like a Tenleytown sign at Tenley Circle
- Schools and churches are the heritage of Tenley; walk children to school; housing for senior citizens
- Preserve existing businesses in future development
- Limit parking in neighborhood for Metro
- Protect neighborhoods from traffic and development on corridor
- Consider higher ratios of parking to supply, ample for each new development
- Better amenities for community from developers
- Consistent 6-story development along the corridor with better architecture
- Signage controls - no signs on top of buildings
- Need guide for citizens that explains zoning and zoning processes
- Seniors should be able to walk across the street safety without fear of being hit by a car.
- Existing zoning protects the neighborhood
- Possible public benefits for PUDs - rebuild or payments to fund to rebuild Janney School; Wilson High School always needs work done on various projects; the plaza around the east exit of the Tenleytown metro stop could be spiffed up.

South of Tenleytown Focus Group Meeting - May 15, 2003

- More parking
- City should buy mini-market to expand firehouse
- Continue farmer's market near circle
- Stay neutral on AU's campus plan
- What is the future of the fast food restaurants?
- Zoning Riggs' Bank parking lot
- Green space management and articulation – recommendations of landscaping improvements and design
- Need to address existing problems from past development boom – parking
- Recommend development of Riggs' parking lot, switching station, and Armand's
- Need to deal with existing nightlight demand for AU students
- Consider growth of AU in neighborhoods and potential to change it
- Greenberg Theater and other development can change neighborhood
- Post office site redevelopment is not possible at this time due to their large facility and 55-year lease with the Washington Home. Post office has an underground facility for mail sorting; 400 employees and 200 parking spaces
- Need to request better landscaping and parking around Post Office
- Encourage alternative transportation thru recommendations of study such as shuttle services, parking restrictions and better parking enforcement
- Circulating bus for Wisconsin Avenue
- Load of trucks off streets and into alleys
- Historic open space needs to be preserved
- Need to control light pollution

Draft and Revised Strategic Framework Plan. In the fall of 2003, the draft Plan was completed and presented to the community at two public meetings. At the request of the ANCs and citizens, the public review and comment period was extended from 30 to 90 days. In addition to the public meetings, OP discussed and presented the draft Plan at several ANC, community and business association meetings. At the end of the 90-day public comment period, OP hosted a public hearing at which 39 people testified. In addition to the public testimony, OP received over 100 comments from individuals as well as resolutions from each of the three ANCs in the study area and from some of the other ANC's in Ward 3 along with several resolutions from local community and neighborhood organizations. OP reviewed and assessed the public comments and entered the information into a database, a summary of which follows. OP was committed to achieving the highest degree of consensus possible on the UWACS Strategic Framework Plan. In January 2004, OP reconvened the UWACS Advisory Steering Committee to assist in addressing some of the public comments and concerns that were being raised on the draft Plan and to advise OP in revising the Plan. The culmination of those efforts resulted in the revised Plan. Due to the somewhat contentious nature of the first few Steering Committee meetings, OP decided to use a facilitator for the remaining meetings. The facilitator maintained an "open questions list" of outstanding questions from Steering Committee members. Those questions and responses from the Office of Planning and other District agencies also follow this section.

Upper Wisconsin Avenue Corridor Study (UWACS) Stratrgic Framework Plan
Summary of Public Process

	2002					2003												2004									
PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS	**AUG**	**SEP**	**OCT**	**NOV**	**DEC**	**JAN**	**FEB**	**MAR**	**APR**	**MAY**	**JUN**	**JUL**	**AUG**	**SEP**	**OCT**	**NOV**	**DEC**	**JAN**	**FEB**	**MAR**	**APR**	**MAY**	**JUN**	**JUL**	**AUG**	**SEP**	**OCT**
Advisory Steering Committee Meetings (Defining the Scope and Process)	1,27																										
Information Sessions on Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and the Retail Market				13		15																					
UWACS Kick-Off Meeting						7																					
Design Charrette							3 - 6																				
Advisory Steering Committee Meeting (Reviewing the Initial Recommendations)								11																			
Focus Group Meetings									22,23	14,15																	
Public Meetings to Present "Draft" Plan															27		8										
90-Day Public Review and Comment Period																											
Discussion/Presentation of "Draft" Plan at Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANCs), Community and Business Association Meetings																											
Public Hearing on "Draft" Plan																			17								
Advisory Steering Committee Meetings (Revising the Plan)																		17	7,21			5, 20	16				
Public Meeting to Present "Revised" Plan																								28			
Discussion/Presentation of "Revised" Plan at Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANCs), Community and Business Association Meetings																											

Summary of Public Comments on Draft UWACS Plan by Comment Category

	Count	Percent of Total
01. Positives of Plan		
Supports Increased Building Heights/Greater Density at Metro Stations	17	14%
Supports Mayor's Goal of 100,000 new residents	5	4%
Supports Mixed-Use Development/Better Retail/More Residential	44	36%
Supports Smart Growth/Utilization of Metro	33	27%
Supports Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)	19	16%
02. Infrastructure		
Needed additional analysis for Public Safety (police, fire, EMS)	34	28%
Needed additional analysis for Public Schools, Library	41	34%
Needed additional analysis for Traffic, Parking, Mass Transit	65	53%
Needed additional analysis for Water, Sewer System	6	5%
03. Height, Density, Zoning, Land Use		
Concerned with Buffer Area/Step-down	3	2%
Concerned with Massing and Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	11	9%

Continued

Summary by Comment Category	Count	Percent of Total
Concerned with Proposed uilding Heights/ Supports Current Zoning	45	37%
Proposes sites to be Rezoned	6	5%
Supports Bonus Density for Affordable Housing	10	8%
Supports Current Planned Unit Development (PUD) Process	8	7%
Supports Framework Plan's Building Heights	8	7%
Supports Zoning Overlay District	4	3%
Would like more certainty in PUD Process/ Public Amenities	10	8%
04. Greenspace, Parks, Historic Preservation		
Concerned with Impacts to Sightlines/Views from Ft. Reno	5	4%
Proposed parks, historic preservation sites to be added to Framework Plan	4	3%
Would like additional Parks/Preservation of Historic Assets	18	15%
05. Design Standards/Guidelines		
Support Design Guidelines/Improved Streetscape	27	22%
06. Retail, Residential		
Concerned with Market Analysis	10	8%
Want additional analysis on tax revenue generated from Framework Plan	10	8%

Continued

Summary by Comment Category	Count	Percent of Total
07. Institutional Uses		
Change Institutional use sites in the Framework Plan	4	3%
08. Growth restriction Area		
Change growth restriction area in the Framework Plan	19	16%
09. Housing Opportunity Area		
Change housing opportunity area in the Framework Plan	7	6%
10. Study Area		
(Included in other categories)		
11. Public Input/Process/Implementation		
Concern with lack of public input/process	20	16%
Would like inclusion of Potential Funding Sources	1	1%
12. Comprehensive Plan, Ward 3 Plan, Cluster		
Support policy in Comp Plan, Ward 3 Plan and/or Cluster 11 SNAP	11	9%

UWACS Steering Committee - *OPEN QUESTIONS Final*

From 5/5/04 SC Meeting:

WMATA

WMATA had announced that Red Line trains would begin running at a higher frequency beginning last month. Are they? **Yes**

What does WMATA show as capacity at Tenleytown at 3pm?
The following is the average hourly entry & exit data for the Tenleytown station for 3:00 pm compared to the busiest hour at that station (9:00 am). Data from five days (May 10 - 14, 2004) was averaged to come up with a weekday average for each hour. 3:00 p.m. - 265 entries and 273 exits; 9:00 a.m. - 827 entries and 1,028 exits.

Can WMATA provide bus capacity and projections for Wisconsin Avenue?
Metrobus Routes 30, 32, 34, 35, and 36 provide service along Wisconsin Avenue between the Friendship Heights Metrorail Station and M Street in Georgetown, then continuing through downtown to various terminals in Southeast Washington. Service is provided over a 22-hour span seven days per week. Buses are scheduled to operate every 4-5 minutes during AM and PM peak periods and every 9-15 minutes off-peak and on weekends. Buses on these routes have a capacity of 50 passengers (42 seats plus 20% standing). Current peak loads average 35 passengers per trip.

The Regional Bus Study completed in 2003 recommends implementation of a limited-stop premium bus service on Wisconsin Avenue overlaid on the existing local routes, which would increase capacity substantially. Implementation of this new service is dependent on obtaining additional funding to support the operating costs.

Metrobus Route N2 provides additional service on Wisconsin Avenue between Friendship Heights and Tenleytown. From Tenleytown, N2 buses turn on Nebraska Avenue to Massachusetts Avenue, then to Farragut Square. N2 service operates weekdays between 6 AM and 8:30 PM. Buses are scheduled to operate every 15-20 minutes during AM and PM peak periods and every 30 minutes off-peak. Buses on this route also have a capacity of 50 passengers with current peak loads averaging 30 passengers per trip.

WMATA's submitted information assumed 1800 new households. What would happen if that number was doubled? Is there any model or guidelines that can assist the community in plugging in different assumptions?
The impact of this total development (1800 new households) on future eight-car trains, (running at April 2004 increased frequency of 20%) during the peak period (mornings) would be about 4 additional persons per car. 3600 new households would result in about 8 additional persons per car during the peak period.

What happens to the Red Line capacity projections if METRO does not get the funding required to meet the assumptions in their 2001 Core Capacity Study?
This is a type of event that will have a system wide impact on METRO and the specifics of the event will be considered by WMATA when they devise policies and plans in response. But it is important to note that the system is simply too important to the regional economy not to use it fully.

Do WMATA projections for Red Line capacity consider assumed ridership from approved projects in Maryland side of Friendship Heights and approved or planned projects north of Friendship Heights? If not, what happens if they are included?
Yes, WMATA projections are based on Council of Governments forecasts and take into account planned projects and assume increased development at the Metro Stations.

How does massing density and proximity to stations impact WMATA projections?
See previous response.

WASA

Can community get an electronic copy of WASA map?
Distributed May 6, 2004

What is the capacity for the four sewer run off pipes? How many households will it take to reach the existing pipes' capacity?

Washington's water system was designed (has been proven to handle) over 800,000 residents; 2000 population was 572,059. WASA evaluates pipe capacity by total anticipated flows from households and inflow/infiltration factors. We also consider the source loads compared to existing flows in the sewer line. Therefore, it is very difficult and time-consuming to speculate on the maximum capacity of dwellings in a given area. If there is a large core of development somewhere, it is highly likely that a relief sewer can be added so there are many factors to consider depending on where the actual development would take place. All of the information provided by the potential developer would be considered during the hydraulic analysis completed in the required EISF process. If capacity is limited, than alternatives will be considered. If the alternatives are too costly or have a great impact, than the development may not be approved for sewer hook-up.

DCPS

Are the Janney School's principal's questions in the record and were they considered by OP in preparing the draft?

The principal's information was provided in response to questions from OP. They are not part of the "public record" per se, in that they were not submitted as public testimony. However, since they have been provided in response to FOIA requests, they are now in the public domain. OP's understanding of the Janney school infrastructure and capacity issues is based on a number of sources, including, the DCPS Master Facility Plan, work that OP has done with DCPS, the Twenty First Century Fund, the Bookings Institution and others with regard to public schools and charter schools throughout the city and conversations with the DCPS facility planning staff, in addition to the information provided by the principal.

Does the revised UWACS continue the recommendation from the draft UWACS to keep Janney Elementary School in the Growth Restriction Area?

They are located in the Growth Restriction Area, but the revised plan has created a separate category for the public schools in the corridor, so as to not preclude future additions or public/private partnerships.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Can the Plan propose a site for a second fire station?

OP cannot do this in the context of the Upper Wisconsin Area Corridor Study, because consideration of whether or not a second fire station is warranted will need to consider a much broader area. However, OP will be working with the Fire Department to identify possible future needs for expanded services in the area and throughout the City, in conjunction with the on-going Master Facility Plan effort and future capital budget planning.

Will there be more public safety information on police and fire situations?

See Chapter 3 of revised draft, pg 30.

TRANSPORTATION

Is the existing transportation study inconsistent with the UWACS assumptions and proposals?

No. To the extent any of the assumptions in the final draft differ from those in the Friendship Heights Transportation Study, we will provide that revised information to the consultant for the Wisconsin Avenue study which is about to begin.

MISCELLANEOUS

Are there models, benchmarks, guidelines, etc. that establish what level of height and density at Friendship Heights and Tenleytown Metro would be seen by developers as incentives to develop the areas?

OP is working with the Deputy Mayor's Office for Planning and Development to analyze pro formas addressing this issue.

Can OP present renderings for Friendship Metro?

OP is working on it.

What FAR will OP recommend for Tenleytown area?

Existing zoning, including the FAR permitted under the existing zoning as a matter of right and through the PUD process.

Will OP propose alternative scenarios or include alternatives offered by ANC and/or community groups in the final study?

In order to serve as a basis for future land use decisions, the plan must provide a clear recommendation on uses, heights

and density. Alternative scenarios would be inappropriate to fulfill that purpose. The original contract called for the consultant to consider "up to three" scenarios, but as the project evolved, the consultant advised that only one scenario was advisable, based on the results of the market study.

Are the green-hatched zones as now depicted on these maps the entire area "where OP is considering changes in heights/density from what is permitted under current zoning."
Yes. This information was presented at the steering committee meeting on 5/20 and is explained in the revised text of Chapter 3 (pp. 4-5).

5/13 email from Marti Edmondson

I have a question about the function of the steering committee. It is not and never has been clear to me what role the Steering Committee will have in developing the final version of the UWACS. I have seen reference to the Steering Committee playing an "advisory role" and a role as "liaison" with the community. But when push comes to shove (metaphorically speaking!), what power does the Steering Committee have over the decision-making process? If a majority of the committee, let's say, disagrees with a recommendation made by OP, must OP comply with the will of the committee? In short, are we there simply to ask questions or make determinations about the finally version of the plan? Are we really steering anything?
The Steering Committee has been and continues to be the most significant element of public participation in the preparation of the UWACS Plan. Other components of the public participation process include the charrette, focus groups, public meetings and an entire process, which is outlined in Appendix B. The Steering Committee has addressed each and every issue it, or any of its members, deemed appropriate. They are being given access to Office of Planning internal drafts of the Plan for their review and comment. The final decision regarding what appears in the Plan is the responsibility of the Office of Planning, having taken into account all the relevant professional and public information, reports, and material. The Office of Planning is solely responsible for, and should be held accountable for, the contents of the Plan.

The public participation process does not stop with OP's final draft. The process continues as the Plan is submitted to the District Council and officially reviewed by ANC's. The Council will hold an additional public hearing for all interested citizens, ANC's and relevant organizations. Ultimately, the Plan must be passed by the Council and signed into law by the Mayor.

5/14/04 email from Carolyn Sherman:

What changes have been made to the recommendations for 4800 Wisconsin Avenue, the Martens Volve site? The original draft recommended 6-8 stories at that site, and I wondered if that is still the recommendation?
The revised draft does not recommend stories; as OP indicated at the last Steering Committee meeting, it is recommending heights and FARs consistent with the existing underlying zoning.

5/14/04 email from David Frankel
QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE CAPACITY OF JANNEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CONNECTION WITH THE UPPER WISCONSIN AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY

1. Can DCPS confirm that Janney Elementary School is listed in its Facilities Master Plan Update (Fall 2003) as a Tier 5 school, which means that it is not scheduled to receive significant modernization and expansion funds anytime in the next ten years, at least? Is there any more recent information that has altered Janney's standing as a Tier 5 school? Can DCPS confirm that the Janney E.S. facility is rated "poor" in the Facilities Master Plan Update and that Janney's educational adequacy from a facilities (not programmatic) standpoint is also rated "poor" in that document? Is it true that since the time the Facilities Master Plan Update was first prepared that the overall DCPS capital budget has been reduced, making it even less likely that there will be new modernization/expansion funds for Janney over the next ten years?

2. How many staff members, if any, will Janney E.S. lose as a result of the DCPS School Board's vote of Tuesday, May 11, 2004, to abolish 334 staff positions from DCPS elementary schools? See http://www.k12.dc.us/dcps/frontpagepdfs/Abolishment%20Process%20and%20Outcomes.pdf Will the number of Janney teachers be reduced from the 2003/04 school year to the 2004/05 school year? What are those two figures? In light of recent DCPS budget cuts, is there any

guarantee that even with an increase in enrollment at Janney, that the staff there will increase from its present level to meet all enrollment needs?

3. On January 15, 2004, Janney's principal, Dr. Abelmann, sent an e-mail message to Cindy Petkac which states in relevant part: "I want you to be aware that we are a crowded school currently facing many facility challenges. While we do have out of bounds students, this reflects the value we place on diversity and the need to operate a large school for fiscal reasons to keep the staff level we want to keep. The growth of in bound families is slowly displacing the chance for out of bound students to attend Janney. For example we have 69 in bound kindergarten students. It is likely that this trend will continue. If this is the case, we will face serious space challenges. We also are not clear as to what DCPS will do with 6th grade and whether it will move to Deal at some point. This could help our space challenges. This district could also require all schools to offer pre k universally. This would create a great challenge for us as we can't meet the current demand for pre k with the space we have. Each year we offer at least one pre k class and depending on space have more spaces or not. I want to be careful how your office represents space issues at Janney and would ask that you consult me on any diction you use in written reports or public presentations. I'd be happy to hose [sic] you visiting the school and reviewing school issues." Did Dr. Abelmann's e-mail message, quoted above, accurately summarize the capacity situation at Janney? If not, how was it inaccurate?

4. On January 29, 2004, Dr. Abelmann sent an e-mail message to Cindy Petkac and others which states in relevant part: "Many of the questions you raise relate to DCPS policy. For example, what are the future plans of the district related to if and when 6th grade will attend Deal? Will DCPS require all schools to continue to offer at least one pre k class. Will the district require schools to meet the demand for pre k? Boundary lines are also determined by the system as part of the review of the master facility plan. Thus, I suggest you contact Robin O'hara or Charles Obi related to some of these system issues. Our current enrollment continues to be above the capacity of the school as reported in the master facility plan. Our enrollment on October 8th can be found on the DCPS web site. As of today, we have 337 in bound students and 135 out of bound students. We have not been able to accept out of bound students in the younger grades as the in bound population has grown significantly and it appears more and more families are sending their children to public school. We have 70 in bound pre k students this year and projections suggest about the same number for next year." On January 29, 2004, Dr. Abelmann sent an e-mail message to Cindy Petkac and others which states in relevant part: "Please note the following correction: We have 70 in bound kindergarten students this year and project about the same for next year. Note: Pre K spaces are more limited. We currently only have 1.5 classes of pre k." Did Dr. Abelmann's two e-mail messages, quoted above, accurately summarize the capacity situation at Janney? If not, how were they inaccurate?

5. The table that Robin O'Hara provided to the Steering Committee on February 21, 2004, that is labeled "Recommendations: Effects of Requested CIP and Non-CIP Actions on Availability of Seats," projects Janney's enrollment as ranging between 75 and 85 students (about 20 percent) above and beyond its permanent capacity through the 2007/2008 school year. That table does not take into account any plans within the Janney boundaries to greatly expand the number of new residents, correct?

6. What plans, if any, have been made to expand Janney if the population in the area that Janney serves doubles or triples over the next ten years? What plans, if any, have been made to build a new elementary school to serve the existing Janney area if the population in the area that Janney serves doubles or triples over the next ten years? Is the money to expand Janney or build a new school currently available? If not, is this money guaranteed to be available if Janney's student enrollment continues to grow? If a new elementary school were needed to serve some of the area that Janney presently serves, where would that school be located?

7. Can you confirm that to the extent that Janney's in boundary enrollment increases beyond its capacity; there will be fewer spots available at Janney for children who live outside of Janney's boundaries? Is Janney a designated recipient school under the "No Child Left Behind" Act for students who are attending under-performing schools? If so, might this law result in larger class sizes for some Janney students? Also, if Janney is a recipient school under the No Child Left Behind law, will increasing in boundary student enrollment at Janney put additional pressure on Janney to increase its class sizes?

8. Does Janney enroll out of boundary students with special needs or disabilities? What has been the trend for such students over the past five years? Does DCPS want this number to remain stable, increase or decrease over the next five to ten years?

9. During the February 21, 2004 Steering Committee meeting, many in attendance wanted to understand what impact the construction of certain types of housing within the Janney boundaries might have on the number of school aged

children. So, as requested at that time — and as Ms. O'Hara said was possible — can you please provide us with statistics, from within DCPS Planning Area G, of the numbers of school aged children who live in one, two, three and greater bedroom apartments or condominiums? Is it possible for you to break this down by the number of bedrooms? Is there a difference between condos or coops on the one hand versus apartments on the other? [As Ms. O'Hara reported, we would expect to see more children in three bedroom condos than in one-bedroom apartments.] Also, since the draft Upper Wisconsin Avenue Corridor Study also recommends the construction of town houses and row houses within the Janney area, can you provide similar statistics for children living in this type of housing in Planning Area G? In particular, we request that you use the multi-family residential buildings located near the Van Ness/UDC Metro station in performing this analysis. These multi-family residential buildings appear to be the types of buildings and densities that OP seems to contemplate for parts of the Friendship Heights and Tenleytown areas.

10. How are geographic boundaries set for DCPS elementary schools? Who sets them, who is involved in the decision making process, how long does the process take and what criteria are used? How many times has Janney's boundaries been changed over the past 30 years? It was reported in the May 5, 2004 issue of the Northwest Current (on page 7) that Janney's boundaries have recently been expanded for the first time since 1977 despite the growth of its enrollment and the current enrollment overcapacity of the school. Is this correct? That article indicated that neither the Janney PTA nor its principal were involved in the decision to expand Janney's boundaries. Is this correct? If Janney is presently overcrowded (e.g., it has two temporary classroom trailers on its property and the school facility is rated to accommodate only 394 students, but has an actual enrollment far in excess of that), and the enrollment trend has been increasing over the past ten years as indicated by the Facilities Master Plan Update (Fall 2003), why hasn't DCPS already redrawn Janney's boundaries to force some in bounds students to attend other local elementary schools?

11. I note that the Janney site consists of 3.64 acres (including the school building and its staff parking lot). How much green space/playing fields/outdoor play area does Janney have? Does Janney presently have as part of its facilities an amount of green space/playing fields/outdoor play area that is considered adequate for an elementary school of its size? According to DCPS standards, what is the ideal amount of green space/playing fields/outdoor play area for an elementary school of Janney's size?

12. As you know, the Janney community recently considered the possibility of a Public Private Partnership ("PPP"), whereby the school would permanently give up part of its space to a developer in exchange for money to modernize and expand the school building. The April 24, 2004 issue of the Janney School newsletter contains the following quotation from the Principal's Notes section: "PPP. The SIT concluded that at this time there is no consensus around the idea of furthering discussion on the concept of a public private partnership. Thus, the SIT will not ask DCPS to further study the concept at this time. The SIT does recommend that the PTA invest in a third party needs assessment of the school. The school should also advocate for an entrance to the new library off of Albemarle and being able to access school land from Wisconsin Avenue. The SIT recommended that there be a liaison between the school and the library." In light of the lack of consensus for a PPP, can you outline for us the steps that must be taken to successfully achieve a PPP and how long this process takes? Since Janney is located in an R-1-B zone, what hurdles would have to be overcome for a portion of its land to be given up for the development of multi-residential units or townhouses? Assuming a significant portion of the community — somewhat over a majority of those who express any opinions — oppose a PPP, may the PPP nevertheless take place?

13. In the event that Janney needs to be expanded to accommodate an increased student enrollment, Janney will require some of the land around its present building to do its expansion, correct? This would further limit the space/playing fields/outdoor play that presently surrounds Janney, right?

14. Does the fact that the DCPS Facilities Master Plan Update (Fall 2003) lists Janney as "Historically Significant" impact on the types of renovations and expansion that can be performed there? How? Does the "Historically Significant" designation impact on how quickly any renovations and expansion could occur? How?

15. Is Janney's student enrollment capacity dependent to any degree on whether Janney's sixth grade may move at some point to Alice Deal Junior High School if Deal becomes a middle school? See Dr. Abelmann's January 15 and 29, 2004 e-mail messages in item numbers 3 and 4 above. The DCPS Facilities Master Plan Update (Fall 2003) lists Deal as a Tier 2 school, placing it much higher on the renovation and modernization list than Janney, a Tier 5 school. What is the present status of funding for modernization at Deal? What is the realistic schedule for when Deal will be fully modernized and ready to accept all sixth grade students from Janney?

16. According to DCPS, what is the total enrollment capacity at Janney and what assumptions are used to arrive at this figure?

17. When Robin O'Hara distributed an e-mail message dated May 10, 2004 that stated in part that "there is no question that in boundary students can be accommodated at Janney, the question is how many out-of-boundary students can be accommodated at Janney" what assumptions was she making about the number of future in boundary students at Janney over the next five to ten years? Also, what assumptions was she making about students who might seek to transfer to Janney pursuant to the No Child Left Behind law from low performing schools?

DCPS reviewed all of the above questions as well as the email traffic that has touched on this subject. Below is their response. It addresses some, but not all of the questions raised. We have asked DCPS to send a representative to the 5/20/04 Steering committee meeting to discuss issues relevant to the UWACS. At this date, we have received no response to that request. The DCPS response to the above questions is as follows:

Janney while crowded, will have space for any in-boundary student; it just means that there will be fewer out-of-boundary students allowed in.

The affect of No Child Left Behind is likely to be minimal (a total of approximately 230 mostly middle and high school students took advantage of it this past year out of a system of nearly 65000 students).

The educational adequacy indicator refers to facilities that can address educational program requirements such as do they have a gym? A science lab? ...It does not refer to the potential academic prowess of the school (Janney is one of the top in the system based on test scores).

Janney is not tiered in the current Facilities Master Plan (there are no listings past tier 4). Janney was listed as a tier 5 school in the 2001 FMP. The condition of Janney is not the greatest (but then the same goes for most of our facilities). It is in great need of electrical upgrades and kitchen improvements among other things. However the school appears in better shape than many in the school system. The FMP is posted on the web for viewing by the public off of the DCPS home page.

Janney is asked to look at a 10% reduction in budget to make up for FY04. They are however going to be staffed based on the projected number of students for the 04-05 school year which is close to what they had this year, so the over all effect should be minimal and certainly not the hit that many other schools are going to take who are projected to lose students and also didn't come in as high as projected this year (Janney came in within a couple of projections).

5/17/04 email from Marilyn Simon

At the April 2003 meeting at Chevy Chase Pavilion, I asked for a copy of [the market] study, and was told that it would be posted on the web-site. It was never posted. I have attached below, an e-mail sent to the Office of Planning last November, again requesting a copy of the complete economic analysis, or confirmation that the complete economic analysis was included in the OP Draft Study.

The market study was posted on the website. It is Appendix C in the UWACS draft that has been posted on the OP website since November 18, 2003. It was prepared by StreetSense, a well-regarded real estate market research firm.

Since the conclusions of this market study are critical to OP's capacity analyses, a better understanding of the market studies is needed by the Steering Committee in order to fully evaluate the infrastructure studies and the impact on the area of the OP proposals. I request that the Steering Committee be provided with the following information:

Identify each of the economists who was involved in the development of the market analysis for each of the four individual study areas within the Upper Wisconsin Avenue Commercial Corridor.

Appendix C is StreetSense's full report with footnotes for citations. The author of that report is Heather Knause.

Identify each of the economists who have stated, in writing, that it is appropriate to estimate, separately, demand for multi-dwelling units ["MDUs"] for each of these four individual study areas, and that demand for MDUs in each those

individual study areas is not closely related to demand for MDUs in the other study areas or in other District neighborhoods. Provide copies of those statements. [Specifically, we are requesting all statements by economists concluding that MDUs in any other neighborhood would not be a close substitute for MDUs in any of the four UWACCS study areas, such as the area along Wisconsin Avenue between Harrison Street and Western Avenue.]
Author of the Report isn't aware of what is being cited, please provide citation.

Identify all other professionals that participated in the development of the market analysis for each of the four individual study areas within the UWACC.
As indicated previously, Ms. Knause is the primary author of the study.

Provide a complete copy of the economic analysis that estimated the regional demand for MDUs.
Cited in Appendix C, Footnotes 16, 17 (pg 60 of Draft)

Provide a complete copy of the economic analysis that estimated the District's share of demand for MDUs at 25-30% of regional demand for MDUs.
Cited in Appendix C, Footnotes 16 (pg 60 of Draft)

Provide a complete copy of the economic analysis in which the estimates for each of the four individual study areas within the UWACC was determined.
Appendix C

Provide a complete copy of any analyses that demonstrate that demand for MDUs in each of the four individual study areas is independent of demand for MDUs in any of the other individual study areas or in other District neighborhoods, such as the Connecticut Avenue Corridor, the Downtown residential neighborhoods or other District neighborhoods near Metrorail Stations.
Author of the Report, who has done real estate market analysis throughout the city, based her conclusions on her extensive knowledge of the housing market, and the demographic, psychographic and socio-economic characteristics of the market for housing on the Wisconsin corridor. Also, please refer to pg 57 of the Draft for author's related statement.

5/17/04 email from Marilyn J. Simon

We request that OP provide a good faith estimate for each block between Rodman Street and Harrison Street, separately for the west and east side of Wisconsin Avenue, and for each major site north of Harrison Street [for example: WMATA, Buick, Mazza, Lord & Taylor, Starwood, etc.]:
a. the land area included in that block or site;
b. the maximum height and the recommended height for that block or site;
c. the maximum floor area ratio ["FAR"] and the recommended FAR for that block or site;
d. the recommended uses;
e. an estimate of the number of square feet which, under a full build-out of the OP plan, would be used for each of the following purposes: residential, retail, office.
f. an estimate of the number of residential units for that block or site under a full build-out of the OP plan;
g. an estimate of the number of parking spaces that would be included in that block or site with a full build-out of the OP plan.
h. a calculation of the total floor area, for each block or site, that could be developed under matter of right standards for current zoning;
i. an estimate of the number of residential units that could be built on each block or site under a full build-out under matter-of-right standards for current zoning;
j. an estimate of the number of parking spaces that would be required under a full build-out under matter of right standards for current zoning.
This information was presented at the steering committee meeting on 5/20, is explained in the revised text of Chapter 3 (pp. 4-5), and see answers on pgs 21-22 of this document.

5/18 email from Gina Mirigliano

1. Please describe the actions OP is taking to ensure a transportation study is performed for Friendship Heights that considers the UWACS height and density recommendations.
Existing DDOT Friendship Heights study includes projections consistent with UWACS. Next DDOT study will include development scenario consistent with UWACS revised draft.

2. It is common knowledge that the intersection of Wisconsin/Western cannot manage its existing volume of traffic on any given weekday or weekend day. Also, DC MPD designates the intersection of Wisconsin/Jenifer as one of the

poorest performing intersections outside the Central Business District. In light of these issues, and considering current zoning already allows for dramatic growth in this area, please explain OP's rationale for recommending increased height and density beyond the current zoning in this section of Friendship Heights.
DDOT has recommended changes in this intersection. The Comprehensive Plan designates Friendship Heights as a Regional Center and a Housing Opportunity Center. UWACS proposals are based on the Comprehensive Plan.

3. Please explain why OP does not designate the Tenley Study Center on Garrison Street as an Institution in the Draft Plan and does not consider this as a technical correction in the Revised Plan.
It is not clear that this is a legal use under the existing zoning. OP is researching on what basis the Center operates an institutional use in a residential zone.

4. Please explain why OP believes the "regional center" concept associated with Friendship Heights in the Comprehensive Plan is not currently carried out in Friendship Heights under current zoning height and density designations.
Current zoning in Friendship Heights is the same as multi-neighborhood centers. Zoning Commission, in its past consideration of PUDs in this area, has established precedent for zones more in keeping with Regional Center designation.

5. Please explain how the UWACS recommendations "maintain and enhance the low density character of the neighborhood" (Comprehensive Plan) in the American University Park single family neighborhood adjoining the Friendship Heights section of the UWACS planning area.
UWACS uses growth restriction designation and continued use of R zones as buffers to fulfill this goal. It also indicates that projects of greater height and density will have lower heights abutting single family neighborhoods to buffer them from the more intensive uses.

6. Please identify the boundary of the area of the "tightly clustered" blocks in Friendship Heights where OP is recommending height and density increases by street name and parcel. Please also identify the specific increases.
OP provided that information in detail at the 5/20 Steering Committee meeting.

7. Please identify the recommendations OP will make to ensure persistent retail vacancies do not increase in the area west of Wisconsin, north of Harrison Street, particularly in light of the planned Friendship Heights, MD plaza and street level retail, and the pedestrian barriers associated with Western Avenue and Wisconsin Avenue.
Given the strength of the retail demand, we do not expect any problem with vacancies. Providing additional retail anchors as proposed on the DC side, along with the retail development on the Maryland side, will only improve the retail climate, by creating a critical mass of retail, which actually encourages shoppers to come. Also, the UWACS study proposes the establishment of a Main Street organization, working with the ReStore DC program, to coordinate marketing and retail improvement; these programs have already proven to be successful in other neighborhood commercial areas. In addition, OP expects that the proposed Overlay Zone will create a better pedestrian climate through design guidelines.

At present, that area includes a vacant car dealership, a rather desolate Metro entrance plaza and a large, above-ground parking garage with a bank, a sandwich shop and a discount clothing retailer at the ground level, plus a bus garage with an open air bus parking lot. Redevelopment of the site along the lines proposed by the Plan, using the Planned Unit Development mechanism, which involves extensive public involvement, detailed design review, traffic studies and requirements for substantial public benefits and amenities to be provided by the developers, could only be an improvement.

8. In Item 2 of the Revision Proposal distributed to the steering committee on 5/3/04, OP states "…OP finds that the current zoning should be better tailored to what is envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan." Will OP recommend zoning changes in Friendship Heights? Also, given that the Comprehensive Plan and Generalized Land Use Map were developed based on the zoning currently in place in Friendship Heights, how can "tailoring" zoning occur and not become inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan?
Correction: Current and future zoning is based on the Comprehensive Plan, not the reverse. OP is not proposing to rezone Friendship Heights directly. We are indicating in this plan a set of heights and densities consistent with higher density zoning on certain portions of the lots north of Harrison

and west of Wisconsin. We are suggesting the use of the Planned Unit Developments, which include map changes consistent with those recommended heights, so long as they are well-designed (including stepping down in height close to single-family homes), include ground floor retail with generally (but not necessarily exclusively) residential use above, provide a substantial package of public benefits and amenities and have minimal or no adverse impacts in terms of traffic, storm water runoff, etc. We will outline our proposal at the 5/20 meeting, and expect to have more detailed design studies available at the June meeting.

a) Wisconsin Avenue south of Ingomar Street is designated as the Low Density commercial use category ("Shopping and service areas that are generally low in scale, character and activity and that provide a limited range of retail goods and services are the predominate uses.") on the Comprehensive Plan Generalized Land Use Map. Please explain why the UWACS height and density recommendations for Wisconsin Avenue in the area from Ingomar Street to Harrison Street are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and potentially non-conforming to the 1910 Hyde Act.
OP is not proposing any zoning that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or with what we assume you meant to refer to, the Height Act of 1910.

b) The residentially zoned properties west of Wisconsin bounded by Harrison Street and 44th Street are designated as the Moderate Density residential land use category ("Row houses and garden apartments are the predominant uses; may also include low density housing.") on the Comprehensive Plan Generalized Land Use Map. Please explain why the UWACS height and density recommendations for this area are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and potentially non-conforming to the 1910 Hyde Act.
See answer above.

c) In the area north of Ingomar Street, a Medium Density Mixed Use category designation on the Comprehensive Plan Generalized Land Use Map is specified. This provides for multiple-unit housing and mid-rise apartment buildings as the predominant residential use and shopping and service areas offering a large concentration and variety of goods and services where most customers arrive by car, bus or subway. Please explain why the UWACS height and density recommendations for this area are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and potentially non-conforming to the 1910 Hyde Act.
See answer above.

9. In Item 2 of the Revision Proposal distributed to the steering committee on 5/3/04, OP states "…it is appropriate to encourage greater density height than are permitted by current zoning…" Does OP mean density and height in this statement?
Yes

10. What does the term "appropriately buffered" mean in Item 2 of the Revision Proposal distributed to the steering committee on 5/3/04?
It means screening higher-intensity developments with lower developments more consistent with lower-scale residential uses. A good example is the Courts of Chevy Chase project on the backside of the Chevy Chase Pavilion. If one stands in the front yard of houses on 43rd Street, one block away from the Pavilion, the Courts block the view of the Pavilion, which is more than 90 feet tall. Buffering also includes placing loading zones and parking entrances in higher density projects so that cars and trucks don't use residential streets to get to them, and appropriate use of landscaping and other visual shields.

11. In reference to Item 7 above, please identify the recommendations OP will make to ensure the surrounding neighborhood is "appropriately buffered."
See previous responses

12. In Item 2 of the Revision Proposal, how does OP define "greater benefits for the community"?
As outlined in the PUD process regulations: "project must offer a commendable number or quality of public benefits" to offset the flexibility of development (increased building height and density). These benefits can include improvements to local schools, libraries and parks, quality streetscape and landscaping, provision of open space, provision of community rooms, reconstruction of the Metro bus garage so that it is entirely underground and has state-of-the-art air and water pollution controls (without buses having to idle all night in cold weather), and similar public benefits. Greater benefits for the community can also include replacing eyesores such as the Buick dealership parking lot or Metro bus garage with attractive,

well-designed buildings providing adequate underground parking and retail goods and services so that residents don't have to drive to Rockville Pike to shop.

13. Will the Draft Plan recommendation to place parking facilities on Garrison Street west of Wisconsin be excluded from the Revised Plan?
Yes

14. Will the Draft Plan recommendation to place parking facilities on Harrison Street east of Wisconsin be excluded from the Revised Plan?
Yes

15. The R-2 zoned properties bounded by Harrison/Garrison and Garrison/Fessenden were recommended for height increases and placed outside the Growth Restriction Area in the Draft Plan. These R-2 zoned properties, and the R-2 zoned property facing 45th Street, were the sole R-2 zoned properties outside the Growth Restriction Area. At the 5/3/04 steering committee meeting, OP announced that the height recommendations made in the Draft Plan for the Harrison/Garrison and Garrison/Fessenden properties will not appear in the Revised Plan. Has a corresponding change in the recommendation for the Growth Restriction Area been made to now include these areas in the Growth Restriction Area? If not, why not?
No. These areas were included in the Primary Study Area, the boundaries of which were decided by the Steering Committee in July 2002. These areas are also included in the boundaries of the Housing Opportunity Areas. The revised Plan does not recommend any zoning changes to these areas.

16. Will the height recommendations made in the Draft Plan appear in the Revised Plan for the R-2 zoned property facing 45th Street which adjoins the R-1 zoned property directly across the street? If yes, why?
The revised Plan proposes an R-4 zoning designation to this area, as a higher density residential buffer between the R-1-B area across the street and the C-2-A zone at Lord and Taylor. The R-4 has the same height limitation (40 feet) under matter-of-right as the R-1-B district across the street.

17. Will the Growth Restriction Area recommendation in the Revised Plan include or exclude the R-2 zoned property facing 45th Street which adjoins the R-1 zoned property directly across the street?
That area was included in the Primary Study Area, the boundaries of which were decided by the Steering Committee in July 2002. This area is also included in the boundaries of the Housing Opportunity Areas. It is not included in the Growth Restriction Area. (See above.) The revised Plan proposes an R-4 zoning designation to this area, as a residential buffer between the R-1-B area across the street and the C-2-A zone at Lord and Taylor.

18. Will the Revised Plan maintain the height and density associated with the R-5-B zoning designation for the property west of 44th Street currently zoned R-5-B? If not, why not?
This information was presented at the steering committee meeting on 5/20 and is explained in the revised text of Chapter 3 (pp. 4-5).

19. Will the Revised Draft Plan maintain the height and density associated with the R-5-B zoning designation for the property east of 44th Street currently zoned R-5-B? If not, why not?
OP explained the revised recommendations for height and density at 5/20 SC meeting.

20. Will OP integrate the steering committee input provided to OP during the period 5/21/04 - 6/9/04 into the Revised Plan prior to submission of the plan to ANCs? If not, why not?
OP will give great weight to all Steering Committee and public input throughout the entire process, until final action is taken by the Council.

21. Five days is not enough time to review the Revised Plan and formulate questions. Please modify the "Between SC Meetings" period currently designated in the UWACS Draft Schedule as 5/21-5/25 to the period 5/21-6/2.
The time to review the revised draft has been extended until June 16.

<u>5/18/04 email from Kevin Pettit</u>

1 - Since the deplorable state of the Tenleytown commercial core is one of the major problems this plan needs to address, how will the revised plan increase the incentive for land owners and developers to redevelop the area? Given the

removal from the plan of any recommendation for upzoning in Tenleytown, what difference is the plan going to make in terms of incentives?
The Office of Planning is exploring the feasibility of an overlay zone that would encourage ground-floor retail uses within some of the commercially zoned parts of the Corridor. An overlay could set basic design guidelines related to building setbacks, windows, ground floor heights and openings in order to create an attractive pedestrian environment. An overlay may also identify use standards, or preferred uses, and may provide incentives for these uses, such as bonus density. In addition, the Plan now also outlines the PUD process to ensure that "affected " ANCs and the community are involved in identifying public amenities for proposed PUDs.

Second, the Plan includes information on options available to the business community to organize and work with the Office of the Deputy's Mayor for Planning and Economic Development on business retention and expansion. reSTORE DC coordinates activities that support retention, expansion and attraction of retail stores in the District's neighborhood business districts, such as providing financial and technical assistance to non-profit organizations that seek to undertake commercial revitalization. Neighborhood businesses interested in seeking assistance can also join together to form one or all of the following organizations: Business Improvement District (BID), Merchant's Association and/or Main Street Program.

2 - On a potentially related issue, how will the proposed retail overlay incentivize landowners, developers, and/or business owners to initiate the necessary improvements to properties around the Metro?
See previous response.

May 21 email 9:56pm David Frankel

Each of these maps has thick dotted green border lines around parcels to the east and to the west of the C-2-A zoning districts along Wisconsin Avenue between Harrison and Garrison Streets, N.W. Specifically, I am referring to the area bordered by the blue C-2-A zone and the dotted green lines. According to these two maps, these areas are each in R-2 zoning districts and have a maximum height of 40 feet. My question is: Why weren't these two areas included in the so-called "Growth Restriction Area" of the UWACS?
These areas were included in the Primary Study Area, the boundaries of which were decided by the Steering Committee in July 2002. These areas are also included in the boundaries of the Housing Opportunity Areas. The revised Plan does not recommend any zoning changes to these areas.

5/21/2004 email 10:42:31 PM Frankel

Would you please let me know whether the questions I sent to you on May 14th concerning Janney Elementary School and the UWACS were answered and if so what the answers were?
A response was provided to the steering committee in the "open questions" document dated May 20, 2004.

5/24/20 email 11:45:41 AM Frankel

It appears that you did not understand my question. I was not asking why the two areas I identified in my May 21st e-mail to you were originally designated the way they were — as you note "in the summer of 2002." Rather, I was asking why these two areas weren't included in the so-called "Growth Restriction Area" of the revised UWACS that OP is just now circulating for further input and discussion.
These areas were included in the Primary Study Area, the boundaries of which were decided by the Steering Committee in July 2002. These areas are also included in the boundaries of the Housing Opportunity Areas. The revised Plan will not recommend any zoning changes to these areas. The areas were not included in the Growth Restriction Area because the GRA is defined as including neighborhoods already developed with single-family housing, the character of which we want to preserve. The two parcels you have identified are currently vacant lots used for surface parking for commuters and some shoppers. Surface parking lots do not contribute to the residential character of the neighborhood. Therefore, OP does not wish to indicate that it would not support a change in use. However, as stated above, the Plan is not recommending a change in the existing zoning.

5/24/2004 email 11:56:47 AM Gina Mirigliano

I believe David Frankel is asking a similar question I submitted to you at the beginning of last week in my Open Questions submission. Its Question Number 15. I copied it here below for ease of response.

"15. The R-2 zoned properties bounded by Harrison/Garrison and Garrison/Fessenden were recommended for height increases and placed outside the Growth Restriction Area in the Draft Plan. These R-2 zoned properties, and the R-2 zoned property facing 45th Street, were the sole R-2 zoned properties outside the Growth Restriction Area. At the 5/3/04 steering committee meeting, OP announced that the height recommendations made in the Draft Plan for the Harrison/Garrison and Garrison/Fessenden properties will not appear in the Revised Plan. Has a corresponding change in the recommendation for the Growth Restriction Area been made to now include these areas in the Growth Restriction Area? If not, why not?"
See answer above.

5/24/2004 email 1:47:48 PM Marilyn Simon

In reviewing the attached question, which I submitted last week, I realized that I had omitted a critical part of the question. I am now adding to my request, a request for information about the existing development on each block or site of the corridor. The additional questions are listed below. I [am] also request[ing] information on the professional background of Ms. Heather Knouse, who is responsible for the demand forecasts on which OP relied in the preparation of its recommendations.

HEATHER ARNOLD
Principal, Director of Market Analysis and Research

Heather Arnold is a principal with StreetSense, a real estate consulting and brokerage firm dedicated to evaluating, designing, and revitalizing neighborhoods. After years of studying the factors influencing the success of downtown residential, office and retail space, Ms. Arnold leads the Market Analysis and Research Division for StreetSense. This group is dedicated to investigating and creating innovative demand assessment models for urban conditions. The Market Analysis and Research group has evaluated real estate supply and demand for neighborhoods throughout Washington, DC and communities across the country.

She holds a Master's degree in Regional and Urban Planning from Cornell University and a bachelor's degree from the University of Virginia.

Selected Project Experience:

- **Minor League Hockey Mixed-Use Arena District Market Analysis, Overland Park, KS**
- **Residential and Retail Market Evaluation of Port of Seattle Real Estate, Seattle, WA**
- **Residential, Office, and Retail Market Analysis for Segale Site, Tukwila, WA**
- **Retail Market Analysis for H Street NE Revitalization Plan, Washington, DC**
- **Residential, Office, Retail/Hospitality Demand Analysis, Overland Park, KS**
- **Residential, Office, Retail Market Analysis, Upper Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, DC**
- **Retail Market Demand Assessment, Rogers, Arkansas**
- **Downtown Tacoma Retail Market Analysis, Tacoma, WA**
- **Retail Market Analysis for Uptown Destination District, Washington, DC**
- **Customer Profile, Retail Market for Dravis Site, Seattle, WA**
- **City Center Strategic Plan, Falls Church, VA**
- **Retail Repositioning Strategy for Downtown Celebration, Celebration, FL**
- **Center City Charlotte 2010 Vision Plan, Charlotte, NC**

I also understand from Ms. McCarthy's response to my question at the Steering Committee meeting, that the information provided in your recent message [UWACS Open Questions ANSWERS, May 19, 2004 10:07pm] and the information in Appendix C, which was posted on the OP-website on November 18, constitutes the entire response to my May 17, 2004 and November 19, 2003 questions about the market analysis, and fully describes the analysis and any market-specific research that had been done.
That is correct

Addition to earlier question on residential, retail and office capacity on the Corridor: Specifically, we request that OP provide a good faith estimate for each block between Rodman Street and Harrison Street, separately for the west and east side of Wisconsin Avenue, and for each major site north of Harrison Street [for example: WMATA, Buick, Mazza, Lord & Taylor, Starwood, etc.]: k. the total floor area, as currently developed;
This is included in the numbers provided as part of Mr. Cochran's calculations.

l. separately, an estimate of the number of square feet which is currently used for each of the following purposes: residential, retail, office, supermarket;
See the market study completed for this Study, found in Appendix C of the draft Plan.

m. the number of residential units, as currently developed;
See the market study completed for this Study, found in Appendix C of the draft Plan.

n. the number of parking spaces, as currently developed, and separately how many of those spaces are designated for use by: residents, by employees or visitors; in addition, please list any special arrangements such as validated parking, reduced rates, or first hour free;
Collection of this data would be enormously time-consuming, the information would change with each vacant or underutilized site redeveloped and the relevance of this information is not at all clear.

o. the amount of square footage associated with retail vacancies or retail space that is not yet occupied;
the amount of vacant retail space is too small to make a substantial difference. Sites that are not developed have been included in the numbers provided as part of Mr. Cochran's calculations

p. the amount of square footage associated with office vacancies or office space that is not yet occupied; and
the amount of vacant office space is too small to make a substantial difference. Sites that are not developed have been included in the numbers provided as part of Mr. Cochran's calculations

q. the amount of square footage associated with residential vacancies or residential space that is not yet occupied and the number of residential units associated with that space.
the amount of vacant residential space is too small to make a substantial difference. Sites that are not developed have been included in the numbers provided as part of Mr. Cochran's calculations.

5/24 3:07pm email from David Frankel

We request that OP provide a good faith estimate for each block between Rodman Street and Harrison Street, separately for the west and east side of Wisconsin Avenue, and for each major site north of Harrison Street [for example: WMATA, Buick, Mazza, Lord & Taylor, Starwood, etc.]:
r. The number of residential units that will be efficiencies, the number of residential units that will contain only one bedroom, the number of residential units that will contain two bedrooms, the number of residential units that will contain three bedrooms, and the number of residential units, if any, that will contain more than three bedrooms.
The market study that was conducted for this Plan, estimates that there is a demand along the Corridor for 1,500 to 1,800 residential units (average unit size of 1,000 sq. ft.). We can look at the recently built housing development at Tenley Hill as an example of how many children can be expected with new developments on Wisconsin Avenue based on the size of its units. Completed in 2001, it has 38 units, originally priced from $289,000 to $1.5 million, with floor plans ranging in size from 2,000 to 4,000 sq. ft. There are no school-aged children living there. In fact, there is only one child, an infant. Most of the apartment buildings along Connecticut Avenue were built from the 1930s to the 1960s and are generally in a price range lower than what would be expected in new construction. Therefore, they do not provide an accurate comparison of what to expect along Wisconsin Avenue. OP cannot estimate what the unit mix will be. Most developers don't set this until the end of their planning and design process, based on the most up to the minute market data.

5/25/2004 3:43pm email from Amy McVey

Chief Thompson has already stated on several occasions that he is already in need of expanded services for the Tenleytown/Friendship Heights area. How, for the short-term, does he/DCFEMS intend to meet the needed expansion of services? In the long-term?

Same question, but now assume that the area was to be built out to OP's recommendations, e.g., 1800+ new residences and businesses on Wisconsin Avenue?
OP consulted with the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice on this issue and they issued a statement, which is referenced in the revised Plan. It states that the Deputy Mayor's office has full confidence in the ability of the District government to maintain adequate levels of public safety service throughout the city, including expanding the levels of service and infrastructure as required, including for corridors, like Upper Wisconsin Avenue, that may experience future growth in population and density.

In the short-term, the City's Fire Department has initiated the process to select a new contractor for Engine 20 in Tenleytown, which is currently not operating. Construction is expected to begin this summer and completion is planned for summer 2005. The Fire Department has also indicated that it will be working with the Office of Planning to identify possible future needs for expanded services in the area and throughout the City as part of the process to update the District's Comprehensive Plan. Additional information on fire and EMS can be found in Chapter 3 (Strategic Framework Plan) of the revised Plan.

5/25/2004 5:11:35pm email from Jane Waldmann

I have a question/request for clarification regarding DC Government policy regarding municipal parking garages which provide metered parking. I have heard that these facilities are not permitted in the District. If this is so, does the prohibition derive from statute, from formal agreement with the private operators of parking garages or some other arrangement?
The District is not prohibited from building parking garages in the City, but based on the current cost of land in Friendship Heights, and the maximum that patrons would be likely to be willing to pay, it would be cost-prohibitive for the City to build a parking garage at this time. The Office of Planning can explore the feasibility of including increased parking ratios for retail, i.e., increase the minimum standards, as part of the zoning overlay.

\Given the present situation, and even anticipating some improvements, I do not foresee that the traffic/parking environment at Friendship Heights is going to measurably improve in the next decade. So, how can OP responsibly suggest that building in excess of current zoning makes any sense? The wish for more housing in a desirable area and a desire to concentrate development near metros should not trump what common sense and observable patterns of behavior suggest. Current zoning, with a PUD if truly exceptional, is what Friendship Heights can handle. Another question - where is the fiscal analysis of income, property, car registration taxes versus the costs of providing municipal services for the anticipated new residents?
The market study that was conducted for the Plan determined the 5 to 10 year market demand for additional office, residential and retail along the Corridor. Although that Study did not include a fiscal analysis based on the market demand, in a recent Washington Post article on downtown housing ("A New Beginning for the District's East End," 3/7/04) it was estimated that new households there could generate, on average, more than $7,700 a year in tax revenue. And, the article added, since many of the new residents are mostly affluent and not rearing children, they'll require few city services. While there are differences between the downtown housing market and the housing market along Upper Wisconsin Avenue, Tenley Hill does illustrate this point. There, the town homes and condominiums were purchased by young professionals with no children and empty-nesters, just like what's anticipated for downtown. So one could reasonably expect that similar tax revenue dollars would be generated.

5/25 5:22pm email from Allison Feeney

What can the UWACS do to include more affordable units in market-priced developments? What can the UWACs do to encourage an appropriate mix of housing types? Are there any DC programs (aside from PUDs) that would pro

vide developers incentive to provide affordable housing? What else do we have to trade besides density?

As part of the planned unit development (PUD) process, the Office of Planning strongly encourages developers to provide a number of affordable housing units. The number of units is usually determined as a percentage (usually 20%) of the total number of additional units the developer is allowed with the additional height and density provided by a PUD. One example of how the revised Plan encourages an appropriate mix of housing types is the residential buffer OP is proposing behind Lord and Taylor that would allow row houses and flats in an area between commercial uses and single-family homes. OP would also encourage PUDs to follow the Tenley Hill example, which has town homes on the rear of the site that buffers the neighborhood with a more traditional apartment-style building fronting Wisconsin Avenue. With regard to affordable housing, the District is currently working on developing an Inclusionary Zoning policy. As for current programs, the District has a Home Purchase Assistance Program (HPAP), which provides interest-free and low-interest loans to qualified residents that enables them to purchase houses, condominiums or cooperative apartments. In addition, the District also provides below market loans to developers who agree to incorporate a percentage of affordable units in their rental projects. The D.C. Housing Authority administers the Section 8 housing voucher program.

5/25 11:19 pm email from Alison Feeney

In the context of UWACS, does the "growth restriction boundary" preclude the creation of accessory apartments were the underlying zoning to allow it?

The existing zoning regulations currently permit an accessory apartment to be added within an existing one-family detached dwelling if approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment as a special exception, but the new apartment may be created only through internal conversion of the house; garage space may not be converted.

6/1/2004 4:40:00 pm email from Marilyn Simon

Question from May 17 as amended on May 24

Specifically, we request that OP provide a good faith estimate for each block between Rodman Street and Harrison Street, separately for the west and east side of Wisconsin Avenue, and for each major site north of Harrison Street [for example: WMATA, Buick, Mazza, Lord & Taylor, Starwood, etc.]:

a. the land area included in that block or site;
b. the maximum height and the recommended height for that block or site;
c. the maximum floor area ratio ["FAR"] and the recommended FAR for that block or site;
d. the recommended uses;
e. an estimate of the number of square feet which, under a full build-out of the OP plan, would be used for each of the following purposes: residential, retail, office.
f. an estimate of the number of residential units for that block or site under a full build-out of the OP plan;
g. an estimate of the number of parking spaces that would be included in that block or site with a full build-out of the OP plan.
h. a calculation of the total floor area, for each block or site, that could be developed under matter of right standards for current zoning;
i. an estimate of the number of residential units that could be built on each block or site under a full build-out under matter-of-right standards for current zoning;
j. an estimate of the number of parking spaces that would be required under a full build-out under matter of right standards for current zoning.
k. the total floor area, as currently developed;
l. separately, an estimate of the number of square feet which is currently used for each of the following purposes: residential, retail, office, supermarket;
m. the number of residential units, as currently developed;
n. the number of parking spaces, as currently developed, and separately how many of those spaces are designated for use by: residents, by employees or visitors; in addition, please list any special arrangements such as validated parking, reduced rates, or first hour free;
o. the amount of square footage associated with retail vacancies or retail space that is not yet occupied;
p. the amount of square footage associated with office vacancies or office space that is not yet occupied; and
q. the amount of square footage associated with residential vacancies or residential space that is not yet occupied and the number of residential units associated with that space.

Questions a - j were responded to in the 5/27/04 Open Questions Answers. Responses to those questions and questions k - q can be found in the Comparison Exhibit for Friendship Heights that was sent to the Steering Committee on 6/2/04. Parking requirements for individual zone districts can be found in District Zoning Regulations. The market study (Appendix C of the draft Plan) also provides additional information and analysis.

Finally, with regards to this issue, the Office of Planning has received sufficient information to move forward with the revised Plan as presented and for its stated purpose. It is important to remember the original goals of the UWACS planning process, which are addressed in the Plan:
To guide redevelopment opportunities so they will be in harmony with existing development and surrounding residential neighborhoods, but will allow the corridor to meet its full potential utilizing Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) principles. To preserve existing assets of the corridor and enhance them. To recommend strategies to encourage a better mix of uses, including neighborhood-serving retailers and housing.
To recommend strategies to create a better sense of place.

The UWACS Strategic Framework Plan is one important step in an evolving process that continues to include extensive public participation and more focused assessments of specific development impacts will ensure that all issues are heard before final decisions are made. OP is prepared to be held responsible and accountable for this Plan. There are topics and issues, such as affordable housing, future Metro and DCPS budget requests, etc., that are appropriately included or mentioned in the revised Plan, but do not require final resolution or even levels of detail in terms of implementation plans or strategies, as part of this Plan. Those tasks will be dealt with at a later time by the appropriate agencies as part of the regular process of government.

6/2/2004 11:29:00 am email from David Frankel

How can OP or DCPS guarantee that Janney "will always have space for any in-boundary students"? For example, if new development in the Friendship Heights and Tenleytown areas that Janney serves was to result in 100, 150 or 200 additional public school children within Janney's boundaries, does this statement mean that Janney could accommodate them all and still provide a quality education for all of its students? Also, as I have asked previously, doesn't Janney have obligations under the No Child Left Behind law to accept out of boundary students from low performing schools? If so, how many?
This question was addressed in 5/20/04 Open Question Response. It is important to note that DCPS will always handle "in-bound" students at all schools through a variety of methods which include personnel assignment, redefining boundaries as needed, capital projects (which can be funded in the future even if they are not funded now), consideration of "creative funding" proposals both now and in the future, etc.

Second, the revised text on Janney states: "At Janney, 69% of students are in-boundary. Janney's enrollment has increased 18% over the last 11 years." What is the percentage of in-boundary enrollment at Janney by grade? That is, what percentage of pre-K students live in boundary? What percentage of kindergarten students live in-boundary? What percentage of first grade students live in-boundary? Etc. I ask this question because I have the strong sense that the younger grades have more in-boundary students and this may demonstrate a limit on the overall ability of Janney to "always have space for any in-boundary students."
The DCPS Facility Master Plan contains additional information on enrollment for individual schools. But, again, as was stated in the 5/27/04 Open Question Answers, if we look at the recently built housing development at Tenley Hill as an example of how many children can be expected with new developments on Wisconsin Avenue - we can expect few children (there are no school-aged children living in Tenley Hill - in fact, there is only one child, an infant).

Third, the revised text on Janney states: "The teacher to student ratio for all DCPS is 1:23; at Janney, the school uses trailers (demountables) to maintain this ratio." What is the teacher to student ratio at Janney? How has it changed (if at all) over the past five years? How will the addition of 100, 150 or 200 new in boundary students at Janney impact on its teacher to student ratio?

As stated, the Janney teacher to student ratio is 1:23, they use trailers to maintain that ratio. Also, see previous response.

Fourth, the revised text on Janney states: "Plans for modernization at Janney are long-term and there is no tier level identified for it." Please be more specific on what is meant by "long-term." I understood the DCPS Facilities Master Plan Update (Fall 2003) to mean that there are no plans to renovate, expand or modernize Janney. Am I wrong? If there are indeed long term plans to modernize Janney, please let me know the precise schedule for this modernization and what that modernization will entail.
This question was responded to in the 5/20/04 Open Question Answers. It stated, "Janney is not tiered in the current Facilities Master Plan (there are no listings past tier 4). Janney was listed as a tier 5 school in the 2001 FMP. The condition of Janney is not the greatest (but then the same goes for most of our facilities). It is in great need of electrical upgrades and kitchen improvements among other things. However the school appears in better shape than many in the school system. The FMP is posted on the web for viewing by the public off of the DCPS home page." The revised Plan will reflect this.

Fifth, the revised text on Janney states: "DCPS needs additional funding for the school modernization program. To meet the funding gap, DCPS utilizes creative funding, such as public-private partnerships (Oyster School), and issues bonds." I thought that given the strong community opposition, the public-private partnership idea for Janney was no longer being pursued. Am I right? Has any other "creative funding" been identified to pay for Janney's modernization? If so, please describe this and the timetable for its implementation.
Specific "creative funding" proposals will always be considered and sometimes they may be implemented.

With regards to this issue, the Office of Planning has received sufficient information to move forward with the revised Plan as presented and for its stated purpose. It is important to remember the original goals of the UWACS planning process, which are addressed in the Plan:

1) **To guide redevelopment opportunities so they will be in harmony with existing development and surrounding residential neighborhoods, but will allow the corridor to meet its full potential utilizing Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) principles.**
2) **To preserve existing assets of the corridor and enhance them.**
3) **To recommend strategies to encourage a better mix of uses, including neighborhood-serving retailers and housing.**
4) **To recommend strategies to create a better sense of place.**

The UWACS Strategic Framework Plan is one important step in an evolving process that continues to include extensive public participation and more focused assessments of specific development impacts will ensure that all issues are heard before final decisions are made. OP is prepared to be held responsible and accountable for this Plan. There are topics and issues, such as affordable housing, future Metro and DCPS budget requests, etc., that are appropriately included or mentioned in the revised Plan, but do not require final resolution or even levels of detail in terms of implementation plans or strategies, as part of this Plan. Those tasks will be dealt with at a later time by the appropriate agencies as part of the regular process of government.

6/4/2004 9:22:09 email from Carolyn Sherman

What part of the Ft. Reno Park has been leased or given over from the Park Service to the DC Department of Recreation? Specifically, who is in charge of the land north of Donaldson Place?
The area north of Donaldson Place is owned by the National Park Service.

6/6/2004 1:39:00 PM email from David Frankel

In view of this newly-announced need for $22.7 million for DCPS (cost to use District's new computer system), is it possible that there may be additional personnel or programmatic cuts at Janney Elementary School, Alice Deal J.H.S. and Woodrow Wilson H.S. over the next year or two or three? over and above whatever cuts they will each take as part of the May 11, 2004 DCPS board vote to abolish 557 local school staff positions? If so, what is the worst case scenario and the most likely case scenario for Janney, Deal and Wilson as

DCPS seeks to find additional monies to fund this newly-identified system wide need for $22.7 million?

DCPS reviewed both the above, as well as all other Janney related questions. DCPS has submitted the following information. It includes DCPS' response to the February 21 Steering Committee discussion as well as additional responses to Mr. Frankel's May 14 question. OP believes that this is as much information as it expects to receive from DCPS before moving forward with a final UWACS plan. DCPS response was prepared by Robin R. A. O'Hara, Planning Manager, District of Columbia Public Schools and follows:

The two addresses that were used for students were 5415 Connecticut Ave (Smith Prop)- 18 students and 4545 Connecticut Ave (also Smith Prop)- 29 students. I do not have the number of units nor number of bedrooms per unit at either address. When I said it was possible to get generation rates by number of bedrooms per DU it was under the assumption that I would be able to get that data. I did not have it then, nor do I have it now. I have calculated the generation rate for students in the area by type of unit using for single family the area bound by Albermarle, 47th, Davenport and 44th streets. There are 342 lots. The generation rate by level is: .14 for ES, .05 for MS, and .04 for HS students (in other words it would take 100 single family houses to generate 4 high school students). For Townhouses I found a group of 36 DUs bound by 41st St, Military Rd and Belt St. There are only 3 elementary students attending DCPS schools in those units. A second set of Townhouses off of Wisconsin Ave between Military and Jenifer has 35 units and only 1 student. The generation rate is therefore .08, or for every 100 TH DUs you would expect to see 8 DCPS elementary students. I found what appear to be garden apartments (condo) off of Wisconsin Avenue (Rodman St), I think there are about 260 dus. There are 7 students, 2 HS and 5 ES. The generation rate for this type of unit would be .02 for ES, and .01 for HS (rounded up). As for midrise multi family- there are two buildings on Wisconsin Ave around Van Ness that have student who attend Hearst ES. 4105 has 20 students and 4115 has only 1 student. I don't know how many units there are in each building. Neither building has any middle/junior high, or high school students attending DCPS schools. There are usually more students in DUs with more bedrooms. It is important to note that not all children who reside in an area are of school age, nor do all school age students attend DCPS schools. Furthermore, DCPS students also may choose to apply to attend a school out of boundary.

In David's question #10 he asks about school boundaries. Boundaries are approved by the Board of Education. The boundaries were just adopted on April 21st, 2004 after a year long process, which included many community meetings. The last time Janney's boundary was changed officially was in 1977. There is to be a boundary study for elementary schools in Planning Area G in the future to be timed with the completion of an addition at Hearst Elementary School. The recent adoption of boundaries did include a small triangle addition to the Janney boundary from Hearst elementary school. It was a grassroots recommendation (including a petition of the residents). There was a public hearing for the Facilities Master Plan which included the boundaries, and it was posted on the web for months. All of the public meetings for Planning Area G were held at Janney Elementary school and the PTA provided refreshments. Boundaries were discussed along with other topics related to planning for DCPS facilities. The petition was also presented at one of these meetings. The boundary change has a minimal effect in that there are fewer than 5 students who reside in the area and they will continue to attend the school they are currently enrolled in. In the future (there are pre pre school age children), there will a couple children who will attend Janney from this area.

Again, the relocatable classrooms on the Janney site enable the entire Janney student population to be accommodated appropriately at the present.

Note: Mr. Frankel's 5/14 email is presented below followed by both DCPS's most current response (immediately after each numbered question where applicable) and the original response presented on 5/19/04

5/14/04 email from David Frankel

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE CAPACITY OF JANNEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CONNECTION WITH THE UPPER WISCONSIN AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY

1. Can DCPS confirm that Janney Elementary School is listed in its Facilities Master Plan Update (Fall 2003) as a Tier 5 school, which means that it is not scheduled to receive significant modernization and expansion funds anytime in the next ten years, at least? Is there any more recent information that has altered Janney's standing as a Tier 5 school? Can DCPS confirm that the Janney E.S. facility is rated "poor" in the Facilities Master Plan Update and that Janney's educational adequacy from a facilities (not programmatic) standpoint is also rated "poor" in that document? Is it true that since the time the Facilities Master Plan Update was first prepared that the overall DCPS capital budget has been reduced, making it even less likely that there will be new modernization/expansion funds for Janney over the next ten years?

Janney is not listed as a specific tier in the Facilities Master Plan update adopted on April 21st, 2004. It was listed as a tier 5 school in the 2001 FMP. It is still listed as being in Poor condition with Poor Educational Adequacy (and that is as it relates to Facilities not academic program). The budget is a moving target from year to year, and there will be adjustments to the CIP program that cause and react to the change in the budget. While there are no CIP $s in the current plan, there could be in future plans prior to 10 years from now (I for one would like to see a program addition to Janney, but again, it is not currently in the plan).

2. How many staff members, if any, will Janney E.S. lose as a result of the DCPS School Board's vote of Tuesday, May 11, 2004, to abolish 334 staff positions from DCPS elementary schools? See http://www.k12.dc.us/dcps/frontpagepdfs/Abolishment%20Process%20and%20Outcomes.pdf Will the number of Janney teachers be reduced from the 2003/04 school year to the 2004/05 school year? What are those two figures? In light of recent DCPS budget cuts, is there any guarantee that even with an increase in enrollment at Janney, that the staff there will increase from its present level to meet all enrollment needs?

I am not responsible for the budget process, however, Janney is projected to have 478 students in the fall of 2004. This is essentially the same as last year, and will be staffed appropriately for the number and type of students they have.

3. On January 15, 2004, Janney's principal, Dr. Abelmann, sent an e-mail message to Cindy Petkac which states in relevant part: "I want you to be aware that we are a crowded school currently facing many facility challenges. While we do have out of bounds students, this reflects the value we place on diversity and the need to operate a large school for fiscal reasons to keep the staff level we want to keep. The growth of in bound families is slowly displacing the chance for out of bound students to attend Janney. For example we have 69 in bound kindergarten students. It is likely that this trend will continue. If this is the case, we will face serious space challenges. We also are not clear as to what DCPS will do with 6th grade and whether it will move to Deal at some point. This could help our space challenges. This district could also require all schools to offer pre k universally. This would create a great challenge for us as we can't meet the current demand for pre k with the space we have. Each year we offer at least one pre k class and depending on space have more spaces or not. I want to be careful how your office represents space issues at Janney and would ask that you consult me on any diction you use in written reports or public presentations. I'd be happy to hose [sic] you visiting the school and reviewing school issues." Did Dr. Abelmann's e-mail message, quoted above, accurately summarize the capacity situation at Janney? If not, how was it inaccurate?

Dr. Abelmann is correct in saying that there are facilities challenges that Janney faces (as do nearly every DCPS school). There are 3 relocatable classrooms (1 single and 1 double) located on site to handle the overflow of students. The student teacher ratio is still an appropriate level for each class. Janney has had to modify delivery of some programs due to space limitations in the school. It is the current intent to move 6th grade from Janney to Deal upon completion of the Deal modernization not scheduled to occur for many years. Approximately 93% of elementary students residing in the Janney boundary choose to attend Janney, but the in-boundary students only make up 69% of the total student population of Janney. Therefore, there is room for additional in-boundary students, and future out-of-boundary would be limited accordingly.

4. On January 29, 2004, Dr. Abelmann sent an e-mail message to Cindy Petkac and others which states in relevant part: "Many of the questions you raise relate to DCPS policy. For example, what are the future plans of the district related to if and when 6th grade will attend Deal? Will DCPS require all schools to continue to offer at least one pre k class. Will the district require schools to meet the demand for pre k? Boundary lines are also determined by the system as part of the review of the master facility plan. Thus, I suggest you

contact Robin O'hara or Charles Obi related to some of these system issues. Our current enrollment continues to be above the capacity of the school as reported in the master facility plan. Our enrollment on October 8th can be found on the DCPS web site. As of today, we have 337 in bound students and 135 out of bound students. We have not been able to accept out of bound students in the younger grades as the in bound population has grown significantly and it appears more and more families are sending their children to public school. We have 70 in bound pre k students this year and projections suggest about the same number for next year." On January 29, 2004, Dr. Abelmann sent an e-mail message to Cindy Petkac and others which states in relevant part: "Please note the following correction: We have 70 in bound kindergarten students this year and project about the same for next year. Note: Pre K spaces are more limited. We currently only have 1.5 classes of pre k." Did Dr. Abelmann's two e-mail messages, quoted above, accurately summarize the capacity situation at Janney? If not, how were they inaccurate?
Dr. Abelmann reported the situation at the time. The numbers used in the FMP may be from a different snapshot in time, but reflect a similar situation. Again, the overflow of students are being accommodated in the relocatables on site, and by modifying some of the delivery models for some of the programs.

5. The table that Robin O'Hara provided to the Steering Committee on February 21, 2004, that is labeled "Recommendations: Effects of Requested CIP and Non-CIP Actions on Availability of Seats," projects Janney's enrollment as ranging between 75 and 85 students (about 20 percent) above and beyond its permanent capacity through the 2007/2008 school year. That table does not take into account any plans within the Janney boundaries to greatly expand the number of new residents, correct?
The intent to greatly expand the number of new residents does not necessarily translate to greatly expanding the school age population who will attend DCPS facilities (specifically Janney).

6. What plans, if any, have been made to expand Janney if the population in the area that Janney serves doubles or triples over the next ten years? What plans, if any, have been made to build a new elementary school to serve the existing Janney area if the population in the area that Janney serves doubles or triples over the next ten years? Is the money to expand Janney or build a new school currently available? If not, is this money guaranteed to be available if Janney's student enrollment continues to grow? If a new elementary school were needed to serve some of the area that Janney presently serves, where would that school be located?
Upon the completion of an addition at Hearst there are plans to redistrict the elementary schools in Planning Area G of which Janney is a part. There are no plans for a new school within the Janney boundary at this time. There are no funds available or identified at this time for construction or design for Janney. If the need presented itself, a request would be made during the annual CIP process. There is no site currently identified.

7. Can you confirm that to the extent that Janney's in boundary enrollment increases beyond its capacity; there will be fewer spots available at Janney for children who live outside of Janney's boundaries? Is Janney a designated recipient school under the "No Child Left Behind" Act for students who are attending under-performing schools? If so, might this law result in larger class sizes for some Janney students? Also, if Janney is a recipient school under the No Child Left Behind law, will increasing in boundary student enrollment at Janney put additional pressure on Janney to increase its class sizes?
The number of out-of-boundary slots available has diminished in the past two years to reflect the capacity constraints of the school. NCLB status has not yet been defined for the next year.

8. Does Janney enroll out of boundary students with special needs or disabilities? What has been the trend for such students over the past five years? Does DCPS want this number to remain stable, increase or decrease over the next five to ten years?

9. During the February 21, 2004 Steering Committee meeting, many in attendance wanted to understand what impact the construction of certain types of housing within the Janney boundaries might have on the number of school aged children. So, as requested at that time — and as Ms. O'Hara said was possible — can you please provide us with statistics, from within DCPS Planning Area G, of the numbers of school aged children who live in one, two, three and greater bedroom apartments or condominiums? Is it possible for you to break this down by the number of bedrooms? Is there a difference between condos or coops on the one hand versus apartments on the other? [As Ms. O'Hara reported, we would expect to see more children in three bedroom condos than in one-bedroom apartments.] Also, since the draft Upper Wisconsin Avenue Corridor Study also recommends the construction of town houses and

row houses within the Janney area, can you provide similar statistics for children living in this type of housing in Planning Area G? In particular, we request that you use themulti-family residential buildings located near the Van Ness/UDC Metro station in performing this analysis. These multi-family residential buildings appear to be the types of buildings and densities that OP seems to contemplate for parts of the Friendship Heights and Tenleytown areas.
See response from Ms. O'Hara above (pg 29), where she indicates that, based on other townhouse projects in the general area, the expected yield of students would only be 8 students for every 100 townhouses constructed. She also indicates that apartment buildings do not generate large numbers of school aged children, and that there tend to be more school-aged children in apartments with larger number of bedrooms. Generally, new apartment building construction in the District has featured mixes of studios, one bedroom, one bedroom with den and a maximum of two bedrooms. In general, the Office of Planning notes that the apartment buildings cited with larger numbers of students tend to be older buildings with lower rent structures than are typically found in new construction. (OP response)

10. How are geographic boundaries set for DCPS elementary schools? Who sets them, who is involved in the decision making process, how long does the process take and what criteria are used? How many times has Janney's boundaries been changed over the past 30 years? It was reported in the May 5, 2004 issue of the Northwest Current (on page 7) that Janney's boundaries have recently been expanded for the first time since 1977 despite the growth of its enrollment and the current enrollment overcapacity of the school. Is this correct? That article indicated that neither the Janney PTA nor its principal were involved in the decision to expand Janney's boundaries. Is this correct? If Janney is presently overcrowded (e.g., it has two temporary classroom trailers on its property and the school facility is rated to accommodate only 394 students, but has an actual enrollment far in excess of that), and the enrollment trend has been increasing over the past ten years as indicated by the Facilities Master Plan Update (Fall 2003), why hasn't DCPS already redrawn Janney's boundaries to force some in bounds students to attend other local elementary schools?
See Ms. O'Hara's response above (pg 29), where she indicates that DCPS feels that the present enrollment level at Janney is appropriate to the size of the facility, that DCPS expects to redistrict when the addition to Hearst is completed, and that additional space will be created at Janney when the sixth grade is moved to Deal. (OP response)

11. I note that the Janney site consists of 3.64 acres (including the school building and its staff parking lot). How much green space/playing fields/outdoor play area does Janney have? Does Janney presently have as part of its facilities an amount of green space/playing fields/outdoor play area that is considered adequate for an elementary school of its size? According to DCPS standards, what is the ideal amount of green space/playing fields/outdoor play area for an elementary school of Janney's size?

12. As you know, the Janney community recently considered the possibility of a Public Private Partnership ("PPP"), whereby the school would permanently give up part of its space to a developer in exchange for money to modernize and expand the school building. The April 24, 2004 issue of the Janney School newsletter contains the following quotation from the Principal's Notes section: "PPP. The SIT concluded that at this time there is no consensus around the idea of furthering discussion on the concept of a public private partnership. Thus, the SIT will not ask DCPS to further study the concept at this time. The SIT does recommend that the PTA invest in a third party needs assessment of the school. The school should also advocate for an entrance to the new library off of Albemarle and being able to access school land from Wisconsin Avenue. The SIT recommended that there be a liaison between the school and the library." In light of the lack of consensus for a PPP, can you outline for us the steps that must be taken to successfully achieve a PPP and how long this process takes? Since Janney is located in an R-1-B zone, what hurdles would have to be overcome for a portion of its land to be given up for the development of multi-residential units or townhouses? Assuming a significant portion of the community — somewhat over a majority of those who express any opinions — oppose a PPP, may the PPP nevertheless take place?
See Ms. O'Hara's response above (pg 29), which she indicates that DCPS is always open to innovative financing arrangements to improve school facilities. In order to redevelop the Janney site at a density above R-1-B, any proposed application would have to submit either a map amendment to change the zoning classification, or a Planned Unit Development which includes a map amendment. In either case, such a zoning action would involve a public hearing before the Zoning Commission, before such a change could take place, in addition to approval by the School Board and officials of D.C. Public Schools. (OP response)

13. In the event that Janney needs to be expanded to accommodate an increased student enrollment, Janney will require some of the land around its present building to do its expansion, correct? This would further limit the space/playing fields/outdoor play that presently surrounds Janney, right?

14. Does the fact that the DCPS Facilities Master Plan Update (Fall 2003) lists Janney as "Historically Significant" impact on the types of renovations and expansion that can be performed there? How? Does the "Historically Significant" designation impact on how quickly any renovations and expansion could occur? How?
The Janney School is not designated as an historic landmark, therefore there are no limitations on the types of renovations and expansions which are possible there. Should it be designated in the future, there is a process through the Mayor's Agent for Historic Preservation to demolish all or part of historic structures if it is necessary to accomplish a project of special merit. (OP response)

15. Is Janney's student enrollment capacity dependent to any degree on whether Janney's sixth grade may move at some point to Alice Deal Junior High School if Deal becomes a middle school? See Dr. Abelmann's January 15 and 29, 2004 e-mail messages in item numbers 3 and 4 above. The DCPS Facilities Master Plan Update (Fall 2003) lists Deal as a Tier 2 school, placing it much higher on the renovation and modernization list than Janney, a Tier 5 school. What is the present status of funding for modernization at Deal? What is the realistic schedule for when Deal will be fully modernized and ready to accept all sixth grade students from Janney?
See Ms. O'Hara's response above (pg 29).

16. According to DCPS, what is the total enrollment capacity at Janney and what assumptions are used to arrive at this figure?
See previous answers to Open Questions.

17. When Robin O'Hara distributed an e-mail message dated May 10, 2004 that stated in part that "there is no question that in boundary students can be accommodated at Janney, the question is how many out-of-boundary students can be accommodated at Janney" what assumptions was she making about the number of future in boundary students at Janney over the next five to ten years? Also, what assumptions was she making about students who might seek to transfer to Janney pursuant to the No Child Left Behind law from low performing schools?

The following was the original (5/19/04) DCPS response to the above email:

DCPS reviewed all of the above questions as well as the email traffic that has touched on this subject. Below is their response. It addresses some, but not all of the questions raised. We have asked DCPS to send a representative to the 5/20/04 Steering committee meeting to discuss issues relevant to the UWACS. At this date, we have received no response to that request. The DCPS response to the above questions is as follows:

Janney while crowded, will have space for any in-boundary student; it just means that there will be fewer out-of-boundary students allowed in.

The affect of No Child Left Behind is likely to be minimal (a total of approximately 230 mostly middle and high school students took advantage of it this past year out of a system of nearly 65000 students).

The educational adequacy indicator refers to facilities that can address educational program requirements such as do they have a gym? A science lab? ...It does not refer to the potential academic prowess of the school (Janney is one of the top in the system based on test scores).

Janney is not tiered in the current Facilities Master Plan (there are no listings past tier 4). Janney was listed as a tier 5 school in the 2001 FMP. The condition of Janney is not the greatest (but then the same goes for most of our facilities). It is in great need of electrical upgrades and kitchen improvements among other things. However the school appears in better shape than many in the school system. The FMP is posted on the web for viewing by the public off of the DCPS home page.

Janney is asked to look at a 10% reduction in budget to make up for FY04. They are however going to be staffed based on the projected number of students for the 04-05 school year which is close to what they had this year, so the over all effect

should be minimal and certainly not the hit that many other schools are going to take who are projected to lose students and also didn't come in as high as projected this year (Janney came in within a couple of projections).

With regards to this issue, the Office of Planning has received sufficient information to move forward with the revised Plan as presented and for its stated purpose. It is important to remember the original goals of the UWACS planning process, which are addressed in the Plan:

1) **To guide redevelopment opportunities so they will be in harmony with existing development and surrounding residential neighborhoods, but will allow the corridor to meet its full potential utilizing Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) principles.**
2) **To preserve existing assets of the corridor and enhance them.**
3) **To recommend strategies to encourage a better mix of uses, including neighborhood-serving retailers and housing.**
4) **To recommend strategies to create a better sense of place.**

The UWACS Strategic Framework Plan is one important step in an evolving process that continues to include extensive public participation and more focused assessments of specific development impacts will ensure that all issues are heard before final decisions are made. OP is prepared to be held responsible and accountable for this Plan. There are topics and issues, such as affordable housing, future Metro and DCPS budget requests, etc., that are appropriately included or mentioned in the revised Plan, but do not require final resolution or even levels of detail in terms of implementation plans or strategies, as part of this Plan. Those tasks will be dealt with at a later time by the appropriate agencies as part of the regular process of government.

<u>6/8/2004 10:01:22 AM email from David Frankel</u>

1. What studies have been conducted by or for WMATA and by or for federal, Maryland and DC environmental and health agencies since the toxic waste spill described above was first uncovered to determine the types of pollutants and their geographic scope?

2. What efforts have been undertaken over the years to monitor toxic waste on the WMATA site and nearby sites?

3. What efforts have been undertaken over the years to determine whether people and pets living or working in homes, apartments or offices near the WMATA site have not been harmed in any way by the toxic waste spill described above?

4. Has any additional toxic waste been discovered in or near the WMATA site? If so, what and when?

5. What efforts have been made to contain and clean up toxic waste in and around the WMATA site?

6. Is there any toxic waste on or near the WMATA site today? If so, what, how much and how is it stored or contained?

7. What impact, if any, does the fact that the WMATA site is located on or near the Little Falls Branch and/or the Jenifer Run storm sewer have on the movement of toxic waste located on or near the WMATA site?

8. Is there any risk whatsoever that development of the WMATA site could cause toxic waste to contaminate nearby ground, air or water in DC or Maryland? If so, what efforts will be taken to ensure that no toxic waste will contaminate or migrate to nearby sites?

9. I respectfully request that any and all studies, reports, evaluations and analyses of any of the above-described issues and questions be made publicly available to the community right away.

WMATA reviewed the above questions and provided the following response.

As you are aware, there had been leaks from WMATA and the predecessor bus company's underground storage tanks (USTs) resulting in releases of diesel product. The released diesel product migrated downward and reached the groundwater which carried the product to some off-site properties. The

groundwater is 30 to 60 feet below grade. It also migrated into deep elevator sumps on adjacent properties and were inadvertently discharged directly to Willard Creek.

These problems have been addressed under directives from what is currently the District of Columbia Dept of Health, Environmental Health Administration. Soil and groundwater remediation systems have significantly reduced the contamination on-site and under adjacent properties.

The only hazardous waste generated at the garage are typical maintenance byproducts such as contaminated antifreeze or paints and they are stored and disposed of in accordance with federal and local regulations. The facility is "conditionally exempt" due to minimal or zero hazardous waste generation.

There is extensive documentation of all studies and remediation activities at the site that are available through the District of Columbia, Environmental Health Administration.

6/10/2004 4:07:27 PM email from David Frankel

1. Who is performing the traffic study[being conducted in connection with the Upper Wisconsin Avenue Corridor Study? How much does it cost? Please provide a copy of the request for proposals and the contract along with any documents attached to or referenced in the contract.

2. What is the scope of the traffic study? Does it include parking issues? Does it include truck traffic issues? Does it include residential street cut-through traffic issues? Does it include traffic calming issues? What precise geographic area is being studied? Does it take into account proposed development in Friendship Heights, Maryland and Chevy Chase, Maryland?

3. What assumptions are being made as the underpinnings of the traffic study? For example, is the person, agency, entity or company performing the study making any assumptions concerning: (a) the number of existing square feet of development in the plan area; (b) the number of proposed square feet after a maximum build out in the plan area using the most generous figures possible under OP's plans; (c) the number of new residential units and new residents in the plan area; (d) the number of cars the people living in those new residential units are likely to have and the number of auto trips these people are likely to make; (e) the number of square feet of new retail development in the plan area and the number of shoppers who are likely to visit the plan area via automobile; (f) the number of new office space development in the plan area and the number of workers who are likely to commute to and from the plan area via automobile; (g) the number of parking spaces per unit that new residential, retail and office development will have; (h) the impact on motor vehicle traffic that will result when Metrorail reaches its full capacity, as projected, around the year 2025; and (i) what specific development projects, if any, are being considered both in and around the plan area? Please fully describe each these assumptions.

4. Will the traffic study analyze the impact of new development on fire protection service, police and EMS response times to emergencies and on the ability of residents, shoppers, workers, etc. to evacuate in the event of a mass regional emergency?

5. Is OP still relying upon the Friendship Heights Transportation Study ("FHTS") for part of the study area? Are any corrections or modifications being made to the FHTS to take into account the various detailed criticisms of it from the community?

6. When will this traffic study be completed? Will OP commit to not finalizing the UWACS Small Area Plan or releasing it to the public, the impacted ANC's and the DC Council until after the traffic study has been completed and analyzed? If not, why not?

6/10/2004 4:15:26 PM email from Colleen Hawkinson
The District Department of Transportation will indeed be undertaking a study, as recommended in the UWAC Study. However, we are still in the early stages of pulling the scope of work, cost, consultant, etc. together. We plan on having a public meeting in September to go over all the details and to gather comments. I should also inform you that I was recently offered and have accepted a new position within DDOT. I am now the City-Wide Transportation Planner and will be gradually transitioning out of Ward 3 issues. I do plan on remaining the contact person until someone is hired to take over the position. We anticipate having someone on board hopefully within the next month or so.

6/15/2004 12:57:48 PM email from David Frankel

1. I understand that the FHTS did not take into account how future development in Friendship Heights would impact on the level of service at the major intersection of River Road and Western Avenue. Am I correct? If I am correct, why is this major intersection not being studied? Will development at Friendship Heights on both the Maryland and DC sides have any impact on the intersection of River Road and Wisconsin Avenue? What will that impact be?

2. I understand that the FHTS did not take into account the possibility of development of the Lord & Taylor site, upon which the revised UWACS may now permit over 900 residential units plus 190,000 square feet of retail in addition to the existing department store. Am I correct? If I am correct, why is this development not being considered as part of a traffic study? Will the development of the Lord & Taylor site have any impact on traffic congestion and on-street parking availability in Friendship Heights? What will that impact be?

3. I understand that the FHTS did not take into account the possibility of building up to five new floors on top of Mazza Galerie, which could accommodate approximately 380 residential units. Am I correct? If I am correct, why is this development not being considered as part of a traffic study? Will the additional development of the Mazza Galeria site have any impact on traffic congestion and on-street parking availability in Friendship Heights? What will that impact be?

4. I understand that the FHTS did not take into account the development of the surface parking lot between Mazza Galerie and Lord & Taylor, which could accommodate approximately 500 residential units plus about 70,000 square feet of retail space. Am I correct? If I am correct, why is this development not being considered as part of a traffic study? Will the development of this surface parking lot have any impact on traffic congestion and on-street parking availability in Friendship Heights? What will that impact be?

5. I understand that the FHTS did not take into account the development of the Doll Museum and neighboring lots, which could accommodate approximately 140 residential units in addition to the existing retail and office space. If I am correct, why is this development not being considered as part of a traffic study? Will the development of the Doll Museum and neighboring lots have any impact on traffic congestion and on-street parking availability in Friendship Heights? What will that impact be?

6. I understand that the FHTS did not take into account the large increase in density proposed in the UWACS with its endorsement of Planned Urban Developments at current zoning levels for the area along Wisconsin Avenue from Harrison Street to Rodman Street. Am I correct?
Will the development of the area along Wisconsin Avenue from Harrison Street to Rodman Street have any impact on traffic congestion and on-street parking availability in Friendship Heights? What will that impact be?

7. Will development in Friendship Heights on both the Maryland and DC sides increase the amount of cut-through traffic on any residential streets in the so-called "Growth Restriction Area"? Which streets? What will the impacts be under a maximum buildout scenario?

8. Will development in Friendship Heights on both the Maryland and DC sides (especially the development of retail stores) increase the amount of truck traffic along Wisconsin Avenue, Western Avenue, Military Road, River Road and Connecticut Avenue? Which streets? What will the impacts be under a maximum buildout scenario?

9. Will development in Friendship Heights on both the Maryland and DC sides increase the demand for on-street parking on any residential streets in the so-called "Growth Restriction Area"? Which streets? What will the impacts be under a maximum buildout scenario?

10. I understand that when Montgomery County, MD developed trip generation rates for development on the Friendship Heights, MD side of the UWACS border, that Montgomery County assumed rates that are significantly higher than the rates that the DC DOT has assumed for the DC side of the UWACS border. Am I correct? What trip generation rates were utilized by Montgomery County, MD for its ongoing Friendship Heights development projects? What trip generation rates has DC DOT assumed in its FHTS? What is the basis of the Montgomery County trip generation rates for Friendship Heights? What is the basis for the DC trip generation rates for Friendship Heights? Which trip generation rates are more reliable and realistic and why? I understand that in developing the trip generation rates for the FHTS, DC DOT applied its significantly lower estimated trip generation rates even to development on the Montgomery County, MD side of the UWACS border (i.e., even when Montgomery County itself is predicting much higher trip generations for its own development). Am I correct?

11. If Montgomery County, MD trip generation rates are applied to both Montgomery County and to DC development (instead of the lower DC DOT rates), how does that alter the traffic situation within the UWACS area? In making this calculation, please make sure you take into account the full development potential for items 2 through 5 above.

12. The Ward 3 Comprehensive Plan includes a policy of "improving the level of service at street intersections to 'B' or 'C' at worst" for the "protection and improvement of the quality of life, air quality, and residential character of the ward." Even without considering the bulk of recommended development (e.g., items 2 through 5 above), the DC DOT transportation studies found that several key Friendship Heights area intersections will be performing at unacceptable or barely acceptable levels, including Wisconsin @ Western, Wisconsin @ Military, Western @ Military, Wisconsin @ Jenifer, Military @ Reno, Military @ Connecticut, and Military @ Nebraska/Broad Branch. Am I correct?

13. In January 2004, the Washington Post published an article about traffic congestion in Washington, DC. Part of that article consisted of a map of the city designating the most frequently congested intersections as designated by the DC Metropolitan Police Department. The Friendship Neighborhood Association attached a copy of that map as an appendix to its official public comments on the draft UWACS. Only a handful of those frequently congested intersections were located outside of the downtown business core. Of those, one was the intersection of Wisconsin Avenue and Jenifer Street, N.W., which was rated as frequently congested during both the morning and evening rush periods. This rating was done by the MPD before any of the development that would be permitted under the UWACS. The FHTS rates the level of service of the intersection of Wisconsin Avenue and Jenifer Street at a "C," correct? Yet, anyone who attempts to drive through that intersection on a routine basis knows how gridlocked it gets during on workdays and on weekend afternoons. How does OP reconcile DC DOT's "C" rating with the MPD's rating of this same intersection as among the most congested in Washington, DC?
These questions were addressed at 6/16/04 Steering Committee Meeting.