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**BASIC SITE FACTS**

- 20 non-reinforced concrete cells about 1 acre each in size and 2 courts; once connected to Reservoir site
- Approximately 25 acres total
- Conceived as part of Senator James McMillan Emerald Necklace open space strategy for the Nation’s Capital; Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. hired as landscape architect
- Facility provided clean and safe drinking water until outdated by technical advances
- Surplus site sold by federal government to District government in 1987 for community development purposes
- Listed on District’s Inventory of Historic Sites since 1991
McMillan Sand Filtration Site

HISTORIC PRESERVATION PARAMETERS

Historic Overview Collage

McMillan Plan - 1901
Emerald Necklace of Parks

The McMillan Plan was the product of a collaborative effort between the District of Columbia's Parks Board and the Water Department, with the goal of enhancing the city's water treatment facilities. The plan included the development of a new filtration plant and the creation of a network of parks and greenspaces to improve water quality and aesthetic value. The McMillan Plan was a visionary effort to combine public works and environmental preservation, setting a precedent for modern urban planning.

McMillan Park - 1926

McMillan Fountain by Sculptor Herbert Adams

After the death of William McMillan in 1922, the site was renamed McMillan Park and dedicated to his memory. The McMillan Fountain, designed by sculptor Herbert Adams, was installed in the park. The fountain features a large basin with cascading water, surrounded by a formal garden with benches and pathways. The fountain serves as a symbol of the city's commitment to providing public greenspaces and water features for residents and visitors.

Clean Water for the Nation's Capital

McMillan Reservoir, one of the city's water storage facilities, plays a critical role in ensuring the supply of clean drinking water to the population. The reservoir was designed to meet the growing demand for water, reflecting the city's commitment to sustainability and resilience.

Filtration Plant Shown During Excavation

The filtration plant, a crucial component of the McMillan Plan, was built to ensure the quality of the treated water. The facility was designed to remove impurities and contaminants from the water before it was distributed to the city's residents. The plant was equipped with advanced filtration technologies, enabling efficient water treatment and conservation.

Landscape Design by Olmsted - c. 1900

The landscape design, attributed to the renowned firm of Olmsted Brothers, incorporated natural elements and integrated the McMillan Park into the surrounding urban fabric. The design featured a network of pathways, green spaces, and water features, creating a harmonious environment that enhances both the aesthetic and functional aspects of the park.

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

McMillan Reservoir Sand Filtration Plant Site
Washington D.C., NW • District of Columbia Office of Planning • Summer 2000

This page contains historical images and text related to the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, detailing the historic overview, the McMillan Plan, the McMillan Park, and the McMillan Fountain. The text provides insights into the planning, design, and significance of these elements in the context of urban development and historical preservation.

Scale is shown. No diagram.
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HISTORIC PRESERVATION PARAMETERS

- Built structures above and below ground on 25-acre site are historic
- On the DC Inventory of Historic Sites
- Listing of site on National Register is pending
- Ongoing consultation process established by MOA w/ US Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (allowed sale to District)

Planting Scheme by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr.
McMillan Sand Filtration Site

COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION GOALS

Provide Open Space

Preserve and Adaptively Reuse the Site Features

Be Creative

Mitigate Neighborhood Impacts

Make It Feasible

Be Responsive to Community Needs & Concerns
McMillan Sand Filtration Site

COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION GOALS

**Provide Open Space**

- Develop publicly accessible recreation/open space on the Site.

- Provide for both active and passive recreation uses.

- Create imaginatively developed open space in critical locations that preserve significant existing views into the Site, particularly at the intersection of Michigan Avenue and North Capitol Street.

- Ensure that high standards are adhered to for open space maintenance, landscape design, accessibility, and security.

- Incorporate thoughtfully considered signage and lighting in the landscape design plan.
McMillan Sand Filtration Site

COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION GOALS

Preserve and Adaptively Reuse the Site Features

- Restore key above ground elements of the Site in a way that is compatible with the original plan.
- Maintain the alleys or courtyards as a prominent connection to the McMillan Reservoir site.
- Use currently stable cells as a historic record of the Site.
- Revitalize the Site through adaptive reuse with a mix of uses.
- Retain, restore, and incorporate the historic McMillan Fountain as a part of the improved site design.
- In areas where the cell structure may be completely or partially removed, attempt to incorporate references to the removed elements.
- Understand the cultural significance of this Site and others that were part of the McMillan Plan so that proposed development is sensitive and respondent.
- Understand the historic landscape so that it can be accurately interpreted, preserved, and/or recreated as appropriate.
Be Creative

- Think “outside the box” to make elements of the revitalized Site more of an amenity—“a jewel”—to residents and others.

- Seek new, historically sensitive and creative uses to occupy key elements of the Site.

- Consider incorporating a well-designed and appropriate monument, memorial, and/or museum into the Site.

- Explore the significance of technology as a tool for redevelopment and reuse of the Site.
Mitigate Neighborhood Impacts

- Reduce the impacts and/or visibility of parking, traffic, and noise.

- Coordinate area-wide planning and development efforts.

- Make new development architecturally compatible with the surrounding communities.

- Integrate new development on the Site architecturally and structurally with the historic structure.

- Encourage redevelopment or rehabilitation of existing vacant or unoccupied housing sites within the neighborhoods simultaneous with new development on the Site.

- Improve transportation options for the neighborhood in conjunction with any improvements to the Site, where feasible.
COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION GOALS

Make It Feasible

- Maximize, to the extent possible, revenue-producing opportunities on both private and non-profit components of the Site development.
- Partner with private, not-for-profit, and other public sector investors to obtain resources to achieve community goals for the Site.
- Develop a mix of preferred uses including open space, housing, and neighborhood serving retail.

Be Responsive to Community Needs & Concerns

- Develop amenities or a site program that would be attractive to and accessible by a diverse population of residents and others.
Today, the Site is not suitable for any type of use due to varying degrees of structural instability.
Stabilization of the site will require a combination of structural interventions:

**Preservation** – Reinforcing the cell structure to prevent future cracking and to allow for re-use either above or below grade.

**Fill** – Compacting a cell with sand to prevent further cracking and bulking and to allow for above grade re-use.

**Demolition** – Removing a portion or all of a cells structure, particularly the deck where there is cracking and collapse. Demolition costs include amount for compacting the land to make it suitable for new development.
## SITE STABILIZATION COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CELL DESIGNATION</th>
<th>TYPE I</th>
<th>TYPE II</th>
<th>TYPE III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CELLS</td>
<td>19,22,23,24,26,27,28,29</td>
<td>10,11,12,13,14,15,20,25</td>
<td>16,17,18,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Built on fill, active cracking, some failures, add'l failures likely</td>
<td>Built in cut areas, active cracking observed around perimeter</td>
<td>Interior cells, built in cut areas, no signs of new cracking in last 30 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstable, Unsafe</td>
<td>Stable except at edges</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>Not Feasible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESERVE CELLS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.02M per cell</td>
<td>$1.79M per cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLISH CELLS</td>
<td>$860K per cell</td>
<td>$860K per cell</td>
<td>$860K per cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILL CELLS</td>
<td>$440K per cell</td>
<td>$440K per cell</td>
<td>$440K per cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR STORY BUILDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESERVE CELLS</td>
<td>Not Feasible</td>
<td>$2.56M per cell</td>
<td>$2.33M per cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLISH CELLS</td>
<td>$2M per cell</td>
<td>$1.37M per cell</td>
<td>$1.37M per cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Also Includes Site Compacting Costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILL CELLS</td>
<td>$1.61M per cell</td>
<td>$920K per cell</td>
<td>$920K per cell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: C.C. Johnson & Malhotra, PC
### COST RANGES BY CELL CONDITION

**TYPE I** – Significant Deterioration – 8 Cells

- Preservation Not Feasible
- Fill for Open Space: $3.52 M
- Demolish for Building (4 stories): $16.0 M

**TYPE II** – Moderate Deterioration – 8 Cells

- Fill for Open Space: $3.52 M
- Preserve for Building (4 stories): $20.5 M

**TYPE III** – Stable – 4 Cells

- Fill for Open Space: $1.76 M
- Preserve & Open Space: $7.16 M
- Preserve for Building (4 stories): $9.32 M

### TOTAL STABILIZATION COST RANGE***

- Open Space - min: $14.2 M
- Preserve for Building & Open Space - max: $45.8 M

*** Cost do not include design and construction for preserving and/or restoring the two (2) courts or any part of the Olmsted scheme for the site.
CONCLUSIONS ABOUT SITE CONDITIONS

1. Site stabilization should occur on the entire site before revitalization activities can occur and should occur as soon as possible.

2. Final stabilization costs should be considered as a public infrastructure investment.

3. The 4 TYPE III Cells are the most stable and should be preserved and adaptively re-used as well as the 2 courts. These cells are in the best location and in the best condition to accommodate a central community open space.

4. The 8 significantly deteriorated TYPE I Cells are beyond preservation and should be demolished. However, parts of the column grid system could be maintained and incorporated into future uses.

5. The 8 moderately deteriorated TYPE II Cells can be preserved for adaptive re-use above and below grade or used as needed to accommodate uses compatible with proposed revitalization efforts.
The site is an important cultural landscape in the history of the District of Columbia. The site is also one of the few large scale, District-owned revitalization sites in Ward 5 and in the city.

Revitalization of McMillan must balance historic preservation, community impacts and economic sufficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNED PROJECTS</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McMillan Sand Filtration Site</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Soldiers Home East Campus</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Soldiers Home West Campus (pending)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rhode Island Metro/Brentwood Kmart</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>WMATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Proposed Conference Center / Hotel</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Georgia Avenue / HU Town Center</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Brookland Metro Site + CUA Site</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>WMATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Future New York Avenue Metro Area</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. North Capitol Street Retail</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also … Fort Totten Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td>WMATA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McMillan Sand Filtration Site

REVITALIZATION NEEDS & CURRENT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Residents</th>
<th>16,048 (as of 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Employees</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Patients Served (annually)</td>
<td>560,000 (visitors also represent potential market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Students (annually)</td>
<td>16,250 (parents also represent potential market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Uses for Employees</td>
<td>For sale housing, restaurants, dry cleaner, book store, full service bank, post office, job training center, grocer, fitness center, hotel/conference center, recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRIMARY MARKET AREA SUPPORTABLE USES

A. Townhouse Sales  
200 to 245 units

B. Condominium Sales  
24 to 43 units annually (2000-2004)

C. Rental Apartments  
Approximately 120

D. Shoppers Goods (retail)  
Approximately 50,000 SF

E. Office  
60,000 SF

F. N’hood Professional Offices  
Approximately 10,000 SF

G. Hotel  
90 to 105 rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNED PROJECTS</th>
<th>Townhomes</th>
<th>Condos</th>
<th>Apts</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Soldiers Home East Campus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Soldiers Home West Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rhode Island Metro/Brentwood Kmart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Proposed Conference Center / Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Georgia Avenue / HU Town Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Brookland Metro Site + CUA Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Future New York Ave Metro Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. North Capitol Street Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also … Fort Totten Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is essentially no publicly accessible open space within the Study Area.
REVITALIZATION NEEDS & CURRENT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
Traffic Analysis & Intersections Performance

LOCATION LOS
1 – North Capital Street at Michigan Avenue D
2 – Michigan Avenue at First Street C
3 – Bryant Street at First Street C
4 – Harvard Street at 5th Street B
5 – Irving Street at North Capitol Street GSI
6 – Rhode Island Avenue at North Capitol GSI
## EXISTING AVERAGE DELAY/LEVELS OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Delay Sec/veh.</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard St/5th St</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Ave/1st St</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Ave/North Capitol St</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant St/ 1st St</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O.R. George and Associates

## AVERAGE DELAY/LEVELS OF SERVICE WITH PROJECTED WASHINGTON HOSPITAL CENTER EXPANSION, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Delay Sec/veh.</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard St/5th St</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Ave/1st St</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Ave/North Capitol St</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant St/ 1st St</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O.R. George and Associates
1. The District is in its first years of fiscal recovery and is working smartly to first ensure basic city services are being met.

2. Forty percent (40%) of the District’s land is non-taxable (federal or not for profit) and therefore contributes no property tax revenue.

3. The District’s fiscal health must therefore rely heavily on revitalization strategies that encourage new residential development to increase intake of property and income tax revenues.

4. The District must use its public assets to contribute to the city’s fiscal health and to the overall quality of life of residents in our neighborhoods.
CONCLUSIONS ABOUT REVITALIZATION NEEDS

1. Many of the development sites within the area are currently in the pipeline. Much of the market demand forecast by OP consultants may be absorbed on other sites within the primary market area.

2. When interviewed, the development community viewed the site as a prime opportunity for new housing and neighborhood-oriented development.

3. The primary market area severely lacks publicly accessible open space and other community amenities, including libraries and recreation centers. The McMillan site offers one of the best opportunities in the area to accommodate these needs.

4. Employees, students, visitors and residents lack quality choices for retail, hotel and conference facilities, and could use more for sale and rental housing in the Primary Market Area, but the traffic impacts of this site and others must be coordinated and mitigated.

5. Throughout the District a variety of housing opportunities are needed. A portion of McMillan can help to fill this housing demand and generate much needed revenues to support the site.
1. Given several factors including planned development in the market area, existing and projected traffic and infrastructure constraints, structural engineering conditions, and input from area residents and local developers, many uses were found undesirable for the site:

- Big Box Retail
- High Rise Office
- High Rise Hotel
- High Rise Residential
- Fast Food Restaurants
- Hospital/Medical Facilities
- Vehicle Service Facilities
- Liquor Store
- Department Store
- Warehouse
- Uses that require large amounts of surface parking

2. Five (5) scenarios were analyzed using a combination of desirable uses at low, moderate and high intensities of development. Desirable uses are:

- Park/Open Space
- Historic Preservation
- Recreation Facilities
- Federal/National Monument
- Public Facilities
- Condominiums
- Apartments
- Townhouses
- Low-Rise Office
- Conference Center
- Restaurants
- Neighborhood Retail
- Church
- Cultural Facilities
- Entertainment/Movies/Theatre
1. Given several factors including planned development in the market area, existing and projected traffic and infrastructure constraints, structural engineering conditions, and input from area residents and local developers, many uses were found undesirable for the site:

- Big Box Retail
- High Rise Office
- High Rise Hotel
- High Rise Residential
- Fast Food Restaurants
- Hospital/Medical Facilities
- Vehicle Service Facilities
- Liquor Store
- Department Store
- Warehouse
- Uses that require large amounts of surface parking

2. Five (5) scenarios were analyzed using a combination of desirable uses at low, moderate and high intensities of development. Desirable uses are:

- Park/Open Space
- Historic Preservation
- Recreation Facilities
- Federal/National Monument
- Public Facilities
- Condominiums
- Apartments
- Townhouses
- Low-Rise Office
- Conference Center
- Restaurants
- Neighborhood Retail
- Church
- Cultural Facilities
- Entertainment/Movies/Theatre
McMillan Sand Filtration Site

USE(S):
- Park/Open Space 25 Ac.
- Development 0 Ac.

PRESERVATION IMPACT:
- Open Space 25 Ac.
- Filter Cells- 5 25%
- Stabilized Cells – 13 65%
- Courts – 2 100%

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
- Est. Sale Income $0
- Est. Stabilization $16.8M
- Est. Cost for Park $6-12 M
- Shortfall ($22.8-28.8 M)

EST. TOTAL PUBLIC INVESTMENT****:
+$23 – 29 M

****Total public investments indicated are a minimum and do not include needed transportation improvements (roadway reconstruction) or preservation cost for the courts.
**SCENARIO: LOW INTENSITY**

**USE(S):**
- Park/Open Space 18.2 Ac.
- Development 6.4 Ac.
  - 100 Townhomes
  - 300 Pkg. Spaces

**PRESERVATION IMPACT:**
- Open Space 18.2 Ac.
- Filter Cells - 4 20%
- Stabilized Cells – 10 50%
- Courts – 2 100%

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**
- Est. Sale Income $4.67M
- Est. Stabilization $16.9M
- Est. Cost for Park $4.4-8.7 M
- Shortfall ($16.6-20.9M)

**EST. TOTAL PUBLIC INVESTMENT:**
+$17 – 21 M

****Total public investments indicated are a minimum and do not include needed transportation improvements (roadway reconstruction) or preservation cost for the courts.**
SCENARIO: MEDIUM INTENSITY

USE(S):

- Park/Open Space 15.4 Ac.
- Development 9.2 Ac.
  - 80K SF Entertainment
  - 200 Hotel Rms.
  - 50K Retail
  - 1,030 Pkg. Sp.

PRESERVATION IMPACT:

- Open Space 15.4 Ac.
- Filter Cells- 4 20%
- Stabilized Cells – 7 35%
- Courts – 2 100%

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

- Est. Sale Income $3.24M
- Est. Stabilization $15.5M
- Est. Cost for Park $3.7-7.4 M
- Shortfall ($16-19.6 M)

EST. TOTAL PUBLIC INVESTMENT:

+$16 – 20 M

****Total public investments indicated are a minimum and do not include needed transportation improvements (roadway reconstruction) or preservation cost for the courts.
SCENARIO: RESIDENTIAL/RETAIL – MEDIUM INTENSITY

USE(S):
- Park/Open Space 10.8 Ac.
- Development 13.8 Ac.
  - 50K SF Retail
  - 80 Townhomes
  - 150 Apartments
  - 710 Pkg. Sp.

PRESERVATION IMPACT:
- Open Space 10.8 Ac.
- Filter Cells - 2 10%
- Stabilized Cells – 6 30%
- Courts – 2 ea 100%

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
- Est. Sale Income $6.49M
- Est. Stabilization $12.5M
- Est. Cost for Park $2.6-5.2 M
- Shortfall ($8.6-11.2M)

EST. TOTAL PUBLIC INVESTMENT:
+$9 – 11 M

****Total public investments indicated are a minimum and do not include needed transportation improvements (roadway reconstruction) or preservation cost for the courts.****
McMillan Sand Filtration Site

SCENARIO: HIGH INTENSITY

USE(S):

- Park/Open Space: 4.4 Ac.
- Development: 20.2 Ac.
  - 100K SF Office
  - 40K SF Conference
  - 200 Hotel Rms.
  - 100K Retail
  - 8K SF Restaurant
  - 1,561 Pkg. Sp.

PRESERVATION IMPACT:

- Open Space: 4.4 Ac.
- Filter Cells: 4 (10%)
- Stabilized Cells: 1 (5%)
- Courts: ½ ea (50%)

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

- Est. Sale Income: $11.6M
- Est. Stabilization: $12.6M
- Est. Cost for Park: $1.1-2.1M
- Shortfall: ($2.1-3.1M)

EST. TOTAL PUBLIC INVESTMENT:

+$2 – 3 M

****Total public investments indicated are a minimum and do not include needed transportation improvements (roadway reconstruction) or preservation cost for the courts.
McMillan Sand Filtration Site

**MC MILLAN PARK COMMITTEE*** SCENARIO

**Recommended Desirable Uses**

- Formal Park;
- Gardens;
- Water park;
- Towers, courtyards, buildings & structures as boutique shops;
- Waterworks museum;
- Cultural center & library;
- Outdoor theater;
- Children’s play area;
- Coffee shop;
- Café;
- Restaurants (family style and fine dining);
- Farmer’s market

Below ground shops, gymnasium, parking, police sub-station;

Commemorative Memorials;

McMillan Park Committee represents a component of the broad range of area and McMillan stakeholders.

Conceptual Plan prepared by Sorg Associates for McMillan Park Committee
“A minimum of 80 to 90% of the McMillan site should be revitalized as public open space. (Original design of site for the Federal City {McMillan Plan and the original comprehensive plan})

“The remainder of the site should be developed as a National Monument, Museum, Outdoor Theater, Bottle Water Plant and Farmer’s Market; the aforementioned uses should be able to offset the cost of site stabilization and to provide on going revenue for maintenance.

“McMillan should be zoned to accommodate the following mix of uses at low density: publicly accessible open space, a cultural destination (museum and/or memorial), and retail consistent with the above uses.

“Planners should exhaust all feasible 80 to 100% open space, preservation options first, before pursuing moderate density development; Efforts should be made to relocate housing and other development inconsistent with the above, to other planned development projects in the McMillan area (i.e. Soldiers Home and Catholic, etc.

“The two (2) courts that cross the site are key plan elements that once linked the Sand Filtration Site with the adjacent McMillan Reservoir. These courts should be preserved and adaptively re-used (Farmer’s market)

“Vistas from the site are significant and should be preserved in conjunction with development of public open space.”
Howard University also presented a mixed use revitalization strategy for the site. Proposed uses included a hotel, conference center, restaurant, retail stores, bank, open space, and a visitor center.

Staff from Catholic University’s School of Architecture also presented a conceptual scenario that integrated multiple layers of the site’s history and site conditions with sensitively developed housing and retail.
Since 1989, 10 community forums about revitalizing McMillan have occurred. Five (5) were held in conjunction with OP’s recent series of community workshops (July 2000-January 2001).

There is no consensus about how the site should be revitalized. One sector of the area stakeholders wants to preserve of the site as accessible open space. Another contingent generally wants preservation, open space, museums, memorials and adaptive reuse of the underground cells only. While stakeholders immediate to the site, area institutions, and a panel of public, private and not for profit development representatives have put forth that the site is large enough to accommodate preservation, open space, and cultural uses that are economically supported by some selective development (neighborhood serving retail and housing.)

A technical advisory group (TAG) was voluntarily established to assist in reporting the concerns of their constituents and in crafting content of the community meetings. Several members of the TAG were also members of the McMillan Park Committee.

Five sub-committees were established to address: a cultural landscape analysis, short-term site maintenance, potential non-District funding sources, video documenting the site and process, and cultural amenities (museums, memorials, etc.) The results of the committee have been incorporated into the revitalization effort.
## McMillan Sand Filtration Site

### BROAD STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

#### COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TIME LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Site Completed</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access to Site Restricted due to wartime concerns about sabotage</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of Site Closed</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ownership from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to GSA</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Surplus and sold to District Government</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural/Engineering Feasibility Study</td>
<td>October, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Sponsored Public Forum</td>
<td>May 9, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Sponsored Public Forum</td>
<td>May 24, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilperson Jarvis Sponsored Community Forum</td>
<td>June 6, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP Issued for Site Development</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Received</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawsuit filed challenging re-zoning of property</td>
<td>1990-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Archaeological Survey</td>
<td>June 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing on DC Inventory of Historic Sites</td>
<td>August 21, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan designates “Mixed Use” as land use for the Site</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited Proposal for Site Received</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC5C Sponsored Workshop</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council requires Community Input about Site Development – referred to OP</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC5C Sponsored Workshop</td>
<td>May 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Stability Report and Market Analysis</td>
<td>July 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions Assessment Report</td>
<td>August 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “Visioning Goals and Opportunities” – OP Workshop</td>
<td>July 29, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “Exploring Options” – OP Workshop</td>
<td>August 26, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-committee Meetings</td>
<td>November 2000-January 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Community Meeting: “Site Programming”</td>
<td>January 13, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report and Recommendations from Consultants</td>
<td>January 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Tour &amp; Strategy Session with Private, Public and Quasi Public Developers</td>
<td>April 11, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Session with Area Institutions</td>
<td>May 23, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: D.C. Office of Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS FROM REVITALIZATION SCENARIOS

- A minimum of 50% (approximately 12.5 Acres) of the McMillan site should be revitalized as publicly accessible open space.

- The remainder of the site should be developed with low and moderate intensity uses to offset the cost of site stabilization and to provide ongoing revenue from which the publicly funded components on the site (open space, gardens, libraries, etc.) are maintained.

- McMillan should be zoned to accommodate the following mix of uses at moderate density: publicly accessible open space, a cultural destination (museum and/or memorial), neighborhood serving and destination enhancing retail, and housing.

- It is more likely that the TYPE I and II Cells will need to be considered for revenue generating uses that help defray ongoing site maintenance costs.

- The two (2) courts that cross the site are key plan elements that once linked the Sand Filtration Site with the adjacent McMillan Reservoir. These courts should be preserve and adaptively re-used.

- Vistas from the site are significant and should be preserved in conjunction with development of public open space on the site particularly over the stable TYPE III cells where views are possible to surrounding institutions as well as the reservoir. See “Key Planning Elements Diagram.”
Diagram of conditions and opportunities which have and should continue to frame revitalization efforts. Components of this diagram are responsive to site conditions and stakeholder input.
This conceptual diagram illustrates how community goals, District economic revitalization needs and planning conclusions might be met at McMillan.
A RFP related to development of McMillan should **not** be issued at this time.

DHCD received stewardship of the site for disposition purposes, but it does not appear now that revitalization of the site will occur in the short term. Given this, the site should be returned to the Office of Property Management which should assume the cost for maintaining the site until such a time as it is transferred for revitalization.

The site requires a public-private partnership development strategy. Transfer the long-term stewardship and management of the revitalization process for McMillan from District Government to a public development entity.

The primary responsibilities of the Public Development Entity would be to develop and implement a Master Development Plan and Disposition Strategy that includes:

- Detailed design and site guidelines
- Detailed financial modeling and phasing strategy
- Development program
- Public sector costs analysis-development and operating
- Solicitation for innovative design and development partners
By the end of December 2002, the District should accept proposals from potential public development entities. Proposals should respond to these recommendations and present strategies for how the potential entity might managing the revitalization process for this site.

The District should retain ownership of the historic site. Development on McMillan should be through a long-term grounds lease structure that allows the District to regain some revenue that is then used to maintain and upgrade public components of the site and in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Establish a Coalition of McMillan Revitalization Partners (CMRP), an advisory group to work with the public development entity. The Coalition should include: District Government, NCRC, area universities and hospitals, Soldiers and Airmen’s Home, Army Corp of Engineers, WMATA, National Capital Planning Commission, National Park Service, Federal Department of Transportation and McMillan Park Committee.
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