The Honorable Phil Mendelson  
Chairman  
Council of the District of Columbia  
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Chairman Mendelson:

Enclosed for consideration by the Council is a resolution entitled the “McMillan Surplus Declaration and Approval Resolution of 2014.”

This resolution will declare District owned real property located at 2501 1st Street, N.W. as no longer required for public purposes, pursuant to D.C. Official Code §10-801.

In 1901, Congress approved the construction of a chemical-free slow-sand filtration system to be located at what is now known as the McMillan Sand Filtration Site (the “Property”). The Property is one of three discrete divisions in what has been dubbed as the McMillan Park Historic District, named after the late Senator James McMillan, who died in 1902. The other two components are the existing McMillan Reservoir and the former McMillan Park, an area southwest of the Reservoir which was utilized as active recreational until World War II. The entire system was created as a water filtration and storage facility.

From 1908 to 1920, the entire property was enhanced with landscape design by Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. The “parking of the grounds” consisted of a three-pronged approach by Olmsted.

The Property was operational for slow sand water filtration until 1985, when it was decommissioned after the Army Corps built a modernized chemical filtration process plant across on the Reservoir side, west of First Street. The site was designated surplus and the District of Columbia government purchased it from the federal government in 1987 for $9.3 million with the intention of redevelopment.

In 1991, the McMillan Park Historic District, also with the Reservoir, was designated a Historic Landmark and listed on the D.C. Inventory of Historic Sites.
The Property is currently vacant and is in varying levels of deterioration, with the exception of DC Water’s use of Cell 14 and construction of the Northeast Boundary and Branch Tunnel project, which is utilizing the South Service Court and Cells 25 and 26.

The Property consists of approximately 1,075, 496 square feet of land, of which a portion will be reserved by the District for a community center, open space, parks, and landscaped areas.

Pursuant to D.C. Official Code §10-801 (a-1)(2)(C), a public meeting was held in the community on June 6, 2013 at All Nations Baptist Church to receive public comment on the proposed surplus of the Property. Multiple meetings with the community have been held since 2007 to discuss the proposed redevelopment of the site.

Approval of this resolution will declare the Property surplus and allow for the disposition to a private developer to redevelop the Property.

As always, I am available to discuss any questions you may have regarding this resolution. I look forward to prompt and favorable consideration of this resolution.

Sincerely,

Vincent C. Gray
A PROPOSED RESOLUTION

IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To declare and approve as surplus the District-owned real property located at 2501 1st Street, N.W., formerly the McMillan Sand Filtration Site.

RESOLVED, BY THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, That this resolution may be cited as the “McMillan Surplus Declaration and Approval Resolution of 2014”.

Sec. 2. Findings.

(a) The McMillan Site is located at 2501 1st Street, N.W., known for tax and assessment purposes as Lot 0800 in Square 3128, and consists of a total of approximately 1,075,496 square feet of land, of which approximately 453,614 square feet of land will be reserved by the District for a community center, open space, parks, and landscaped areas, as determined by the Mayor and the remaining 621,882 square feet of land (the “Property”).

(b) The Property is no longer required for public purposes because the Property’s condition cannot viably accommodate a District agency use or other public use without cost prohibitive new construction. The most pragmatic solution for reactivating this space is to declare the Property surplus and dispose of the Property for redevelopment.
Pursuant to An Act Authorizing the sale of certain real estate in the District of Columbia no longer required for public purposes ("Act"), approved August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1211; D.C. Official Code § 10-801 et seq.), D.C. Official Code 10-801 (a-1)(4), a public hearing was held on June 6th, 2013 at the All Nations Baptist Church located at 2001 North Capitol Street, N.E., regarding the finding that the Property is no longer required for public purposes.

Sec. 3. Pursuant to D.C. Official Code §10-801 (a-1), the Council determines that the Property is no longer required for public purposes.

Sec. 4. Fiscal impact statement.

The Council adopts the attached fiscal impact statement as the fiscal impact statement required by section 602 (c)(3) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-206.02 (c)(3)).

Sec. 5. Transmittal of resolution.

The Secretary to the Council shall transmit a copy of this resolution, upon its adoption, to the Mayor.

Sec. 6. Effective date.

This resolution shall take effect immediately.
SURPLUS ANALYSIS

Project Name: McMillan Sand Filtration Site
Property Description: Square 3128, Lot 800; 2501 1st Street, NW in Washington, D.C. (the "Property")
Size of Property: 1,075,496 Square Feet (24.69 Acres), of which approximately 621,882 Square Feet will be designated as Surplus
Zoning of Property: Unzoned
Ward: Ward 5
Proposed Purchaser: Vision McMillan Partners, LLC (Trammell Crow Company, EYA, JAIR LYNCH Development Partners)

1. History of Parcel: description of parcel (including approximate square footage, description of any structure/improvements on the parcel and whether such structure/improvements are historically landmarked, and any available parking on and off the parcel), how and when the District acquired this property; the terms of the acquisition; a description of the property’s former and current use; and, if the improvements are occupied.

The Property is located at 2501 1st Street, NW in Washington, D.C and is further identified as Square 3128, Lot 800. The property has a trapezoidal footprint defined by First Street, NW, to the west, Michigan Avenue, NW, to the north, North Capitol Street to the east, and Channing Street, NW, to the south, and measures approximately 24.69 acres or 1,075,496 square feet. The Property features two paved service courts that divide the site into a tripartite configuration of expansive open spaces. These grassy open spaces correspond to the roofs of the twenty unreinforced concrete filter beds that have been covered by a layer of fill. To construct these filter beds, the site’s topography was re-graded, and an extensive campaign of cut and fill created an artificial topography that rises approximately sixteen feet above the level of Channing Street to the south and is depressed approximately ten feet from the level of Michigan Avenue to the north. The paved service courts are depressed approximately five feet into this plateau and are bounded to the north and south by the parapet walls of the subterranean filter beds. These walls function as retaining walls for the fill that covers the roofs of the filter beds. Each filter bed is accessed from the service courts via an arched portal. A mound in the fill behind each portal corresponds to the subterranean path of a ramp that leads from the portal into its corresponding filter bed. The ramp terminates five feet above the floor, as typically the filter bed would contain five feet of sand. Within each service court, the sand bins, sand washers, and regulator houses are arranged in a single east-west line. There are a total of twenty sand bins (one for each filter bed), four regulator houses, and twelve sand washers. The roofs of the filter beds are accessed from the service courts by several ramps and stairs. ramps and stairs also connect the roofs of the filter beds and the service courts to the adjacent roads at five locations. The expansive open spaces contain approximately 2,100 circular manholes that provided natural light to the filter beds below. A tunnel, similar in style to the filter bed portals, runs under First Street to connect the northern service court of the Property to the west side of the McMillan Reservoir. Most of the built resources above ground are also constructed of unreinforced concrete, with varying types of treatments. The regulator houses are constructed of red brick coursed in Flemish bond and
feature arched fenestration and hipped roofs covered in terra cotta tiles. Doors and windows, including those of the regulator houses and filter bed portals, are constructed of wood with iron hardware. All of the resources on the McMillan Site reflect the original design and construction of the slow sand filtration plant.

The Property is one of three discrete divisions in what has been dubbed as the McMillan Park Historic District. The other two components are the existing McMillan Reservoir and the former McMillan Park, an area southwest of the Reservoir which was utilized as active recreational until World War II. The entire system was created as a water filtration and storage facility. In August of 1900, Colonel Alexander Miller recommended the construction of mechanical (or rapid-sand) filters at the new Howard University Reservoir. Local professional and citizen organizations objected to the chemicals used in this filtration process, and the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia chaired by James McMillan, who had been very involved in public works in Detroit before being elected to Congress in 1889, held hearings on the issue. A subsequent Senate-appointed committee of civilian experts recommended chemical-free slow-sand filtration, and Congress approved construction of such filters on March 1, 1901. This effective filtering system, substantially designed by Miller, was built between the spring of 1903 and the end of 1905. The following year, Secretary of War William Howard Taft ordered the reservoir and new filters named after the late Senator McMillan, who died in 1902.

From 1908 to 1920, the entire property was enhanced with landscape design by Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. His “General Plan for the Landscape Treatment of McMillan Park,” (March 27, 1908), provides a narrative of his design intentions for the Park. The plan starts by dividing the entire site into three distinct parts — Part A (the Parcel), Part B, and Part C—which Olmsted described as follows:

- **Part A:** “The area including the covered reservoirs, filter beds, sand-washers and their appurtenances [sic], consisting of a series of engineering constructions of a strikingly artificial and formal appearance.”
- **Part B:** “The spacious and impressive open reservoir with its enclosing banks and hillsides, including the curvilinear banks of the filter beds which face toward it.”
- **Part C:** “The southerly part, lying in the main below the dam of the reservoir but sweeping up gradually to the hill top in the southeast corner of part B.”

Olmsted’s design for Part A (the Property) was based on the primary physical structures of the site: the “straight banks” bordering the site; the “formal plain” created by the roofs of the filter beds; and the architectural elements found in the two service courts. From the 1908 general plan, it is apparent that one of Olmsted’s primary design intentions was to emphasize and reinforce the border of the formal plain, through the introduction of a perimeter path and multiple layers of perimeter plantings. Olmsted started the design with a “low formal hedge bordering the formal plain and marking the top edge of the bank.” Olmsted specified the “low” hedge because of his concern that a high, solid hedge would obscure visibility to the site from the street and would be ill-proportioned to the “straight banks” at certain points. As a result, he limited the perimeter hedge to three feet in height. Olmsted did not think the small hedge would “in itself provide as strong an emphasis of the border as the scale of the plain demands.” Therefore, he also
recommended planting a double row of small-scale trees inside the hedge, "beneath the foliage of which the view could pass and between which a border path could be provided whence the plain could be overlooked." This idea of overlooking the formal plain from a perimeter path, rather than allowing public access on the plain, was based on Olmsted's recognition of the dangerous condition created by the hundreds of open manholes across the plains. (Records indicate that between three and four acres of manholes would be open at any given time to provide light and air to the workers that were cleaning the sand in the filter beds below.) Olmsted was so concerned about this condition that he thought it was "perhaps inexpedient to admit the public to the use of the plain even upon a fenced path." In addition to safety issues, Olmsted was also aware of the detrimental effects the roots of the trees could have on the concrete substructure. Olmsted's concept for the hedge and double row of trees was implemented, and he addressed his various concerns through the species and placement of plantings.

In 1913, the citizens of Michigan paid for a fountain designed by Herbert Adams to honor Senator James McMillan. The federal government paid for the base and landscaping designed by Charles Adams Platt. The McMillan Park, located at the corner of First and Channing on the Reservoir side, was created and was publicly accessible. The park was active until 1941 when the fountain was dismantled and the entire McMillan Park Historic District was fenced off to prevent potential sabotage.

The Property was operational for slow sand water filtration until 1985, when it was decommissioned after the Army Corp built a modernized chemical filtration process plant across on the Reservoir side, west of First Street. The site was designated surplus and the District of Columbia government purchased it from the federal government in 1987 for $9.3 million with the intention of redevelopment.

In 1991, the McMillan Park Historic District, also with the Reservoir, was designated a Historic Landmark and listed on the D.C. Inventory of Historic Sites.

Since acquiring the Property, the District has been pursuing a viable redevelopment plan.

The Property is vacant and is in varying levels of deterioration, with the exception of DC Water's use of Cell 14 and construction of the Northeast Boundary and Branch Tunnel project, which is utilizing the South Service Court and Cells 25 and 26.

2. Describe the surrounding neighborhood, including the following information: What does the neighborhood offer in terms of housing, shopping, recreation, and commercial space?

The Property is situated east of Brookland, Stronghold, and Edgewood, west of Pleasant Plains, and immediately north of Bloomingdale in Ward 5.

The surrounding neighborhood to the south and east is predominantly residential in character with older rowhouses, single-family detached dwellings, and apartment buildings. However, a significant portion of the neighborhood to the north and west is devoted to institutional uses,
particularly health care facilities. These include the subject, the remaining McMillan Reservoir, Washington Hospital Center, Veterans Administration Hospital, Children's National Medical Center, National Rehabilitation Hospital, and Providence Hospital. A major land user in this neighborhood is Catholic University of America which boasts a 193-acre campus located between North Capitol Street and Metro's Red Line. Other institutional uses include Rock Creek Cemetery, U.S. National Cemetery, Trinity Washington University, Howard University School of Divinity, Glenwood Cemetery, Prospect Hill Cemetery, and Saint Mary’s Cemetery.

Commercial development is generally absent for the immediate area and can only be found over a mile away: 1) to the west along Georgia Avenue; 2) to the south along Rhode Island Avenue; and 3) to the east along Michigan Avenue. Commercial buildings are typically older, one-to-three story retail structures, oriented to serving the needs of local residents. Public recreation and open space opportunities are lacking in the immediate area, with the closest District Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) facility in Edgewood at Third and Evarts Street, NE.

Recent development activity in the area has generally been centered around Metro stations. Urban Atlantic completed a 274-unit apartment building known as Rhode Island Row in mid-2012 at the Rhode Island Metro Station. At the Brookland Metro Station, Abdo Development, Bozzuto, and Catholic University are developing four multi-family buildings containing a total of 718 units, 45 townhomes, 83,000 sq.ft. of retail, 2,000 sq.ft. of amenity space, and 850 parking spaces on nine acres of land owned by the university along Michigan Avenue, NE and Monroe Street, NE. To the east at 901 Monroe Street, NE, Menkiti Group is planning 212 multi-family units with 13,000 sq.ft. of retail. Near the Georgia Avenue-Petworth Metro Station, the Neighborhood Development Corporation constructed a 69-unit affordable apartment building in 2013 known as 32 Thirty-Two Apartments while the Landex Corporation developed an 83-unit apartment project in 2012 known as the Avenue. At the Shaw-Howard University Metro Station, Ellis Development Group just completed a mixed-use project known as Progression Place with office, retail, and a 206-unit apartment known as Seventh Flats.

At the Fort Totten Metro Station, the JBG Companies and Lowe Enterprises are constructing a mixed-use project at Riggs Road, NE and South Dakota Avenue, NE to be known as Fort Totten Square that will consist of 350 residential units and 130,000 sq.ft. of retail including a Walmart. Also planned for development along South Dakota Avenue, NE is the Cafritz Foundation’s Art Place at Fort Totten project. This development is proposed for 929 residential units, 305,000 sq.ft. of retail including a grocery store, a 47,000 sq.ft. Children’s Museum, and 170,000 sq.ft. of cultural and public uses in six buildings on 16.5 acres of land. Just north of the subject property along Irving Street, a portion the Armed Forces Retirement Home is proposed for redevelopment with 4.3 million sq.ft. of multi-family, retail, medical office, and office uses. This redevelopment is still in the planning stage with development solicitation issued as of yet.


   a. Please describe allowable future uses for the subject property.

Presently, the Property is unzoned, forms a contiguous lot, and lacks the necessary infrastructure to support allowable future uses. Additionally, there are many hazards on the property caused by
deterioration of the built resources. The twenty filtration cells, each approximately one acre in size, were constructed with unreinforced concrete and vary levels of current condition, including demolished, collapsed, substantially deteriorated, and visibly stable but cracked. The roof of each filtration cell contains 105 manholes, either uncovered or with deteriorating covers that were not designed to bear weight. Significant portions of the property have collapsed or are collapsing. Immense resources will be required to remedy these hazards and to bring the property up to a standard that would enable public access. As a result, any and all allowable future uses on the property require significant alterations and improvements to the site.

Subject to final Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission, there will be eight distinct components for the Development Program of the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, which will include approximately 2,058,600 square feet of gross floor area, or an aggregate floor area ratio (“FAR”) of approximately 1.91. The proposed uses will include approximately 1,030,000 square feet of gross floor area devoted to healthcare facilities (Parcels 1 and 3); approximately 80,000 square feet of gross floor area devoted to neighborhood serving retail uses (Parcels 1, 2, 3 and 4), including 50,000 square feet intended to be a grocery store; approximately 566,930 square feet of gross floor area devoted to multi-family residential units (Parcels 4 and 2) and 350,000 square feet devoted to residential row houses (Parcel 5). Additionally, Parcels 6, 7, and 8 will be retained by the District of Columbia Government and the proposed uses will include approximately 17,500 square feet of gross floor area devoted to a community center and a major feature of the site is an extensive amount of open space: approximately 444,056 square feet of land area devoted to parks, landscaping and open areas.


b. How were other District facility needs considered? Please explain if the Property has any viable District use or why the Property has no viable use by the District, including the process for making the determination not to implement the viable District use or that the Property has no viable use by the District.

Portions of the property will be improved, but will not be designated as surplus (to be defined as Parcels 6, 7 and 8). These portions will contain, as proposed and subject to PUD approval, publically accessible District uses: open and park spaces, preserved and adapted historic structures and a new recreational facility. For the other portions of the property that are designated as surplus, a determination was made that there were no other viable uses for the District due to the immense infrastructure improvements that would need to be made. Further discussion of these challenges is described under question 3a.

c. Please describe most viable and reasonable future use(s) for the subject property.

Currently, the Property sits vacant and remains under-utilized by the District because of existing safety hazards. However, based on the assumption that approvals are granted for a Planned Unit Development and with the requisite regulatory and historic review bodies; that the property is adequately subdivided; and that the necessary public infrastructure work occurs; the most viable and reasonable future uses for the subject property is a mixed-use development that includes
approximately 1,030,000 square feet of gross floor area devoted to healthcare facilities; approximately 94,170 square feet of gross floor area devoted to retail uses, including approximately 52,920 square feet intended to be a full-service grocery store; approximately 566,930 square feet of gross floor area devoted to multi-family residential units and 350,000 square feet devoted to residential row houses. Additionally, a significant portion of the site will be retained by the District of Columbia Government and the proposed uses will include approximately 17,500 square feet of gross floor area devoted to a community center and a major feature of the site is an extensive amount of open space: approximately 444,056 square feet of land area devoted to parks, landscaping and open areas.

4. Why determination that the real property is no longer required for public purposes is in the best interest of the District. DC Code § 10-801(a-1)(2)(B).

   a. Please describe what potential uses of the Property would be in the best interest of the District (economic, social, educational, provision of affordable housing potential).

As outlined above, the potential uses all balance a series of public policies and benefits that will be in the best interest of the District. Twenty percent of the residential units in the project will be affordable to households that range in incomes from 50% to 80% of the Area Median Income. The creation of an 8-acre Park will be the largest new park created in the District of Columbia in recent years. A 17,500 Square Feet Community Center with a 25-meter swimming pool, the necessary support space, multipurpose indoor recreational space, and exhibit space that tells the story of McMillan and launches visitors on walking tours of preserved buildings and views. The re-creation of the Olmsted Walk, the preservation of two Underground Cells, the Service Courts, and all 24 historic structures will have commemorative signage throughout this landmarked site.

Additionally, 3,000 construction and 3,000 permanent jobs will be created because of the project and residual income, sales, and property taxes, will generate over $400 million dollars in revenue to the District of Columbia in the first 10 years following the stabilization of the proposed development.


   a. What specific outreach was done to solicit community input on the proposed surplusing and disposing of the current property, including any outreach conducted in addition to the public hearing required under DC Code § 10-801(a-1)(2)(C).

Community outreach and engagement efforts began when the project was competitively bid in 2007 and continue through the present efforts in 2014 for a total of 198 public meetings, presentations, workshops, salons and other forums on behalf of the Vision McMillan Partners. This total includes 40 meetings in 2012, 31 meetings in 2013 and thus far, 25 meetings in 2014 covering the Masterplan, building designs and forum focused specifically on key community concerns of traffic management, stormwater management, preservation and public amenities.
Efforts also include 2013 surveys of community members, wherein consistently over 90% of respondents answer YES, they want the site redeveloped and re-opened for public use (97% on paper surveys at a VMP hosted community open house; 91% via online survey). Of the respondents that we know have seen a presentation of the plan (33 who responded after attending), the average satisfaction with the plan was rated a 3.82 (1 - low, 5 - high).

The Development Plan earned the formal support of ANC 5E by a resolution in June 2014 and its predecessor ANC 5C by a resolution in October 2012. In addition adjacent ANC's 5A and 1B voted by formal resolution to defer their support to the affected ANC 5E.

A public meeting to solicit community input on the proposed surplusing of the Property was held on June 13, 2013 at the All Nations Baptist Church. The affected ANC, ANC5E, as well as ANC5A, were provided advanced written notice on May 6, 2013 and notice of the public meeting was published in the District of Columbia Register on May 17, 2013.

b. Summary of Public Hearing on Surplus

Meeting Date and Location:

Date: Thursday, June 6, 2013
Time: 6:30pm
Location: All Nations Baptist Church,
          2001 North Capital St NE, Washington, DC 20002

Approximate Number of Attendees:

115 approximately, including members of the development team, community residents, including ANC Commissioners: Mark Mueller (then ANC 5E08); Dianne Barnes (ANC 5E09).

Summary of Public Comments:

The meeting began at approximately 6:30pm. Shiv Newaldass, the Project Manager from the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development ("DMPED") provided the audience with introductions, explained the purpose of the meeting, and gave a brief history of the project. Meeting attendees were encouraged to provide feedback regarding the proposed declaration of the property as surplus and then the meeting was opened up to receive public comments.

1. Name: Anne Sellin
   a. Comment: This site is on the Historic Preservation list as one the most endangered sites. There is misinformation about what was park. Site is located here. I have spoken to people who played on the park. Hot summer nights, people slept on site. The City never looked at this as an asset.
2. Name: Malcolm Kenton
   a. Comment: Sierra club environmentalist. Region is growing and there needs to be places to accommodate. I'd like to see some development. If no surplus, nothing happens.

3. Name: Theodore Bush
   a. Comment: Residents since 1964. No surplus. I'd rather see a park.

4. Name: Blanche McCloud
   a. Comment: She's lived on Franklin Street for 19 years and suggests that the site be turned into park, since they are worried about revenue would be for a water park. Virginia and Maryland have them. None of the recreation center pools are really legal for them to be swimming, meaning for the pools to have meets. There are a bunch of developers. Where she lives, there are lots of children. More than one child. Not just a water park, different size pools, kiddy pools. Her grandkids don't have a place to ride bikes. Why can't they do a bike lane around it?

5. Name: Jason Sadian
   a. Comment: Resident of, born in DC, lived all over the place. Since we are hearing the process, just airing our grievances, he wants to speak to you directly. This is the problem in the world right now. Incestuous relationship between business and government. The same thing happened in Gaza Turkey, the same thing is happening here. If we are being told right that the process doesn't involve our voices, we have over 90% of the room wanting one thing, then we should consider working together horizontally to making this a park ourselves. It's a matter of removing the fence and covering some holes. He wanted to put it out there and see how the process works.

6. Name: Mark Mueller
   a. Comment: He's an ANC for Bloomingdale, below the park. If surplus is needed, for smart, creative, balanced growth, even if there is some development. We know that they are surplusing for a particular plan, which I don't believe has all of that now. Until they find a plan that we all love, then I say we surplus it. So right now, not quite yet. DC Code 10-801 states that the Mayor is authorized for the best interest of the District to sell, lease, etc. real property for which the Council finds that are no longer for public purpose. McMillan is needed for very necessary public purposes. Area needs for the last remaining green space. McMillan is our National Historic site in our community. We need it for historic status and rare aesthetic beauty. But with smarter growth, McMillan can fulfil its maximum potential and purpose. The City should take in consideration how all the development in area can act in concert to bring the most community satisfaction and the most amount of money. McMillan is consistently thought of in a Silo without thinking how this monument would greatly enhance the many projects around it. Development of the 100 acres soldiers home, the idle Reservoir, Howard and Catholic University's development. The development of
the 4 leaf Clover, Main Street Revitalization and Rhode Island. The other development of NoMa, which is solely lacking greenspace. Of more immediate importance, our neighborhood has been ravaged by flood, which Councilmember started work at McMillan for flooding. What if it doesn't work? Goes against the code for surplusing it. Need to keep it in case additional cells for more flooding. Government transparency and freedom of information as cornerstone. Diligent oversight.

7. Name: Kirby Vining
   a. Comment: Kirby Vining, active in the Stronghold Association and Friends of McMillan Park. Mayor's proposal to surplus raises legal and ethical questions. What is the basis? The City is the developer, so why do we need to sell the land. DC Code 10-801 lists several documents needed before surplus. Clearly the Mayor has decided to proceed to surplus this land. What are the economic bases for the 10-801? DMPED has an exclusive rights agreement with Vision McMillan Partners where VMP has competition to buy land. This makes the land surplusing a sham as there will be no opening bidding process. The Secret Document for which we submitted a Freedom of Information Action, for which we have not heard from DMPED. The site is to be used for two DCWater projects. Is this the right time to be surplusing the land? The comprehensive plan recommends leasing, not selling. There has been no competition for the land. How can Mayor consider selling the park? Do we have enough parks to give away?

8. Name: Dara Johnson
   a. Comment: I am a 4th generation Washingtonian and places like McMillan park has anchored me here when things are changing. So preserving McMillan park and utilizing it as a park, and historic elements, and not just economic. This is an anchor.

9. Name: Daniel Wolkoff
   a. Comment: Historic Restoration Artist in Brookland. Need to reject this fixed process. Gives us crumbs of community meetings to vent concerns and then move forward. Fixed process. Bribes given to Harry Thomas. Nobody has to know about this. It's a neighbourhood issue. We need things like Glen Echo in Bethesda. We need things like historic restoration like landmarks. Class schedule at Glen Echo, I'll pass around. I lived in Mt. Pleasant for 20 years. No idea what the city was like. Like living in a country club. Walked under beech trees, in the shade looking at lizards. Fixed process, we need to reject it. This entire thing is racism and class discrimination. If McMillan was in Friendship Heights, Cleveland park. Who believes this would be fenced off for 27 years. An affront to the community. We need this for public use. Tired of bullshit use for the fucking law. The City Council is people are in prison. Harry Thomas number is prison. Kwame Brown smiled throughout resignation. Give $55,000. Prison and corruption.
10. Name: Patrick Hudak  
a. Comment: When my partner and I moved to Bloomingdale, I tried to get involved with the McMillan Park process but dropped out after finding it confusing. Came to find out that this boiled down a few main facts and common sense. Despite the anti-park crowd facts. The facts are this. The McMillan Reservoir Historic Park is on Historic Registrar and was landscaped by Olmsted Jr. It was the first park to de facto integration and was closed off in World War II. Some people have memories of playing in the park. No one was wants this site to remain fenced off. And the fact the City has fenced it off is not an argument for its destruction. The Friends of McMillan have collected over 2000 signatures who believe we can have amenities and green space. Collage City Plan has the creative thinking. According to Historic Preservation Review board, the Vision McMillan plan will destroy 80-90% of the historic site. Will turn into tombstones. Will turn it into Roslyn or Tysons Corner. There is 10 million feet of development, including grocery, coming around the area by the park. There is no metro. Paying NoMa $50 million and giving $50 million to rich developers to destroy our park. DC can’t afford park? DC is sitting on over $1 billion in savings. DC is not poor. I oppose the surplus of McMillan. These are 2,000 signatures on this petition. Present it to you, as pro park, anti-surplus.

11. Name: Laura Good  

12. Name: Stewart Davenport  
a. Comment: Owner of Big Bear Café. Wanted to say that we’ve done a good job building community over the years. Met with developers a lot, including with Jair Lynch. Working hard and plan has come a long way from the K-Mart. Last time, Big Bear was flooded and lose your tenants, who should I be talking to. Who’s listening? If I lose tenant, it’s becomes hard. More investment in what you have, the better.

13. Name: McKinney  
a. Comment: Thank everyone who was here. Not many in the past. It’s not us and them. It’s about the neighbors who live around the site. Live across the property. A few weeks ago, I got to see Mr. McDuffie and the EYA team walking around the cells, just like Tony Norman used to do. Only Tony Norman cannot do it anymore because it’s not safe. Corrupt way for the City to be behaving. 600 lbs lawnmower going over the property. Been there, can see the National Monument. Grand view, Olmsted built that walk. Beyond pale, turning it into another Shirlington. Another ugly place for Chipolte. Two issues, traffic
and stormwater. Three issues, maybe four now, traffic, stormwater, lack of design, and corruption. Four reasons to stop this thing. Don’t want to be grumpy old man. God will not let them build Shirlington. He went back to an old favourite, flooding.

14. Name: 
   a. Comment: Hello everybody. People talk about balanced approach, quotation mark. All about smart growth. I’m all about Chipolte. There are so many buildings that have Chipolte. Happening all over Eckington, Brookland. We have opportunity to do something different, something great. For those that want more money for the City treasury, vast property that is being underutilized. It’s called Rock Creek Park. Of course we wouldn’t do that, it’s a special place. People go there. Add to property value. Tourist go there. This is our special place. New York City was going to raze Highline until citizens got together with another vision. New York made right call, DC should too.

15. Name: Cheryl Cort
   a. Comment: Have a cold. With Coalition for Smarter Growth. Support surplussing this property. This property has been locked up for over 70 years. We need to restore in order for everyone to enjoy it. Concerned that so much demand to put in new park, which we love, but we are losing affordable housing. Want DMPED to do more. Commit to affordable housing during land disposition. Very special place, important historic features. Don’t walk away from this planning process now. Strongly in support of moving project forward.

16. Name: Tali Vardi
   a. Comment: Brought house a year ago. Have PHD in Marine Biology and studied climate science. Not sure if the District is paying attention to this. These floods are only going to get worse. This little creature playing on the sidewalk and she wants park. Obviously make our property values go up. Voice my support.

17. Name: Phillip Blair
   a. Comment: Grumpy old man, especially when competing with a good looking kid. Reason I’m grumpy, I make my opinion known and my neighbors make theirs known. Opinions overwhelming. We do not get paid attention to. Why is this? Big reason, we let you people tell us what alternatives are. We think a park is a real alternative. You said we never did it before. If that’s what the people want. If that’s what the people are willing to pay for. Why not? This is a site to have to be developed for the economic interest of the City. What real smart growth looks like. Finding the 25 acres property up and down Rhode Island Avenue. Doing infills, small things. Traditional arteries. Not messed up by big tract development. If we let them tell us, then we will lose. Grumpy enough for you?

18. Name: Ana Simon
   a. Comment: I live in Bloomingdale. Lived here for a couple years. I thought that no surplus meant that the land would stay in public domain. After listening to
introduction and I think there is some confusion. Add that to your record. Need more explanation. What surplus process means. If surplussing means turning this into a park, then surplus it. I need more information. We want to keep it in public domain. We can develop in the sense that takes down the fence. Whatever process supports that, I’m for. I’m an Art Historian and I work in a 1970s building, in a brutalist building. If we can’t change a brutalist building, then why can we develop something that was designed by the son of the man who developed central park. At US Capitol, we have obligation to preserve our history and heritage. Know that cells have structural issues. Doesn’t matter. Can’t do it. It shouldn’t be allowed. More affordable housing? What about North Capitol? What about all that’s developed? When green spaces are gone, they are gone. Urban decay, this is our place. Our neighbourhood. All the advocacy, people restoring houses. We need to do everything we can to make this possible.

19. Name: Peter Miles
   a. Comment: Got involved with Miriam as part of Collage City Studios. Now graduated. The plan that cannot be named. The purpose of the surplus is to change the site. The only thing that changes site is the plan that cannot be named. You saw what a professor and four students did. What can be done with site when you think creatively and how to use it when greed and money isn’t primary motivation. The purpose of government isn’t for more revenue, they don’t have shareholders, they have citizens like us. The plan cannot be named, I’m not sure if we can trust the judgment of the Mayor’s office, especially when there is a campaign that shall be seen.

20. Name: Hugh Youngblood
   a. Comment: Good evening, live in Bloomingdale community. Work for organization called the Friends of McMillan Park. Speaking in opposition to declare the Historic McMillan Park as surplus. Thank Deputy Mayor Victor Hoskins. Native from Chicago, he appreciates creative thinking and public-private collaboration that created Millennium Park. Recognize he is a busy man and is unaware that Mayor Gray is proposing to privatize Bloomingdale’s only national landmark. Transfer critical water and security assets to a private developer. We must resist the privatization. Petition going around. Petition says McMillan Park is a tremendous asset to the City. Action should be taken to return this space to public use. Any plan must be appropriate. Strongly urge to reject the plans from Vision McMillan. To consider more alternatives that creates destination for our capital. Over 2,000 have signed in agreement. Key part of debate is that this is a tremendous asset. What you hold on to. Does Ward 5 have a surplus of national parks? Certainly not. McMillan Park is a strategic water security asset. DCWater will be testing a partial solution to Bloomingdale. May require expansion. One day, we might need to purify our drinking water again. Let’s avoid rushing judgment on homeland security issue. Creative adaptive reuse of the future. We urge rejection of Surplus.

21. Name: Dean Floyd
a. Comment: No surplus. Opposed to Surplus on basis of process involved. The HPRB has not been made findings as yet. Premature to consider when the board needs to make it findings as to what can be done with the property. The other issue, such a large commitment of public funding, something in the order of $55 million. A lot of money. We have to see what bidding process is necessary to see if someone could come in and do it for less. Not a drain on DC budget. We have schools and not just condos for the private sector.

22. Name: Paul Bloch
   a. Comment: Lived in Bloomingdale for the last 10 years and DC for the last 27. Opposed to the surplussing. DC has created a false dichotomy. This property with a chained link fence or we could have this plan. That’s not the only two choices. This used to be a park. If they took down the fence again, this would be a park again. Three things can be served. It can be a park. It can be a green roof. It’s doing its part. Aesthetic beauty. The Mayor’s sustainability plan of having parks within 10 minute walk for all DC residents. That is the only thing within a 10 minute walk for Bloomingdale. Turn into Crystal City and nothing is left. There is nothing of that nature here. Want to enjoy site with view and history. Largest green roof, soaking up water. Keeping water out of basements, even though water is coming into basement. City has no plans or concept for all water that will come from development. Just take down the fence. Build it up as a park to enjoy it.

23. Name: Justy Justice
   a. Comment: Working in Eckington for 12 years, living in Bloomingdale for 9 years. Biking for 3 years, right past McMillan. Wow when saw it. Been inside, thought wow. Been here before New York Metro. Third federal, third local, third private. First infill station. My ask, surplus seems a short-circuit to losing control. Ask is for City Council to reject surplus until we have a better idea of what we can get.

24. Name: Gwen Southerland
   a. Comment: Like to acknowledge officials and people of church who let us meet. Testifying on her behalf to say, please do not privatize this site unless the offer is made to this community first. Regarding site listed on notice, beg and implore elected officials of District to maintain site. The McMillan reservoir as known as the Industrial Sand Filtration site must be maintained for public purposes and not for profit making. Do not privatize. Although no voting rights in the Congress, it is the public that flips the bill. This site is a historic national treasure. It is a special kind of place. I was practically down there every day. Not go in everyday in case I fall into one of the holes. Spirit of the place that drop her there. According to Historic Preservation Review Board, this high density mixed-use development plan will destroy most of the historic structures. Don’t need Historic Review Board to tell them that, meetings and literature from developer tells that this will destroy the site. Not going to be anything there. Opposed to the current plan. The multi-million of square footage. Recommendation to create and design
a world class destination. To engage community in order to create this park. The communities of Stronghold, Park Place, and Bloomingdale, are competent to design and implement plan for McMillan. Accused of not wanting anything there. Contiguous open space. What’s wrong with it? Low density consisting of cultural, recreation and retail. Can be limited community developed. Suggested to bring farmers market there. Give us first dibs so that we could create something special.

25. Name: Chris Leptak  
   a. Comment: Lived in Stronghold for 8 years. Coming to meetings. By training, I am scientist, not creative. Something simple is so beautiful is mind-boggling. How to approach things, what are assumptions about decision. The City had a competition to see who would develop site. No creativity or competition for the rest of the process. The team to their credit has brought together experts. The City has spent 10% of budget and we still don’t have a plan. Want to tell the City to do. Take away restrictions and let them design something that they are capable of. Putting glass ceiling on amount of revenue, will never happen. Asked Jeff Miller how much to develop an acre of park, he said $10 million. Where figures, he didn’t know. Bigger park and Department of Transportation says we need safety. Park got bigger. DDOT didn’t change recommendations. The assumptions for the developers are to silence discourse. We need to change them.

26. Name: Miss Mueller  
   a. Comment: Against the privation and surplus of park. Resident of Ledroit Park and a third generation Washingtonian. Also, a teacher. Teach high school currently. You can’t really lie to them. In addition to the problem of privation of the park is the process. Tomorrow, I am going to tell them. The meeting has gone great. The model we are setting before them. What I heard is confusing and not in the foreground. Not to mention echoes of Kwame Brown. The same old business as usual. I guess that’s back to you.

27. Name: Barrie Danneker  
   a. Comment: This site needs a balanced plan. The city purchased this site 30 years ago from the Federal government for $9 million and we spent x amount since. The City said we did not want this as a part. Heard lot of misinformation about the history of the site. Both and positive. The community has gone through the process three times. I suggest the City surplus this property. Unless we do surplus the property, we will not be able to do even a park. There will be no development there. We should ask the Federal Government to buy this back since our community cannot come together in a balanced way to bring job, affordable housing. Work at HUD. Heard from several residents who are older, who cannot afford upkeep on home. Property value has gone up $200,000. Statistically in District, all condos, with 20 or 30 cranes, the District will be short 80,000 housing units for the population growth and job factor that we have. Families, just like you, will be homeless. We have failed as a community. Suggestion surplus this property or ask the federal government to buy back.
28. Name: Mark Materno
   a. Comment: Listening all night. Been in Bloomingdale for 13 years. When asked you what it means to Surplus. You said, it cannot be used for Public use. We are giving a false dichotomy. We’re being told that we have to surplus or the fence stays. Take down the fence and we can walk on it. I’ve walked on the property. Take down the fence and then we can walk on it. Ask the Federal Government to take it back. We can also ask to give it to Ward 5 because we know what to do with it. Give it to us for free.

29. Name: Wanda Foster
   a. Comment: Live at 2905 North Capitol Street, directly across from McMillan. I purchased house in 1986. I have the absolute most beautiful sunset. Lived in other parts of District and don’t see such beauty in other parts of the District. I can look out to a clean, undeveloped and it brings me happiness. My neighbors have lived across for 30 years and it brings them joy. It makes me angry that my tenants, who have small children, cannot walk across the street to play ball. There are a lot of young children on Girard Street. Younger people, now renting. It is Stronghold For someone to not have respect for all people who live on North Capitol. I can see Howard. I can see the monument. That will be obstructed by these buildings. I can see the fireworks every July 4th. How dare someone think that I would want the monstrosities of Virginia in my front door? Totally disrespectful people, who are DPW workers who are able to pay off their houses. Linda Cropp said that you don’t pay more money to live in your house. Don’t daughters and nieces and nephews to live in my house. Don’t want them living across the street from 13th story buildings. They don’t live in Virginia. There should be a park across the street from my house. The City should be ashamed of itself.

30. Name: Juliia Orazato
   a. Comment: Lived in Stronghold for 6 years. I really liked place. With this proposed plan, heard about need for balance. Surplus thing came about recent. Everything has been about VMP. Meeting about proposal and great opposition. People cried out for Parks. Can’t understand why this is not listened to. Parks. City Official or Planning office should listen rather than concentrate on development. Only for objectivity. Look at the other plans. Heard one councilmember has voted for additional $450 million to support the Vision Plan. I’m not sure it’s true. Candidate went door to door asking for support. I ask what is your vision of the McMillan. For mixed management, development or something. No there is no big buildings. I say we need transparency and she I agree with you. All that we want. City Officials to listen and not just focused on what should come. That’s how corruption starts. I am for against this. Community support is important. We are together. We have a vision of what we want.

31. Name: Jane Huntington
a. Comment: I know some of you. Been McMillinista since 1998. Have had many many meetings. The City knows what we want. It’s so curious to me. They use to tell us think outside of the box. They stay in the box. We have offered so many opportunities to meet with developer. No we don’t want this development but we are not Nimby’s. We want something appropriate. One very important thing. We talk about transparency. This meeting isn’t being recorded. How respectful is that? Our input.

32. Name: John Salati
   a. Comment: Great to see all of you in Stronghold and Bloomingdale. And Brookland. I like just across North Capitol in Bloomingdale. I have been an ANC commissioner here. That is what drove me into this issue. Hearing what they had to say and giving them tours on the site. hundreds of people. All kinds of good stuff. Speak to surplus. Should the District surplus this property so that it could be sold or given away to private uses. My answer to that is no. Four ideas about the surplus process. It’s great to give opinion here, but we do not have information to give good opinion. We are missing documentation that the City is required to give, which it will do at some point, but will do that at some point, long after you all have this opportunity. The documentation as to why this is a good idea. What is the economic justification for this? What is the exclusive rights the City has with development team. My real problem is that we do not have the information. What’s in Ward 5, limited park space. Lots of green, but not park space. Irony is that City is about spend $40 million for Park-space in NoMa. The City didn’t have foresight with Office of Planning. Plan your park-space and build around it. How you do urban redevelopment, they pushed that out of the window. The moment the City is about spend $40 million to fix a planning mistake, they have budgeted $50 million to take away a park it already owns. Surplusing idea too quickly. Should this just be a park. How do we turn this to a world class destination? It’s not that this can’t be done. This is a historic site for both scientific and technologically. As the District’s first integrated park, that should be preserved. We have 2,000 residents who said, maybe we are rushing this. The District’s urge to turn this place that was extraordinary into something that is ordinary. That is why I say no to the surplus.

33. Name: Steve Sena
   a. Comment: Live across the red sea, on place called Pleasant Plains. Newbie I guess. Been there about 4 years. Wife and I found a great home, doing renovations. Walk around reservoir. Very beautiful, but frustrating because of the fence. Walk by and drive by the site. First thought were what is this? Appreciated right from the start. Something unique, interesting. DC got to move quick. Driving by it. Saw it, lush green grass. Bring farmers to get goats to cut grass. Against surplus this site. Coming to meeting confirmed. Wasn’t sure if I was for or against it. Something wrong in process. Clearly. Against on the grounds that echo what some many have said, I don’t have enough information, but yet I’m here for you to take my comments for whether this should be surplused. I went to Charette. They echo the sentiments here. Should review
planning notes. The unnamed plan on paper does not reflect what was discussed in meetings. I value it as open space. I want the fence down. I want the fences down at the reservoir. Just put up some security. Put lower fence towards water so we could use the green space. The whole thing is our site. I live in one of the few east-west cross streets. Unnamed proposed, this is a traffic mitigation. If traffic increases 2%, back up to Columbia Heights. These have not been addressed. Cannot support. Feel terrible that it’s taken this long. 3 minutes.

Break from Community Member. Wants to know how is this being recorded? When told that it’s being transcribed, claims that this is an affront and absurd.

34. Name: Gabe Oliver
   a. Comment: I just moved here. Moved from North Dakota. Desperate for places like this. This is our Nation’s Capital. The comments reflect that yearning for maintaining that history. It’s easy to win that argument. If we have to restrict our comments to surplus and the limited information given. The question is whether this is serving a public good. It deals with watershed, traffic. Already serving a public good. The surplus question has been answered.

35. Name: Cherise Smith
   a. Comment: Resident of Bloomingdale, native Washingtonian. Even in the courtrooms, they have apps to record. People writing notes. This is ridiculous. There is an app for that. Reiterate a lot of point. We have a flooding problem. We are now using cells to mitigate those efforts. The City worried about spending money. What would the City do, if this process goes through and the climate change and everything happening. If Bloomingdale gets flooded, how would they take if people start suing the City? City overlooked, didn’t have foresight and planning. The City and infrastructure going in, and the over-infrastructure. No planning, no foresight in terms of green space. We are capital of America. The fact that we don’t have the innovation and people, to bring in City with this, and we’re supposed to be the Capital of America. I am ashamed. Let me reiterate about traffic. Infrastructure to metro to Pepco. First moved in, there weren’t enough grids. Pepco needed to update the infrastructure. Residents have to deal with these issues. The City doesn’t have the foresight to plan. Just overbuilding.

36. Name: Abby Lindsey
   a. Comment: Recently became a homeowner in Columbia Heights. I studied Urban Planning, with a masters. Studied public participation processes. Working with 15 other countries. Helping them with public participation processes. They call on US experts and look at my backyard. It’s great that the City having us, but public participation is only good as what happens afterwards. I’ve been very proud with what the City’s done with bike lane and infrastructure, but want the City to do more. Space that the community can enjoy.
37. Name: Tim Sloan
   a. Comment: Start writing girls. Agree with everyone here. Our DC government has gone off the rails. Fifth generation Washingtonian. Blown away looking at them. 13 Story buildings. Can’t imagine 13 Story buildings there. McMillan is 26 Acres. The Washington Hospital Center has 32.5 Acres of surface parking, including parking garage. None are green surface. Should storm, 2 inches of rain, on just parking lots, creates 2 million gallons of water. Accounts for 1/3 first street over capacity line. This thing is broken. They are talking development. Haven’t built the infrastructure. Density is great. It’s called transit oriented development. DC has vision for Trolley line, but they have a lot of visions. Washington Hospital Center is largest employer in Washington DC that doesn’t have direct access to Mass Transit. Will make traffic worse. Need intervention.

38. Name: Kelly Kotean
   a. Comment: Got involved a few months ago. Thankful for those who kept this alive. Started research, internet and talking to people. I went to the website of the plan and all of the resources, all the links were broken. Administrator email bounced back. Emailed to ANC and they forwarded to individual who were overseeing it and couple months later, still not working. You try and find information. Freedom of Information has gone in. You don’t have the information to make a decision. Going to Sunshine week and Councilmember spoke at it. He supports government accountability. He wants a transparent government. Government needs to be transparent about what they plan to do with Surplus. No to surplus at this time. Don’t think it’s something that should be rushed into. Incredible community that’s engaged and active. Could do better.

39. Name: Kelly Genes:
   a. Comment: Lived in Bloomingdale for a couple years. Social worker with dual masters. Walk to the VA Hospital where I work. Blessing. Peace walking up First Street. Wonderful. As a social worker, concerned about this process. Eye for justice, health and community health. Shamed and appalled. Want accountability. Not ok with this process. Want to know what are the next steps for voices to be heard. Want an email or to see it in Newspaper. Not ok with this, no surplus.

   Break to announce that the next comment would be the last testimony for the night.

40. Robin Diener
   a. Comment: Worked with DMPED for several, long years. One of the people with the West End library, was given away in a no-bid deal. Went to work with Council to make this better. Sorry to say that we can up with this bifurcated process which is misunderstood by DMPED. Saw at the Hines School and the West End. Supposed to bring information and analysis to the community, so that they could give feedback. Your DMPED, economic development and planning and that’s missing. Stay strong and fight. Sick of fighting with government. They are about to privatize the Library. Fight on. Sorry it has to be this way.
Break from audience. Community member reads contact information for Shiv Newaldass off of a business card and encourages everyone to email their councilmembers.

41. Name: Christopher
   a. Comment: Resident of Ward 5. If we let this be surplus, the Government of DC will not have the upper hand. It will become this, people who don’t have the government of DC at heart. We need this land to produce more taxes. Very simple. There is something called the proximate principle. The closer you are to a park, the higher of your house. As price on residential, there is no premium for medical office building. We have three large tall, 13 story medical office building. Destruction of economic value. Of tax value. Very easy to deal with this. 6 to 8 acres right North of Michigan Avenue. Have map. Right here, 6 to 8 acres, covered or uncovered parking. Put medical offices where they belong. There in emphasis on row houses. City doesn’t need more row houses. Row houses are low density. 4 rows. 1 row as partial frontage of park. Even row house will not benefit from 20% premium on park. A lot less row house. Residential, mixed-uses. Need to move. Northern quadrant. Needs to higher than what’s currently here. Needs to be slightly higher. No surplus, because City will not be assess our interest, which is raising taxes.

1. Meeting Adjourns
   8:30 pm
GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Executive Office of the Mayor
Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development

MEMORANDUM

TO: Debbie Smith-Steiner, ANC 5E01, 2826 6th Street, NE, 20017
    Christy 'Love' Davis, ANC 5E02, 611 Edgewood Terrace, NE, Apt 410, 20017
    Tim Clark, ANC 5E03, 1901 2nd Street, NE, Apt 1, 20002
    Sylvia M. Pinkney, ANC 5E04, 34 R Street, NE, 20002
    Joyce Robinson-Paul, ANC 5E05, 16 N Street, NW, 20001
    Teri Janine Quinn, ANC 5E06, 1708 2nd Street, NW, 20001
    Wanda B. Foster, ANC 5E07, 141 Randolph Place, NW, 20001
    Mark Mueller, ANC 5E08, 114 W Street, NW, 20001
    C. Diane Barnes, ANC 5E09, 41 Adams Street, NW, 20001
    Angela Blanks, ANC 5E10, 223 Bryant Street, NE, 20002
    Frank Wilds, ANC 5A01, 5016 Eastern Avenue, NE 20017
    Adrian T. Jordan, ANC 5A03, 4618 S. Dakota Avenue, NE 20017
    Grace J. Lewis, ANC 5A02, 4945 Sargent Road, NE, 20017
    Ronnie Edwards, ANC 5A05, 122 Michigan Avenue, NE Apt L24, 20017
    Sandra "Sandi" Washington, ANC 5A07, 32 Buchanan Street, NE, 20011
    Angel Sherri Alston, ANC 5A08, 4720 7th Street, NE, NE 20017

CC: Honorable Kenyan McDuffie, DC Councilmember, Ward 5
    Jeannette Mobley, Chief of Staff, Office of the Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie
    Stephanie Liotta Atkinson, Legislative and Policy Director, Office of the Councilmember
    Kenyan McDuffie

From: Shiv Newaldass, Project Manager

Date: May 6, 2013

The District will conduct a public hearing to receive public comments on the proposed surplus of the parcel located at the property address of 2501 First Street, NW Washington, DC 20001, (SQUARE: 3128, LOT: 0800). Below, please find the date, time and location of the hearing:

Date: Thursday June 6th, 2013
Time: 6:30pm
Location: All Nations Baptist Church,
          2001 North Capital St NE, Washington, DC 20002

Please feel free to contact Shiv Newaldass at 202.674.2336 should you have any questions or comments.

VINCENT C. GRAY, MAYOR • VICTOR HOSKINS, DEPUTY MAYOR
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY MAYOR FOR
PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING REGARDING
SURPLUS RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO D.C. OFFICIAL CODE §10-801

The District will conduct a public meeting to receive public comments on the proposed surplus of District property. The date, time and location shall be as follows:

**Property:** McMillan Sand Filtration Site
Square: 3128 Lot: 0800 located at 2501 First Street, N.W.

**Date:** Thursday, June 6th, 2013

**Time:** 6:30 p.m.

**Location:** All Nations Baptist Church
2001 North Capitol Street, N.E.,
Washington, DC 20002

**Contacts:** Shiv Newaldass, Shiv.Newaldass@dc.gov
Summary of Public Hearing on the Proposed Surplus Designation of
the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

1. Meeting Date and Location:

A public meeting to solicit community input on the proposed surplusing of the Property was held on June 13, 2013 at the All Nations Baptist Church. The affected ANC, ANC5E, as well as ANC5A, were provided advanced written notice on May 6, 2013 and notice of the public meeting was published in the District of Columbia Register on May 17, 2013.

Date: Thursday, June 6, 2013
Time: 6:30pm
Location: All Nations Baptist Church,
2001 North Capital St NE, Washington, DC 20002

2. Approximate Number of Attendees:

115 approximately, including members of the development team, community residents, including ANC Commissioners: Mark Mueller (then ANC SE08); Dianne Barnes (ANC SE09).

3. Summary of Public Comments:

The meeting began at approximately 6:30pm. Shiv Newaldass, the Project Manager from the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development ("DMPED") provided the audience with introductions, explained the purpose of the meeting, and gave a brief history of the project. Meeting attendees were encouraged to provide feedback regarding the proposed declaration of the property as surplus and then the meeting was opened up to receive public comments.

1. Name: Anne Sellin
   a. Comment: This site is on the Historic Preservation list as one the most endangered sites. There is misinformation about what was park. Site is located here. I have spoken to people who played on the park. Hot summer nights, people slept on site. The City never looked at this as an asset.

2. Name: Malcolm Kenton
   a. Comment: Sierra club environmentalist. Region is growing and there needs to be places to accommodate. I’d like to see some development. If no surplus, nothing happens.

3. Name: Theodore Bush
   a. Comment: Residents since 1964. No surplus. I’d rather see a park.

4. Name: Blanche McCloud
   a. Comment: She’s lived on Franklin Street for 19 years and suggests that the site be turned into park, since they are worried about revenue would be for a water
park. Virginia and Maryland have them. None of the recreation center pools are really legal for them to be swimming, meaning for the pools to have meets. There are a bunch of developers. Where she lives, there are lots of children. More than one child. Not just a water park, different size pools, kiddy pools. Her grandkids don’t have a place to ride bikes. Why can’t they do a bike lane around it?

5. Name: Jason Sadian
   a. Comment: Resident of, born in DC, lived all over the place. Since we are hearing the process, just airing our grievances, he wants to speak to you directly. This is the problem in the world right now. Incestuous relationship between business and government. The same thing happened in Gaza Turkey, the same thing is happening here. If we are being told right that the process doesn’t involve our voices, we have over 90% of the room wanting one thing, then we should consider working together horizontally to making this a park ourselves. It’s a matter of removing the fence and covering some holes. He wanted to put it out there and see how the process works.

6. Name: Mark Mueller
   a. Comment: He’s an ANC for Bloomingdale, below the park. If surplus is needed, for smart, creative, balanced growth, even if there is some development. We know that they are surplusing for a particular plan, which I don’t believe has all of that now. Until they find a plan that we all love, then I say we surplus it. So right now, not quite yet. DC Code 10-801 states that the Mayor is authorized for the best interest of the District to sell, lease, etc. real property for which the Council finds that are no longer for public purpose. McMillan is needed for very necessary public purposes. Area needs for the last remaining green space. McMillan is our National Historic site in our community. We need it for historic status and rare aesthetic beauty. But with smarter growth, McMillan can fulfill its maximum potential and purpose. The City should take in consideration how all the development in area can act in concert to bring the most community satisfaction and the most amount of money. McMillan is consistently thought of in a Silo without thinking how this monument would greatly enhance the many projects around it. Development of the 100 acres soldiers home, the idle Reservoir, Howard and Catholic University’s development. The development of the 4 leaf Clover, Main Street Revitalization and Rhode Island. The other development of NoMa, which is solely lacking greenspace. Of more immediate importance, our neighborhood has been ravaged by flood, which Councilmember started work at McMillan for flooding. What if it doesn’t work? Goes against the code for surplussing it. Need to keep it in case additional cells for more flooding. Government transparency and freedom of information as cornerstone. Diligent oversight.

7. Name: Kirby Vining
   a. Comment: Kirby Vining, active in the Stronghold Association and Friends of McMillan Park. Mayor’s proposal to surplus raises legal and ethical questions. What is the basis? The City is the developer, so why do we need to sell the land.
DC Code 10-801 lists several documents needed before surplus. Clearly the Mayor has decided to proceed to surplus this land. What are the economic bases for the 10-801? DMPED has an exclusive rights agreement with Vision McMillan Partners where VMP has competition to buy land. This makes the land surpassing a sham as there will be no opening bidding process. The Secret Document for which we submitted a Freedom of Information Action, for which we have not heard from DMPED. The site is to be used for two DC Water projects. Is this the right time to be surpassing the land? The comprehensive plan recommends leasing, not selling. There has been no competition for the land. How can Mayor consider selling the park? Do we have enough parks to give away?

8. Name: Dara Johnson
   a. Comment: I am a 4th generation Washingtonian and places like McMillan park has anchored me here when things are changing. So preserving McMillan park and utilizing it as a park, and historic elements, and not just economic. This is an anchor.

9. Name: Daniel Wolkoff
   a. Comment: Historic Restoration Artist in Brookland. Need to reject this fixed process. Gives us crumbs of community meetings to vent concerns and then move forward. Fixed process. Bribes given to Harry Thomas. Nobody has to know about this. It’s a neighbourhood issue. We need things like Glen Echo in Bethesda. We need things like historic restoration like landmarks. Class schedule at Glen Echo, I’ll pass around. I lived in Mt. Pleasant for 20 years. No idea what the city was like. Like living in a country club. Walked under beech trees, in the shade looking at lizards. Fixed process, we need to reject it. This entire thing is racism and class discrimination. If McMillan was in Friendship Heights, Cleveland park, Who believes this would be fenced off for 27 years. An affront to the community. We need this for public use. Tired of bullshit use for the fucking law. The City Council is people are in prison. Harry Thomas number is prison. Kwame Brown smiled throughout resignation. Give $55,000. Prison and corruption.

10. Name: Patrick Hudak
    a. Comment: When my partner and I moved to Bloomingdale, I tried to get involved with the McMillan Park process but dropped out after finding it confusing. Came to find out that this boiled down a few main facts and common sense. Despite the anti-park crowd facts. The facts are this. The McMillan Reservoir Historic Park is on Historic Registrar and was landscaped by Olmsted Jr. It was the first park to de facto integration and was closed off in World War II. Some people have memories of playing in the park. No one was wants this site to remain fenced off. And the fact the City has fenced it off is not an argument for its destruction. The Friends of McMillan have collected over 2000 signatures who believe we can have amenities and green space. Collage City Plan has the creative thinking. According to Historic Preservation Review board, the Vision
McMillan plan will destroy 80-90% of the historic site. Will turn into tombstones. Will turn it into Roslyn or Tysons Corner. There is 10 million feet of development, including grocery, coming around the area by the park. There is no metro. Paying NoMa $50 million and giving $50 million to rich developers to destroy our park. DC can't afford park? DC is sitting on over $1 billion in savings. DC is not poor. I oppose the surplus of McMillan. These are 2,000 signatures on this petition. Present it to you, as pro park, anti-surplus.

11. Name: Laura Good

12. Name: Stewart Davenport
   a. Comment: Owner of Big Bear Café. Wanted to say that we've done a good job building community over the years. Met with developers a lot, including with Jair Lynch. Working hard and plan has come a long way from the K-Mart. Last time, Big Bear was flooded and lose your tenants, who should I be talking to. Who's listening? If I lose tenant, it's becomes hard. More investment in what you have, the better.

13. Name: McKinney
   a. Comment: Thank everyone who was here. Not many in the past. It's not us and them. It's about the neighbors who live around the site. Live across the property. A few weeks ago, I got to see Mr. McDuffie and the EYA team walking around the cells, just like Tony Norman used to do. Only Tony Norman cannot do it anymore because it's not safe. Corrupt way for the City to be behaving. 600 lbs lawn mower going over the property. Been there, can see the National Monument. Grand view, Olmsted built that walk. Beyond pale, turning it into another Shirlington. Another ugly place for Chipolte. Two issues, traffic and stormwater. Three issues, maybe four now, traffic, stormwater, lack of design, and corruption. Four reasons to stop this thing. Don't want to be grumpy old man. God will not let them build Shirlington. He went back to an old favourite, flooding.

14. Name:
   a. Comment: Hello everybody. People talk about balanced approach, quotation mark. All about smart growth. I'm all about Chipolte. There are so many buildings that have Chipolte. Happening all over Eckington, Brookland. We have opportunity to do something different, something great. For those that want more money for the City treasury, vast property that is being underutilized. It's called Rock Creek Park. Of course we wouldn't do that, it's a special place.
People go there. Add to property value. Tourist go there. This is our special place. New York City was going to raze Highline until citizens got together with another vision. New York made right call, DC should too.

15. Name: Cheryl Cort
   a. Comment: Have a cold. With Coalition for Smarter Growth. Support surplussing this property. This property has been locked up for over 70 years. We need to restore in order for everyone to enjoy it. Concerned that so much demand to put in new park, which we love, but we are losing affordable housing. Want DMPED to do more. Commit to affordable housing during land disposition. Very special place, important historic features. Don’t walk away from this planning process now. Strongly in support of moving project forward.

16. Name: Tali Vardi
   a. Comment: Brought house a year ago. Have PHD in Marine Biology and studied climate science. Not sure if the District is paying attention to this. These floods are only going to get worse. This little creature playing on the sidewalk and she wants park. Obviously make our property values go up. Voice my support.

17. Name: Phillip Blair
   a. Comment: Grumpy old man, especially when competing with a good looking kid. Reason I’m grumpy, I make my opinion known and my neighbors make theirs known. Opinions overwhelming. We do not get paid attention to. Why is this? Big reason, we let you people tell us what alternatives are. We think a park is a real alternative. You said we never did it before. If that’s what the people want. If that’s what the people are willing to pay for. Why not? This is a site to have to be developed for the economic interest of the City. What real smart growth looks like. Finding the 25 acres property up and down Rhode Island Avenue. Doing infills, small things. Traditional arteries. Not messed up by big tract development. If we let them tell us, then we will lose. Grumpy enough for you?

18. Name: Ana Simon
   a. Comment: I live in Bloomingdale. Lived here for a couple years. I thought that no surplus meant that the land would stay in public domain. After listening to introduction and I think there is some confusion. Add that to your record. Need more explanation. What surplus process means. If surplussing means turning this into a park, then surplus it. I need more information. We want to keep it in public domain. We can develop in the sense that takes down the fence. Whatever process supports that, I’m for. I’m an Art Historian and I work in a 1970s building, in a brutalist building. If we can’t change a brutalist building, then why can we develop something that was designed by the son of the man who developed central park. At US Capitol, we have obligation to preserve our history and heritage. Know that cells have structural issues. Doesn’t matter. Can’t do it. It shouldn’t be allowed. More affordable housing? What about North Capitol? What about all that’s developed? When green spaces are gone, they are gone.
Urban decay, this is our place. Our neighbourhood. All the advocacy, people restoring houses. We need to do everything we can to make this possible.

19. Name: Peter Miles  
a. Comment: Got involved with Miriam as part of Collage City Studios. Now graduated. The plan that cannot be named. The purpose of the surplus is to change the site. The only thing that changes site is the plan that cannot be named. You saw what a professor and four students did. What can be done with site when you think creatively and how to use it when greed and money isn’t primary motivation. The purpose of government isn’t for more revenue, they don’t have shareholders, they have citizens like us. The plan cannot be named, I’m not sure if we can trust the judgment of the Mayor’s office, especially when there is a campaign that shall be seen.

20. Name: Hugh Youngblood  
a. Comment: Good evening, live in Bloomingdale community. Work for organization called the Friends of McMillan Park. Speaking in opposition to declare the Historic McMillan Park as surplus. Thank Deputy Mayor Victor Hoskins. Native from Chicago, he appreciates creative thinking and public private collaboration that created Millennium Park. Recognize he is a busy man and is unaware that Mayor Gray is proposing to privatize Bloomingdale’s only national landmark. Transfer critical water and security assets to a private developer. We must resist the privatization. Petition going around. Petition says McMillan Park is a tremendous asset to the City. Action should be taken to return this space to public use. Any plan must be appropriate. Strongly urge to reject the plans from Vision McMillan. To consider more alternatives that creates destination for our capital. Over 2,000 have signed in agreement. Key part of debate is that this is a tremendous asset. What you hold on to. Does Ward 5 have a surplus of national parks? Certainly not. McMillan Park is a strategic water security asset. DCWater will be testing a partial solution to Bloomingdale. May require expansion. One day, we might need to purify our drinking water again. Let’s avoid rushing judgment on homeland security issue. Creative adaptive reuse of the future. We urge rejection of Surplus.

21. Name: Dean Floyd  
a. Comment: No surplus. Opposed to Surplus on basis of process involved. The HPRB has not been made findings as yet. Premature to consider when the board needs to make it findings as to what can be done with the property. The other issue, such a large commitment of public funding, something in the order of $55 million. A lot of money. We have to see what bidding process is necessary to see if someone could come in and do it for less. Not a drain on DC budget. We have schools and not just condos for the private sector.

22. Name: Paul Bloch  
a. Comment: Lived in Bloomingdale for the last 10 years and DC for the last 27. Opposed to the surplussing. DC has created a false dichotomy. This property
with a chained link fence or we could have this plan. That’s not the only two choices. This used to be a park. If they took down the fence again, this would be a park again. Three things can be served. It can be a park. It can be a green roof. It’s doing its part. Aesthetic beauty. The Mayor’s sustainability plan of having parks within 10 minute walk for all DC residents. That is the only thing within a 10 minute walk for Bloomingdale. Turn into Crystal City and nothing is left. There is nothing of that nature here. Want to enjoy site with view and history. Largest green roof, soaking up water. Keeping water out of basements, even though water is coming into basement. City has no plans or concept for all water that will come from development. Just take down the fence. Build it up as a park to enjoy it.

23. Name: Justy Justice
   a. Comment: Working in Eckington for 12 years, living in Bloomingdale for 9 years. Biking for 3 years, right past McMillan. Wow when saw it. Been inside, thought wow. Been here before New York Metro. Third federal, third local, third private. First infill station. My ask, surplus seems a short-circuit to losing control. Ask is for City Council to reject surplus until we have a better idea of what we can get.

24. Name: Gwen Southerland
   a. Comment: Like to acknowledge officials and people of church who let us meet. Testifying on her behalf to say, please do not privatize this site unless the offer is made to this community first. Regarding site listed on notice, beg and implore elected officials of District to maintain site. The McMillan reservoir as known as the Industrial Sand Filtration site must be maintained for public purposes and not for profit making. Do not privatize. Although no voting rights in the Congress, it is the public that dreams the bill. This site is a historic national treasure. It is a special kind of place. I was practically down there every day. Not go in everyday in case I fall into one of the holes. Spirit of the place that drop her there. According to Historic Preservation Review Board, this high density mixed-use development plan will destroy most of the historic structures. Don’t need Historic Review Board to tell them that, meetings and literature from developer tells that this will destroy the site. Not going to be anything there. Opposed to the current plan. The multi-million of square footage. Recommendation to create and design a world class destination. To engage community in order to create this park. The communities of Stronghold, Park Place, and Bloomingdale, are competent to design and implement plan for McMillan. Accused of not wanting anything there. Contiguous open space. What’s wrong with it? Low density consisting of cultural, recreation and retail. Can be limited community developed. Suggested to bring farmers market there. Give us first dibs so that we could create something special.

25. Name: Chris Leptak
   a. Comment: Lived in Stronghold for 8 years. Coming to meetings. By training, I am scientist, not creative. Something simple is so beautiful is mind-boggling.
How to approach things, what are assumptions about decision. The City had a competition to see who would develop site. No creativity or competition for the rest of the process. The team to their credit has brought together experts. The City has spent 10% of budget and we still don’t have a plan. Want to tell the City to do. Take away restrictions and let them design something that they are capable of. Putting glass ceiling on x amount of revenue, will never happen. Asked Jeff Miller how much to develop an acre of park, he said $10 million. Where figures, he didn’t know. Bigger park and Department of Transportation says we need safety. Park got bigger. DDOT didn’t change recommendations. The assumptions for the developers are to silence discourse. We need to change them.

26. Name: Miss Mueller
   a. Comment: Against the privation and surplus of park. Resident of Ledroit Park and a third generation Washingtonian. Also, a teacher. Teach high school currently. You can’t really lie to them. In addition to the problem of privation of the park is the process. Tomorrow, I am going to tell them. The meeting has gone great. The model we are setting before them. What I heard is confusing and not in the foreground. Not to mention echoes of Kwame Brown. The same old business as usual. I guess that’s back to you.

27. Name: Barric Danneker
   a. Comment: This site needs a balanced plan. The city purchased this site 30 years ago from the Federal government for $9 million and we spent x amount since. The City said we did not want this as a part. Heard lot of misinformation about the history of the site. Both and positive. The community has gone through the process three times. I suggest the City surplus this property. Unless we do surplus the property, we will not be able to do even a park. There will be no development there. We should ask the Federal Government to buy this back since our community cannot come together in a balanced way to bring job, affordable housing. Work at HUD. Heard from several residents who are older, who cannot afford upkeep on home. Property value has gone up $200,000. Statistically in District, all condos, with 20 or 30 cranes, the District will be short 80,000 housing units for the population growth and job factor that we have. Families, just like you, will be homeless. We have failed as a community. Suggestion surplus this property or ask the federal government to buy back.

28. Name: Mark Materno
   a. Comment: Listening all night. Been in Bloomingdale for 13 years. When asked you what it means to Surplus. You said, it cannot be used for Public use. We are giving a false dichotomy. We’re being told that we have to surplus or the fence stays. Take down the fence and we can walk on it. I’ve walked on the property. Take down the fence and then we can walk on it. Ask the Federal Government to take it back. We can also ask to give it to Ward 5 because we know what to do with it. Give it to us for free.

29. Name: Wanda Foster
a. Comment: Live at 2905 North Capitol Street, directly across from McMillan. I purchased house in 1986. I have the absolute most beautiful sunset. Lived in other parts of District and don’t see such beauty in other parts of the District. I can look out to a clean, undeveloped and it brings me happiness. My neighbors have lived across for 30 years and it brings them joy. It makes me angry that my tenants, who have small children, cannot walk across the street to play ball. There are a lot of young children on Girard Street. Younger people, now renting. It is Stronghold For someone to not have respect for all people who live on North Capitol. I can see Howard. I can see the monument. That will be obstructed by these buildings. I can see the fireworks every July 4th. How dare someone think that I would want the monstrosities of Virginia in my front door? Totally disrespectful people, who were DPW workers who are able to pay off their houses. Linda Cropp said that you don’t pay more money to live in your house. Don’t have the money. I have nieces and nephews to live in my house. Don’t want them living across the street from 13th story buildings. They don’t live in Virginia. There should be a park across the street from my house. The City should be ashamed of itself.

30. Name: Julia Orazato
   a. Comment: Lived in Stronghold for 6 years. I really liked place. With this proposed plan, heard about need for balance. Surplus thing came about recent. Everything has been about VMP. Meeting about proposal and great opposition. People cried out for Parks. Can’t understand why this is not listened to. Parks.

31. Name: Jane Huntington
   a. Comment: I know some of you. Been McMillinista since 1998. Have had many meetings. The City knows what we want. It’s so curious to me. They use to tell us think outside of the box. They stay in the box. We have offered so many opportunities to meet with developer. No we don’t want this development but we are not Nimby’s. We want something appropriate. One very important thing. We talk about transparency. This meeting isn’t being recorded. How respectful is that? Our input.

32. Name: John Salatti
   a. Comment: Great to see all of you in Stronghold and Bloomingdale. And Brookland. I like just across North Capitol in Bloomingdale. I have been an
ANC commissioner here. That is what drove me into this issue. Hearing what they had to say and giving them tours on the site, hundreds of people. All kinds of good stuff. Speak to surplus. Should the District surplus this property so that it could be sold or given away to private uses. My answer to that is no. Four ideas about the surplus process. It's great to give opinion here, but we do not have information to give good opinion. We are missing documentation that the City is required to give, which it will do at some point, but will do that at some point, long after you all have this opportunity. The documentation as to why this is a good idea. What is the economic justification for this? What is the exclusive rights the City has with development team. My real problem is that we do not have the information. What's in Ward 5, limited park space. Lots of green, but not park space. Irony is that City is about spend $40 million for Park-space in NoMa. The City didn't have foresight with Office of Planning. Plan your park-space and build around it. How you do urban redevelopment, they pushed that out of the window. The moment the City is about spend $40 million to fix a planning mistake, they have budgeted $50 million to take away a park it already owns. Surplusing idea too quickly. Should this just be a park. How do we turn this to a world class destination? It's not that this can't be done. This is a historic site for both scientific and technologically. As the District's first integrated park, that should be preserved. We have 2,000 residents who said, maybe we are rushing this. The District's urge to turn this place that was extraordinary into something that is ordinary. That is why I say no to the surplus.

33. Name: Steve Sena
   a. Comment: Live across the red sea, on place called Pleasant Plains. Newbie I guess. Been there about 4 years. Wife and I found a great home, doing renovations. Walk around reservoir. Very beautiful, but frustrating because of the fence. Walk by and drive by the site. First thought were what is this? Appreciated right from the start. Something unique, interesting. DC got to move quick. Driving by. Saw it, lush green grass. Bring farmers to get goats to cut grass. Against surplus this site. Coming to meeting confirmed. Wasn't sure if I was for or against it. Something wrong in process. Clearly. Against the grounds that echo what some many have said, I don't have enough information, but yet I'm here for you to take my comments for whether this should be surplus. I went to Charette. They echo the sentiments here. Should review planning notes. The unnamed plan on paper does not reflect what was discussed in meetings. I value it as open space. I want the fence down. I want the fences down at the reservoir. Just put up some security. Put lower fence towards water so we could use the green space. The whole thing is our site. I live in one of the few east-west cross streets. Unnamed proposed, this is a traffic mitigation. If traffic increases 2%, back up to Columbia Heights. These have not been addressed. Cannot support. Feel terrible that it's taken this long. 3 minutes.

Break from Community Member. Wants to know how is this being recorded? When told that it's being transcribed, claims that this is an affront and absurd.
34. Name: Gabe Oliver
   a. Comment: I just moved here. Moved from North Dakota. Desperate for places like this. This is our Nation’s Capital. The comments reflect that yearning for maintaining that history. It’s easy to win that argument. If we have to restrict our comments to surplus and the limited information given. The question is whether this is serving a public good. It deals with watershed, traffic. Already serving a public good. The surplus question has been answered.

35. Name: Cherise Smith
   a. Comment: Resident of Bloomingdale, native Washingtonian. Even in the courtrooms, they have apps to record. People writing notes. This is ridiculous. There is an app for that. Reiterate a lot of point. We have a flooding problem. We are now using cells to mitigate those efforts. The City worried about spending money. What would the City do, if this process goes through and the climate change and everything happening. If Bloomingdale gets flooded, how would they take if people start suing the City? City overlooked, didn’t have foresight and planning. The City and infrastructure going in, and the over-infrastructure. No planning, no foresight in terms of green space. We are capital of America. The fact that we don’t have the innovation and people, to bring in City with this, and we’re supposed to be the Capital of America. I am ashamed. Let me reiterate about traffic. Infrastructure to metro to Pepco. First moved in, there weren’t enough grids. Pepco needed to update the infrastructure. Residents have to deal with these issues. The City doesn’t have the foresight to plan. Just overbuilding.

36. Name: Abby Lindsey
   a. Comment: Recently became a homeowner in Columbia Heights. I studied Urban Planning, with a masters. Studied public participation processes. Working with 15 other countries. Helping them with public participation processes. They call on US experts and look at my backyard. It’s great that the City having us, but public participation is only good as what happens afterwards. I’ve been very proud with what the City’s done with bike lane and infrastructure, but want the City to do more. Space that the community can enjoy.

37. Name: Tim Sloan
   a. Comment: Start writing girls. Agree with everyone here. Our DC government has gone off the rails. Fifth generation Washingtonian. Blown away looking at them. 13 Story buildings. Can’t imagine 13 Story buildings there. McMillan is 26 Acres. The Washington Hospital Center has 32.5 Acres of surface parking, including parking garage. None are green surface. Should storm, 2 inches of rain, on just parking lots, creates 2 million gallons of water. Accounts for 1/3 first street over capacity line. This thing is broken. They are talking development. Haven’t built the infrastructure. Density is great. It’s called transit oriented development. DC has vision for Trolley line, but they have a lot of visions.
Washington Hospital Center is largest employer in Washington DC that doesn’t have direct access to Mass Transit. Will make traffic worse. Need intervention.

38. Name: Kelly Kotean
   a. Comment: Got involved a few months ago. Thankful for those who kept this alive. Started research, internet and talking to people. I went to the website of the plan and all of the resources, all the links were broken. Administrator email bounced back. Emailed to ANC and they forwarded to individual who were overseeing it and couple months later, still not working. You try and find information. Freedom of Information has gone in. You don’t have the information to make a decision. Going to Sunshine week and Councilmember spoke at it. He supports government accountability. He wants a transparent government. Government needs to be transparent about what they plan to do with Surplus. No to surplus at this time. Don’t think it’s something that should be rushed into. Incredible community that’s engaged and active. Could do better.

39. Name: Kelly Genes:
   a. Comment: Lived in Bloomingdale for a couple years. Social worker with dual masters. Walk to the VA Hospital where I work. Blessing. Peace walking up First Street. Wonderful. As a social worker, concerned about this process. Eye for justice, health and community health. Shamed and appalled. Want accountability. Not ok with this process. Want to know what are the next steps for voices to be heard. Want an email or to see it in Newspaper. Not ok with this, no surplus.

Break to announce that the next comment would be the last testimony for the night.

40. Robin Diener
   a. Comment: Worked with DMPED for several, long years. One of the people with the West End library, was given away in a no-bid deal. Went to work with Council to make this better. Sorry to say that we can up with this bifurcated process which is misunderstood by DMPED. Saw at the Hines School and the West End. Supposed to bring information and analysis to the community, so that they could give feedback. Your DMPED, economic development and planning and that’s missing. Stay strong and fight. Sick of fighting with government. They are about to privatize the Library. Fight on. Sorry it has to be this way.

Break from audience. Community member reads contact information for Shiv Neualdass off of a business card and encourages everyone to email their councilmembers.

41. Name: Christopher
   a. Comment: Resident of Ward 5. If we let this be surplus, the Government of DC will not have the upper hand. It will become this, people who don’t have the government of DC at heart. We need this land to produce more taxes. Very simple. There is something called the proximate principle. The closer you are to a park, the higher of your house. As price on residential, there is no premium for
medical office building. We have three large tall, 13 story medical office building. Destruction of economic value. Of tax value. Very easy to deal with this. 6 to 8 acres right North of Michigan Avenue. Have map. Right here, 6 to 8 acres, covered or uncovered parking. Put medical offices where they belong. There in emphasis on row houses. City doesn’t need more row houses. Row houses are low density. 4 rows. 1 row as partial frontage of park. Even row house will not benefit from 20% premium on park. A lot less row house. Residential, mixed-uses. Need to move. Northern quadrant. Needs to higher than what’s currently here. Needs to be slightly higher. No surplus, because City will not be assess our interest, which is raising taxes.

1. Meeting Adjourns
8:30 pm
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place. D.C. is already a very walkable city, but we need to consistently be striving for even greater livability standards for our residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron King
304 F St NE
Washington, DC 20002
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that the city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah DiJulio
209 6th St SE
Washington, DC 20003
Shiv Newaldass, and Jeff Miler, Deputy Mayors Office for Economic Development, this is my testimony to the "surplusing" public comment meeting for McMillan Park. Please include it in the package the mayor sends to the city council.
I am still seeking information from Shiv on the contractor that is paid, I think, $250,000 a year to cut the grass at McMillan. Please supply the information you had said you would provide, thanks.

Our own Office of Planning, Historic Preservation Office, staffer Kim Williams wrote this great nomination for McMillan Park to The National Register of Historic Places (http://www.nps.gov/nr/feature/places/13000022.htm). One can quickly understand from the description of the park, a memorial to Senator McMillan, The Sand Filtration Plant, and it's history, that McMillan is a resource of NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE. Any city in the country would gather the resources to restore and preserve it and return this wonderful park to public enjoyment. This is just plain common sense. I have been disappointed that the City Council has not educated the people in DC or even itself very well, while determining the future of this incredible site, just awesome as originally designed and landscaped by the founder of American landscape architecture, rederick Law Olmsted Jr.
Tragically, the DC government's chosen developer's plan will demolish most of the historic structures, over crowd and super urbanize the site with poorly coordinated and uninspiring, 50 buildings and streets. The ten planning and design firms in VMP (Vision McMillan Partners) are predictably failing as the re-working of any great design is always a mistake, substantially diminishing the original intent and elegance. It's presumptuous, even ridiculous, over-building the work of Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. with condos, medical offices and a grocery store, can have some graciousness.
The design team’s response to community demands for more "park" has resulted in a supposed "50%" park space, really a big lawn, VMP grudgingly carved out of their site plan but it has nothing to do with the historic engineering treasure and shows how little understanding these current architects possess. Our Historic Preservation Review Board criticized their disconnected, discordant, and inappropriate designs throughout HPRB hearings. Parks are not created by percentages of land remaining unpaved, they are cultural, historic, or reflect the natural geography, streams, valleys, hills, etc. Like in the privileged upper NW section of DC, parks are community gardens, stream valleys and glens and Civil War Fortifications, while we, in central DC, are confronted by the city government with an unhealthy deficit of natural areas, mature trees and real parks. We don’t want destructive compromisers that are not comparable to McMillan, when specifically hiking and biking trails, woods, and water features are desperately missing. Senator McMillan planned an "emerald necklace" of parks, and green-space over 100 years ago and we have every right to see all of these recreational areas fulfilled, and our families enjoy the benefits.

McMillan, a spectacular, historic "great place" is a perfect arts/performance/cultural Glen Echo type community campus and just one element in the System of Parks needed from NOMA to Woodridge, and Michigan Park. McMillan belongs to the people, not the mayor or city council. Gray was elected by campaign fraud, flat out electoral fraud, and Mayor Gray confronts us with wrestling our own resources back from arrogant, classless, dc officials abusing their power. A very small number of DC politicians are guilty of blocking public access and fencing it off, in utter contempt of the residents for 27 years. There is nothing in this record of miserable, arrogant disservice that recommends any DC official to run this development. RIGHT NOW as I write this, Mayor Gray, under federal prosecutor’s investigation, is declaring "McMillan is no longer needed for any public use" as required by law, as part of his process to "surplus" this billion dollar 25 acre park, and literally give away the land, and a $319 million taxpayer subsidy to the VMP, ten developers, architects, planning companies, all set to feed on this PIG trough for years to come, at our expense. The barbed wire fence, and cancelling site tours organized by neighborhood ANC shows the mayor and his economic planning deputy's, hypocrisy, as if every kid, teenager, family, parent with babies, senior citizen, wouldn’t be enjoying McMillan Park every day, views, breezes, strolling, jogging, picnicking, urban farming, arts, music, movies, festivals, classes, our place to exercise, and "build community".

This is not an either or proposition, full services like the City Market can cleverly occupy the existing huge, 20 acres of under-surface, 15 foot high galleries, in adaptive re-use as the entire surface park is restored, planted green, and active for all, residents and visitors alike. This is not a delusion, and could have been helping to build our community for 27 years!! It is specifically the THEFT of multi-millions, in recreational value to the community, lost for 27 years, that should be added to the crimes of the corrupt DC officials who brought you this failed "re-development" scheme. All along, we have demanded an open process of education, analysis, and proper public discussion of all options for McMillan and a system of parks, for DC voters to decide, it's called SELF DETERMINATION Mr. Mayor.

We must demand our representatives on the city council, who openly profess, not even knowing very much about McMillan, to reject the "surplusing" of our park land. This "re-development" has had so many versions, and agencies, and at present ten failing design partners as to be such an overworked flop. And frighteningly, it is even the work of corrupt dc officials imprisoned, indicted, convicted, and awaiting sentencing, for bribery, fraud, theft, and this plan is being run by
a mayor under federal investigation for massive electoral fraud. WAMU reporter Patrick Madden and Julie Patel are right now in the middle of an expose of the "symbiotic" relationship between the DC government and the developers, a relationship distorting, our cities brilliant L'Enfant and McMillan Senate Parks Committee urban plan. A very tiny number of DC "elected" and appointed officials who are hell bent on removing wholesale our mature tree canopy, filling up every last sq ft with curb to curb, mega-urbanization, right as devastating flooding of this very section of DC is destroying our homes. Endless massive construction is a delusion, and the most damaging thing there is to the environment, as if the resources of the planet are endless and there is no imperative to restore, re-use, and adapt existing structures, to conserve our planet. Mayor Gray has produced a "Sustainable DC" plan aiming for DC to be the "greenest city" in the country by 2032. But continuing right up to 2032, exploiting every remaining open space, denuding the city of the most valuable tree cover, paving over endless more land, and overloading a failing antiquated infrastructure is not the path to this farcical goal. Their priority, to keep the construction trade piping along at full speed is unethical, not the way to the "green city" when these same construction industries should be renovating, restoring, and helping dc residents, especially seniors, improve their deteriorating houses. They need to be training the young and underemployed for good careers, not lining up to a pig festival of consumption, and pride in how many cranes mark the skyline, a view soon to be blocked by even more irresponsible zoning.

This is the time, right now, right here in the center of our city, to put this wasteful, over-consumption under sensible control, and make this incredible opportunity for a healthier quality of life HAPPEN at McMillan, it is 27 years late.

email reply from Councilmember
Mary Cheh to Daniel Wolkoff's McMillan HPRB testimony below

Dear Mr Wolkoff,

Thanks so much for sending me your testimony. I found your vision for the Park to be inspirational. I confess I have not been focused on this and regret that. Have all of the plans proceeded so far that this is a lost cause....

I am having my staff brief me on this next week.
Again, thanks for sending this to me.
Mary Cheh

On Mar 6, 2013, at 7:13 AM, "Daniel Wolkoff" <amyla...@yahoo.com> wrote:

The hearing to raze-demolition of parts of McMillan concurs with the approval of the HPRB nomination to the National Registry of Historic Places, which protects the site and it's context. HPRB is responsible for preservation as it's mission and responsibility is stated in, the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Act. It is obvious that many DC residents would support the preservation, and restoration of the 25 acre Olmsted Park at McMillan Sand Filtration Plant had there ever been this option presented by the government to the community and given any proper consideration. No vote of any kind has ever been taken by the people of the district, not even a proper evaluation of the park and
re-incorporating the reservoir and park, "A Great Place" worthy, healthy, great for DC. My testimony below hopefully opens up a discussion, not a fait-accompli of massive over-development plopped onto the historic site. This on top of the flooded houses of Bloomingdale, turns McMillan into a storm water retention pond, with shops and condos and literally re-shapes our whole city, destructive of the l'Enfant and Senator McMillan plan for a gracious park ringed city.

please read the testimony below, scroll down. Thanks, Steve, Daniel Wolkoff

---

**Save McMillan Park Daniel Goldon Wolkoff for HPRB July 2012**

McMillan Park, designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., is a gem in the Emerald Necklace of parks planned by Sen. McMillan's Senate Parks Commission in 1906. Parks that the DC govt. does not think this section of the city deserves.

It is difficult to understand, why we are confronted with wrestling our own resources back from a government and development community, obsessed with huge new construction, which needlessly destroys our parkland. The simple recognition of the limits of resources, nature, energy and available land, need to be recognized and adhered to, for a healthy living environment. This tunnel vision would not have allowed NY Central Park or Rock Creek Park to exist unless excessively built over.

We need to emulate Manhattan's Central Park, one of the world's "Great Places". Over 500 acres, declining in the 1970s, where a conservancy joined with the City of New York for a 28-year public-private partnership to restore, manage, and enhance the magnificent park. It is hard to accept the District fencing off McMillan, our Olmsted park, wasting this "Great Place" and over $17 million for over a quarter of a century. Then spending over $250,000 annually to mow a lawn, no one could ever sit on, picnic on, stroll on, or in any way benefit from! How could they leave this precious, large tract of parkland to waste, instead of simply planting trees which by now would have already grown into a tall lush forest with all its critical benefits to the environment, the storm water retention, the air, and the health of the community.

In any city including the preferred upper NW section of DC, with proper planning, the millions of dollars would have supported a McMillan Park Conservancy, and funded the restoration of the park and all its activities for our city, years ago. The complete waste of McMillan Park demonstrates the neglect and contempt the DC government has for DC's eastern section, under-served for generations, with one fifth the park space as the NW section, always given preferences. The Vision McMillan Partners development which destroys most of the historic landmark continues this unacceptable imbalance. I encourage the HPRB to reject the city's development plans.

The McMillan Site is protected under the Landmark and Historic District Act of 1978, DC Law 2-144, the entire site and its context "PROTECTED!" VMP itself commissioned the Historic Preservation Report by EHT Traceries, Inc. which states "this level of development, is inconsistent with historic preservation of the site," AND THAT IS SELF EVIDENT!

We need all of this park space, our land, even more we need an expanded park system, for critical community activities and recreation. We need the vision of Sen. McMillan to restore and complete "The Emerald Necklace" of green space, woods, and trails for the health of our central city. For a higher quality of life, like the upper income areas of DC have enjoyed, since Olmsted designed Rock Creek Park in 1890.

Our wasteful city govt., sucking every dollar it can out of the tax paying residents, and pleading about increasing its revenue from McMillan. But the richest government in the world can increase its tax revenue as the parkside property values rise and the concessions, performances, art classes and a huge City Market generate tax revenue and fees in McMillan Park.

Revenue and benefits to our city will also come from the new residents, who do not buy condos on our parkland, but who buy and rent in alternative locations and renovate derelict properties, thus returning them to the tax rolls. Medical offices can be built across the street at Washington Hospital Center, where they belong. While patients from all the hospitals, especially Children's National Medical Center, and their families, get some fresh
air, take a nice walk, and help their recovery in a "Healing Garden" at McMillan. City residents and our visitors need parks, destinations, and "Great Places." The real McMillan (Senator from Michigan) had that vision over 100 years ago. Nothing about this miserable failure, by the DC govt., recommends them to develop, pave over, and sell out our park. McMillan should never have been topped off in the first place. When the federal government offered it to DC for free if they maintained it as green space. The best option is to now revert to federal control where National Park Service and McMillan Park Conservancy can restore and provide recreation along the Glen Echo Model.

I support the park restoration and more sustainable community design like CUA Professor Miriam Gusevich and the CUA College City Grad students, a design which sunlights the underground creek creating a sand beach, offers us urban agriculture and forestry, and brilliantly creates a world-class City Market, in adaptive reuse of the huge existing under-surface masonry galleries. Even the "so dangerous" manhole covers can be converted to skylights for a natural light source as you buy your fresh local farmed ingredients for dinner in the City Market below.

The restoration of McMillan is an incredible opportunity, the crass vision-less DC govt. is destroying. The reservoir in New York's Central Park serves thousands of joggers everyday, people meet and walk, for good exercise and camaraderie. It is a center, a social gathering, meanwhile our reservoir is fenced off and our park wasted since the 1980's. Even as First Lady Michelle Obama promotes exercise, urban gardening, and good nutrition, we need our jogging paths, our reservoir, and our urban farming system in the city center at McMillan. This is really a last chance, as all remaining available land is being over-developed in an anti-environmental onslaught by the DC government and the big developers they serve, at our expense.

We need space where youth and under-employed can train in masonry (that's how it will be affordable to restore the park), carpentry, plumbing, landscaping, forestry and so much more.

The restoration of McMillan will be a wellspring for the whole city, training programs can spin off into urban conservation corps, to help seniors fix-up and insulate their houses, etc., etc. We need sustainable energy demonstrations, and we can preserve functioning sand filtration cells to exhibit the legacy of McMillan. And even more so, it is critical we preserve all of McMillan, as a back-up emergency clean water system. Just as the fence went up in World War II to protect McMillan, this, in a world of terrorism and sabotage, how irresponsible to demolish this critical clean water infrastructure.

The shining example, Glen Echo Park in Montgomery County, benefits all ages with a myriad of art, education, dance, theater, and festivals 365 days a year and preserved the charming 1930s amusement park and 1890s Chattaqua. Why did Montgomery County and the Maryland Park System join with the National Park Service and a Park Consortium, and do the most spectacular historic renovation? They considered a mixed use development at Glen Echo too, but they had the foresight and they value the population, the areas young people, and provided such wonderful services and recreation and preserved the history. It is very sad how mindless the DC govt. is, and no surprise we suffer crime and disrespect in return from our urban youth. They are killing each other and lives are destroyed, as DC launches another and another and another development for the rich. At McMillan, the community is ready to support our "Glen Echo", as a place to develop DC youth in health, character, and respect, "COMMUNITY BUILDING." Every city official campaigns on supporting our young people, and all continue to fail them, and our homes and neighborhood security suffers the result.

We need this "Great Place" to help our youth and underemployed to succeed.

We can teach masonry, carpentry, electrical, landscaping, forestry, urban agriculture and gardening, pottery and theater, all useful trades for becoming a responsible, productive adult.

McMillan is a protected landmark. The entire site is protected by our law — all of it — not to be demolished, paved, sectioned off with 50 buildings and strips of green space. We need to restore our Olmsted Park. It is your responsibility as the HPRB to preserve the historic character of our city and McMillan is ready for such beneficial adaptive reuse. The report from the developers, that McMillan is too deteriorated for reclaiming is ludicrous and they would have built over Manhattan's Central Park too. I encourage the HPRB to reject the city's development plans. Stop wasting a fortune in treasure, preserve historic McMillan
Park, for so many excellent reasons, for its value to the environment, to our city, to our young people.
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aimee Custis  
1727 Massachusetts Ave NW #402  
Apt 402  
Washington, DC 20036
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cheryl O'Neill
3619 Everett Street NW
Washington, DC 20008
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christina Sobiloff
3708 Albermarle St NW
Washington, DC 20008
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I hope it is not too late to submit comments for the record on the surplussing of McMillan. I am a resident of Bloomingdale. I live at 2218 Flagler Place, NW, about 3 blocks from McMillan. I support the surplussing. Because the property is unzoned, the only way to move forward is to surplus it. The land has been sitting in its derelict state for more than 30 years, and I appreciate and support the Government of the District of Columbia moving forward.

I was at the public hearing on the surplussing at All Nations Baptist Church. The room was filled with individuals who were openly against surplussing—holding signs, wearing sashes, and cackling. Their disruptive behavior made it too uncomfortable for me to go up to the microphone and share my viewpoint: I support the surplussing of McMillan.

Sincerely,
Victoria A. Leonard
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

The National Association for Olmsted Parks is writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, we urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, we urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Iris Gestram

Iris Gestram
Executive Director
National Association for Olmsted Parks
1111 16th Street NW, Suite 310
Washington, DC 20036
202-223-9113 (p)
202-223-9112 (f)

Learn more! Register now!

Frederick Law Olmsted Jr.:
Inspirations for the 21st Century

October 10-11, 2013, Washington, DC
www.olmsted.org/symposia
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surpluse and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Elyor Vali
70 R St NW
Washington, DC 20001
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

To those who question whether McMillan Park was ever a park or not - and, more specifically, whether it included the sand filtration plant or not... I have done some research.

McMillan Park, including the sand filtration plant, was a park serving the surrounding communities from its inception.

Any attempt to re-write the history - as is being done by the VMP development lobby and its agents - is simply a shallow attempt at misleading the public.

The facts speak for themselves - I have summarized below a few highlights with sources:

1) McMillan Park comprised the entirety of the ground level surface area of the Sand Filtration Plant (both east and west of 1st Street) and the grounds surrounding the reservoir (west of 1st Street). The exact boundaries can be seen on Google Maps by clicking on the link below:

https://maps.google.com/maps?q=mcmillan+park+dc&ie=UTF-8&ei=vkrC7ZDS9bG4AOOnjYFg&ved=0CAgQ_AUoAg

To be clear:
-Southern boundary was Bryant Street (west of 1st Street) and Channing Street (east of 1st Street)
-Eastern boundary was North Capitol Street
-Northern boundary was Michigan Ave/Hobart Place
-Western boundary was 5th Street NW

Sample Sources:
=> The Sunday Star, April 15, 1906; "McMillan Park - Name for Filtration Plant Grounds Approved: It was announced at the War Department yesterday that Secretary Taft had approved the name "McMillan Park" as the official designation of the public grounds embracing the Washington city filtration beds and plant, the adjacent reservoir and all approaches thereto belonging to the United States."
=> The Evening Star, June 6, 1907; "The Public Stable Site: ....The reservoir and filtration bed reservation has been formally styled "McMillan Park" in honor of the late senator from Michigan, to whom is today due the highest credit for the work of developing the capital."
=> Washington Times, November 9, 1912; "Board of Trade Will Re-Elect Its Present Officers - Campaign for Park Improvements in Capital Supported From Michigan: ...The monument referred to (McMillan Memorial
Fountain) is now being erected on the grounds of the filtration plant, McMillan Park, near the head of North Capitol Street."

2) McMillan Park included the "Bloomingdale Playgrounds" - which included the contemporary understanding of playground as in children's playground (swings, slides, etc, etc) AND sports venues (tennis courts, baseball/soccer/football fields).

Sample Sources:
=> Washington Times, February 28, 1919; "City Playgrounds Reopen Tomorrow: ...Bloomingdale, First and Bryant streets northwest;..."
=> Washington Times, August 5, 1919; "What's Doing: Where; When: Dance Fiesta - McMillan Park, Bloomingdale playground, children, 7:30 p.m."
=> Washington Times, August 9, 1920; "Playgrounds Help Make 10,000 Happy - D.C. Recreation Centers in 29 Locations Prove Mecca for Children: ...Bloomingdale playground is the shadiest (as in lots of shade from the sun). It has six tennis courts and will accommodate 3,000 children."

3) McMillan Park's "Bloomingdale Playgrounds" contained sports venues including tennis (six tennis courts), track & field, baseball/soccer/football fields with use by diverse age groups and organized teams/leagues.

Sample Sources:
=> Baseball => Washington Herald, August 7, 1921; "Playground Baseball Season Opens - The midsummer season of the Junior Baseball League for boys 16 years of age and under of the various playgrounds under the Municipal Playground Department opened Wednesday. Western Division League: Tuesday, August 9 - Mackin vs. Bloomingdale at Bloomingdale"
=> Football => Washington Times, November 6, 1921; "Liberty Wants Games - The Liberty A.C. (Athletic Club) will take on the Mohawk Reserves today at 1:30pm on the Bloomingdale playgrounds..."
=> Soccer => Washington Herald, November 2, 1916; "Surprises Sprung In Playground Leagues: One of the best games to date in the playground soccer ball leagues was played on the New York avenue grounds yesterday between Twining and Seaton schools elevens.... On the Bloomingdale Playgrounds the Brookland School eleven defeated the Gage School, 5 to 1."
=> Track & Field => Washington Herald, June 14, 1922; "Grade Schoolboys Conclude Meets - Wallach and Brookland Win Final Preliminary Track Contests: The last two playground division track and field meets for elementary school students under the supervision of the municipal playgrounds were held yesterday. Wallach School won the Virginia avenue division meet with eighty-one points, while Brookland romped away with the Bloomingdale meet with sixty-five points."

4) McMillan Park included a Park Staff who organized children's activities and events.

Sample Sources:
=> Washington Times, August 5, 1919; "What's Doing; Where; When: Dance Fiesta - McMillan Park, Bloomingdale playground, children, 7:30 p.m."
=> Washington Herald, March 16, 1921; "Playground Work Proves "Poppal" - Speaking of popular clothing apparel, the most "poppal" piece of clothing which has been put on display in the District in many seasons was hung up for inspection in the office of Mrs. Susie Root Rhodes, supervisor of municipal playgrounds, Saturday. The article is a piece of neck wear made of poplar tree catkins pasted on a piece of silk, shaped like a necklace. It was made by a class of the Bloomingdale playground under the direction of Director Elizabeth Mahon..."
=> Washington Herald, April 18, 1921; "Kind to Animals - Miss Elisabeth Mahon, director of the Bloomingdale Playgrounds, reports that the boys and girls under her care are striving to make this week a successful "kind to animals week."

5) McMillan Park had a yearly summer Concert Series.

Sample Sources:
=> Washington Times, May 29, 1919; "Summer Concerts For D.C. Arranged - A detailed list of the evening concerts to be given this summer by the Engineers' Band, the Sixty-third infantry Band and the Cavalry Band was made public today... June 13, McMillan Park; June 26, McMillan Park; July 18, McMillan Park; July 25, McMillan Park; August 6, McMillan Park; August 29, McMillan Park; September...".
=> Washington Herald, June 5, 1921; "Park Concerts Program - Washington music lovers who enjoy hearing band concerts are fortunate this year. Col. Sherrill, of the office of public buildings and grounds, war department, has announced the summer schedule of 84 outdoor concerts in the parks and circles of the District. The list follows: ...McMillan Park, June 7, July 7, Aug 8, Sept 6

6) McMillan Park had multi-purpose pavilions.

Sample Sources:
=> Washington Herald, July 11, 1917; "Dancing Pavilions For Playgrounds - Five Washington Centers to Have Improvements in Near Future - Mrs. Susie Root Rhodes, superintendent of playgrounds, has announced that dancing pavilions will be erected this week on five of the Washington Playgrounds, New York avenue, Bloomingdale, Virginia avenue, Georgetown and Howard. These pavilions will be for kindergarten work, Red Cross work and dancing."
=> Washington Times, August 5, 1919; "What's Doing; Where; When: Dance Fiesta - McMillan Park, Bloomingdale playground, children, 7:30 p. m."

All of the above exists today in NY's Central Park...

-McMillan Park's McMillan Memorial Fountain (Three Grace's Fountain) in its original form and setting is just as beautiful and unique as Central Park's Bethesda Fountain (Angel of the Water's Fountain)!
-McMillan Park's Olmsted Walk is just as beautiful as Central Park's many Olmsted walking paths!
-McMillan Park can and should once again have "Playgrounds" as exists today in Central Park!
-McMillan Park can and should once again host sports for all ages - baseball, football, soccer, tennis, running, walking, cycling as exists today in Central Park!
-McMillan Park can and should once again host children's activities and summer camps as exists today in Central Park!
-McMillan Park can and should once again host a Summer Concert Series as exists today in Central Park!

McMillan Park is our Central Park + the High Line + the Low Line + So much more! It should be restored - in its entirety - to serve the surrounding communities and all DC residents with development of the existing historic structures - both above ground and below ground - for public use.

NO to Surplus! NO to the VMP plan!

Save Historic McMillan Park!

Best regards,
Paul

Paul J. Cerruti
From: Phenomw <Phenomw@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, June 21, 2013 7:26 AM
To: gwensouth@aol.com; devi@bengfort.com
Cc: dianne_bruno@yahoo.com; cleeptak@aol.com; b-ashton-thomas@verizon.net;
rbrannum@robertbrannum.com; Mdwa1105@aol.com; Crain, Deborah (OP);
r_l_edison@yahoo.com; Pinkney, Sylvia (ANC 5E04); tonynorman@peoplepc.com;
scott@scott-roberts.net; david.scott52@gmail.com; kmcduffie@gmail.com;
ronnieedwards5c11@gmail.com; mrgoevani@aol.com; james.fournier@gmail.com;
edgewooddc@comcast.net; LADinDC@aol.com; alc@envisionmcmillian.com;
tclark@dccouncil.us; satkinson@dccouncil.us; cherylw@crosslink.net; Quinn, Teri Janine
(ANC 5E06); laxmi2555@gmail.com; mcrmsalon@gmail.com; athakkar@eya.com;
abr2594238@aol.com; info@jtpowell.com; nulliparaacnestis@gmail.com;
tlehner@gmail; markmueller100@hotmail.com; Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

Subject: Follow up to June 20 MAG meeting

Importance: High

Good morning, MAG and others,
It was great to see many of you again and to meet new faces that have arrived since I had been able to regularly attend our meetings.

As a follow up to our discussion of the proposed grocery store location, I am recommending that the original request on behalf of Stronghold residents be restored. Since "somebody left the gate open" so to speak, let me go on record and remind the group about the original store location recommendation and why.

If retail is planned, locate it away from the residences along North Capitol St., NE. It is a residential area with homes at a maximum height of 33 ft. and these homes are already impacted by high traffic flow and negative environmental effects of current noise and air pollution from traffic.

Locate store as originally planned along Michigan Ave., NW which has no residential homes immediately North of the site and is along the business/commercial property route near the hospital complex.

The current drawing proposes a 75 ft grocery store (including apartments above the store) be centrally located on the site's N. Capitol St., NW area immediately across from 33 ft residential homes on N. Capitol, NE. This is a height in excess of 40 ft above the skyscape of the homes immediately across from the location! Another issue is that such a store location could also mean higher traffic volume and water and sanitation challenges of having a grocer so close to homes.

However, the current drawing proposes 33 ft residential homes along Michigan Ave., NW. I recommend moving these proposed homes to the N. Cap location as originally planned and moving the store back to MI Ave. The extra medical building proposed in the current drawing could be moved to the current hospital property or other area, thus again satisfying the need for more area for the grocery store. Thanks!
Respectfully submitted,
Doris J. Newton
Sent from my Sprint phone.
Dear Mr. Newaldass:

I am writing to you today to provide my thoughts on the proposed surplus of the McMillan site. I grew up in the DC suburbs, am a 17-year resident of the District, and am a ten-year resident of Bloomingdale. I strongly oppose the determination to surplus the McMillan site. I have several reasons for this opinion.

First, I understand that the determination requires that the site not have a public use. Given that two of the cells are about to be retrofitted for use in collecting stormwater, the site quite clearly has a public use, and a very important one. But beyond that use, there are many ways that the site could have a public use, and it is disingenuous for the DC government to let it fall into disrepair and then seek to make a determination that it has no public use. The site is a unique one that could serve a multitude of public purposes, even more so given the two levels it has – above and below ground. Among others, those purposes include parkland (which is sorely lacking in this part of the city) and storm water diversion. Many seem to think that slow sand filtration is an outdated technology. Not so. In fact, the city of Los Angeles is turning back to this inexpensive and efficient means of filtering water instead of using the more supposedly high-tech methods. With some creative thinking, the DC government could come up with more efficient uses of this gem of a property.

Second, supporters of development like to talk about balance: “we need a balanced approach,” “the site should have a mix of uses.” I disagree. Not every site in the city should have balance, should support a mix of uses. Take the Mall, for instance. Why should the Mall have balance? And Rock Creek Park. Do they need more retail? Should National Place or the Old Post Office Pavilion have balance as well? Should we stick a little tiny park in them? Some apartments? Of course not. It is the city that should have balance, and not every square foot of the city. With all of the construction that the city has seen over the last ten years, the need for public parks is greater than ever, and growing. And Bloomingdale is an area of the city with very few public parks. Further, there are many areas all around Bloomingdale that are rapidly being developed: Brookland, NoMa, Georgia Ave. to name a few – these are successfully developing neighborhoods with retail, residential, and office space. We need to make McMillan into a public park to balance out that development.

Third, there is an argument that the city needs more affordable housing, and more housing in general. I agree. But there are vacant lots all over the city, and other brownfield sites, where we can put more housing. In the Bloomingdale neighborhood, just look at the corner of Florida and North Capital, where a lot has stood vacant for well over a decade.

Fourth, I don’t hear people talk much about traffic. Adding hundreds of residences will increase the traffic problem all around Bloomingdale, a neighborhood already saddled with several major arteries: North Capital, Michigan, Rhode Island, and New York Ave. already bring an immense amount of traffic through Bloomingdale. I have yet to see any realistic plan for dealing with the increase in traffic that the proposed development will bring. I think this is because there really is no way to deal successfully with the increase. I understand that the developer proposed building a Metro station, which is absurd.
Fifth, I cannot understand how the city could possibly consider making surplus and selling a property that is on the National Park Service’s National Register of Historic Places. There may be no law against it, but it says a lot about a city that it chooses to sell such a gem to private development that will essentially destroy its character. When I first heard that, I just couldn’t believe that the city would consider such a move. A property on that list by definition serves an important public purpose.

Finally, I would finish by asking what legacy the city wants to leave to its future residents 20, 50, or 100 years from now at the McMillan site. Does it want to leave yet another mixed-use development – just like in NoMa, Columbia Heights, the old Convention Center, even the Kentlands in Maryland – that retains a mere veil of its original character? Or does it want to leave a unique piece of history that can be enjoyed by all, an oasis in the middle of the city that provides a much-needed natural respite for its residents? McMillan could be a wonderful investment in the long-term quality of life of the city and its fortunate residents.

Because we can do so much better than to surplus and sell this incredible gem, I am strongly opposed to the proposal. Thank you for including my letter in the record for consideration.

-Peter Chessick
Dear Mr. Mayor, Distinguished members of the Council, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Miller, Mr. Newaldass and Ms. Tregoning,

McMillan Park is a National Landmark and it is public property. I urge you to vote NO to the plans to declare McMillan Park a surplus property, to change course and adopt a more creative solution for both the design and the economic development.

A. NO SURPLUS because it remains a vital site for the public good.

1. It is designated a National and a District of Columbia Historic Landmark because of its demonstrated architectural, civic and landscape values. The District of Columbia has a responsibility to be a good steward of our common land and to safeguard our heritage for the future.

2. It is still crucial to the water infrastructure of the District of Columbia, as proven by DC Water’s current use of the site to store storm water and alleviate the flooding in the Bloomingdale neighborhood.

It is premature to assume that more of the site will not be needed for flood control.

3. The city can achieve economic development without designating the site a surplus. It can remain in the public domain and become a business incubator for lease to start-ups and small entrepreneurs.

B. A creative plan for McMillan Park is wise business. It will promote economic opportunity for the 21st century.

4. McMillan offers ready-made loft spaces ready to be put to work with minimum investment. The historic vaults can be used as business incubators to create new businesses and therefore, real jobs with a future. These could include restaurants, cafes, bars, IT, bakeries, art galleries, breweries, wineries, creameries, crafts, small design and digital manufacturing.

5. McMillan could become a beehive of economic enterprise to complement the governmental and institutional jobs dominant in the Washington, DC area.

It would be a vital urban environment for work and play.

It would be a unique destination to promote tourism.

Ultimately, a creative plan will be cost effective. It will increase tax revenues and local property and would give the residents more wealth in their increased equity. It will be more sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.

Jane Jacobs stressed the importance of a mix of older buildings to promote enterprise of all kinds, since new construction is prohibitive for start-ups. Let’s take advantage of this unique site to build a better future.

To see our more creative, alternative vision, go to www.McMillanPark.com

See today’s article on the Washington Post.
http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/group-has-alternative-vision-for-disputed-mcmillan-redevelopment-site/2013/06/18/df599894-d776-11e2-9df4-895344e13e30_story.html

Sincerely,

Miriam Gusevich
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Darrell Duane <d@duane.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Calicott; Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmccuffie@dcccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dcccouncil.us; dgrosso@dcccouncil.us; abends@dcccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cherb, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmccmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: Make McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site into an Open Park!

Review Board:

I am writing for three reasons regarding the McMillan Park.

First, I would like to see this land also used for Community Gardens or otherwise for sustainable agriculture, as opposed to building more commercial or residential structures on it.

Second as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Third, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Darrell Duane

3110 13th St NW

Washington, DC 20010-2408
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings.

After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, while I also believe the city should pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I urge that more be agreed to in order to ensure that those who live in the neighborhoods can continue to afford to do so and that those from other parts of the city can have a realistic opportunity to relocate to Ward 5 to add to the diversity and potential vitality of the region.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Camille Loya
1412 Shepherd Street NW
Washington, DC 20011
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 5:54 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); friends-of-mcmillan-park@googlegroups.com; hugh@youngbloodcapitalgroup.com; Kirby Vining
Cc: Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL)
Subject: McMillan

Mr. Newaldous, please supply me with the transcript of my verbal testimony from the June 6th public comment meeting on "surplus property" for McMillan. I understand it will be included in the “package” going to city council. Thanks for supplying this to me. The lack of any recording, any video, any public address system and the difficult acoustics of the room, concern me. I know the speakers had their backs to you, were not facing you or the other DC employees writing notes, so how accurate is the transcription?

I have one more question I hope you can help with. It is my understanding that an expenditure of $250,000 per year is spent at the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant, to mow the lawn. I would like this corroborated, and please tell me who contracts this, which DC office, and who is responsible? It seems like I might have this figure incorrect. That would come to almost $5000 a week. Could we be expecting the taxpayers to spend almost $5000 a week on the lawn mowing at McMillan? Please clarify this expense for me, and how long it has been going on. thanks so much. Daniel Goldon Wolkoff

Daniel Goldon Wolkoff
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com
Shiv, please include all my testimony below, including the additional paragraphs at the end in package of public comments for "surplus property legislation" McMillan to the City Council.

Thanks so much, Daniel Goldon Wolkoff

Daniel Golden Wolkoff
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com

--- On Thu, 6/20/13, Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com>
Subject: Testimony on "surplussing" McMillan
To: "Jeff (EOM) Miller" <jeff.miller@dc.gov>, shiv.newaldass@dc.gov
Cc: mccheh@dccouncil.us, "KenyanMcDuffie" <kmcduffie@dccouncil.us>, "Phil"
<pnendelson@dccouncil.us>, "Jim Graham" <jim@grahamwone.com>, "friends-of-mcmillan-
park@googlegroups.com", "friends-of-mcmillan-park@googlegroups.com", mbarry@dccouncil.us,
"Muriel Bowser" <mbowser@dccouncil.us>, dctania@dccouncil.us, jevans@dccouncil.us, "David
grosso" <dgrosso@dccouncil.us>, "yvette alexander" yalexander@dccouncil.us

Shiv, please include all of the following text and the additional testimony below to the package of public comments on "surplus property" legislation of the DC City Council

Daniel Golden Wolkoff
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com

SAVING MCMILLAN PARK - TESTIMONY TO DMPED

DANIEL GOLDON WOLKOFF

McMillan Park, designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., is a gem in the Emerald Necklace of parks planned by Sen. McMillan's Senate Parks Commission in 1906. Parks that the DC govt. does not think this section of the city deserves.

It is difficult to understand, why we are confronted with wresting our own resources back from a government and development community, obsessed with huge new construction, which needlessly destroys our parkland. The simple laws of conservation of the limits of resources, nature, energy and available land, need to be recognized and adhered to, for a healthy living environment. This tunnel vision would not have allowed NY Central Park or Rock Creek Park to exist unless excessively built over.

We need to emulate Manhattan's Central Park, one of the world's "Great Places". Over 500 acres, declining in the 1970s, where a conservancy joined with the City of New York for a 26-year public-private
partnership to restore, manage, and enhance the magnificent park. It is hard to accept the District fencing off McMillian, our Olmsted park, wasting this "Great Place" and over $17 million for over a quarter of a century. Then spending over $250,000 annually to mow a lawn, no one could ever sit on, picnic on, stroll on or in any way benefit from! How could they leave this precious, large tract of parkland to waste, instead of simply planting trees which by now would have already grown into a tall lush forest with all its critical benefits to the environment, the storm water retention, the air, and the health of the community.

In any city including the preferred upper NW section of DC, with proper planning, the millions of dollars would have supported a McMillan Park Conservancy, and funded the restoration of the park and all its activities for our city, years ago. The complete waste of McMillan Park demonstrates the neglect and racist discrimination the DC government commits against DC's eastern section, under-served for generations, with one fifth the park space as the NW section, always given preferences. The Vision McMillan Partners development which destroys most of the historic landmark continues this unacceptable imbalance. I encourage the City Council to reject the Mayor's "surplusing" plans. Elected by campaign fraud, he has no right to rob the public of our parks.

The McMillan Site is protected under the Landmark and Historic District Act of 1978, DC Law 2-144, the entire site and its context "PROTECTED!" VMP itself commissioned the Historic Preservation Report by EHT Traceries, Inc. which states "this level of development, is inconsistent with historic preservation of the site." AND THAT IS SELF EVIDENT!

We need all of this park space, our land, even more we need an expanded park system, for critical community activities and recreation. We need the vision of Sen. McMillan to restore and complete "The Emerald Necklace" of green space, woods, and trails for the health of our central city. For a higher quality of life, like the upper income areas of DC have enjoyed, since Olmsted designed Rock Creek Park in 1890.

Our wasteful city govt., sucking every dollar it can out of the tax paying residents, and pleading about increasing its revenue from McMillan. But the richest government in the world can increase its tax revenue as the parkside property values rise and the concessions, performances, art classes and a huge City Market generate tax revenue and fees in McMillan Park.

Revenue and benefits to our city will also come from the new residents, who do not buy condos on our parkland, but who buy and rent in alternative locations and renovate derelict properties, thus returning them to the tax rolls. Medical offices can be built across the street at Washington Hospital Center, where they belong. While patients from all the hospitals, especially Children's National Medical Center, and their families, get some fresh air, take a nice walk, and help their recovery in a "Healing Garden" at McMillan. City residents and our visitors need parks, destinations, and "Great Places." The real McMillan (Senator from Michigan) had that vision over 100 years ago. Nothing about this miserable failure, by the DC govt., recommends them to develop, pave over, and sell our park. McMillan should never have been lopped off in the first place. When the federal government offered it to DC for free if they maintained it as green space. The best option is to now revert to federal control where National Park Service and McMillan Park Conservancy can restore and provide recreation along the Glen Echo Model.

I support the park restoration and sustainable community design by CUA Professor Miriam Gusevich, a design which sunlight the underground creek creating a sand beach, offers us urban agriculture and forestry, and brilliantly creates a world-class City Market, in adaptive reuse of the huge existing underground masonry galleries. Even the "so dangerous" manhole covers can be converted to skylights for a natural light source as you buy your fresh local farmed ingredients for dinner in the City Market below.

The restoration of McMillan is an incredible opportunity, the vision-less DC govt. is destroying. The reservoir in New York's Central Park serves thousands of joggers everyday, people meet and walk, for good exercise and camaraderie. It is a center, a social gathering, meanwhile our reservoir is fenced off and our park wasted since the 1980's. Even as First Lady Michelle Obama promotes exercise, urban gardening, and good nutrition, we need our jogging paths, our reservoir, and our urban farming system in the city center at McMillan. This is really a last chance, as all remaining available land is being over-developed in an anti-environmental onslaught by the DC government and the big developers they serve, at our expense.

We need space where youth and under-employed can train in masonry (that's how it will be affordable to restore the park), carpentry, plumbing, landscaping, forestry and so much more. The restoration of McMillan will be a wellspring for the whole city, training programs can spin off into urban conservation corps, to help seniors fix-up and insulate their houses, etc., etc. We need sustainable energy demonstrations, and we can preserve functioning sand filtration cells to exhibit the legacy of McMillan. And even more so, it is critical we preserve all of McMillan, as a back-up emergency clean water system. Just as the fence went up in World War II to protect McMillan, this, in a world of terrorism and sabotage, how irresponsible to demolish this critical clean water infrastructure.
The shining example, Glen Echo Park in Montgomery County, benefits all ages with a myriad of art, education, dance, theater, and festivals 365 days a year and preserved the charming 1930s amusement park and 1890s Chataques. Why did Montgomery County and the Maryland Park System join with the National Park Service and a Park Consortium, and do the most spectacular historic renovation? They considered a mixed use development at Glen Echo too, but they had the foresight and they value the population, the areas young people, and provided such wonderful services and recreation and preserved the history. It is very sad how mindless the DC govt. is, and no surprise we suffer crime and disrespect in return from our urban youth. They are killing each other and lives are destroyed, as DC launches another and another and another development for the rich. At McMillan, the community is ready to support our "Glen Echo", as a place to develop DC youth in health, character, and respect, “COMMUNITY BUILDING.” Every city official campaigns on supporting our young people, and all continue to fail them, and our homes and neighborhood security suffers the result.

We need this "Great Place" to help our youth and underemployed to succeed. We can teach masonry, carpentry, electrical, landscaping, forestry, urban agriculture and gardening, pottery and theater, all useful trades for becoming a responsible, productive adult.

McMillan is a protected landmark. The entire site is protected by our law – all of it - not to be demolished, paved, sectioned off with 50 buildings and strips of green space. We need to restore our Olmsted Park. It is the responsibility of HPRB to preserve the historic character of our city and McMillan is ready for such beneficial adaptive reuse. The report from the developers, that McMillan is too deteriorated for reclaiming is ludicrous and they would have built over Manhattan’s Central Park too. I demand the City Council act in the best interest of the public, not a private group of Developers and wealthy new residents. You must reject the Mayor's plan to "surplus" our park, McMillan. He was elected by campaign fraud, he is under federal investigation and has refused the prosecutors invitation to be interviewed three times. You must not do this disservice to our community, and abide such dishonesty. This development was brought to us by the mayor and his campaign fraud, Harry Thomas Jr. In federal prison, Kwame Brown, convicted of bank and IRS fraud, and Michelle Brown pleading guilty to taking bribes. I demand more from my elected representatives!! Stop wasting your fortune in treasure, preserve historic McMillan Park, for so many excellent reasons, for its value to the environment, to our city, to our young people. Reject the "surplusing" of McMillan
June 6, 2013

Please include my additional testimony.

I have some points I would like to share on this meeting, june 6th public comments on "surplusing" Mc
The Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Dev., Jeff Miller, is uniquely positioned to help solve the problem we are confronted with on McMillan, flooding, and area development and especially my conces parks. A park system of trails, wooded areas, like I enjoyed so much when I lived in Mt. Pleasant/Adam Morgan for 20 years. I'm now a homeowner in Brookland and haven't walked up a city trail since I left

June 6, 2013 Basement of All Nations Baptist Church

This meeting on "surplus property " was really extraordinary. I think it might have been 150 people virtu united in their commitment against the dividing up and "surplusing" of McMillan Park to the team of V McMillan Partners. The selected team which 10 top design, planning and architecture firms, who hav so devoid of design talent, as to constantly add more "professionals" to salvage this misguided "Master l The community wants a fair deal of parks for their families. I think of how busy the parks are on Capitol and how great the wooded trails are in NW.

What kind of racial and class discrimination has decades of DC government perpetrated against this area: the fencing off of McMillan? The flooding just makes it much worse. The input from this meeting is cle: don't want the super-urbanization of a special place that is already a park. The city govt. responsible to p parks, kept this park fenced off with barbed wire since 1987 and now claims there is no public use. A se1 saving lie, is not open or honest govt. You do not have our consent!! This is bringing hypocrisy to a new even for this city. We are going to demand that the fence be removed, or other access created, all hazard: the manhole covers be secured, and tours restart immediately.

I can tell you the farce this govt. calls-community input, and engaging the people in the process must be
rejected.
We have sensible alternatives and the city holds SHAM meetings like this and refuses to open proper discussion of the potential of this whole park system. A park system designed over 100 years ago.
The public comment meeting is required by the "Surplus Property Law", but imagine how infuriating it was that there was no public address system, no audio or video recording for the City Council, no webcast or any way to include the electorate to hear the 60 or 70 people testifying. I believe that this alone would violate the wording of the law, certainly it's intent.

The fraudulent process aside, this is a problem that the Mayors Office of Economic Development is uniquely positioned to solve, especially your role in real estate. The VMP needs to place it's "talented" landscape designers across Michigan Ave, where all the hospital center parking lots are impermeable and contribute millions of gallons of storm water runoff to the flooding problem in Bloomingdale. The entire hospital complex must be re-engineered to capture the storm water and reduce that runoff as these new medical offices are built at the hospital grounds? Like wise other area re-engineering to permeable surfaces, recharging curbs, alley green spaces and of course massive tree planting. The other places to have the VMP work is the Old Safeway Plaza (where a grocery would at lest be on the metro) at the Rhode Island Ave. Metro and also a large lot that has been sitting in Brookland for years at 13th St. NE and Rhode Island Ave. These are needed developments, and McMillan and the Emerald Necklace of Parks be renewed, with a DC Parks Renewal Taskforce.
The public needs and will use McMillan again, that was the almost totally unanimous message of an exciting evening for DC. I have followed this issue since 2006 and never experienced a level of passion and commitment like this at All Nations Baptist Church.
What a great coincidence that on the same night, former Council-at-large Michael Brown was cornered by an FBI sting and said he will plead guilty to accepting bribes on tonight's 11 o'clock news. I had just testified about the criminal acts of Kwame Brown and Harry Thomas Jr. a few hours earlier. All three integral to the McMillan process. My newest humourous remark is that when HTJ is released from the Federal Prison Camp, he will not be able to vote during his 3 years of probation, but he can run for city council again!
The Mayor and your office, Mr. Miller have rammed this project down our throats from the beginning with Harry Thomas Jr., who arranged a $55,000 payment from EYA to smooth the way for their Chancellors Row development. We have to be skeptical about the relationship between EYAA and Harry Thomas Jr.

The "surplus property" legislation requires the Mayor to find there is no longer public use for this land. WHAT A Miserable Fixed Deal!! The land is fenced off, and the much needed park space blocked from public use, and this Mayor is going to declare "no longer needed by the public". Even the mayors own ANC tours of the Sand Filtration Plant were blocked by your office. We hav ehad enough of your manipulation! This is disgusting my friend, and demonstrer exactly the distorted and corrupt relationship between our fraudulently elected and criminal officials and the developers. The Mayor Will lie, and the people are bossed around and ABUSED, you will do his bidding, I hope your future employers see this corruption and you and the city council-members suffer an appropriate reward. Your perpetrating a big mistake, contrived, forced, and WRONG! Your builders will have massive problems, geologically, hydrologically, and politically! The pathetic reputation this city government has among the people of this county, and the entire world, is justified, and you and the city council are proving it at McMillan.

Daniel Golden Wolkoff
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com
Dear Mayor & Council Members:

I wanted to copy you this testimony written last summer about McMillan Park from Mr. Daniel Woikoff, I believe in this vision and I want our government to embrace it too and give us back our park. Please don’t waste our green spaces for more buildings that don’t serve us all.

Thank you,

Frederick Nunley
3934 10th St. NE
Ward 5
woodcut55@aol.com

McMillan Park, designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., is a gem in the Emerald Necklace of parks planned by Sen. McMillan’s Senate Parks Commission in 1906. Parks that the DC govt. does not think this section of the city deserves.

It is difficult to understand, why we are confronted with wrestling our own resources back from a government and development community, obsessed with huge new construction, which needlessly destroys our parkland. The simple laws of conservation of the limits of resources, nature, energy and available land, need to be recognized and adhered to, for a healthy living environment. This tunnel vision would not have allowed NY Central Park or Rock Creek Park to exist unless excessively built over.

We need to emulate Manhattan’s Central Park, one of the world’s “Great Places”. Over 500 acres, declining in the 1970s, where a conservancy joined with the City of New York for a 26-year public-private partnership to restore, manage, and enhance the magnificent park. It is hard to accept the District fencing off McMillan, our Olmsted park, wasting this "Great Place" and over $17 million for over a quarter of a century. Then spending over $250,000 annually to mow a lawn, no one could ever sit on, picnic on, stroll on or in any way benefit from! How could they leave this precious, large tract of parkland to waste, instead of simply planting trees which by now would have already grown into a tall lush forest with all its critical benefits to the environment, the storm water retention, the air, and the health of the community.

In any city including the preferred upper NW section of DC, with proper planning, the millions of dollars would have supported a McMillan Park Conservancy, and funded the restoration of the park and all its activities for our city, years ago. The complete waste of McMillan Park demonstrates the neglect and contempt the DC government has for DC’s eastern section, under-served for generations, with one fifth the park space as the NW section, always given preferences. The Vision McMillan Partners development which destroys most of the historic landmark continues this unacceptable imbalance. I encourage the HPRB to reject the city’s development plans.

The McMillan Site is protected under the Landmark and Historic District Act of 1978, DC Law 2-144, the entire site and its context “Protected!” VMP itself commissioned the Historic Preservation Report by EHT Traceries, Inc. which states “this level of development, is inconsistent with historic preservation of the site,” and that is Self Evident!

We need all of this park space, our land, even more we need an expanded park system, for critical community activities and recreation. We need the vision of Sen. McMillan to restore and complete “The Emerald Necklace” of green space, woods, and trails for the health of our central city. For a higher quality of life, like the upper income areas of DC have
enjoyed, since Olmsted designed Rock Creek Park in 1890.

Our wasteful city govt., sucking every dollar it can out of the tax paying residents, and pleading about increasing its revenue from McMillan. But the richest government in the world can increase its tax revenue as the parkside property values rise and the concessions, performances, art classes and a huge City Market generate tax revenue and fees in McMillian Park.

Revenue and benefits to our city will also come from the new residents, who do not buy condos on our parkland, but who buy and rent in alternative locations and renovate derelict properties, thus returning them to the tax rolls. Medical offices can be built across the street at Washington Hospital Center, where they belong. While patients from all the hospitals, especially Children's National Medical Center, and their families, get some fresh air, take a nice walk, and help their recovery in a “Healing Garden” at McMillan. City residents and our visitors need parks, destinations, and “Great Places.” The real McMillan (Senator from Michigan) had that vision over 100 years ago. Nothing about this miserable failure, by the DC govt., recommends them to develop, pave over, and sell out our park. McMillian should never have been lopped off in the first place. When the federal government offered it to DC for free if they maintained it as green space. The best option is to now revert to federal control where National Park Service and McMillian Park Conservancy can restore and provide recreation along the Glen Echo Model.

I support the park restoration and sustainable community design by CUA Professor Miriam Gusevich, a design which sunlights the underground creek creating a sand beach, offers us urban agriculture and forestry, and brilliantly creates a world-class City Market, in adaptive reuse of the huge existing under-surface masonry galleries. Even the "so dangerous" manhole covers can be converted to skylights for a natural light source as you buy your fresh local farmed ingredients for dinner in the City Market below.

The restoration of McMillan is an incredible opportunity, the vision-less DC govt. is destroying. The reservoir in New York’s Central Park serves thousands of joggers everyday, people meet and walk, for good exercise and camaraderie. It is a center, a social gathering, meanwhile our reservoir is fenced off and our park wasted since the 1980’s. Even as First Lady Michelle Obama promotes exercise, urban gardening, and good nutrition, we need our jogging paths, our reservoir, and our urban farming system in the city center at McMillian. This is really a last chance, as all remaining available land is being over-developed in an anti-environmental onslaught by the DC government and the big developers they serve, at our expense.

We need space where youth and under-employed can train in masonry (that’s how it will be affordable to restore the park), carpentry, plumbing, landscaping, forestry and so much more.

The restoration of McMillan will be a wellspring for the whole city, training programs can spin off into urban conservation corps, to help seniors fix-up and insulate their houses, etc., etc. We need sustainable energy demonstrations, and we can preserve functioning sand filtration cells to exhibit the legacy of McMillan. And even more so, it is critical we preserve all of McMillan, as a back-up emergency clean water system. Just as the fence went up in World War II to protect McMillan, this, in a world of terrorism and sabotage, how irresponsible to demolish this critical clean water infrastructure.

The shining example, Glen Echo Park in Montgomery County, benefits all ages with a myriad of art, education, dance, theater, and festivals 365 days a year and preserved the charming 1930s amusement park and 1890s Chataqua. Why did Montgomery County and the Maryland Park System join with the National Park Service and a Park Consortium, and do the most spectacular historic renovation? They considered a mixed use development at Glen Echo too, but they had the foresight and they value the population, the areas young people, and provided such wonderful services and recreation and preserved the history. It is very sad how mindless the DC govt. is. and no surprise we suffer crime and disrespect in return from our urban youth. They are killing each other and lives are destroyed, as DC launches another and another and another development for the rich. At McMillian, the community is ready to support our “Glen Echo”, as a place to develop DC youth in health, character, and respect, “Community Building.” Every city official campaigns on supporting our young people, and all continue to fail them, and our homes and neighborhood security suffers the result.

We need this “Great Place” to help our youth and underemployed to succeed. We can teach masonry, carpentry, electrical, landscaping, forestry, urban agriculture and gardening, pottery and theater, all useful trades for becoming a responsible, productive adult.

McMillan is a protected landmark. The entire site is protected by our law -- all of it - not to be demolished, paved, sectioned off with 50 buildings and strips of green space. We need to restore our Olmsted Park. It is your responsibility as the HPRB to preserve the historic character of our city and McMillan is ready for such beneficial adaptive reuse. The report from the developers, that McMillan is too deteriorated for reclaiming is ludicrous and they would have built over Manhattan’s Central Park too. I encourage the HPRB to reject the city’s development plans. Stop wasting a fortune in
treasure, preserve historic McMillan Park, for so many excellent reasons, for its value to the environment, to our city, to our young people.

Daniel Wolkoff
amolassar@yahoo.com
July 2012
Dear Mr. Newaldass--

I oppose DC’s surplus of the McMillan Sand Filtration Site as premature because the city does not have a fully developed plan to address the flooding in Bloomingdale. DC Water’s First Street Tunnel plan will have severe community impacts on residents of the 2200 Block of Flagler Place NW that have not been resolved. Until DC Water fully and sufficiently resolves resident concerns and obtains permits for the First Street Tunnel, the city does not have an adequate plan in place to address the flooding.

At this time, the McMillan site retains a “necessary use by the District” and is “required for public purposes” because the property remains an option to mitigate flooding in Bloomingdale. Section 5.2.3 of the Final Report of the Mayor’s Task Force on the Prevention of Flooding in Bloomingdale and LeDroit Park identified a solution to store the excess water at the McMillan Sand Filtration site, by building a pumping station on Bryant. According to the Task Force Report, this solution would achieve flooding relief for Bloomingdale. Additionally, it would be more than $100 million cheaper and would achieve flooding relief about 2 years sooner than the First Street Tunnel project. And most importantly, it would have minimal community impact because the pumping station could potentially be built on or near DC Water’s own property on Bryant St. Table 5-13 in the Mayor’s Task Force report says the McMillan storage and Flagler Pumping Station would reduce sewer backups, reduce impacts of surface flooding, protect downstream properties and have a “high” benefit. It was, without good explanation, deemed not “practical.”

Until DC Water and the city fully address the very serious concerns of the residents on the 2200 Block of Flagler Place NW, the McMillan storage and Flagler Pumping Station option must remain on the table.

I write with some regret because I would like to see McMillan developed and put to good use. I have no issue with VMP or its plans, and I look forward to continuing to work productively with them on the design. But that is not the point right now. The point is that McMillan remains required for public purposes until the city figures out a flooding mitigation plan that does not throw some residents under the bus in the name of economic development. (I note that DC Water continues to work with Flagler residents. But we do not yet have all the information, we’re not sure what DC Water is committed to, we need plans in writing, and we need to know specifically, in writing, how all of our concerns will be addressed).

The city and DC Water are simply operating with far too little transparency and process in Bloomingdale right now. There is a paternalistic attitude, a lack of notice, and a lack of timely and adequate information. Even if there is no corruption, the process feels corrupted. The time to remedy this is now.

Regards,
Alicia Hunt
2208 Flagler Place NW
703-585-9217
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 3:17 AM
To: Calcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL);
vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim
(COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL);
Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray,
Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM);
Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: Testimony to HPRB McMillan

- To: steve.caltc@dc.gov, historic.preservation@dc.gov
- Cc: pmendelson@dccouncil.us, kmcduffie@dccouncil.us, dcatania@dccouncil.us,
vorange@dccouncil.us, dgrosso@dccouncil.us, abonds@dccouncil.us, jgraham@dccouncil.us,
jevans@dccouncil.us, mccheh@dccouncil.us, mbowser@dccouncil.us, twells@dccouncil.us,
yalexander@dccouncil.us, mberry@dccouncil.us, vincent.gray@dc.gov, victor.hoskins@dc.gov,
jeff.miller@dc.gov, shiv.newaldass@dc.gov, harriet.tregoning@dc.gov,
friends.of.mcmillanpark@gmail.com

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

This meeting was an insult to the city. In a church basement, with no proper recording or transcription of the passionate testimony against this corrupt system of taking from the public and giving to the corporations. There was no microphone, no public address system, no video or audio recording, and no web cast. You obviously do not want to share the shame of what your doing with the rest of the city. The city council should be ashamed of itself. This is a CHARADE, not a process with any legitimacy. Democracy is where the governed GIVE informed consent to be governed. SHAME ON YOU!

Second. I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (EPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

The buildings as rendered by VMP would be hideous anywhere. They are offensive and ugly, especially in McMillan PARK. Likewise the entombment of our historic structures, like some bizarre architectural oddities,
displayed out of context is just WRONG. Designers all over the world do much better, as is the Cottage City Gusevich Plan.

This violates the Historic Preservation Act, which is your job to administer. MISERABLE FAILURE!!!

The Park, the historic context, all there for a glorious park restoration, and cohesive, complimentary, urban adaptive re-use. Must we aim this low with the VMP plan? You and the City Council must reject the VMP PLAN if we have any integrity and any courage. We the people of DC, your employers, want to see a gracious future for this Olmstead PARK for our families and children!

Thank you,

Daniel Goldon Wolkoff

amglassart@yahoo.com
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I've had a chance to hear the developers present their plan at an ANC meeting, and last Sunday I also spoke to some of the "Friends of McMillan Park" at the Bloomingdale Farmer's Market. I found their plan to be unrealistic, a disingenuous cover for doing nothing. The McMillian sand filtration site is not a good location for a major park—there aren't enough people living nearby. It's dead flat, and it's questionable whether the roofs of the underground reservoirs could support large trees. The little development in the "friends" plan couldn't support the lavish facilities that they are proposing.

I thought the developer proposal was thoughtful and imaginative, with the right balance of development and well-designed park space. I look forward to using the new park and pool, and to walking the streets of this new neighborhood.

I can't speak to the financial arrangements - perhaps the developer is really getting too sweet a deal. Given the corruption that has afflicted Ward 5 I don't trust that the city got the best possible deal. That said, the development plan is a good one. I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site site.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Farrell
73 S Street NW
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

Thank you for hosting the June 6 McMillan Surplus Community Meeting at All Nations Church. We counted about 150 persons who turned out for that event on a rainy Thursday evening. In my experience, getting 150 persons out for any political purpose is huge. Advertising of the event was poor. Most of the persons you saw in the room were there because many of us who advocate NOT surplussing the land put flyers out throughout the community advising people about the meeting. Why didn’t the city do this? Several persons who testified do not have e-mail or computers at all, so a paper flyer is the only way they knew about the meeting. These people must be included in the political process.

I submitted a copy of my written and spoken testimony to your staff on the evening of the hearing, and include a copy of that testimony below for your reference.

I noted that about 45 persons gave testimony at the hearing, 3 persons advocating the surplussing of the McMillan property, and 42 advocating NOT surplussing the property. I was in the latter group, most of whom noted the importance of that site in our past and for our future as a resource for park and other uses more important than those provided by the current Vision McMillan Partners proposal which is the only proposal currently being entertained by the city. We hope to see this all reflected in your memo to the Mayor concerning the proposed surplussing of the property, so that community input is given proper place in this.

Many of us who attended the hearing still have many questions about the Mayor’s justification for considering to surplus the property. DC law notes that the Mayor may do so if he deems that a given property is no longer required for public purposes. You heard many speak of the fact that since the city acquired the property in 1987, the city has not attempted to put it to public use. You also heard many state that the property was a park until it was fenced off at the beginning of WWII, and that since 1986 the justification for that fence (to protect our drinking water supply, previously purified beneath the property) has ended, and advocated taking the fence down and using it as a park. The city has not done this, not even tried, not even considered this, and yet the Mayor is indicating that the property is “no longer required for public purposes.” Further, DC Water has just begun preparing two of the 20 water filtration cells on the site for use as storm water diversion cells in part of a plan to stop the catastrophic flooding in Bloomingdale, yet the Mayor still says that the property is “no longer required for public purposes.” Is that not a very important public purpose?

We are also concerned that the city has entered into a special arrangement with Vision McMillan Partners such that if the land is surplussed VMP would automatically be offered the property with no bidding and no competition for the design of a development at the site. Many of us believe that this is definitely unethical and may be illegal. There was no RFP for the vertical development of the site. Why? While the Mayor may select a developer rather than go through the RFP process, we would like to know why he is considering doing so in this case, precluding any other competing designs for the site. There is one fully-fledged plan for an alternate development scheme which would include city and
community needs. But even the author of that plan would like to see the vertical development put out for RFP and open bidding, with a clear set of terms of what the city and the community want in a development. That has never been done.

The current proposal by VMP is not well liked by the community, as attested by the survey of 1,000 homes in the neighborhood several of us undertook last year, which points out several strong, specific desires for the site from the community which are not satisfied by the VMP plan, a current petition campaign several of us are doing which already has over 4,000 signatures asking the Mayor to please open the development of McMillan up to open competition so that we can get a plan we like, and several strong letters from the Stronghold Civic Association and the Bloomingdale Civic Association citing particular aspects of the currently proposed plan which their respective neighborhoods are very unhappy with.

We hope that the summary you prepare for the Mayor of the testimony given at the June 6 hearing will reflect the items above which were brought out by many of the 42 persons who gave testimony AGAINST surplussing the property for inclusion in the Mayor's decision about whether or not to do so.

Thank you.

Kirby Vining
Friends of McMillan Park, Stronghold

Civic Association

202 213 2690
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: cherylw <cherylw@crosslink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 9:50 PM
To: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL);
vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM);
Tregoning, Harriet (OP)

Subject: Please reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass;

I am writing as a follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting. I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cheryl Wagner
3103 Hawthorne Dr NE
Washington DC 20017-1040
(202) 387-2361 Home
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity. It is important that we continue to recognize the need for affordable housing as development moves across the city. The most dynamic DC I can imagine includes families of all income levels living in neighborhoods together.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anne Geggie
531 Ingraham Street NE
Washington, DC 20011
Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I would like to request that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Also, regarding the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

--

Tula Connell, Ph.D.
connell.tula@gmail.com
Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I would like to note the following:

First, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

--

Tula Connell, Ph.D.
connell.tula@gmail.com
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Victor Perry
1400 20th St NW
612
Washington, DC 20036
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that the city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matt Jarvis
44 V St
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matt Jarvis
44 V St
Washington, DC 20001
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Eric S <eschultzdc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:23 PM
To: McDuffie, Kenyan (Council); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Cc: Mandel, Jon (Council); Smith-Steiner, Debbie (ANC 5E01); Davis, Christy (ANC 5E02); Clark, Tim (ANC 5E03); Pinkney, Sylvia (ANC 5E04); Robinson-Paul, Joyce (ANC 5E05); Quinn, Teri Janine (ANC 5E06); Foster, Wanda B. (ANC 5E07); Mueller, Mark (ANC 5E08); Barnes, Dianne (ANC 5E09); Blanks, Angela (ANC 5E10)

Subject: Re: McMillian Park

Dear Councilmember McDuffie –

Thank you for your suggestion to attend the surplus hearing concerning McMillian Park. I was surprised that you did not attend. It was simply amazing. The room was packed with people and there was standing room only. The people were overwhelmingly united in the fact that they DO NOT LIKE the city’s plans to build 12 story buildings on McMillian park. Only two people supported the development and people lined up to speak out against the city’s plans until the time ran out and they were cut off.

There was so much excitement, energy and commitment to change in the room it was tremendous. The overwhelming take away from the meeting was that people do not want tall buildings built on the park. In fact, they want the park opened. One of the lines that was repeated that night was, “Mr. Mayor, tear down this fence!” The people are speaking and they want the historical aspects of the park preserved and they want a park, not more development.

Ward 5 is lacking in parks. Take a look at a map of the parks in the city and you will clearly see that Ward 5 has less parkland than the rest of this city. This is your opportunity; this is the city’s opportunity to do something special. McMillian could be a truly wonderful place, a world class park, please don’t destroy it with office buildings and condos. Sincerely,

Eric Schultz

58 Rhode Island Ave NW

Washington, DC 20001

On Mon, Jun 3, 2013 at 10:44 PM, McDuffie, Kenyan (Council) <kmcduffie@dccouncil.us> wrote:

Eric,

Thank you for emailing me regarding McMillan. I will take your concerns under advisement. Also, should your schedule permit, I would encourage you to attend the McMillan surplus public meeting on June 6 at 6:30 pm at All Nations Baptist Church, 2001 North Capitol Street NE (North Capitol & Rhode Island).

Best,

Kenyan
On Jun 1, 2013, at 9:46 PM, "Eric S" <eschultzdc@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Council Member McDuffie - I am writing to you because I do not like the existing plans for McMillian park. The development is too big for that space. The residential neighborhood does not need 12 story office buildings replacing a park. Washington, DC needs more park spaces. DC just spent 50 million so that the residents of NoMa could have some park space. McMillian is a special place and is a real treasure that should not be destroyed and turned into more office buildings and condos.

> This park should not be declared surplus when so many people need parkland. the residents of Eckington are fighting over a small plot of land that some people want to use as a dog park. Developed properly, McMillian could be a world class tourist destination that would also benefit the residents of the community. Please ask the mayor to cancel the surplus meeting. McMillian is not surplus, it is desperately needed by the citizens of DC, not just ward 5 but the entire city. Last weekend, I took my out of town friends to Meridian Hill park. It was great, crowded, but great. This is ward 5's opportunity to have a real park. Please don't let this development take place. Thanks, Eric

> Eric Schultz
> 58 Rhode Island Ave NW
> Washington, DC 2000202-903-6595
>
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Anna Cero

1101 New Hampshire Ave NW Apt 721, Washington DC 20037
From: cherylw <cherylw@crosslink.net>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:40 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgross0@dccouncil.us; abond3@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Written Testimony to the Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) for the hearing scheduled for June 27, 2013

Written Testimony to the Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) for the hearing scheduled for June 27, 2013

RE: Urging the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners' proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the following comments on the McMillan Park Reservoir-Revised Master Plan and Building Design Guidelines. I understand the need for responsible planning and land use. However, I feel it is also important to respect the values inherited from the L’Enfant Plan (1791-92) and the McMillan Commission (1901-02). I am urging consideration of options for reuse of the site while preserving its historical context and blending into the surrounding neighborhood. Nearly 3,000 local residents have endorsed preserving at least 50% of the site as parkland and this should also be respected.

There is an inherent tension on the McMillan site: on the one hand, a gridded landscape and industrial facility and on the other hand an evocative almost surreal landscape and structure that reminds people of Stonehenge. I hope that both aspects of the history and industrial facility can be celebrated.

Careful consideration of building massing and footprint can be used to great benefit to retain and celebrate the unique spatial and historic qualities of the McMillan site.

Although the park was enlarged in the current design, there does not appear to be any concomitant trimming of the buildings. The result is that the building footprints are pushed out to the edges of the site and some building heights have been increased (cf. pp. 32-33 February 24, 2012 Master Plan submission with p. 11 March 20, 2013 Master Plan submission). The buildings on the northern segment are still too high and should be shortened, particularly when considered in context of the topography of the entire site. Judicious reduction of the buildings should be considered to bring the site’s open space/building ratio back into a complimentary relationship.

In quoting from relevant sections of the Comprehensive Plan,

MC-2.6 McMillian Sand Filtration Site

... The McMillian site has been the subject of community forums for nearly 20 years. ... Whatever the outcome, several basic objectives should be pursued in the re-use of the McMillan Sand Filtration site.

Policy MC-2.6.1: Open Space on McMillan Reservoir Sand Filtration Site Require that reuse plans for the McMillan Reservoir Sand Filtration site dedicate a substantial contiguous portion of the site for recreation and open space. The
open space should provide for both active and passive recreational uses, and should adhere to high standards of landscape design, accessibility, and security. Consistent with the 1901 McMillan Plan, connectivity to nearby open spaces such as the Armed Forces Retirement Home, should be achieved through site design.

Policy MC-2.6.2: Historic Preservation at McMillan Reservoir Restore key above-ground elements of the site in a manner that is compatible with the original plan, and explore the adaptive reuse of some of the underground “cells” as part of the historic record of the site. The cultural significance of this site, and its importance to the history of the District of Columbia must be recognized as it is reused.

I am hoping you will take into consideration the many special aspects of the McMillan site and not allow a pedestrian design of dense buildings to dominate this historic place.

Thank you.

Cheryl Wagner
3103 Hawthorne Dr NE
Washington DC 20017-1040
(202) 387-2361
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Jennifer Marsoni
23 S Street NW
Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board,

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I strongly urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site. Second, I likewise strongly urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines. The McMillan Park Reservoir should be maintained as an historic site. The only future changes on this site must be entirely consistent with ecological and recreational principles, preserving the historic sand filtration structures. Then it will be consistent with the vision developed by the participants in Sustainable DC (I was a member of the Green Economy Working Group, with links to Energy and Climate).

Thank you,

David Schwartzman (Professor Emeritus, Howard University)

1634 Montague St NW

Washington DC 20011
DC Stateshood Green Party, Tax & Budget Coordinator
Dear Preservationist,

I request that you overlook the fact that I am sending you a form letter, as I am communicating from travels overseas via my phone's "keyboard," which makes original composition arduous.

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Sincerely,
Andrea Rosen
3266 Worthington Street, NW., 20015
Ward 4

Sent on the fly from my fone.

Sent on the fly from my fone.

On Jun 18, 2013, at 12:09 AM, Andrea Rosen <aerie@rcn.com> wrote:

Dear Preservationists,

Sent on the fly from my fone.
Dear Preservationists,

Sent on the fly from my fone.
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:
I am writing for two reasons. First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site. Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).

The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,
Ronny Robinson
119 V. Street NW
Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board,

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus. The sand filtration site, even as is, is of clear value to our community, neighborhood, and city as a rare green space and flood mitigation site.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Kind regards,

Francis Gassert
74 V St NW 20001
Mr. Mayor and members of the Council,

I attach to this e-mail my testimony from the June 6th community meeting concerning the District's effort to surplus the the District-owned portion of the McMillan Park. The reasons I offer strictly concerning the issue of surplussing and problems I found with the process. To my written submission, I note these lapses in how the District handled this meeting.

Specifically, I am troubled that the District decided it was necessary and took the trouble to take police officers away from patrolling our neighborhoods to have them at the meeting, but it was either unable or unwilling to put equipment in the room that would have improved the meeting.

First, the meeting was not videorecorded for future review by the Council or the community. Having a video of what was said in the public record would have been the correct action. Having multiple scribes taking notes of what people said was something, but that method leaves you and the public at the interpretative whim of the people who are taking notes. And however good the notes may be, they cannot convey the sentiment and gravitas that came through, especially from the elderly neighbors who came forward slowly but determinedly using their canes and speaking in firm yet emotional cadences. In this day and age of simple and miniaturized technology, such a recording should have been an unquestioned part of the evening.

Second, DMPED did not have a sound system that would have greatly improved attendees' ability to hear the people who spoke, not the least of whom was DMPED's Mr. Newaldass. Anyone with any kind of hearing deficit (and the room held many seniors) was having some trouble hearing the people speaking. Given the District's resources and the fact that public meetings are being held all the time, not having a sound system in place was a real lapse in the planning for this meeting.

Beyond those technical considerations and the other legal and technical points I raise in my attached testimony, I also want to say that I oppose this surplus effort because we can do better. I’ve had the pleasure and privilege of working with a number of you and can say that Washington, DC the creativity and the talent to do great things and we can
definitely do better than what we are looking at right now. The city of Pierre L'Enfant and James McMillan can do better; I dare say that those two men are not looking kindly on this effort to surplus McMillan. In the midst of the most enviable economic boom of any city in the country, Washington should be leading the way on creative innovation of publicly owned land. New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Seattle, etc. all should wish they were doing what we could be do here at McMillan.

Very sincerely yours,

John T. Salatti
(202) 986-2592

"Together, Building a Better Bloomingdale"
Mr. Newaldass,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit the attached remarks. I believe the McMillan site is a tremendous asset and should be retained by the city for use as park and open space. I do not support declaring it surplus property.

Best regards,

Alex Shtogren
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

I lived in the Bloomingdale neighborhood near McMillan Park for 2 years, and have since moved to another location in DC. Bloomingdale and the surrounding area still remains my favorite part of the city because of the beautiful views and incredible history of McMillan Park.

Thank you,

Anna Nehring
3900 16th St NW #239
Washington, DC 20011
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons: first, I very much want to convey the opinion of myself and my family that we greatly disagree with the manner by which the "friends of McMillan" have falsely claimed that those who live near the McMillan site are opposed to the VMP plan. We live one block away from the site and very much support the VMP plan and planned surplussing of the property (as do many of our neighbors). I urge the City Council to ACCEPT Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the the site so that development can move forward immediately.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to ACCEPT the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are APPROPRIATE for the historic site and are consistent with the needs of a rapidly growing city, as well as the needs of families such as mine who desire access to amenities that citizens on other areas take for granted, including a park and a grocery store, both of which are currently too far away to easily access. I find that proposed building designs are compatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site.

Thank you,

VN Campbell, 25 Franklin St NE
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ralph Garboushian <ralphgarboushian@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:48 PM
To: ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Support the Surplus of McMillan for the Good of the City and the Environment

Mr. Mayor, Members of the DC City Council, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the HPRB:

I am writing to urge you to ACCEPT the proposal to surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, and I urge the HPRB to ACCEPT the proposal from Vision McMillan Partners for the proposed building designs on the McMillan site.

It is unfortunate that the vocal minority opposing the redevelopment of this abandoned industrial site are wrapping themselves in the cloak of environmentalism. In an urban context, environmentalism is much more nuanced than trees, grass or 'parks'. Urban environmentalism is about land use and energy consumption. It is the unwise and profligate use of these two resources that has put our region at the point that we find ourselves today: an urban core that, despite recent growth and vibrancy, remains well below its peak population surrounded by a seemingly endless sea of sprawl that has destroyed tens of thousands of acres of prime agricultural land and wildlife habitat, impaired water quality in the Chesapeake Bay and fostered an automobile dependence that fouls our air and clogs our streets. (And makes too many of our children obese and requires too many households to assume deep debt as a prerequisite for accessing jobs and participating in our economy.)

The proper antidote to this situation is to use our remaining urban land as efficiently as possible in a manner that maximizes the use of previous infrastructure investments and places homes in close proximity to jobs and stores. In the context of urban environmentalism and urban planning, transforming the McMillan Sand Filtration site, an abandoned industrial site that is close to the city center, into a walkable, mixed-use development following traditional urban patterns is precisely what the District ought to be doing.

On the 'park' issue that the vocal minority of opponents appears to hang their hat on: in an urban setting, parks are for people. To a large extent, the success of an urban park is determined by the number of people that use it and its accessibility more than by its size. (I would argue that tiny Dupont Circle is a much more successful urban park than large but mostly empty and forlorn Fort Totten.) At present, there simply aren't significant numbers of people sufficiently close to the sand filtration site to create a successful park. In addition, the site is surrounded by a traffic sewer on two sides. As currently designed, Michigan Avenue and North Capitol Street are designed to move suburbanites in their cars through the neighborhood as quickly as possible, a design that discourages all but the most intrepid pedestrian or bicyclist from trying to access the site. The best strategy for success of the proposed new parkland in the southern end of the site will be to add as many residents, and daytime workers, as is possible and to improve pedestrian and bicycle access to the site from adjacent neighborhoods.
I once again urge you to ACCEPT the proposal to surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, and I urge the HPRB to ACCEPT the proposal from Vision McMillan Partners for the proposed building designs on the McMillan site.

Thank you.

Ralph Garboushian
1726 Potomac Avenue SE
Washington DC 20003
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jane Huntington <bzhuntington@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:34 PM
To: Calicott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL);
vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim
(COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL);
Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray,
Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM);
Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: McMillan Park
Attachments: June 17 2013 mayor +.doc

Mr. Mayor, members of the Council, Mr. Newaldass, Mr. Calicott, and members of the Historic Preservation Review
Board, I am attaching my testimony, in response to the June 6 Surplus meeting and for the June 27th HPRB
meeting, about the future of McMillan Park.

If you have any questions or comments, I can be reached at my information, below.

Cordially,

Jane F. Huntington
1920 Shepherd Street, NE
Washington, DC 20018
202.526.2601
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Robert Robinson <robobrin@me.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); Councilmember Vincent Orange; Councilmember David Grosso; Councilmember Anita Bonds; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP);
friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com; Councilmember Jim Graham

Subject: My Opposition to the Mayor's Plan to Surplus and Dispose of the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

June 17, 2013, 4:20 p.m.

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

The Truxton Circle, Bloomingdale, Eckington and Stronghold neighborhoods and the gateway to the Capitol at North Capitol Street, Florida Avenue and New York Avenue have been the victim of one civic embarrassment after another, notably:

1. the Gateway vista from North Capitol Street and Florida Avenue south to the US Capitol blasted, first, by low-rise urban decay and, second, by high-rise, Shanghai-style commercial metastasis.


3. The Florida-New York Avenue Traffic Noose; and,

4. The unsustainable growth of polluting commercial and commuter traffic engulfing these communities from Irving Street, Michigan Avenue, North Capitol Street, Rhode Island Avenue, Florida and New York Avenue.

Now comes the proposal to remove most of the green space and cram a maximum-security development on the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, originally planned as a park by the celebrated Frederick Law Olmsted.
Enough is enough: elegant North Capitol vista of the US Capitol does not deserve further visual mutilation and the gracious Ward 5 neighborhoods that frame it are under incessant attack from traffic, blight and pollution.

Thank you,

/s/
Robert Robinson
1631 Newton Street, NW
Washington, DC 20010
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus. As many members of the local community tried to make clear on June 6th, this land is not surplus. It is public land that can and should be put back into use as public land. The officials at the community meeting set out this idea as a zero-sum game of either we develop the land or it sits completely useless to the community. This is not the only option. Please do not declare this land surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillian site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

I am sure that you have seen this same language in many emails today. Please know that the community is sincere in its desire to see a good, public use of this space. One that is in line with the historic character of McMillian Park. This is a unique space in DC. Please do us the courtesy of recognizing that and working to preserve it for current and future generations.

Thank you,

Christie Wren
1108 Monroe St NW
From: Tod Preston <todpreston1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:02 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Calcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park -- no surplus

June 17, 2013

Mr. Mayor, City Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am resident of the District of Columbia (Ward 5) and am writing for two reasons:

First, I strongly urge you **not** to declare McMillan Park surplus. I attended the June 6th surplus meeting in Bloomingdale, which only strengthened my opposition to this action.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Tod Preston
120 V St, NW
Washington, DC 20001
June 17, 2013

Mr. Mayor, City Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am resident of the District of Columbia (Ward 5) and am writing for two reasons:

First, I strongly urge you not to declare McMillan Park surplus. I attended the June 6th surplus meeting in Bloomingdale, which only strengthened my opposition to this action.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Tod Preston
120 V St, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Office of the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development,

Dear Sirs,

I oppose any building on the historic McMillan site up for consideration by HPRB. This site does not qualify in any way to be considered surplus. This historic park is a thing of beauty that must be preserved for this and future generations. The plans proposed by the city at this time would destroy this historic resource and rob the citizens of this city of a potentially magnificent park on this site open to the public. Adaptive reuse of the underground and above ground historic structures has yet to be fully explored. The full site devoted to parkland with adapted reuse of the underground and above ground historic structures is not only possible it is economically beneficial to the neighborhood and the city.

The master plan and details presented at this time by the city destroy an historic landmark. It is the responsibility of the Mayor and the City Council to prevent this from happening.

Devoted to saving McMillan as a city park since 1999,

Mary Pat Rowan

Mary Pat Rowan
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
1518 Kearney Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
blair-rowan@starpower.net
202-526-8821
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Scott L. Aker, AIA

2929 Connecticut Ave. NW Apt. 405,

Washington, DC 20008
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Keith Stanley
3934 10th Street NE
Washington, DC 20017-1828

Sent from my iPad
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jessica Hopson <hopson07@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:56 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Calicott, Steve (OP); friends@mcmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Jessica Hopson
74 V Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: sherrill <sberger4@ix.netcom.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:55 PM
To: abonds@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); dgrosso@dccouncil.us; ATD OP HP; Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); kmcduffe@dccouncil.us; Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); vorange@dccouncil.us; Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com; Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Callcott, Steve (OP)
Subject: - My Opposition to McMillan Prk Development

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Sherrill Berger
1631 Newton Street, NW
Washington, DC 20010
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, after attending the meeting on June 6th I request that you not declare McMillan Park a surplus property. Numerous reasons for saving the park space were discussed and presented and I believe declaring the park a surplus property is premature.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board Meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan park and water filtration site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The currently proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank You,

Frederick Nunley
3934 10th St. NE
Washington, DC 20017
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Katelijn van den Berg <katelijnvandenberghotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:37 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: kmcduffie@ddcouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@ddcouncil.us; dgrosso@ddcouncil.us; abonds@ddcouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofcmillanpark@gmail.com; Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL)
Subject: No to surplus and comments for HPRB meeting for Mc Millan Park Sand Filtration Site

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

The analysis of why the Mayor has determined that the property is no longer required for a public purpose is missing, there are many critical functions which the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site continues to fulfill and should further fulfill in the future and the developers plan stands in contravention with the DC Comprehensive Plan. The land should be kept as a public park with its historic identity intact for the neighborhood, Ward 5, and the District with the development on the site based on adaptive re-use and preservation of above ground and under ground historic structures.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Katelijn van den Berg
69 V street, NW
Washington, DC
From: Lisa Holley <holley13@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:11 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Cailcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Lisa Holley and Brian Lounsbury
1216 Taylor Street NE
Washington DC 20017
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:
First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.
Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,
Jo de Berry
1731 FIRST Street, NW, Apt#2
Washington DC, 20001
Mr. Mayor, members of the Council, Mr. Newaldass, and members of the Historic Preservation Review Board, I would like to submit my testimony - for both the June 6 Surplus meeting and the June 27th HPRB meeting - about the future of McMillan Park.

The testimony is attached. If you have any questions or comments, I can be reached at my information, below.

Best,

Sam Shipley
Stronghold Resident
26 Bryant Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
202 330 1205
samuel.shipley@gmail.com
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Lauren Deromedi
185 U ST, NW
From: Candace Mitchell <cemdds@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:32 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Calcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Reservoir Project
Attachments: image.png
Importance: High

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

I have lived in the LeDroit Bloomingdale area for almost 25 years. I have raised my child here and I work in the neighborhood at Howard University. I am also a fourth generation Washingtonian and I have watched the many changes in this city - some excellent and some which are poor choices for the city and its citizens. I grew up near Rock Creek Park and miss the green space I was surrounded by as a child. As it is, with the new housing and other projects in this area we are becoming more and more congested. We do not need to mar the natural beauty of the McMillan Reservoir by erecting medical buildings but should consider enhancing the natural beauty of what is there. We already have a large hospital and medical office complex across the street - we do not need more of the same. Don't allow the plan for McMillan to be a poor choice.

Thank you,

Candace E. Mitchell, DDS, MBA
121 S Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
To: Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Furthermore, McMillan is a unique space that requires unique and creative ideas. The current concept presented by VMP and past developers, is merely a humdrum, cookie-cutter template of a mixed-used design. There is no creativity, only a plan that will destroy the site. I would ask all of you to reflect on the legacy that you leave behind in your treatment of McMillan. There are many creative design ideas that could be implemented on the site, including one of low-density, park and contiguous open. McMillan is an opportunity for great and creative design.

Also, please see the attachment of contiguous open green space ideas that would be suitable for McMillan.

Thank you,

Gwen Southerland
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Todd Crosby <tcrosby@usaid-yaajaende.org>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:19 PM
To: Callicott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgross@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; jgraham@dccouncil.us; jevan@dccouncil.us; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: No surplus of McMillan

Dear Members of the DC City Council,

I am writing to express my concern that surplussing McMillan in this context of non-transparency around McMillan sends the wrong message to citizens of Washington. Because the selection of VMG has not been conducted in a transparent, public manner (via an RFP and bids) it would be a disservice to the city as well as damaging to the Council’s reputation to surplus the land without providing clarity to the community on details surrounding the transaction. To do so would give the appearance of possible impropriety on behalf of council members who have received funds from EYA, Trammel Crow or other VMG partners.

The VMG design has potential, but it is far from adequate from an aesthetic, architectural perspective to occupy this last great open space in mid-city. This is clearly NOT world class design. What is called for here, is a public/private/foundation partnership that allows the site to be divided up and developed by several interests. VMG perhaps, but also the community in conjunction with foundations and other partners.

I hope that you’ll resist surplussing this property until a good plan is in place and the HPRB has approved it.

Sincerely,
Todd V. Crosby
20 W street NW
Washington DC 20001
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Corinne M. Land <corinne.m.land@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:19 PM
To: Cailcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Chah, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: McMillan Historic Preservation Review

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site. Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you.

Corinne Land
1620 Fuller St. NW #205
Washington, DC 20009
Please know there are voices out there who do not stand with "Friends of McMillan." I for one would prefer more options for the development, but am not opposed to development if done right with proper considerations for transportation and flooding.

I am sick of FoM's strong-arm tactics and misrepresentation that they speak for all of Bloomingdale and surrounding communities. They are a very vocal minority. Their petition is not entirely accurate—I am counted as one of the names, though when I signed two years ago, I was not asked to sign in opposition of development or surplussing, it was to see more options for the development.

FoM is rhetorically and ethically questionable.

Kevin Caldwell
Ward 5
ANC 5E08
Mr. Mayor, Members of the DC City Council, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the HPRB:

I am writing to urge you to ACCEPT the proposal to surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, and I urge the HPRB to ACCEPT the proposal from Vision McMillan Partners for the proposed building designs on the McMillan site.

Environmentalism in an urban context is often counterintuitive. A century or more of profligate waste of two of our most precious natural resources, land and energy, has brought us to crisis points with global warming and wildlife habitat destruction. The proper corrective measures are to make as efficient possible use of our remaining land and energy. In the context of urban planning, transforming an abandoned industrial site that is close to the city center—the McMillan Sand Filtration site—into a walkable, mixed-use development following traditional urban patterns is precisely what the District ought to be doing.

On parkland in particular: first, an honest inspection of maps from the early 20th century shows that the proposed development area, bounded by Michigan Avenue, Channing Street, 1st St NW, and North Capitol Street, was NEVER a public park; it was an active industrial area. The park was the area immediately around the reservoir, and the area west of 1st ST NW and north of Bryant St NW. Second, in an urban setting, parks are for people. The success of a park is not determined by its size but by the number of people that use it. People love parks, but research has shown that once a park is more than a three minute walk away, the distance to travel starts to outweigh the desire to use a park. At present, there simply aren't significant numbers of people sufficiently close to the sand filtration site to create a successful park; the best strategy for success of the proposed new parkland in the southern end of the site will be to add as many residents, and daytime workers, as is possible.

Thank you,

Tom Metcalf
3809 17th ST NE
Washington, DC 20018

thmetcalf@mac.com
From: Larry Martin <imartindc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:00 PM
To: Calcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Chah, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP)

Subject: HPRB McMillan Reservoir Site Review

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing to support a smart-growth, green space and green infrastructure alternative for the McMillan Reservoir site plan (HPA#13-318). This site has provided little public amenity since its closure in 1986, and the status quo should not be considered a viable alternative any longer. This sizable parcel of land can and should serve multiple purposes for development, modeling green infrastructure to manage stormwater flows, and to provide historic continuity with the Park’s original intent. Various agencies have at different times asserted various best use for the land, and the HPRB should use these arguments prudently to exercise its discretion in developing the parcel for its highest purpose. Presently, some 25% of the land has been proposed to be used as park-space. This will result in some dimensions of the historic parkland being lost, and should be considered the very minimum set aside for this use. Recreational areas, particularly playing fields are in high demand in DC - and this use of the site should be seriously considered for up to half of the parcel. Its hard to site new playing fields in DC, but our youth population is growing. This use is also consistent with green infrastructure for management of storm water run-off to reduce the need for expensive engineered alternatives. DC Water’s plan to the use part of the site to relieve flooding in Bloomingdale is a logical, low cost strategy that should be permanently incorporated into the site. It will in some measure protect and preserve a couple of the historic underground structures.

I'd argue that the most important dimension of the new site proposal should be to reintegrate this part of DC back into DC. "Smart growth" neighborhoods that will provide convenient walkability to surrounding land-uses including the hospital complex and Howard University should be understood to provide both affordable housing to folks employed locally as well as to students. Accommodations for people visiting at the hospital would be valuable. All of this integrated into the neighborhoods with improved local retail and parkspace will make McMillan once again a destination for District residents.

Larry Martin, Ward 4

--
May 2013 - The Senate Energy Committee, by a bi-partisan voice vote, approved the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S. 761). H.R.1616, companion legislation for S761 awaits action by the House Committee. The bills will spur the use of energy efficiency technologies in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors, using a variety of low-cost tools to reduce barriers for private sector energy users and drive adoption of off-the-shelf efficiency technologies. The bills also contain a private commercial building financing provision that will provide modest funding to states to create and operate innovative financing programs for efficiency upgrades to private sector commercial buildings. The Alliance to Save Energy, the Bipartisan Policy Center, Business Roundtable, the National Association of Manufacturers and the US Chamber of Commerce’s Institute for 21st Century Energy have put their support behind the legislation.
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and belowground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Larry Chang
3800 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Apt 507, Washington DC 20011
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six-acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Reginald Esteban
635 Ingraham Street NW
DC, DC 20011
From: Richard Nunno <ricknunno@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:38 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park planning

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray’s proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines. Please keep me apprised of your thought process on this critical issue for the city’s future.

Thank you,

Richard Nunno
3539 13th St. NW Washington DC 20010
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Cathy Ginther
1441 Rhode Island Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20005
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: nancie coan <nanco4000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 11:54 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Nancie S. Coan
4000 Cathedral Ave. NW,
Washington, DC 20016
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
Sarah Coleman
Washington, D.C.
20017
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 8th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

James Drane
1524 Monroe St NW DC 20010
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Anna Adamczyk
3923 Illinois Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20011
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Melissa Kramer
1433 W ST NW
Washington, DC 20009
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
Mary Kenel
mekenel@aol.com
901 Perry Place NE
Washington, DC 20017
From: Laura Milner Shipley <laura.milner@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:52 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Calcott, Steve (OP); McMillan Park
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Laura Milner Shipley
26 Bryant street ne
Washington DC, 20002

Sent from my iPad
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Abbasi, Ayesha (EOM)  
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:33 AM  
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)  
Subject: RE: McMillan Park Surplus

"McMillan Park" is really the portion of the site that is now that area on the Reservoir side, right? We'll have to clarify with Council before we go forward with the surplus legislation anyways, but I'd rather do that in person before we are moving forward with the surplus legislation. We'll also have to make sure that McDuffie very clearly understands this so that he can explain to his colleagues as well. I know he supports the redevelopment of the site, but I think his ability to explain it to his colleagues will go far with Council being able to weed through the misinformation.

In addition, does HPRB understand what the difference is between the Reservoir side and the Sand Filtration side?

From: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)  
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:24 AM  
To: Abbasi, Ayesha (EOM)  
Subject: FW: McMillan Park Surplus

I've gotten like 30 of these in the last day. I expect it to increase as we get closer to the 21st. My concern is that these folks are being misled by the Friends of McMillan Park. We aren't surplussing the McMillan Park or anything else on the McMillan Reservoir grounds, where the McMillan use to be. Can we create a message to the Council and HPRB that clarifies this? Thanks.

Shiv

Shiv Newaldass | Project Manager  
Government of the District of Columbia  
Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development  
1350 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 317 | Washington, DC 20004  
| W 202.674.2336 | F 202.727.6703 | Shiv.Newaldass@dc.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and contains information which may be confidential, legally privileged, proprietary in nature, or otherwise protected by law from disclosure. If you received this message in error, you are hereby notified that reading, sharing, copying, or distributing this message, or its contents, is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please telephone or reply to me immediately and delete all copies of the message.

OneCityYouth.DC.gov is your new, one-stop source for summer activities for District youth. Head to the site today for programs & services for young people across the District!

From: Carla Merritt [mailto:cmerritt@inkco.com]  
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:22 AM  
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrasso@dccouncil.us; sbonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)  
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com  
Subject: McMillan Park Surplus
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Regards,

Carla M. Merritt
President
LeDroit Park Development Company, LLC
2027 M.L. King Jr., Avenue S.E.,
Washington, DC 20020
202-577-4007
http://www.lodco.com
A CBE Certified Company
@MerrittCarla on twitter

-Depending on the content herein, this communication may be considered an advertisement or solicitation.
-This is not intended to solicit property currently listed by another broker.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

In my own words, razing this site (which is what this development would essentially do) is truly a loss for DC. An innovative plan that brings this park into the 21st century would be a great boon to an area of DC with no major park, and an asset to the city. Let us look to New York for ideas; this could be Washington, DC’s High Line, an innovative and cutting edge green space that has had wide teaching social and economic benefits for Manhattan. Or look at the new plan for Governor’s Island. Other cities are taking note, so why shouldn’t we? Let DC be a forerunner in the movement to green cities; let us be a model for livable cities that seamlessly blend innovation with tradition.

Thank you,

Kate Fox
37 R St NW
Washington, DC 20001

Sent from my mobile
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Carla Merritt <cmerritt@lpdco.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:22 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Cailcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.co
Subject: McMillan Park Surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Regards,

Carla M. Merritt
President
LeDroit Park Development Company, LLC
2027 M.L. King Jr., Avenue S.E.,
Washington, DC 20020
202-577-4007
http://www.lpdco.com
A CBE Certified Company
@MerrittCarla on twitter

*Depending on the content herein, this communication may be considered an advertisement or solicitation.*
*This is not intended to solicit property currently listed by another broker.*

Please consider the environment before printing this email
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus. Ward 5 does not have enough park space as it is. The residents of NoMa just received 50 million from the city so that they could have a small park. Residents in Eckington are fighting over a small plot of land that some people would like to use as a dog park. Building on McMillian will increase traffic and increase water runoff in Bloomingdale. More people are moving into ward 5 all the time. The people need this park, it's not surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Eric Schultz
58 Rhode Island Ave NW
Washington, DC 20001
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Nathan Castellanos
135 Florida Ave, NW
Washington DC, 20001
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Jo Constance Bond
1712 Second St NW
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Patrick Hudak
120 V Street NW
From: Richard Senerchia <richardsenerchia@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:41 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Calicott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: saving McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Richard Senerchia
1351 Otis St. NE
Washington DC
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Susan Eubank <susaneubank@cherryantiques.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:36 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); abonds@dccouncil.us; Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vonrange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com; Larry Bowers
Subject: Save McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Susan Eubank & Larry Bowers
711 E Capitol St, SE
Washington, DC 20003
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Natalya Scimeca <natalya_scimeca@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:36 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friends@mcmilianpark@gmail.com

Subject: McMillan site

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, I understand that the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. I also understand that the proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

I firmly believe that the McMillan Park site should be developed for the benefit of the city as a whole, with a particular eye toward the neighborhood in which it is located. However, the democracy deficit suffered by the current plan, which has been pushed forward by the city government without endorsement by the neighboring community, is unacceptable. Because of the tactics it has chosen to employ, the city must now go back to the drawing board to develop a plan that will inspire and encourage buy-in from all interested parties.

Thank you,

Natalya Scimeca
53 W Street, NW
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Sarah Gray
4711 9th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Janine Harris
3200 16th St. NW Apt. 619
Washington DC 20010
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ben Laws <laws.ben@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:20 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Ben Laws
1718 Hobart St NW
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ashley Lancaster <allancaster@gmail.com>  
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:01 AM  
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com  
Subject: McMillan Park RE: Historic Preservation Review Board hearing

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Ashley Lancaster  
28 Bryant Street NE
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 8th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Sergey Guryakov
33 Florida Ave NW

http://www.stereoj.am
http://tumblr.stereoj.am
@stereojam
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Rachel Ward
621 11th Street NE
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I was unable to attend the meeting on June 6th and regret that I was not able to add my voice to the many that object to McMillan Park being declared a surplus.

In light of the upcoming meeting on June 27th with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Joyce Gordon-Shapkaliska
1812 1st St. NW Unit 1
Washington, DC 20001
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale, and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you for your consideration,

David J. Hoexter
125 11th Street, Southeast
Washington, DC 20003
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

EK Bert
152 W Street NW, DC 20001
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Katherine Young
16 Franklin St. NE
Washington, DC
20002
Dear Mr. Mayor, DC Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
Heather Phipps
18th Street NE, WDC  20017
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Claire Surrey <claires118@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:23 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Claire Surrey
120 5th St NE
Washington, DC 20002
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ben Willman <benwillman@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:16 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park - Please do not declare it surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Ben Willman
1638 5th St. NW
Washington DC 20001
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: SG <bikerindc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:28 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: Surplus of McMillan

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Why do residents in NW DC enjoy the peace and beauty of Rock Creek Park, while we in the eastern and central parts of town are deemed unworthy of such amenities? If the City cannot maintain a park because it is "too expensive," can I respectfully request that we deed the property over to the National Park Service, so that they can preserve this historic landmark, which was, from its original design, intended to be a place of respite and relaxation for the general public. Erecting a bunch of ugly office buildings and condos will totally destroy the spirit of this beautiful and unique slice of DC’s history.

Thank you,

Scott E Graham
2030 1st Street, NW
Washington DC 20001
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Laura Friedenbach
1441 Rhode Island Ave NW, Apt M09
Washington, DC 20005
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kevin Hein <kevin.hein@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 11:39 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP;
friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Subject: Please do not declare McMillan Park surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I urge you not declare McMillan Park surplus. I strongly oppose VMPs current plans for development of McMillan. McMillan has so much potential to be a unique amenity for the city. It shouldn't be haphazardly developed in a cookie cutter suburban style fashion. Selection of a developer should be open and transparent. Alternative concepts for the site should be fully explored.

Also, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
Kevin Hein
57 U Street NW
Washington, DC 20001-1010
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
Caroline Mousset
1426 S Street, NW

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus. I was at the meeting and saw the overwhelming number of community members that were against the Vision McMillan plan.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Abby Lindsay
785 Fairmont St NW
Washington, DC 20001

--
---
Abby Lindsay
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Aaron M. Ucko
2817 Woodley Road, NW
Washington, DC 20008
(202) 669-7495
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Matt Higgins
1441 Rhode Island Ave NW #101
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons;

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

--

Ms. Sim Smiley
4469 Sedgwick St. NW
Washington, DC 20016
(202) 812-8466
Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons.

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board. Please do not rush this process and do not ignore the community opposition to the proposed plan.

Thank you,

Colleen Dailey
904 Jackson St. NE
Washington, DC 20017
Dear Mayor Gray & Council Members,

I again urge you not to declare McMillan Park surplus and convert such beautiful green space into concrete. My third grade students at Excel Academy wrote letters on behalf of the park. Perhaps a child's perspective will shed a different light on this very important matter. A sampling of their letters and illustrations is attached. I will mail the remainder of the letters to your office. Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Laura Good
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: David Taube <pinnacle20009@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 15, 2013 3:58 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Taube
2136 12th pl nw
Washington, DC 20009
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Anthony James <anthonydjames@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 9:18 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anthony James
1703 Kenyon St NW
Washington, DC 20010
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I do not support the McMilan plan. Too many construction/development in the area already like the Brookland new apartments by Buzzuto Group. These developments will force low income out of the area as it has been happening already.

Thank you for your consideration.

M. Michel
1238 Evarts St. NE
Washington, DC 20017
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tony Lucadamo
535 Florida Ave NW
Apt 2
Washington, DC 20001
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sharon Cochran <Sharon.cochran@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 9:28 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sharon Cochran
1327 Emerald st NE
Washington, DC 20002
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

LA Seidensticker
3000 7th St NE No. 211
Washington, DC 20017
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leslie Dembinski
Ward 3 Vision
4115 Emery Place, NW

Leslie Dembinski
Emery Place, NW
Washington, DC 20016
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Donald Winkler
3137 Aberfoyle Pl NW
Washington, DC, DC 20015
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Miller
1477 3rd St. SW
Washington, DC 20008
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steven Boyd
9 W St NW
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

Good Afternoon Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development,

As a resident of Northeast District of Columbia and Ward 5, I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious redevelopment plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see this now fenced off and closed site opened up to public access with the District’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that District pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan, especially as we are redeveloping public property. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the District move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bryan Martin Firvida
510 Regent Place NE
Washington, DC 20017
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that the city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Shilpi Paul
1709 4th Street NW
Apt. 2
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that the city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mike Samuelson
628 Kenyon Street NW
Washington, DC 20035
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Siko
3408 20th St. NE
Washington, DC 20018
Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jeffrey Oser <jeff.ozer@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 12:33 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey Oser
14 S Street, NE, #205
Washington, DC 20002
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Powell
52 Channing Street NW
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rahul Mercand-Sinha
1615 Q, Street NW
Apartment 102
Washington, DC 20009
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I would like to see bigger park space and am still concerned about traffic congestion.

I also encourage you to question the accuracy of Mr. Youngblood’s signatures. He has been asking people to sign petitions for years, not specifically opposing the development.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin Caldwell
77 U Street NW
#1
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matthew Dickens
1654 Euclid St NW
Washington, DC 20009
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Ricksecker
2904 Upton St. NW
Washington, DC 20008
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jesse Rauch
744 13th Street SE
Washington, DC 20003
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that the city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Aiello
221 R St NE Apt B
Washington, DC 20002
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Foley Santamaria  
913 8th St NE  
washington, DC 20002
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I attended the surplus hearing on June 6 and didn’t stand up and testify because supporters of the "Friends of McMillan" group, which is opposed to Vision McMillan’s plan, were oppressively claiming to be there representing “the community” and making it difficult to get a word in edgewise.

So, I am writing instead to express my support for the plan. As someone who lives on North Capitol Street one-half block south of the site, I believe it’s the best chance we have of turning the land into useable space. In an article that was just posted today on Greater Greater Washington, Malcolm Kantor sums up the reasons very well: http://greatergreaterwashington.org/post/19128/redeveloping-mcmillan-is-the-only-way-to-save-it/

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Mills
2407 North Capitol Street NE
Washington, DC 20002
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

Count on me to support your declaring the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant surplus property. A tiny few of my neighbors, the naysayers, apparently would prefer to keep a desolate waste land undeveloped.

I am tired of seeing our streets and avenues serve as traffic sewers for suburbanite car commuters. Density and good options for moving about (walking, cycling, bikeshare, and public transportation) are bound to improve the quality of life in the nation's capital for everyone.

Thank you for your work on evaluating this issue. Wonderful that something is being done.

John Hagood
71 P St NW
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alex Posorske
1417 West Virginia Ave NE
Washington, DC 20002
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gino Duda
2312 First St Nw
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that the city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cristina Antelo
2312 First St NW
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I understand the need to preserve green space, but also know that the development of this space is expensive and needs developer support. I also do not believe that solely a park would be safe and used for productive purposes by all. I also do not think that the site should sit idle either and wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ray Perez
3099 Hawthorne Dr. NE
Washington, DC 20017
Hello,

I am a resident of the 500 block of Kenyon Street NW and would like to express my opinion regarding the development of McMillan Park. I am opposed to McMillan park being declared a surplus. This area desperately needs more public and green space, and it would be a disservice to the community to develop this precious historic landmark. Furthermore, public transportation does not serve this area adequately and traffic will become even worse with this development. The area simply cannot handle it. Finally, the public is not adequately informed on these matters, and there should be more input from the community before something like this is advanced.

Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration.

Regards,

Robin Arnett
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris Wagner
Oakdale Place NW
Washington, DC 20001
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my opposition for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" to stop the currently proposed development plan which will destroy 80-90% of the historic resources of this site in the words of the HPRB and take away forever this historic integrated park.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kirby Vining
16 Franklin St. NE
Washington, DC, DC 20002
Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city’s largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that the city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey Oser
145 Street, NE, #205
Washington, DC 20002
GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Office of the Attorney General

Legal Counsel Division

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ayesha Abassi
    Legal Affairs and Policy Specialist
    Executive Office of the Mayor

FROM: Janet M. Robins
       Deputy Attorney General
       Legal Counsel Division

DATE: October 3, 2014


This is to Certify that this Office has reviewed the above-referenced proposed resolution and found it to be legally sufficient. If you have any questions in this regard, please do not hesitate to call me at 724-5524.

Janet M. Robins