



Summary of Community Integrated Master Plan Forum Session 2

Held on Tuesday, December 7, 2010
Eastern Market – North Hall
5:00 PM – 9:00 PM

A total of 22 persons signed in as meeting participants at Session 2 of the Community Integrated Master Plan (CIMP) Forum. The session began with a 2-hour open house followed by a question and answer session that lasted the remaining 2 hours. The majority of attendees arrived for the question and answer portion of the forum.

At 7 PM, Mr. Bruce Jackson (Headquarters Marine Corps [HQMC] Land Use and Military Construction Branch [LFL]) called the participants together and provided the following remarks: Headquarters Marine Corps is presently working on the special legislation with the Department of the Navy, there will be information about the Request for Proposals (RFP) process, Public Private Ventures, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) placed on the project website (www.sedistrictcimp.com) sometime in January (this is an action item in response to inquiries posed during the 30 November CIMP Forum session). The website will continue to be updated as needed to keep the public informed and the ability to post comments will remain open through the RFP development timeline. The CIMP Team will provide periodic briefings to Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton and Councilman Tommy Wells as required. Mr. Jackson introduced BGEN Robert Ruark (Assistant Deputy Commandant, Installations & Logistics (Facilities), HQMC) to provide opening remarks.

BGEN Ruark spoke of how in his roughly 3 months in his current assignment, he has had the opportunity to meet with Congresswoman Norton and Councilman Wells, but not yet had the opportunity to meet with the community. He will continue to meet with members of the community as the Marine Corps works closely with the neighborhood through the RFP process and other implementation steps for finding a replacement facility for Building 20. He spoke of the uniqueness of Building 20 within the Marine Corps, as the facility serves a number of other functions in addition to berthing space (e.g., gymnasium, weight room, dining facility) and how this is a complex challenge that the Marine Corps is committed to working with the community to solve. He spoke of the Marine Barracks Washington Annex soccer field and its uniqueness as a facility that is shared with the community. He also shared that he was recently in Guam where the Marine Corps is instituting similar efforts to work closely with the community to solve planning issues and look at joint opportunities, such as shared use facilities.

Next, Mr. Robert White, legislative aide to Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton, read a statement of behalf of the Congresswoman that extended her regrets for not being able to attend as her attention was on Washington D.C. budgetary matters, including budget autonomy for D.C. She extended her

appreciation to the neighbors and Capitol Hill community that have been involved in the CIMP process and those who came to visit with her personally. She has toured the sites and understands the concerns that have been raised by the community. She thanked the Marine Corps also for visiting her and keeping her informed about the process and noted that it appears that the Marine Corps has removed all of the particularly disturbing sites from consideration for a BEQ Complex. At this time, she is reserving endorsement of the CIMP outcome until more details are available. Mr. White stated that he would be present the rest of the evening to answer any questions.

Ms. Carol Wirth (TEC Inc.) provided some follow-on information regarding concepts of shared use facilities to address some questions raised at the 30 November CIMP Forum session. Three types of potential shared use were discussed: 1) Marine Corps dedicated use of a portion of a facility (e.g., the 25% occupied space shared use contemplated for Building 20 reuse), 2) scheduled use of a facility (e.g., the MBW Annex parade deck/soccer field), and 3) a less structured arrangement where there is a purely public facility that is used frequently by the Marine Corps (e.g., a privately run fitness facility where the Marine Corps membership is an organized service provided through Marine Corps Community Services). To date, the discussion on shared use facilities has primarily regarded indoor and outdoor fitness facilities and meeting space. Antiterrorism and Force Protection (AT/FP) standoff distances would apply wherever there is likely to be 50 or more Department of Defense personnel typically present or whenever leased use of a facility exceeds 25 percent of the occupied space of a facility. Discussions have been held on potential shared use facilities primarily in regard to Building 20 reuse and the Van Ness site and adjacent D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation lands and multi-purpose facility to accommodate a displaced planned Cappers-Carollsborg Community Center with the option of locating the BEQ Complex at the MBW Annex site. The owners of the “Blue Castle” also have expressed interest. The potential for shared use facilities is above and beyond what is the primary need being addressed in the CIMP/RFP – i.e., the 150,000 SF BEQ Complex facility. It is intended that the RFP will include broad language inviting proposals for shared use.

This discussion was followed by a step-through review of draft development objectives for Building 20 and the three concept BEQ Complex Sites (the MBW Annex, “Exxon Site,” and Square 929/930 Sites).

Discussion regarding Building 20 included the following:

- A question/suggestion that the RFP include conditions that require the developer to come to an agreement with the community on development options.
- A clarification that the intended Building 20 site reuse would add to the tax rolls.
- A question/comment that environmentally responsible design and LEED certification standards were not mentioned in the development objectives. It was noted that these are mentioned in the overarching goals and objectives, but not the site specific development objectives under discussion. Additionally, it was noted that the NEPA analysis would address historic resources, traffic, air quality, noise, etc.
- The concern that the Building 20 site not becomes a parking garage was again stated.
- The question was asked if there had been any commitment made to the Architect of the Capitol for Building 20 reuse and the answer is no, that they have just expressed an interest and the CIMP Team was interested in the community’s perspectives on whether or not these would be a good fit for Building 20 reuse.
- Clarification on what architectural compatibility will be needed with the adjacent historic Main Post and Building 20, with Dr. Sue Goodfellow providing clarification that the National Historic

Preservation Act (NHPA) does not call for development of “fake” history; rather, that the new architecture is comparable with the historical architecture of the neighborhood.

- Height requirements were discussed, with clarification provided on existing height and zoning, but no concrete input from participants on desired height.
- A suggestion was made that the RFP include evaluation criteria specifically addressing design aspects.
- A question about when the proposals come in and shared space and real estate are identified, would developers be required to say who would be in the spaces? The response given was that typically the developers do market analysis and include what they propose and what types of use are to be in the space and business analysis showing that the market would support that use. The participants stated that they would like to see that the building space usage is planned and spelled out. Mr. Matt Bordelon (HQMC LFL) stated that he envisions that aspirations would be listed but not specific goals and usage.
- The question was asked, will the developer be required to buy the land at Building 20? The response was the property would be leveraged to offset the developer’s expense.

Discussion regarding the MBW Annex site included the following:

- Since the properties in play are government owned, special legislation likely would still be required for funding aspects, but the authorization that is being sought for private development of a BEQ Complex may not be necessary under this option.
- Regarding the potential replacement of the Cappers-Carrollsborg Community Center in a multi-purpose facility, the question was asked if discussions have included retention of a school at the Van Ness site. The answer was yes, that the CIMP Team understands that the Van Ness site was set aside with a commitment of a school being provided between South Capitol Street and the 11th Street Bridge south of the freeway and there are limited sites where a school can be sited in this area.
- A concern was raised about what would happen with shared use facilities if security requirements increase. Col. Montanus (CO MBW) addressed this concern by stating that there is no guarantee on what future security measures will require, but that the Marine Corps would assuredly address this potential in any planning for a shared use facility (e.g., contingency in the event of a “lock down”), just as they have for the shared use of the MBW fields.

Discussion of the “Exxon” Site included the following:

- Clarification on what street closures would potentially occur at this site.
- Clarification that the land to the west of the site is still being considered in response to the RFP, but the analysis has shown that it is possible to locate a BEQ Complex primarily within Square 976, eliminating some concerns raised by the community with the block to the west.

Other more general discussion included the following:

- A question regarding the rooftop gardens being a realistic option and the adverse impacts of this operationally for building occupants, which was answered by saying that the community suggestions and objectives could possibly be met in a more convenient way and other options will be considered.
- A question regarding financial responsibility for meeting historic preservation goals, which were answered by stating that cost (and best value/quality) would be considered in the evaluation of proposals.

- A question about how community input will be solicited as the RFP is drafted with the response being that this is yet to be determined, but that once in the real estate process there is a much more structured program for making sure that the same level of information is available to all potentially interested parties. There could be an industry forum, but this has not yet been determined. Public input will be sought as part of the NEPA process.
- A question/suggestion that developers should be required to list community benefits in their proposals.
- A question regarding the possibility that totally different sites could be proposed with the response that yes this is possible and the RFP will be written broadly enough that if a proposal is received that provides the best option for the community and the Marine Corps and yet did not result from the CIMP process, there will be an avenue to pursue such an option.
- A question was asked regarding how secure special legislation would be/is there danger that it would not pass. The response was that is always a possibility; other avenues could be pursued by the Marine Corps as needed. Congress had previously authorized privatization project for Department of the Navy BEQs; two privatized BEQs were constructed under the program and a third was sought, but the authorization has since expired. Special legislation provides tools to create solutions to address issues. Project funding will be addressed in a future step. The determination concerning the ability to use current authorities is still being explored.

Closing Remarks provided by Col. Spasojevich highlighted that the CIMP has provided a discovery learning process. He stated that the concerns have been recorded and community and stakeholder interests have been identified and that these will all be factors in the RFP process. Also, he stated that the market analysis study was awarded 7 December 2010 and this will better inform the process with the value of Building 20 and other market information. He requested that attendee's keep in mind that the NEPA process will provide more opportunities for the community to provide additional input. He stated that there are restrictions that must be followed in the RFP process, but the Marine Corps will attempt to incorporate as many public requests as possible. Col. Spasojevich said that the overall concern for the Marine Corps is to provide a secure and safe barracks for the young men and women who serve at Marine Barracks Washington.