



*Meeting notes provided by Michael J. Henderson*

[www.edgewooddc.org](http://www.edgewooddc.org)

*Not official minutes*

## **McMillan Advisory Group (MAG)**

**Thursday, August 26 2010**

**All Nations Baptist Church**

**7 PM**

### **Robert Brannum – Welcome, introductions**

**Meeting Protocol** – Commissioner Daneker; the closer you are the more impacted you are; there will be public forums for question/answer but today's meeting is a working meeting (no public input)



Someone said he was uncomfortable with there being six police officers present; another person said there are people who do not feel comfortable in this environment and it is the job of the government to make help them feel comfortable; Mr. Cox has been retained as facilitator as part of their community engagement initiative; Mr. Cox said he hopes we will be able to map out plans today today



**Historic Preservation Report** – Site description and resource inventory; site integrity; resource treatment recommendations and mitigation recommendations; person said he was very impressed with the report; McMillan National Park Committee got a grant from the National Trust; person said he was impressed with the report, and he hopes the recommendations are followed by the government; person asked about the purpose of the study; answer to inform the developer;

10 guidelines put together by the Secretary of the Interior as to protection of resources; they are guidelines which are then interpreted by the National Park Service, others; the report recommended “rehabilitation” – a sort of umbrella of all of them which can include preservation/reconstruction; designed to maintain the integrity of an historic

resource; person asked 20 years from now based on your recommendation what is your vision – either this is meeting your expectations or it is not; or, what percentage of the site should be preserved; there were some harsh words exchanged....person asked his question again about percentages; member said they have assigned values to the different resources; for example if you did not have X or Y how would you understand the site, and that is how they made their recommendations;



same person asked if they could make a simple one page summation to that; Historic Preservation Office is the office that will ultimately decide; the Board has 9 members and they will vote on what is appropriate; person asked about the timeline – next step is a determination of what will be proposed (not done yet); will weigh the different points of view; all of this will be used to develop a plan; two more members have been added to the design team; the designers will interpret the guidelines into a site plan which will include a series of community meetings; there was further discussion about the process; a series of meetings will occur; Vision McMillan Partners did their best to share their interpretation of the report with you tonight; person asked why would you have this report if you are not going to change the designs based on the report; Commissioner Daneker re-stated the goal of tonight's meeting; then he asked about some of the design details; Commissioner Daneker asked about the areas specifically used for sand filtration; he also spoke about the landscaping; the site was never classified as industrial, it was considered an open green space, then amended in the 90's as industrial; the whole site was actually designated as a park; the whole site was open for pedestrians to walk around; zoning did not exist in 1907; currently there is no zoning; new architects on board



#### **Fiscal and Economic Impact Analysis Statements – (slide show) –**

This report estimates what the economic benefit will be for a particular project over a period of time (looked at 30 years for this project); there are direct and indirect benefits; also asses the amount of public funding available (taxes etc); construction related jobs, temporary jobs and permanent jobs estimated also; reminder this is not a market analysis; get information from the DC Tax Assessor, census, etc; there is a mix of affordable and market rate residential units, retail space, a 175-room hotel, other items were listed as well; there were a lot of detailed slides about direct and indirect benefits (such as the general fund, neighborhood investment fund, etc); biggest revenue on this project will be income taxes from residents living on the site and employees working there; government bonds will be issued; one expenditure is student population; another is operating costs; revenue is 756 million over 30 years; 243.5 million in expenditures; 513 million is the net fiscal benefit to the city's general fund; there was a breakdown of expenditures (going by quicker than I could record); Convention Center and Neighborhood Investment Funds – Net 550.9 million net fiscal benefit to the city; she also spoke about the many indirect fiscal benefits

(businesses buying supplies, additional labor income (additional income tax), workers living and working and spending in the District; she also spoke about job creation – 1500 directly on site, 1800 temporary construction jobs; 520 indirect but permanent jobs created; combined over 3900 jobs (direct and indirect); Robert B. asked how they were able to create these numbers for a project that does not exist; presenter said they used a draft project and timeline, and costs associated; and from 3<sup>rd</sup> party reports they got estimates; this is one tool the District uses to determine one estimate of income stream, the presenter is sure the costs and numbers will change but this provides a baseline; Robert said he is concerned as to how the baseline may or may not apply, and how to move forward when we don't have a clear site plan; presenter said there will be several iterations of this; they did the analysis without an opinion; she recommends coming to the next meeting to view a revised site plan because the numbers will change; this is one of several iterations; person said the study is not valid and that there are things that are not factored into the numbers like the cost of bonds; land cost 55 million 20 year bonds were estimated at 73 million (assuming the District pays for them); that information was received from the developer; person said at the end of this project it would be helpful to have the actual numbers; all of this is extremely premature; another person said they have done a conservative estimate; it is just a matter of direction; it is conservative that they estimate that all of the costs will be paid by bonds; Vicky Leonard asked for a year-to-year estimate to locate a break-even point; presenter said after third year there is profit; Commissioner Daneker said but where is the break even when you factor in the bonds – answer was it is around 10 – 12 years; Barrie said since the variables change they need to be tracking on a 6-month basis at a minimum, and the numbers will need to be updated; floating bonds earlier is beneficial; presenter said it is ultimately determined by what is going on in the market; person asked about balancing the commercial and community interest; person said we will have a very constructive dialogue for that; person asked about the annual costs broken down by year; they handed him a copy of the report; primary costs going into the early years are the bond payments; there was discussion about market studies

The City has decided to pull together a full public process; asked a design team to work with the stake holders/ community; will be 3 public meetings; first one will be scheduled in September; will be an opportunity to view the work that has guided the MAG'S work and to acknowledge that work; will introduce the design team; will share the outcome of the historic preservation report with the community; there will also be a community survey for folks who could not attend the meeting; they have brought in folks to design a workshop to allow folks time to share their opinions which will be recorded to help shape and guide how this is to move forward; they are preparing not one grand scenario but more than one of how this site would be developed over time; then there will be a third meeting that will arrive at some site plan that the community identifies as a product of their input; there was a question about setting the dates for the



meetings; there was extensive discussion about the process and setting meetings; there was discussion about the purpose and process of MAG and public input

Commissioner Anita Bonds said this is a city project, and there are many people who want to have their say in this process and it would be beneficial to the overall project; what if we can't support rental units or housing sales – would it change?; there are many people who want a say on this and we as MAG members should be open to other opinions; person said he is a tax payer so he owns part of this project – asked if medical offices can generate revenue , will “derelict houses” provide jobs?, all of these benefits can be produced elsewhere, like Washington Hospital Center; also the Historic Office of Planning website says the “site is to be preserved”; historic preservation is not compatible with a billion dollars of development; and he also asked where are the art classes; he wants to recommend another designer be brought on board; recommends Miriam Gusevich be a third designer for this project; person said they have reached out to her; Jerry P. said those who are not informed by history are doomed to repeat; the community input must be much better managed; people need to give meaningful answers to the questions from the community; the facilitator said he has no dog in this fight and he believes we must and will operate openly

*Meeting notes provided by Michael J. Henderson*

[www.edgewooddc.org](http://www.edgewooddc.org)

*Not official minutes*