

Transcript of ANC 3B Meeting of July 10, 2025

Edited for Clarity and Readability

Timestamp	Agenda Items
0:00:00	Call to Order
0:00:00	Approval of Agenda
0:01:56	Police Report
0:08:54	Old Business
0:08:54	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Zoning Request 21308 for Special Exception for 2622 41st Street, NW
0:17:44	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Zoning Request 21312 for Special Exception for 2200-2212 40th Place, NW
0:41:50	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Resolution on Mayor's RFK Stadium Deal
	New Business
1:30:40	Updates and Information
1:32:11	Open Forum
1:35:20	Administrative Matters

Call to Order [0:00:00]

Approval of Agenda [0:00:00]

Turmail: All right. Evening, everyone. We've got people logging in, and so we'll give it a couple seconds before we get started. All right, that was a long couple seconds for me. So, I think that we'll go ahead and get started. As other people log in, they can get caught up. Welcome to our July meeting of ANC 3B. We have circulated an agenda and posted it to the various neighborhood listservs and up on our website with a prerequisite seven days in advance. So, I

would make a motion to approve the agenda. I was just thinking, before we do that though, do we need to note that we're also going to handle-- Kevin, which report is it again? I know you just told me

Lavezzo: The quarter three quarterly financial report.

Turmail: Gotcha. And we do, it wasn't noted on the agenda, have a representative from the Mayor's office. I want to make sure I'm saying your first name right. Is it Jill, or Gilles Stucker?

Stucker: Yeah, it's Gilles. It's a French name. Don't worry. You get used to hearing it wrong all day long. Everyone does. No problem.

Turmail: Gilles. All right. Gilles Stucker with the Mayor's office here to speak about the RFK stadium deal as well. So, we're going to add him into the agenda when we get to that part in the old business section of the agenda. With that, I would make a motion that we approve the agenda for tonight.

Howie: I second. Can you hear me?

Turmail: Yes, we can. Loud and clear, Gupi. All in favor say, "aye," raise your hand, whichever, if you don't want to unmute. All right. Wonderful.

Police Report [0:01:56]

Turmail: Okay. The first thing up on the agenda is I see Lieutenant Johnson is here. It's time for the monthly police report. How are things going, Lieutenant?

Johnson: Hello, everybody. This is Lieutenant Johnson from the Second District PSA 204, which includes ANC 3B. This month, we have a reduction in crime compared to the same time a year ago. We have ten crimes to report as opposed to 15 this time last year. We had only one serious ADW gun, which was a shooting that took place in the 3700 block, took place on 37th Street, I'm sorry. And I believe I emailed everyone about that. An arrest was made. That was a dispute between two friends, or ex-friends. One shot the other one. And we made an arrest. We had four, I'm sorry, two theft from autos. Six thefts, which is down from ten. One motor vehicle theft. That was a scooter that was left unattended. Someone was doing a delivery and their scooter was taken. It's unfortunate. Other than that we had no arson, no sex abuses, no burglaries, no robberies. We're doing good in ANC 3B so far this month as far as crime goes. Any questions from anyone out there?

Turmail: On the incident between the -- I guess if you shoot someone you're probably not friends anymore -- the former friends. Had there been any prior police interaction with either of the individuals?

Johnson: Yes. The shooter, he had been arrested a couple times for shooting people.

Turmail: I'm sorry, did you say had been arrested a couple times for shooting people?

Johnson: Yeah, I think at least twice. He had two previous ADWs.

Turmail: Is there any indication of what the Assistant US Attorney's Office will do with the individual this go-around? Or is he going to be out there shooting more people having been arrested now another time?

Johnson: Well, he's being held. Of course, he hasn't had-- That's between him, and the courts, and the judge. But I can't see him getting out, any logical person wouldn't let him out anytime soon with his background. But both of them had histories, in all fairness. But the shooter, he definitely had one.

Pollock: Question.

Turmail: Go ahead, Richard. I'm sorry, you had a question.

Pollock: No, go ahead.

Turmail: No, no, please, please go for it.

Pollock: Concerning this guy, I mean, you said-- How many people did he actually shoot before? And was he imprisoned for any of them? And what happened in the previous incidents?

Johnson: Well, I can't get into his complete history, but he did do some jail time before, and he was out. And he had another incident on the 13th with his friend, which involved another shooting. But hopefully this time he'll do some serious time.

Turmail: Is there anything-- Well, maybe at some point we'll invite the Assistant US Attorney's Office here. I do seem to recall that in the past they have asked for community impact statements that help them with their efforts to prosecute individuals. So, maybe we'll get some more information and have something to share when we meet. We won't meet in August, but in September.

Johnson: Oh, that'd be great. That sounds good.

Turmail: I have one other question. The difference between, and I know you've explained it before, Lieutenant Johnson, and I'm just a bad student. The difference between a theft and a robbery?

Johnson: A theft is when you steal something from, you know, like a store. And a robbery

occurs when you steal something from a person. Like, I steal something from you, out of your hand, from your pocket. I stick a gun in your face and take it from a person. A robbery is more serious because you're stealing from a person. You're causing fear. You might use violence, you know, doing a robbery. But a theft, usually no one's involved. No one sees it. They just, you know, like a porch, they steal something from a porch. That's a theft. Or from a shelf in the store, a theft.

Turmail: And the thefts we had this past month were all from automobiles?

Johnson: No, we had thefts from CVS. We had some porch pirates steal some packages. And two bikes were stolen.

Turmail: Interesting. With CVS closing stores, I do worry about the fact that every month we hear about theft from CVS. I don't know how we address that, but I think the last thing our neighborhood needs is another vacancy.

Johnson: Yeah, with CVS, that's an ongoing work in progress. We have a crime suppression team working with them every month doing, you know, CVS things. We have multiple CVS's in DC, as you know, and their policy is not to call the police until somebody, until the person leaves the store. That's their policy. They don't interact with people. Their security doesn't try to stop it. But we try to get in the store and set up surveillance and catch the persons in the act when it happens.

Turmail: Gotcha. Well, thank you for indulging my curiosity. Other questions from commissioners?

Pollock: I have one more question. The shooter, did he-- Were all those other shooting incidents in Ward 3, or were they in different parts of the city? Do you know?

Johnson: Different parts of the city. They weren't in Ward 3.

Pollock: Okay.

Turmail: It's an equal opportunity offender. Are there questions from the community for Lieutenant Johnson? Were there any other questions from the commissioner? Sorry, I didn't mean to rush anyone. Questions from the community for Lieutenant Johnson? You can raise your hand on the control bar, I'm pretty sure, and then we'll call on you.

Lane: I don't see anyone.

Turmail: Or you can also type in a question in the chat function. I think it's the chat function, right, Melissa?

Lane: Yes.

Turmail: You would think five years of Zoom meetings, I would have figured it out by now.

Johnson: Yep. You also email me questions also. I'll put my email in the chat.

Turmail: Oh, you're the best. It looks like someone has typed a question. "Is the victim okay?"

Johnson: Yes, the victim's okay. He's recovering.

Turmail: Okay. All right. Thank you, Lieutenant Johnson. I don't think we have other questions. You're going to put your contact info in the chat. And you're welcome to hang out, or you're welcome to get back to the day job, but we appreciate what you're doing and hope you and the rest of the team are staying safe.

Johnson: Yep. Just to be advised, I work at night, so I do email kind of late as some of you know. But if you email me, I will email you back or call you back. All right, I'll put it in the chat right now. Everyone be safe.

Turmail: To paraphrase our late and former Mayor, Lieutenant Johnson's a night owl. So, there you go.

Johnson: There you go. Everyone be safe.

Turmail: Thank you, Lieutenant Johnson.

Johnson: See you next month.

Turmail: You bet.

Old Business [0:00:08:54]

Zoning Request 21308 for Special Exception for 2622 41st Street, NW [0:08:54]

Turmail: All right. Now we've got some old business on the agenda. And we have two separate zoning requests. Melissa, because you understand this way better than I, and because it's in your area, if you want to go ahead and start the conversation, please.

Lane: Sure. The first zoning request is-- These are two zoning requests that we did last month, but we asked for more information. So, the first one is for 2622 41st Street, and that is to expand a four-unit building to seven. And we have Matt Medvene and Sam Medvene here, if I'm saying their names right, to talk about those requests. Sam or Matt, do you want to say

anything?

Matt Medvene: Yes. Good evening, everyone. I am-- One second, sorry, I need to get back in front. But is there any way you can share? Can we host, so we can share our presentation?

Lane: You can share.

Matt Medvene: All right. Sam, can you share your, can you pull it up, the powerpoint for 41st Street?

Sam Medvene: Yep. Doing it now.

Matt Medvene: So, piggybacking off of where we left off. You know, apologies again for the miscommunication on our team's side last month. But as stated last month, we are looking for a special exception to add three units to the existing four-unit building. We are not changing the footprint of the building. We're adding a partial third floor and digging out the basement, which is a tried-and-true practice in the area, among much of the city as well, but it's happening all over the place. Sam should be presenting.

Sam Medvene: Give me a second to start.

Matt Medvene: Yep. So, can you do full screen?

Sam Medvene: Yep.

Matt Medvene: And then go down to the renderings that just gives everyone a sense of what we're doing.

Sam Medvene: The renderings are--

Matt Medvene: Oh, that's the site plan right there. But basically it's we have an existing parking space at the rear. That's remaining. And we are adding the three units, two in the basement and one on the partial third floor. The only relief we need is a special exception for the three additional units, and that is it. Everything else is by right.

Lane: Right. And this project is similar to four other projects on that block that have been approved, and are actually almost done. I have not gotten any objections to these. If anyone in the audience has anything to say about it, please let us know.

Turmail: And this is the-- I'm sorry to interrupt, Melissa. This is the building that I believe you guys own the adjoining one, and presumably don't have an objection to what you're doing here?

Matt Medvene: Correct.

Lane: Yeah, they own the adjacent buildings.

Turmail: Any concerns from the-- Any questions, or concerns, or comments from the community? I see there's one written question.

Lane: Carol asks, "Will the single parking spot increase to three?"

Matt Medvene: No, it will not.

Turmail: Gotcha. It'll stay one. Is that correct, if I'm reading it right?

Matt Medvene: It will stay one, which is all we need to meet the requirement.

Turmail: Gotcha.

Lane: "Are these being zoned for housing vouchers like 4101 Davis Place?"

Matt Medvene: There is no covenant or anything being done to require housing vouchers.

Lane: Yeah. And I don't think that's a zoning thing. I think that's a housing thing.

Rodriguez: Yeah, and thanks for this, the revised notes on this one. Also the renderings for what it's going to look like when you guys finish, it looks really nice. It looks like it's going to be a nice improvement to the community.

Matt Medvene: Yeah, we look forward to it. That whole block, just the amount of construction and renovation on that block, it's tremendous, but will be in line with all the other nice, fresh new buildings coming up.

Lavezzo: I just have one question. It's more of a general question about this type of development. Not specific to this building necessarily, but you know, why not more units? Is it a cost thing? Is it a zoning thing? Is it a demand thing? DC is and has been in a housing crisis for some time now. And I'm a fan of adding more units to the area because people need places to live. But why just three? Why not more?

Matt Medvene: It's a combination of all the above. You know, with each new unit there comes added costs with added kitchens, added bathrooms. There is only a finite amount of space that we could increase the building size, which is why we only have the partial third floor. And we could technically carve the building into more small units, but we have, as a general practice and strategy, have targeted our projects to provide family sizes, or as close to family-size units as possible. Rather than just having a big, or not big, but a building full of studios and ones. Which if we did that, we could probably get maybe two more out of it, but it just doesn't pencil out the same. And it's not in as much demand as what we look for within our portfolio.

Lavezzo: Makes sense. Thank you.

Matt Medvene: No problem.

Lane: We have a couple more questions in the chat. "What is the estimated schedule for this? When do you think it'll be done?" After you get the zoning thing accepted.

Matt Medvene: Assuming we get the BZA approval next week, the hope is that we can have our permits in hand in September. And we would start fairly quickly with the goal of being completed by next summer.

Lane: "And are these being converted to condos?"

Matt Medvene: No, they are not.

Lane: They're rentals. Okay. Thank you.

Turmail: Do you guys serve as your own general contractors, or do you--

Matt Medvene: Sometimes. It depends on the size of the project.

Turmail: Gotcha. But you guys are pretty committed to moving forward. In my day job, I spent a lot of time complaining about tariffs and construction materials costs. Just, you guys are all ready to move forward?

Matt Medvene: Yes. We have financing that is already in place. We have big purchases already locked in. So things are ready to go. We just have to get the building permit to continue moving forward.

Turmail: Got it. Any other questions, Melissa, or comments from the community?

Lane: Somebody wants to know what the two bedrooms will go for. But they're rentals, right?

Matt Medvene: Correct? They're rentals, and we don't know at this moment.

Turmail: You've got someone looking for a two-bedroom already.

Lane: Already. There you go. You've already got demand. Okay. I don't see any further questions. I don't have any further concerns if other-- Still getting comments.

Matt Medvene: There is no space for additional parking, unfortunately. There is a tree, a very large tree, directly behind our building.

Lane: Right. I've been down that alley. It would be hard. And DC's not going to let you take that

tree out.

Rodriguez: You were talking about that hidden parking that's over in that side street there. I did drive by about 7:00 p.m., I think it was on a Wednesday night, and there was plenty of parking. So I wasn't concerned now with that, because that was my initial concern when we were talking about this last time.

Lane: Okay.

Turmail: Are there other questions, Melissa?

Matt Medvene: Well, that's, yeah, that's a different property. But still, this one is the same.

Lane: Yeah, this is 2622.

Rodriguez: The other one I looked at, then, with that additional side street in the back.

Turmail: We're almost at that one.

Matt Medvene: Almost there.

Turmail: I don't want to jinx it, but we're almost at that one. I would go ahead and make a motion that we approve their request.

Howie: I'll second.

Turmail: All in favor say, "aye."

Lane: Aye.

Turmail: Or raise your hand if you don't want to unmute. Anyone opposed? All right.

Zoning Request 21312 for Special Exception for 2200-2212 40th Place, NW [0:17:44]

Turmail: Melissa, would you like to start the conversation about the other zoning request we have?

Lane: Sure. The other request is a much bigger project. It's at-- Well, it's two buildings that are connected. Two, four-unit buildings connected with two others. And the proposal is to connect those buildings with a corridor. They would not build over those buildings, but there'd be a courtyard behind it. And to expand the units from four each to, well, from 16 to 29. And there were some questions about whether or not the neighbors had been contacted. And Sam and

Matt, I know you've done a lot of work in the last month to contact the neighbors and gotten some feedback. Would you go through what you've done?

Sam Medvene: Sure, happy to. So, on the outreach form, sorry about that. On the outreach form, we have garnered multiple letters of support thus far. And from 2201, which is across the street, as well as 2205 40th place across the street, both of those. And then we have the building right behind us, 4101 W. The large building behind us has also garnered support to us. And then for the building directly north of us, 2216, the one that adjoins to us, or you know, proximity of our lots, that is an already pre-finished, converted into condos building of which we've gotten one of the owner's letters of support. Two others have confirmed, you know, receipt. We've sent certified mail to every individual, every owner, as well as their primary addresses as well. I've got a fun matrix if you have interest in seeing. I showed it to Melissa earlier, that for each of the individual owners from emails that were available, as well as phones, phone numbers. And then I've also met with, and I think Patrick's here.

Forcelli: I am.

Sam Medvene: Perfect. So when we met with Patrick, Patrick's the president of 2217, who we've had several back-and-forth conversations ever since the previous meeting, as well as presented to them of the BZA kind of packet that we have submitted as well. And addressed a lot of the concerns that came from trees, of which DC has a very robust tree protection guideline, of which we ensured, and that's where the majority-- And then of course the parking, to which we also shared kind of the extent and the limitations that were previously talked about, and I know have been discussed as the two biggest concerns that we've garnered from individuals. And that's kind of where we currently sit on this from-- And then we've also canvassed the neighborhood as well since the previous ANC as well trying to communicate with as many people as possible as well.

Lane: Thank you.

Rodriguez: This is the property that I actually drove by on that Wednesday evening, and there was plenty of parking. That was like a non-issue.

Lane: Patrick Forcelli actually sent us an email this afternoon and he lives at 2217. I know you've talked to Sam and Matt, but you also had some concerns.

Forcelli: Yeah, I mean-- So first I have to say Sam and Matt did a great job explaining the project. I think it's exciting to have a potential of revitalization of the buildings at the end of the street. I've talked with the other owners in 2217 and you know we think the green design and all of that is great. The parking remains a concern for us. Not surprising. The current buildings are one and two bedroom. This is proposing to add 13 units and convert everything to three bedroom. That's going from 27 bedrooms to three-and-a-half times the original footprint in terms of number of beds. So, we are a little bit concerned about the parking piece. And we'd like to kind of hear a little bit more about that. I mean, I think this would be the only purely

three-bedroom building on the block. So we would just like to know a little bit more.

Matt Medvene: So piggybacking off of the explanation I had given about the last project. We could have pursued smaller units, which would have generated a higher unit count. But again, as a business, overall business strategy and need that we feel the city has across the board that we have dedicated our resources to meeting, we have pursued just as many family-size units as possible. And filling in, if there's any gaps or just leftover space that could be a unit, then maybe using that as a one or a two. But on the whole, the priority is to maximize family size, and get as many of those as possible. Ultimately there are other large buildings in this neighborhood. Not a ton, but there are several, and there's some more coming. One being up the block, a few blocks up, that also have some family size or other mixes. But ultimately, we feel the greatest need is in family-size units. And while it does increase demand on parking, we feel it's a higher priority to meet the housing needs that the city and the neighborhoods have, especially in such a beautiful and just desired neighborhood as Glover Park. Not to mention, you're just down the street from Stoddert. So, it's primed for families, and that's the target market that we're looking for. As we had kind of explained in the last meeting, and with Patrick and the other owners that we've spoken to, we have pretty much exhausted the conversation in attempts to find ways to get parking. Given the unimproved alley, and given DDOT's stance that they are not going to improve that alley, we really are left with no options. Unfortunately, we just have no access. And a curb cut's not something that they're going to give us. And there isn't anywhere else that we'd be able to get the parking anyway. So, unfortunately, it's just a constraint that the site and properties have that, honestly, pretty much every property on this whole row has that we just have to navigate and work around.

Lane: Yeah. And can I add one thing? The property that he's talking about that's going to be expanded is in the 2300 block of 40th Place. And I think it was called Townley Court, and they are renovating that building to all be two, three and four-unit apartments.

Turmail: I think there are a couple of hands up, Melissa.

Lane: Yeah, Gupi, do you have a question?

Howie: Can you hear me?

Lane: Yeah.

Howie: Okay. I just have two comments. One, I think if people are concerned about the parking, having smaller units would just mean more cars. So, I think having units that are three bedroom actually minimizes the number of cars that would be there. And then second, just from I know that Glover Park is not a historical neighborhood like relief, or like Georgetown. But for developers and their architects, I would strongly encourage you to look at examples like 3918 W Street, where they have put a third floor on top of one of these four-unit buildings. Where they just kind of extended the roof line instead of just dropping a shoe box on top of the existing roof. Because it's very unattractive to look at from any point on the street or the alley. If you just

continue the roof line, it just makes it look nicer. That's my two cents.

Lane: Kevin?

Lavezzo: Agree 100% with Commissioner Howie. Absolutely agree with her on all points. You know, smaller units means more vehicles, and let's make it not look like somebody had dropped a box on top of the building. And more of a general comment, you know, only 64% of households in DC have cars. Going up in units doesn't necessarily mean it's 100% car ownership, right? There's a good chance that not everyone who buys one of these units, or rents units, is going to have a vehicle. And we also have two buses coming through DC now, or through Glover Park, during the week, which will incentivize not having to have a car. The D, I'm still learning the route numbers, but it's the D96 and the C85. The C85 is during the week and the D96 is all the time. So, you know, those are two benefits. And both of those lines will run close to this building site. So, it'd be easy for people that live there to hop on the bus to get to work and go out and about. I've also seen a lot more families using the bike lanes lately with bunch bikes, with cargo bikes, with kids on the back, kids in the front. So, you know, things are looking good for Glover Park when it comes to not having a car. I think it's important to keep that in mind when looking at these projects. And that's it.

Lane: Richard?

Pollock: Sure. In looking at the rendering from the street level, it looked like you are modernizing the front of the building. Is that true? Are you going to have any kind of changes to the front from its current view?

Matt Medvene: Yes. We are preserving the existing brick facade, but what we felt was an architectural complement to the original brick and design was to separate the addition with a more modern frame, which if you look at the renderings, you'll kind of see it. The thought was to have the addition. There's an additional fenestration border put around. And to everyone's concern about not wanting it to just look like a box on a roof, this is not a typical, you know, what you would see in a low-income project, or affordable project, that's just siding, whatever. This, you know, there is some nicer metal panel, brick, and other transitional materials that are being installed on the building along with building signage to really emphasize and add taste and elegance to the building, while also making it a statement piece at the end of that block and an anchor to that street. And by putting the more modern elements on the top of the addition, it allows you to somewhat segregate the new versus the old, and not just try and blend it in and make it all look like it was old before.

Howie: This is Commissioner Howie again. I would beg to differ or disagree in that. I think there's some value into having it still all look somewhat uniform, and kind of go with the aesthetic that's been Glover Park for decades. That's just my opinion. With this project, are these rentals or condos?

Matt Medvene: They are rentals.

Lane: Rentals.

Howie: Okay. Again, I just wanted to reiterate my strong preference for keeping the look and feel of what is Glover Park and not making it a modern, sterile, sanitized block.

Turmail: May I take an opportunity and just ask one quick question, which is-- And then we'll get you Patrick, I promise. When you guys have, I assume you guys have completed other family-size unit buildings, and if I've got the phrase wrong, forgive me. Have you any sense of how many cars are coming with each of those units? To Kevin's point, with these family-sized ones should we expect kind of a lower car utilization, or what have you seen from your past experience?

Matt Medvene: It's across the board. There's no consistency. You'll have a large number of people that don't have any cars. And then you'll have, there's one tenant we have in a building that has four cars. Why is beyond us, but that is the exception. Typically, you would see one car, maybe two per family. But given that you're living in a city, you typically don't see most of the tenants having more than one car per household. But again, there's no consistency.

Turmail: Gotcha. And Kevin's never going to forgive me, but the Turmail family owns five. But in fairness, the three Turmail children are scattered over the country. But anyway, I'm sorry, Patrick. We'll turn it over to perhaps a more serious question.

Lavezzo: At one point I owned two, so.

Turmail: All right. There you go. All right, there you go.

Lane: Patrick.

Forcelli: Yeah, I just want to say that I've spoken with a couple of the folks in my building as well, and we agree with Commissioner Howie that keeping something that was kind of a little bit more in line with the rest of the street would be desirable in terms of the architectural style.

Lane: Rob?

Rodriguez: Just a quick question. Previously I was on W Street Street, on 11th over by U Street. And I petitioned the city on our block to get it zoned, or permitted for the RPP, which is the reserved parking for residents there. Is this block RPP already? Or is that a possibility also to kind of calm some of the concerns? I think I had to have 51% of the population of the block to get the RPP. And they came out and put the signs that say 7:00 a.m. to midnight, 7 days a week, you have to have your RPP parking on your DC tag.

Lane: This is an RPP block.

Rodriguez: It is? Okay.

Lane: Patrick, do you have further concerns? Have we addressed any of the concerns about the parking that you had?

Forcelli: Yeah, I mean, I think as much as we can address them, given the alley and given the number of units being proposed.

Lane: Right. And the DC government says they will not develop that alley. And there's also a heritage tree in the middle of it. And it's not really an alley. It's a forest that was an alley on some plan a long time ago.

Forcelli: Oh, yeah, yeah. I've walked it myself. I think the interesting thing will be as if other units or buildings on the block decide to redevelop as well, this conversation might just get tougher and tougher as we move down the street.

Lane: Agree. I think, yeah, as these buildings are redeveloped, we are going to have to look at them closely, each one. Are there any further questions from commissioners or anyone in the audience? Not seeing any. I don't think we've had any significant, we haven't had any real opposition to this project. And I think it will be a plus to this neighborhood. Carol, you want to say something? Carol?

Howie: She wrote in the chat, "Absent off-street parking, is a smaller footprint possible to mitigate the increase in people residing there?"

Lane: I think Matt answered that.

Vilsack: Right, I'm just concerned that these existing four-unit buildings, which two buildings are attached, so they're four-unit buildings ostensibly owned by two owners. So you've got two sets of four-unit buildings which is 16, typically 7-800 square-foot rentals. I don't think any of these buildings currently has a basement. Is that correct?

Matt Medvene: They all have a partial basement that's storage and utility space.

Vilsack: Okay. But they're unfinished. Is that true?

Matt Medvene: Correct?

Vilsack: Okay. So, you're going to dig out the basements, and then add basement units.

Matt Medvene: That is correct.

Vilsack: And then you're going to add-- By connecting the two disparate eight-unit buildings, you will be adding larger units, plus basement, plus ceiling, without any commensurate parking

to offset the inevitable increase in automobiles. And I do understand that someone drove by or walked by and said they saw parking. But I've lived here for 30 years, and it is the dead of summer, and I do think a lot of people may be on vacation. But that area is notorious for no parking and circling, and circling, and circling. So, I would encourage this project to either consider exploring expanding the alley for off-street parking, or potentially reducing the footprint to offset what is absolutely going to be an increase in parking needs. Families have cars. That area is no longer supported by the D2. So, folks are going to have to walk a little bit from that back corner of Glover Park to get to the bus stop. So, I'm not against the redevelopment, although I would encourage similar facades to maintain the aesthetic of the neighborhood. But I just don't understand why we have to have 13 net new, for a total of 39, from an existing 16.

Howie: This is Commissioner Howie. Just for the sake of wrapping things up and kind of moving things along, they could individually take each of these four-unit buildings and make them a third story and a basement. They can just do that all individually. We have historically always given approval for that exemption or whatever it is, the parking variance. They have exhausted every possibility for parking and looking into the alley and off-street parking, and that's not an option. So I think they've given a fair chance, or they've given a fair look at every possible option, and there's just none. So I think continuing to ask them is not necessarily helpful.

Vilsack: Well, again, I disagree. I mean, the footprint doesn't have to be 39 3-unit, you know, rental apartments, I guess. But I won't delay the conversation. I just, I think it's a very large project for a very small parcel that they're going to join together. And I do think we don't-- No one on this call seems to have parking back there. And I don't think Mr. Medvene or his brother actually live in that area of Glover Park. So, I just would ask the commission to be very careful about this because I do think parking is a primary requirement for any development going forward, regardless of past practice. I just think that, you know, there is a tipping point, and I think it's already been met, and reached, and surpassed.

Lane: I also think for this project, let me just add, that if this-- This is one project. We could have four different developers buy these buildings and go from four units to eight units each, which would be even more. I mean, we'd end up with even more density than what they're proposing. So I think we need to balance that with their request. They've been cooperative with us and have actually exhausted every possibility, and done everything we've asked. And so there are concerns, but again, I actually think parking is easier around here now than it was five years ago. I think fewer people do have cars, and they're, you know, especially they're using much more bikes and Ubers and things like that more so than they ever did five and ten years ago, or even 20 years ago.

Rodriguez: I agree with you. They've jumped through so many hoops and exhausted every possible option, that I think we're at a point now where it's just like they've done beyond due diligence.

Turmail: I would just say that, you know, in my nine, non-cumulative years as an ANC commissioner, this is probably-- There haven't been really any hard, and this may be the

hardest zoning request we've got. And I think it comes down to our comfort level with some additional stress on the parking situation versus meeting the city's objective. And frankly, the growth of our community's objective of having more housing units. And, you know, which do we think is either the greater good versus the worst deterrent? So, it's a hard choice. I'm going to vote in favor of this, but let me just make one last call for anyone else who hasn't had a chance to chime in yet. I want to make sure we've heard from everyone before we take a vote. Thank you for your comment, Carol. Okay, I'm going to go ahead and make a motion that we vote to approve. And obviously everyone should just vote their conscious. We need a second before we vote.

Lane: Second.

Turmail: All in favor say, "aye."

Commissioners: Aye.

Turmail: Raise your hand if you don't want-- Anyone opposed? All right, we're going to watch parking and hope that we haven't made a mistake here. And we appreciate everyone's comments, and I know this is a hard one. So, thank you.

Matt Medvene: Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

Turmail: Got it. Good luck. And good luck to us that we haven't made a mistake.

Resolution on Mayor's RFK Stadium Deal [0:41:50]

Turmail: Okay, going back to the agenda, the next bit. And, Gupi, maybe we'll have you start the conv-- Well, let's do this. At our last meeting, Commissioner Howie talked about the idea of promulgating, if that's the right word, a resolution in support of the RFK stadium deal, which we will get to in a second. We do have a draft resolution that the commissioners all had a chance to review and weigh in on. I think before that, we do, as I mentioned at the front end, have a guest speaker, Gilles Stucker. And hopefully I'm saying the last name right, as I got so worried about the first name. Who is with, I don't even know what DMPED is, but you would tell us. He is here to talk about, and I should know, and I'm sorry, Gilles, that I don't, but who's here to talk to us a little bit about what this deal is, and why presumably the Mayor is supporting it. And then we'll go from there, if that's okay with everyone. Gilles, the floor is yours.

Stucker: Great. Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for your time tonight. I actually lived at Cathedral Court for many years and remember fondly when there was a Blockbuster in your ANC and walking down on Friday nights in around 2000, 2001.

Turmail: I still miss that Blockbuster, but I don't want to digress. Yes.

Stucker: But anyways. So, I'm the Director of Strategic Initiatives with the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development. That's what DMPED means. So, my colleague Kendall Gibson is on here. She's going to control the PowerPoint for tonight. So, on behalf of Mayor Bowser and Deputy Mayor Nia Albert, I'm here to share more about the RFK campus and to answer your questions. This is an exciting time for Ward 3, Ward 7 where RFK is, as well as the entire District, because RFK will be a big part of the city's economic future. As Mayor Bowser says, we have the chance to unlock-- Go back to the last slide, Kendall, thank you. As Mayor Bowser says, we have the chance to unlock 180 acres at RFK. In April, the Mayor made a big announcement about the future of football in DC, and about the future of the entire RFK campus. That we'd be bringing our Commanders home to where they belong here in the sports capital in DC. Our guiding principles for the project have been focused on ensuring a strong return on public investment, activating the campus quickly, creating jobs for DC residents, and generating new revenues that will help us fund the programs that serve residents across this District. Okay, the next slide. Right. And some of you, if you've been following RFK, you may have seen some of this information from the initial announcement in April, but this is the best information we have to share for you towards tonight. So, this is, what you see here in front of you is the RFK campus, the 180 acres. And what we've done is looked at different sections of the campus itself. The orientation of this is north-south. You have the stadium in the middle, the Anacostia River. To the right you have the Anacostia Commons. It's a 30-acre stretch of riverfront, which is a no build area. And then different districts across the site. What we want people to know is this, is that partnering with the Commanders is the fastest and surest route to delivering on the RFK campus. It's just south of RFK. If you're aware, there's a Hill East development. Our office has been seeking to fully build out the Hill East development for many, many years, and it's been slow partially because there hasn't been an anchor in that development. With RFK, with the Commanders, we have a new stadium which is the fastest and surest way to build out this area of the city, similar to what we saw with Nationals Park. Nats Park went up and a lot of economic development, new housing, new retail, new jobs, were created as part of the Nationals Park development. That's what we're seeing here as well. Our partnership with the Commanders goes well beyond just a football stadium. Although it's going to be the best NFL stadium in the nation, and the only NFL stadium on the North Atlantic region with a roof. The team is looking to be part of our city, and many of the Commanders' leadership are DC natives, and it's great to have that as part of their team. 180 acres is a huge opportunity. It's over four Wharfs. I've worked on The Wharf in my special capacity with the city. I've worked on The Wharf development for the last 12 years. I worked on the McMillan development for the last 14. Been with the city 17 years in varying, different ways. Started my tenure as the housing provider ombudsman for the city. Formed the regulations and the program for the inclusionary zoning program. So, I've had different roles across the city, so I fully appreciate the housing goals, appreciate the affordable housing requirements, and what it takes to make a large development work. And with this type of potential at RFK, we can do it all. The Commanders will be responsible for developing two additional parcels, the plaza district you see here in peach. And the riverfront district, which is in blue. They'll help us create a new destination along our waterfront with housing, retail, hotels, restaurants, recreation, and more. The District will retain ownership over two parcels, the recreation district where the fields at RFK currently are, and also will be home to a world-class sports plex for our youth, which I'll talk about in a moment.

The recreation district will also continue to host the fields at RFK without a disturbance to the use of the fields. We know a lot of parents-- I'm a parent. I have three children. They're very active in sports. We have lots of fields at RFK. If you use them, they're very actively used throughout the week and weekend. We've had lots of community stakeholder meetings with the users of the campus right now. And we've heard loud and clear that the recreation uses of those fields needs to remain. We've made that commitment to keep those fields where they are. The District will also be responsible for developing Kingman Park District, which will include housing, recreation, and green space. Finally, the campus will have what we're calling the Anacostia Commons, which is the area along the river, which is a protected environmental space along the waterfront. It's 30 acres, which was mandated by the federal legislation to be a no-build area. And you can see also in frame, you see Kingman and Heritage Islands. I'll make a plug for both of those areas. If anyone on the call or on this meeting has not been to Kingman Island, I highly recommend it. It's as if you're not even in a city. The area along the Anacostia east of Kingman Island is glorious. They have riverboat tours you take through the Anacostia Waterfront Society. And it's a great opportunity here to blend both economic development with an anchor with environmental and recreational uses. Right. Next slide, please. All right. We are very excited to be partnering with Josh Harris and the entire Commanders leadership team to deliver what will be a transformational project for our city. The city will invest 2.7 billion, it's a B, not M, billion dollars for vertical construction of the stadium, which represents the single largest private investment in the District's history, at the RFK campus. As we have done for every major economic development project, DC will be responsible for preparing the land, which involves infrastructure, or what we call horizontal construction. And as an example with The Wharf development, we funded the horizontal development at The Wharf, which allowed for the bulkhead, all of the infrastructure costs that brought it from the old channel in, if you recall that, and what The Wharf was, into what it could become with the normal vertical development costs that a developer would expect. We also know that in order for people to access the campus, including the stadium and the mixed-use districts, we will need some amount of parking. In the FY26 budget, which is before the council, the District will contribute \$181 million from Events DC for parking. We worked hard to strike the right balance for parking and envision 8,000 parking spaces in structured garages. If you've been to RFK now, you'll see that it's all at-grade parking, a sea of parking. And, really, the transformation will take those at-grade parking spaces into structured parking. When the stadium opens in 2030, which is before you know it, it's five years away at this point and we're on a very tight timeline. But we have the right team together to do it. We also want to have a campus, not just a stadium, that is ready to welcome visitors on day one. So the District is investing \$22 million on campus development unrelated to the stadium. That will also include a study for WMATA to look at their capacity for the Stadium- Armory station, which is adjoining the site. All right, next slide. What will this partnership and project deliver? Again, our guiding principles for this deal are creating jobs and revenue for the District. Based on an economic and fiscal impact analysis, the project is projected to create 14,000 construction jobs to build the stadium site over the next four years. We also estimate that the stadium will produce nearly \$15 billion in direct spending. Those are direct contracts with our businesses that will be able to compete for and participate in. We have the goal of 35% of the total project will be done by DC certified business enterprises, otherwise known as CBEs. And we also look at the total project. The stadium combined with mixed-use district, we estimate will

produce \$5 billion over the next 30 years in taxes coming back to the District of Columbia. All right, next slide. Mayor Bowser has made her commitment clear that any development at RFK would have to include housing. We expect to be able to build roughly 6,400 homes, of which 30% must be affordable. And it's interesting also in this area, this is in the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative area along the water. It's a deeper level affordable housing than would be in our standard affordable housing projects. So it's not only the affordable housing, but the level of affordable housing will serve our most needy District residents. That means the campus will be home to more than 10,000 Washingtonians. We are at the very beginning of this process. During the master plan process, which we will be planning for now for the full uses of the site, and how that housing will be spread out and incorporated in other uses. Retail, restaurants, office, a grocery store and more. Parcels in the Kingman Park District, which the District is developing, will be offered for development through District RFP processes, which are different than the Commanders. That'll be RFPs that go out publicly for developers to bid on. All right, next slide. We also know how important recreation is at RFK, including the fields at RFK. We are committed to supporting RFK as a recreational destination by preserving and improving the fields but also by constructing a new state-of-the-art sports plex. This has been a priority of Mayor Bowser's for several years. The sports plex will serve as a world-class facility where DC youth can practice and compete in indoor track and field, cheerleading, swimming, and more. Right now, our youth and families have to go out of state for these activities. And particularly the reason why the indoor track is there is there's no indoor track in DC. We have many, or we've talked to many sports teams that use the field and also other sports users across the city. Many, unfortunately, many sports leagues and athletes need to travel outside of DC to compete and that shouldn't be the case. So, the sports plex is meeting an unmet need right now in the city to provide athletes with an opportunity to compete in the District. Next slide, please. One of the requirements of the federal land transfer legislation is that 30% of all the land will be maintained as open and green space. And that is actually in addition to the 30 acres along the waterfront. The whole RFK campus is 180 acres. 30 acres of that is on the Anacostia Commons. So of the remaining 150 acres, 30% of that, or 45 additional acres, will be open space. There's an incredible opportunity to connect the site to the Anacostia River, to Kingman and Heritage Islands, but also to the 1,200 acres that make up the Anacostia Park system. And this is something that I think a lot of folks in the city, they know Rock Creek Park very well. They don't really-- I think a lot of folks don't really understand the amazing park system that is along the Anacostia River. Not only do you have the arboretum, and you have so many uh parks up and down up through into Maryland along the Anacostia. We know the park space will be another draw to welcoming people to the campus, and ensuring the community is vibrant and activated year round. Next slide. In order for us to make this happen, we need to deliver this campus in the time period we know the community wants, and we need to act. The council has scheduled hearings for the end of July on the 29th and 30th for the RFK deal. And I would encourage everyone here to testify at the public hearing on July 29th. That's the date for the public hearing, or for the public comments. And July the 30th is for the government witnesses. We need the council to take vote on legislation before the fall so that we can start the planning process. And ultimately, we want the stadium to be open and operational at the start of the 2030 NFL season. We know that there's a lot of work ahead, and we know you have questions. We want to be fully transparent with this ANC, with the community. I've been to many ANCs across the city and will

continue to do so. We want you to fully understand and believe, as I do, that this is a great deal for the city. And a win for the fans, the city, and the team. So, with that, I'll turn it over to the commissioners and to those on the meeting for any questions that you may have. Thank you.

Turmail: Wonderful. Why don't we start with-- Thank you, Gilles, by the way. And there was some I think email traffic. We're going to get a copy of the slides so that presumably we can put them up on our website, right?

Stucker: Certainly. And there actually is one thing that we don't have in this, I didn't mention, is that we have a website that has all the information about RFK. It's ourrfk.dc.gov. On that website has this PowerPoint on it. It has any news updates that we have. So if you subscribe to that, you will get a feed of information about RFK as it is posted.

Turmail: Gotcha. What we'll do here is we'll follow kind of our common practice for any folks who are here who might be not regular attendees. We'll ask questions from the commissioners first, then we'll open up to the community. So I'll turn it over. Any questions from my fellow-- I have a few questions, but I'm going to let and see what my fellow commissioners ask, and I have a funny feeling they'll probably get my questions asked. All right. All right. I don't want to-- We're going to go with Gupi, and then we're going to go with Kevin.

Howie: Hi. Thanks for the presentation. It's my understanding that, and maybe you can help clarify, who will own the stadium? Will the city of DC be actually owning the stadium?

Stucker: Yes, the city will own the stadium.

Howie: And the federal government still owns the land that it sits on?

Stucker: Right. So, what happened with the federal transfer is the federal government owns the land, the fee interest. The federal government transferred what's called administrative jurisdiction. It's sort of an anomaly because we're a District, is that we have ultimate control of the RFK campus through an agreement, through this administrative jurisdiction with the federal government.

Turmail: Do you have other questions, Gupi?

Howie: That's all. No, that's it for right now.

Turmail: Fair enough. Kevin, you had some questions?

Lavezzo: Sure. I'm curious how other cities have been able to get stadiums built without public money? And how much public money is really going into this project? The SoFi Stadium in Los Angeles, MetLife Stadium in Jersey, and Gillette Stadium in Massachusetts have all been built without any public money. And I'm curious why the District of Columbia is funding this when it's been proven that private companies that want to build stadiums can pay for this themselves.

Stucker: We did have-- There is a sports study that we did. It's on our website that looks at all different kinds of stadiums, and it's all across the board in terms of what's required for a stadium to be constructed. I believe, I don't want to guess on number, I don't have it in front of me right now. But it's all across the board. We are not, by any means, providing more subsidy than the average stadium, if it is to be constructed. But there are different measures that each municipality will take to incentivize a team to build a new stadium in their jurisdiction. So that's--

Howie: I will also say, Kevin, those stadiums, MetLife, SoFi, and Gillette, are kind of in the middle of nowhere. Like the stadium in Landover, it's not actually in like a downtown like Boston, or LA, or in New York City. So I think maybe that's why there's less public funding going to those. I mean, I just wanted to comment, make that distinction.

Lavezzo: Sure. More specific to the site where the stadium is going to be, the stadium district that you showed. How much acreage is that in the scheme of the entire project?

Stucker: I believe it is 16 acres. Or more. It depends if it's the drip line or the actual sort of the overall sort of district itself. I can get back to the ANC with the exact acreages per district.

Lavezzo: Yeah, just curious how much that is. I mean, I fully appreciate that there's going to be green space and interconnections with Kingman Park and Anacostia Park. I think that's a worthwhile connection. But I'm just curious how much the stadium district is going to be of the entire site. And, you know, 8,000 parking spots, even if they are subsurface, sounds kind of nuts. I'm not sure if you were here for the housing talk we had about an apartment building being built in our area. And, you know, there was a lot of debate over 16 additional units that might generate 16 additional cars. And we're talking about 8,000 vehicles, potentially more, coming into the city on game days. And you know, I worry that that part of the city will be complete gridlock. And that we should do more, if we do go forward with this project, to incentivize use of buses and the Metro system rather than providing thousands of parking spots that most of the time will go unused, presumably, when the stadium is not in use. So, that's a concern that I have as well. I may be the only one that shares that. I do appreciate the 30% affordable housing that's part of the housing plan there. I think that's good. I'm curious if the housing that is not marked as affordable housing strictly is going to have any gradient to it. Is it going to be affordable housing, and then you have a crazy jump in rent and property values where people of average means cannot afford to live in the area? Is it basically going to be affordable housing, which we desperately need, and then super expensive housing that we kind of already have all over the city that average folks can't afford to live in? I wonder if you can speak to that.

Stucker: Sure. Let me speak to your first question if I could first, about the parking.

Lavezzo: Sure.

Stucker: So, we've worked very closely-- The RFK campus was the home to the Washington

football team until 1996. So the site operated as a football stadium with the parking that exists, or existed before the fields took over some of the parking. We have not only an expanded Metro right now and also an additional silver line that goes through Stadium-Armory, we also have an amazing location in terms of having 295 and freeways directly related to connecting almost to the stadium. So, we worked very closely with our District Department of Transportation to look at how RFK operated as a stadium previously. How it needs to operate now as a stadium with the expansion of the Metro, with the bike share, with buses. We have specifically also engaged with WMATA on how can we ensure that the WMATA system operates as part of the campus. So, it's similar to how they operated at Nats Park. There was a huge study of a new demand that's coming in for events at Nats Park. So, when there's an event there's additional cars, and that will accept the flow of people coming to and from the stadium. So that WMATA study is very important as we proceed with this development to ensure that we're trying to incentivize non-vehicular use. And what I can do, I'll get the number of parking spaces at Landover right now. I believe it's far less here than at Landover. I can get that comparison for you. We've trying to have as minimal parking as we can. But there is certain people who will be traveling out of the area. And we've heard from some folks saying, "If you build parking, they'll use parking." So that's really important for us. We want people to use alternative means. The streets are full already, and that's very important for us to try to incentivize other uses. We've also had lots of discussion about creating a connection between east of the river to west of the river at the Minnesota and Benning location across Ward 7. So trying to get that interconnection from both the vehicular traffic coming in and out, pedestrian traffic coming to and from the site, particularly over Benning Road and East Capitol bridges. And your second question was, sorry, I lost my train of thought. Second question was about?

Lavezzo: Sure. About housing that might exist between the affordable housing and the rest of the housing. You know, what's being done to ensure that this area is livable and accessible for the entire city, not just the affordable housing piece and not just people that can spend, you know, three, four, five thousand dollars a month plus on rent or exorbitant fees to buy condos, co-ops, whatever goes in.

Stucker: So, the benefit here is that we have certain elements of the site which will be developed by the Commanders. Those sites, there will be an agreement with the city in terms of those developments, the size of the units, how the properties look and feel, how they interact with the community. And there will also be the city will be developing housing as well in the Kingman Park area. So we have the opportunity and control as well over the community park area to look at housing and the cost of housing. Not just the dedicated, affordable, but the market rate housing that is by its nature affordable, to make the project not only work, but also be affordable to residents who are-- You know, to minimize any kind of housing crunch they would have to live and work in the city.

Lavezzo: Yeah. Thank you.

Stucker: You're welcome.

Turmail: Richard, you have some questions?

Pollock: I have a couple questions, yes. So, first of all, you said that originally I know that there was a hope by the Mayor that by July 15th there could actually be a vote. I heard from you that on the July 28th and 29th there'll be public hearings, one for the public and one for the council. And Councilmember Mendelson, the chair, has said that he thinks that the earliest that the council could reasonably vote on this would be September. Is the Mayor now accepting the idea that it's going to be a September vote?

Stucker: I don't want to speak for the Mayor, but we're trying to have a vote as soon as possible. So, I mean, I think discussions are ongoing with the council on when the vote would occur. But we're trying as much as possible to answer questions from the council. I know the Commanders are engaged with the council. There's engagement with the community on the questions that council would have to make them feel comfortable to take a vote. So, it's a continual process that we hope occurs as soon as possible. And just, Commissioner, if I could, just you mentioned the 28th, 29th. Actually, the hearing is the 29th and the 30th, just for folks who are listening.

Pollock: Right. So, the council has indicated they're going to go on recess in August, and they're going to reconvene in September. So, it seems to me that there can't be a vote on August 1. I don't know what day of the week that is, but it can't be a vote. It's unlikely that there would be a vote in August. It probably will be in September. Is that right?

Stucker: I'm not sure. I don't want to speculate on when it would occur. We're trying to have a vote as soon as possible. And it's the council's directive. So, I would recommend, you know, speaking with the councilmembers and the chair, chairman, on when a vote would be. I don't want to speak for them on when they would anticipate taking a vote.

Pollock: Okay. I have a couple of different questions about the payment to the city by the Commanders. My understanding is the Commanders will pay the city \$5 a year for the use in terms of taxes for the stadium. Is that correct?

Stucker: All of the financial information is in the legislation that's before the council. So nothing is set right now. That framework is-- What the council had done is this transaction was part of the Budget Support Act initially, as the Mayor's proposed Budget Support Act. The council removed the transaction from the Budget Support Act as standalone legislation. So the council is moving on two tracks. They're moving on approving the BSA, Budget Support Act, excuse me. And they're also then looking at the transaction as a standalone measure with the hearings on the 29th and 30th. So as that proceeds, those elements of the transaction will be discussed with, you know, we'll get testimony from the community. Council will take action on the terms of the deal.

Pollock: Yeah. You listed \$181 million for Events DC parking. Will Events DC be paying any taxes to the city for the revenue that they get when they rent out these parking spaces?

Stucker: I don't know the answer to that question. Events DC is an instrumentality of the city. So I don't know if Events DC, I can find out if they would actually pay tax as instrumentality.

Pollock: Let me put it a different way. Will the city get revenue from the sale of beverages, beer, food, and parking from the RFK premises?

Stucker: I don't know the answer to that off the top of my head. Let me get back to you on that answer.

Pollock: Okay. Because my understanding, at least in reading it, the city will get nothing in terms of tax revenue from those, the sales of those under the proposal that I've seen.

Stucker: And, Commissioner, you mentioned beverages and two other things. What were the other two words? Just so I have it clear.

Pollock: Food and parking.

Stucker: Food and parking. Got it. Thank you.

Pollock: Okay. Now, I want to follow up with Kevin. I mean, do we have any set estimate about how many apartments among the 6,400 will be sold for \$1 million or more? Do we have-- Has your analysis looked at that and come up with any information about that?

Stucker: No, we don't. I mean, a lot of the pricing for the units depends on the ultimate size of the housing. You know, the smaller units will fetch less. Through our administrative jurisdiction from the Park Service, it's a limited duration. It's a 99 year with renewal for the administrative jurisdiction. So the housing that will be created will be rental housing on the site. It will not be for sale housing because the city does not own underlying fee interest. So when we're looking at the housing across the site, it'll be rental. So, we won't have million-dollar sales. It'll be rents for the units.

Pollock: Have you done an analysis of how many rents will be, you know, for millionaires?

Stucker: That's a very subjective question. But we can-- Let me see what information we have that we could share on those assumptions. I mean, there will be a process to go through to seek approval and a master planning process that will commence through the Office of Planning on the site. So, the heights of the buildings, the densities, the streets, all that needs to be planned to accommodate a new development. So, I think there's lots of questions that we're going to have to start with the big questions of, you know, what are the roadways looking like within RFK? Where will the buildings be? Where will the recreation open space be? So, we're at the stage now of really planning the overall site. And as we get closer to each building and know when those buildings will deliver, we'll see what the market would bear for those buildings, and go from there.

Pollock: Well, the reason I'm raising it is because the city's claiming that they're going to get a large amount of revenue from the taxes of those accommodations, of those residential units. So, I assume you have some assessment about what the level of leasing fees are going to look like, and how many are going to be at certain types of levels. Don't you have that information?

Stucker: We have certain assumptions on rental rates that are generally garnered in the city. I mean, the benefit of having a resident is that not only do you have the rental income to the ultimate landlord, you also have, if they're moving from Maryland or Virginia, now there's also income taxes that are being received from that resident. So, the taxes, it's a bigger question in terms of overall tax benefit the city achieves by having new residents in those units as well. What I can do is see what we have that answers that question, specifically to the rental rates that you're asking.

Pollock: This is my last question, which I know my other commissioners will be sighing a sense of relief. And that is on the-- About 500 million of it's going to be financed by the sale of municipal bonds, right?

Stucker: Yes.

Pollock: And so in the financial calculations, have you put down-- Right now it's believed to be a municipal bond for this is about 4.75% interest to the bond holders. Have you figured out what the city's going to have to pay in interest over the, I don't know, 10, 20, 30 years? Now, Greater Greater Washington has done an estimate, and I don't know whether this is fiction or not, but they say that the out of payment for the city to the bond holders will be between 623 million, or 962 million, almost a billion dollars. That's not listed in sort of like the overall price tag. What can you say about that?

Stucker: Well, I point to an example at The Wharf. So, with The Wharf, we invested \$200 million in the infrastructure for The Wharf. You may have seen the news recently. We were able to pay off those bonds, I believe it was 10 or 15 years early, because the project overperformed. So, it's a question-- I mean, that sort of helps-- Any developer looks at risk, right? They're looking at, you know, is this investment worth it? And I think what we're doing as a city is proving, through The Wharf and other developments, that the city is a waterfront community. That this is an opportunity for folks to gain access to the water, similar to The Wharf. And people want to be on the water. I mean, The Wharf is a smashing success for the city. But we're looking to sort of use that use case here at RFK. So I don't have the numbers for you right now in terms of percentage, interest rate, or the assumptions in terms of annual cost to the District to have those, that capital outlay. But I can say that if The Wharf is an example, it was a very good investment for the city in the very short term in that we were able to pay the bonds off early.

Pollock: Okay. Thank you.

Stucker: You're welcome.

Turmail: I just have a couple of questions if I may, Gilles. Maybe I missed this. Where does the National Guard go? Where does the Armory go?

Stucker: The Armory stays. The Armory is not part of the RFK campus.

Turmail: Okay. And then my other question is you mentioned that the District has long been trying to redevelop or develop the parcel of land known as Hill East. I assume that's roughly the site of the old DC General Hospital. But that it's struggled because of a lack of kind of an anchor tenant. I'm not sure if you said the word anchor tenant, or if I just made that up.

Stucker: It is. Yeah, you're good. Yep.

Turmail: What's the difference between that parcel of land on the Anacostia, where it's a waterfront access, and The Wharf, which has been a smashing success, but doesn't have a large-- I mean, I don't think people are going there because of Audi Field. The Wharf was developed I think before Audi Field was open. Why is The Wharf so successful without an anchor tenant, but yet we don't, we're pretty sure that we won't be successful with Hill East and the stadium district or whatever without the RFK stadium?

Stucker: I think part of the reason why The Wharf is-- There's many reasons why The Wharf is successful. I think it's the city's investment into the infrastructure to make it work. So, the financials worked for the developer. I think it's close to the downtown core. You can easily get to downtown. We have major, there's a few law firms, and other big users that have anchored in The Wharf. So not as with the overall building, but many floors have been occupied by anchor tenants. I think The Wharf also did an amazing job in, initially The Wharf was going to be delivered in three phases. It truncated it down into two phases and delivered, in each phase, multiple buildings. So I think it's also how you deliver the property. So what we're looking at with the RFK stadium is not just delivering a stadium on its own. What we're looking at is delivering the stadium with housing, with commercial, with the sports plex all at once. So people see RFK campus as an area where you want to be, not just to go to a Commanders game or the many other large acts that want to be in the city, but just don't have the space. You know, the big acts like-- I don't go to big acts, but like a Beyonce or a Taylor Swift or those big acts, they don't go to Nationals Park. They go to Landover, they go up to Baltimore. So, we're looking-- If you have those big acts, then people with the delivery of the larger development, people stay as a community, and that drives interest. It drives occupancy. When projects deliver, when the different vertical buildings deliver, and it will-- You know, Nationals Park is the example that I think goes to that as well, is when you have that anchor in a new area of town, people wanted to be next to an anchor as well.

Turmail: Why don't we open up, in the interest of time, open up to any questions from the community, because we still have to get to our resolution. But let's just see if there were any questions from the community.

Stucker: I did see a comment about Springsteen loves Nats Park.

Turmail: I'm still a little bitter, because we had tickets to see Billy Joel and Sting at Nats Park, which unfortunately got cancelled because of Billy Joel's illness. Anyway, are there any questions from the community?

Estrada: Yes. Hi, this is Jason Estrada. Hopefully, I'm coming through. Perfect.

Turmail: You're coming through great, Jason. Go for it.

Estrada: My question, I have two questions. One, on one of the slides, it looks like the city is estimated to get upwards of \$2 billion, I'm sorry, \$20 billion. \$20 billion as a result of the stadium, which I am for, but I'm curious of where that \$20 billion dollar comes in. Is that the estimate over 30 years like we had talked about for potential bonds, or is it the estimate over 5 years? And so the second part of that question is, of those \$20 billion that we're expected to get, are any of those funds earmarked for continued housing, for continued WMATA so that it's not just reinvested into general funds? Over.

Stucker: Got it. The number, in terms of the number of years that that amount of revenue, it was 2.4 billion in total taxes. Is that what you're talking about, Jason? Or the 5.1 billion-- One of the two?

Estrada: You had 14 billion, 14.8 billion in direct, and then the other five in indirect.

Stucker: Yep. So we have a study that laid out all those amounts, and the years in which, and all the assumptions that went into those numbers. And what I'll do is I think there was a question on that already. I'll make sure that you guys have a direct link to that information so you can see how those numbers were created. I'm not an economist, and I don't do that work, so I don't want to mess up or misstate the assumptions that went into that number.

Estrada: Would it be fair to say that those, that information is on the ourrfk.dc.gov?

Stucker: It might be on our Deputy Mayor's website. So, let me get that. Let me find out where that's located, and I will make sure to get it back to the ANC, the direct location.

Estrada: Thank you. Over.

Turmail: Thank you, Jason. Other questions or comments?

Estrada: Well, just to follow up on that second part of the question. I'm sorry. The second part was, are any of those dollars earmarked?

Stucker: Not that I'm aware.

Estrada: Okay. I will be sure to voice that in the public opinion so that we make sure to save some of those funds for the offsets that we're looking to improve in that area. Thank you.

Turmail: Great. Thank you, Jason. Other comments or questions? If not, why don't I hand things over to Commissioner Howie and maybe you can tell us a little bit about your resolution, and we can go from there.

Hoie: Oh, I mean, my resolution is to vote in favor of this deal, and encouraging the council to vote in favor of the Mayor's deal. Do I need to talk about it more? Do you want me to read it?

Turmail: No, I would just, I just want to clarify that I think Commissioner Howie is underselling her resolution a little bit. She has written a resolution and circulated among the commission that does state our support as an ANC, if we approve it, for the RFK, for proceeding with the plan to redevelop the land at RFK. It does not specify a specific timeline. Because we wanted to be, we heard from our Councilmember Frumin in our last meeting, and he had gone into some detail about the council's desire to learn some more financial information about the deal. And we didn't want to limit the District council's ability to do its due diligence with this, and I think the resolution leaves everyone with the freedom to kind of proceed. It makes it clear that we'd like to see the stadium built, but we don't want to get into the details of exactly how we get there. And Gupi, if I've got that wrong, please feel free to correct.

Howie: Nope, perfect.

Turmail: Gotcha.

Howie: You're much better at public speaking.

Turmail: Some days. Some days, I'm awful. Are there any questions or concerns from the commission? And I do not believe this will be a unanimous vote as we vote. Which is absolutely cool.

Stucker: And if I could, Commissioner, I think to Jason's last comment, I think you need to really look at the legislation that's pending before the council, because that outlines the financial transaction with the Commanders. So that will provide all of the information in terms of the contribution and how taxes will be considered.

Turmail: All right. I'm going to infer, Jason, that your thumbs up is not a hands up. But, Carol, I see your hand is up.

Vilsack: Hi. Is that resolution available on our ANC website?

Lane: It will be once it's voted on.

Vilsack: Okay.

Turmail: And I can assure you, Carol, that all the commissioners have had a chance to see it and review it.

Vilsack: Yay.

Turmail: Thank you. All right. Questions, comments from fellow commissioners about the resolution? Or from the community? Go ahead, Richard, please.

Pollock: Yeah, I see this as an aspirational resolution. There aren't that many conditions, although I think that there are some hopes for it. And so I don't see it as supporting the specific proposal that the city has proposed, but rather we hope that this could actually be something very good for the city. Gupi, am I saying that right, Commissioner?

Howie: Yeah.

Turmail: Yeah. I think that's-- I would agree, Richard. I do think that we don't-- We were deliberate not to say-- We'd like to see the stadium developed. We'd like to see that land redeveloped, and we'd like to see the economic benefits that come with it, but I don't think we want to micromanage the process that the Mayor's office and the council are both engaged in. And we'd like to see something, ultimately, that is beneficial to the District of Columbia. As beneficial as possible.

Rodriguez: Totally agree with you. It's just that it's how they get there on their own accord, but we support them making that happen.

Turmail: Yeah. And I would say that-- Oh, I'm sorry, Gupi. Go ahead. You were about to say something.

Howie: I just wanted to say, let's vote.

Turmail: Okay. I was just going to say before we vote, that I mean, a little-- In a different way than our prior vote that I think this is a difficult one because there are a lot of emotions associated with what could potentially be a significant investment in the District, and gets to some people questions about, "Is this the best use of our public resources?" And so I totally understand and appreciate that. With that, I would make a motion that we vote in favor of Commissioner Howie's resolution in support of the RFK Stadium. Is there a second?

Howie: Second.

Turmail: All in favor say, "aye," or raise your hand.

Commissioners: Aye.

Turmail: And anyone who's opposed say, "nay" and raise your hand. I guess you would say, "nay." Or raise your hand. Fair enough. All right. Thank you all. Gilles, thank you so much for spending time with us and answering our questions, and we certainly look forward to some of the follow-ups that you've promised us. And I assume the best way for us to do that is just distribute your answers or post them somewhere on the website. But I'm looking at Melissa to see if we can do that.

Lane: Yeah, we can do that.

Howie: Brian, can you state if it passed, like how many in favor, how many against, just so it's like in the transcript?

Turmail: Five for, one against.

Howie: Five four, one against. Okay.

Turmail: I hope my math is right. Yes. So, this is why I ended up as a flack for a living and nothing else because math has always been a tough one for me. But I'm pretty sure it was 5-1. All right.

Stucker: Thank you, Commissioners, for allowing me to present tonight.

Turmail: Thank you, Gilles. Appreciate it. We will keep our fingers crossed that we get a final and successful stadium that everyone can agree on, and that that area is successfully redeveloped. Good luck.

Updates and Information [1:30:40]

Turmail: With that, we do have-- I don't know if we have any updates planned, but I'm going to say, do any of the commissioners have any updates or information, or-- Rob, you have one? Please.

Rodriguez: Just a quick, yeah, quick hot topic in 30B6. We've had that water leak in front of Sutton Tower, Sutton Place, for nearly a year and a half now. So, still working with DC Water. A lot of the constituents in the area have voiced a lot of opinions because it's still leaking on New Mexico right at the 3100 block. So, still just dealing with that with the residents, and also working with DC Water. They've been a little uncooperative and a little aloof in trying to get me a project manager, but that's being handled, you know, internally within the SMD. But just to put that out there so the residents know it's being worked on.

Turmail: And Rob, in our September meeting, if we need to, you know, put together a resolution

urging DC Water to move faster, do let us know. Obviously, I think we're all sympathetic.

Rodriguez: It might be helpful, so yeah. We'll discuss, and it might go that direction because it's been a lot of foot dragging.

Turmail: I guess the better way to put it would be we're happy to help however we can so that you're not just fighting this on the SMD level.

Lane: We can ask them to attend the meeting, too.

Rodriguez: Yeah, yeah. And I think that might be helpful. So, we're nearing that point.

Turmail: Okay. Yeah, that seems like a long time. And it can't be good for the road or the substructure of the road.

Rodriguez: Yeah. Started February of '24. So, we're there. Thanks.

Turmail: Oh, my gosh. You bet. Anything else?

Open Forum [1:32:11]

Turmail: If not, I'm going to hand it over to the open forum. Anyone in the community who's hung with us for the last 93 minutes have anything they wanted to share, or an update, or concern? Okay, they are just hanging on because they want to hear the best part of the meeting, which is the approval of our minutes and the financial-- Oh, I'm sorry, Heidi. You had your hand up.

Yacker: I do. I just, I can't figure out how to do it. I always, I think I know how to do it, and then I--

Turmail: You're preaching to the choir here, Heidi. You're preaching to the choir.

Yacker: I just had a question. I noticed that it's always saying, like right now, it says that this meeting is being recorded. Are these recordings put up anywhere that we can listen to it if we miss the meeting?

Lane: No, the transcripts will be available.

Yacker: Yeah, but they're not available till actually like after the meeting?

Lane: Right, once we vote on them.

Yacker: Where's the transcript? The transcript of the meeting?

Lane: The transcripts of the meetings are on the ANC website.

Yacker: Okay. And they're up there reasonably quickly?

Lane: They're up there as soon as we vote on them. So, right now I will put up June tonight.

Yacker: Yeah. See, so that doesn't help me. Because I write a newsletter, or I'm one of the people that writes a newsletter for our building. And I also report at our condo meeting, and that is at the-- That's coming up next week.

Turmail: Which building, Heidi, if I may ask? Which building, if I may ask?

Yacker: 4100 Cathedral West.

Turmail: Gotcha. Okay. It's a good technical question--

Lane: I don't think we'll have the transcript by next week anyway.

Turmail: So, Kendall has her hand up and maybe I'm hoping she's gonna come to our rescue.

Yacker: Well, it would be helpful if the transcript could be up. I'm sorry, what did you say?

Turmail: I said Kendall Gibson, who is a MOCR, which stands for something, but basically she's one of the people who works for the Mayor has her hand up. And the Zoom system we use is a District Zoom system. So, maybe Kendall has an answer here for us.

Gibson: Hi, Heidi. Sorry, I have COVID, so my voice is like dead. But I come to every meeting, and I take notes for every meeting just for my records. I used to be a notetaker in college for people that had accommodations. So, I think I take pretty good notes. If you can't come to a meeting, I'm happy to send you my notes.

Yacker: Oh, that would be fabulous. That would be fab.

Turmail: Look at this. All right. That wasn't the-- I didn't think that was the answer, I didn't know that was an answer that I was expecting, but that's a great answer if that works for everyone. Thank you. And we do hope you feel better. And we do hope you feel better.

Lane: Thank you, Kendall.

Gibson: Thanks.

Yacker: And so, how would I get those?

Gibson: Could I have-- Could you put in the chat your email, and I'll just take that down? And I'll send you an email. And if you ever can't come to a meeting, you can just email me saying, "Hey, I'm not able to come to the meeting and I remembered you offered that you would send me notes," and I will send you the notes.

Yacker: Okay. Thank you so, so much.

Gibson: Yeah, my pleasure.

Turmail: Kendall rocks. Any other updates? Did we get you taken care of, Heidi?

Turmail: Wonderful.

Administrative Matters [1:35:20]

Turmail: Okay, we're going to go on to the approval of the June 2025 minutes, which also I guess will then trigger the placement of the transcript, which is the sort of the-- I think the Zoom converts our meeting into a transcript. But Melissa has put together the minutes, has circulated them among the commissioners. We've all had a chance to review and weigh in on the minutes, and I would make a motion that we approve the June 2025 ANC 3B minutes. Is there a second? All in favor say, "aye."

Commissioners: Aye.

Turmail: Any opposed? Anyone opposed? Okay. And then we have both the June monthly financial report, and the third quarter QFR. What is it? The QFR report. I'll get it eventually. By the time I'm done with this term, maybe I'll get it, Kevin.

Lavezzo: It's the most riveting part of our meetings. I'm sure it's what everyone sticks around for. June, we had no change in balance. We had no checks cashed, no deposits. We started the month with \$43,074.62. And we ended the month with the same amount. For our fiscal year 2025, quarter three quarterly financial report, we received our allotment of \$3,985.21 for that quarter. We spent \$121 on communications, \$121.56. We issued \$6,000 worth of grants during that quarter. We started with \$42,210.97, and we ended with \$43,074.62. And does anyone have questions?

Turmail: From commissioners or the community? Thank you, Kevin, for keeping on top of the numbers. Do we need--

Lavezzo: We just need to do a quick vote and we're good.

Turmail: We're going to vote to approve the third quarter QFR with the financial report.

Lavezzo: The fiscal year 2025 quarter three quarterly financial report.

Turmail: Thank you, Kevin. I would make a motion that we approve the report.

Rodriguez: Second.

Turmail: I see a second. All in favor say, "aye," or raise your hand.

Howie: Aye.

Turmail: Anyone opposed? Wonderful. With that, our next meeting, we will take August off, which means our next meeting will be September 11th. Thursday, September 11th, at 7:00 p.m. We will distribute the agenda in advance of that meeting. And I would make a motion that we adjourn tonight's meeting.

Howie: Second.

Turmail: All in favor say, "aye." And as I've said before, anyone who's opposed can stick around. May everyone stay safe. Kendall, we hope you feel better. Thanks, everyone, for hanging with us and enjoy your rest of your summer. Cheers.