Summary of Workshop 1: Goals and Objectives

Held on Wednesday, February 24, 2010
Van Ness Elementary School Auditorium
6 PM – 8 PM

Bruce Jackson, Headquarters Marine Corps, welcomed participants to the meeting and provided general background on what prompted the Community Integrated Master Plan (CIMP) effort. He stated that the intent is for the plan to realize partnerships and community/stakeholder involvement in a broad and comprehensive manner. He encouraged ongoing participation as essential for the success of the planning effort.

A brief presentation was given that provided additional background information about the CIMP. The CIMP was defined as a first-of-its-kind planning tool, constructed from other planning tools and techniques, which recognizes community and stakeholder involvement as paramount. The CIMP is the result of a transparent planning process and evaluates options for community-military planning and development partnering. The location and functions served at the current Marine Barracks Washington properties were presented. The initial drivers for the CIMP are security and space deficiencies at Building 20, a Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (BEQ) Barracks; the CIMP takes a broader look and endeavors to develop a plan that links military and community needs into a comprehensive package to carry forward through approval and funding process.

Actions taken on the planning process to date include the development of a Community Leadership Group (CLG) that will continue to meet on a monthly basis; definition of the Marine Barracks space requirements; listing and prioritization of potential community-military partnering projects; stakeholder interviews; an open house meeting held on January 27, 2010; and establishment of a project website, www.sedistrictcimp.com.

A broad initial study area has been established based on the boundaries of Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANC's) 6B and 6D. Four initial candidate sites for a new BEQ barracks have been identified: Square 882 south of the existing Annex facility, the northeast corner of Washington Navy Yard, Tyler Elementary/adjacent ballfield, and Potomac Gardens Public Housing. An overview of community input received to date was provided and it was noted that there was a misperception that the Marine Corps had made a decision to buy Potomac Gardens; no such decision has been made – Potomac Gardens is just one initial candidate site based on the initial siting criteria. Additional BEQ sites are expected to evolve

from the process as it moves forward. The planning process will include additional workshops in March, April, and May and a charrette in September with final planning documents submitted for approvals by the end of the year

Next, the draft vision and goals were presented and stakeholder participants were asked to provide input. This was followed by the formation of four breakout groups, each included workshop attendees and a technical representative that focused on providing input on one goal and the underlying set of objectives. The below summarizes input received on the vision, goals, and objectives. Additional dialogue not directly related to the vision, goals, and objectives is summarized under the heading "Other Open Discussion."

Vision

The draft vision statement as reviewed:

> *The Community Integrated Master Plan envisions a vibrant neighborhood that continues to be shaped, in part, by the 200+ year shared history with the Marine Barracks; enriches the lives and better serves the area's residents, workers, and visitors; links the area to surrounding neighborhoods; and embodies an urban form and character that strengthens southeast Washington/Capitol Hill with enduring values, livability, economic viability, and environmental sustainability.*

Comments received on the Vision Statement:

- The statement does not specifically mention accommodation of the security and space needs of the Marine Corps.
- Does the vision need to have a timeline associated with it? (See related notes under the "Other Open Discussion" heading).
- The phrase "urban form and character" seems to be jargon – what does it really mean? Also, the Marines security setback requirements may not be consistent with the term "urban".
- The vision does not incorporate the opportunity presented by the first-of-its kind effort that has a potential to serve as a model for other efforts.

Goal 1

Draft Goal 1 as reviewed:

> *Guide development to preserve and enhance surrounding neighborhoods, ensure there are common / open spaces and historic landmarks; upgrade under-developed areas and provide balanced mixed-use that serves residents, businesses, workers, and visitors.*

Comments received on draft Goal 1:

- The goal should be more Marine Corps "centric" in recognition that the driver for the plan is the need for a new barracks.
- This goal should be revisited at a later date to make sure that it is still appropriate with respect to projects that move forward in the CIMP, security setbacks and desire to not close off areas, and joint use.

Draft objectives for Goal 1 as reviewed:

a. *Use the community involvement process to identify projects and initiatives that satisfy both community and military needs.*
b. *Maximize the level of influence of the Community Leadership Group on the planning process, on the CIMP, and on resulting project implementation.*
c. *Reach out to the community to ensure their maximum involvement.*
d. *Foster enduring Marine Corps-community enrichment programs.*
e. *Identify potential development partnerships early in the process and develop them in plan recommendations and implementation strategies.*

Comments on draft Goal 1 objectives:

- Use community input to quantify community needs as well as identify them.
- This goal should be revisited at a later date to make sure that it is still appropriate with respect to projects that move forward in the CIMP, security setbacks and desire to not close of areas, and maximized joint use.

Goal 2

Draft Goal 2 as reviewed:

Guide development to preserve and enhance surrounding neighborhoods, ensure there are common / open spaces and historic landmarks; upgrade under-developed areas and provide balanced mixed-use that serves residents, businesses, workers, and visitors.

Comments received on draft Goal 2:

- Seems like a good goal.
- Incorporate language that captures that these measures are to be taken when/if appropriate.
- What are under-developed areas – how are they defined/who decides what is considered under-developed?
- Goal 2 is dependent on Goal 1.

Draft objectives for Goal 2 as reviewed:

a. *Ensure smart growth and urban design principles such as maintaining a walkable street grid are incorporated into planning and design, including preservation of historic buildings and facades.*
b. *Be cognizant of both current and future planned land uses and zoning regulations.*
c. *Ensure that plans for public buildings and spaces creatively satisfy physical security requirements while maintaining the vitality of the public realm and human scale.*
d. *Adhere to the comprehensive plans (both Federal and local) for the District.*
e. *Respect and incorporate neighborhood urban design goals in the CIMP.*
f. *Incorporate transit-oriented development to encourage non-auto transportation, such as supporting pedestrian-oriented and bicycle-friendly development, and concentrating more intense development near existing high-capacity transportation facilities.*

Comments on draft Goal 2 objectives:

- With respect to urban design, there is an opportunity to set precedent with development of creative solutions to address security requirements.
- Simplify the language and use real examples.
- Capture that with the need for security understood, there is still a desire for new facilities to fit into the neighborhood.
- Present an overall picture of current and ongoing plans.
- Objective B – "Cognizant" is not strong enough word, use a more "active" word (i.e. integrate). Make sure thought is put into the current/planned transportation changes and finding the right balance of land use in surrounding area.
- Objective C – What is a public building? Remove the word 'public'; the word public is too limiting. A lot of confusion over this objective and the overall intention.
- Objective D – The sentence is too wordy and needs to be simplified and reworded.
- Objective E – This is a repeat of Objective A, include working with neighborhood about design goals, which will differ dependent upon site selection.

Goal 3

Draft Goal 3 as reviewed:

Encourage wise investment and development that addresses both economic health and social vitality for people who live, work, or visit the area.

Comments received on draft Goal 3:

- General agreement that Goal 3 is good and does not need major changes.
- Place emphasis on those that live in the area. Those who work in and visit the area shouldn't be assigned the same "priority." Residents (to include the Marines) should be the focus/emphasis.
- Recognize that the Navy Yard and Marine Barracks is a "unique" neighborhood anchor and the new development plan should address and compliment that uniqueness.
- General agreement that the project would be a "wise investment." Wise investment is an important consideration, particularly with regard to the initially identified Potomac Gardens as a candidate for a new BEQ barracks site as alternative housing would need to be provided for current residents.
- Engage the residents of Potomac Gardens for input.
- A discussion of economic health and social vitality potential as it relates to the CIMP is captured in the related notes under the "Other Open Discussion" heading.

Draft objectives for Goal 3 as reviewed:

a. *Incorporate positive public attractions, inviting and pedestrian-friendly settings, and green spaces into the project development.*
b. *Develop creative solutions that respond to existing market conditions, increase retail opportunities, incorporate local job creation, and stimulate and shape the market in a manner that provides long-term stability.*
c. *Mix public and private use (i.e. live/work), functions, personnel, and programs.*

Comments on draft Goal 3 objectives:

- Clarification that the CIMP proposed projects would include several initiatives.
- Shared use of some functions could aid local economy and society and provide opportunities for Navy Yard workforce requirements.
- See notes on economic health and social vitality under the "Other Open Discussion" heading.

Goal 4

Draft Goal 4 as reviewed:

Address sustainability with high performance planning, design, and construction along with sound environmental management, operation, maintenance, and disposal of facilities and infrastructure.

Comments received on draft Goal 4:

- With respect to "disposal," there was a question whether the CIMP will address follow-on use for Building 20. The CIMP will address reuse options for BEQ Building 20. See related notes under the "Other Open Discussion" heading.
- Terms such as sustainable and disposable were not viewed positively.
- It was suggested that the goal be rewritten in terms people would understand as follows:

  To minimize environmental impact and maximize flexibility of structures with broad planning, careful design and high quality construction along with sound environmental management, operation, maintenance, and disposition or adaptation of facilities and infrastructure.

Draft objectives for Goal 4 as reviewed:

a. *Require a minimum of 50% of CIMP projects to attain Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver certification.*
b. *Maximize natural features in open space and incorporate sustainable urban landscaping and green spaces (parks, community gardens, etc).*
c. *Minimize the physical and visual impact of private vehicle parking on the neighborhood.*

Comments on draft Goal 4 objectives:

Objectives A through C all address construction; add Objective D to address site selection. Suggested text for Objective D – broaden look at sites to achieve Goal 4.

Other Open Discussion

- **Timeline**

  What is the timeline for the CIMP and how that would work in terms of partnerships and CIMP updates? The CIMP at hand is focused on current development needs of the Marine Barracks and the community. The timeline for the CIMP development is to have something developed by fall-winter 2010; the schedule forward is tied to the approval process, which can be unpredictable. The timeline for the implementation will be

established in the CIMP. Post-implementation, there would be a need to address long-term joint use issues and updates to the CIMP. As the CIMP is the first plan of its kind, the periodic update process has not yet been established, but the CIMP updates would occur on an as-needed basis and would also incorporate community/stakeholder involvement throughout the life of the process.

- **Distance between 8th & I and new barracks**
  There was discussion regarding the desired distance between the Marine Barracks and the new barracks facility. The initial radii for siting a new barracks were drawn out to 2,000 feet from the center of 8th & I, as that is the hub of mission activities. There are diminishing returns the farther that Marines are housed from 8th & I, particularly with regard to response time for security contingency operations, every day operations to include the need for the Marines to change uniforms several times and carrying musical instruments and weapons. The 2,000-foot initial distance is not a hard criterion, but was used initially because it generally represents a reasonable walking distance.

- **Could the Marine Barracks be located elsewhere?**
  There was discussion of whether or not the Marine Barracks could be relocated out of the neighborhood entirely. Marine Barracks Washington mission execution, including special security and presidential support duties is location dependent and there are strategic interests with proximity to the White House. Part of this discussion concerned antiterrorism/force protection measures and questions of BEQ barracks vulnerability to attack and if it is appropriate to have one located in a neighborhood. It was pointed out that the BEQ barracks (Building 20) is already in the neighborhood and does not meet antiterrorism/force protection standards. Moving these Marines from Building 20 to a facility that meets those standards would benefit the security of the Marines and the neighborhood as it eliminates the current security risks . It was noted that the presence of Marines in neighborhood is desirable and a positive thing; they are great neighbors and provide a sense of neighborhood safety and security.

  A related question was: could the parade field at 8th & I be developed and parades moved to RFK stadium? There is a lot of legacy and tradition at 8th and I; the parades are part of that legacy and tradition and historic preservation concerns would likely preclude development of the parade field. The costs to relocate the entire facility would also have to compete with the costs to maintain at its current location. Financial accounting to the taxpayer for “best value” decisions weigh heavily in military decision making for facility acquisitions.

- **Who is the decision maker?**
  The intent is for the results of the planning process to reflect mutual agreement of and partnerships between the Marine Corps and stakeholders. Decisions affecting the Marine Corps funding ultimately can only be made by the Marine Corps.

- **Size and configuration of the new barracks**
  The space requirement for the new barracks is 116,000 square feet; 150,000 square feet has been used as an initial round planning number to include some other Marine Corps support space requirements that could be co-located with a new BEQ barracks facility (these other requirements also could be met at a separate site). Ideally, the Marine Corps would prefer the new BEQ barracks to be co-located with its support facilities at one site. There would be financial, operational and unit cohesion benefits to co-location with existing Marine Barracks Washington properties. However, there are a variety of options that will be explored together with the community during the planning process to ensure all options are comprehensively addressed.

- **Security setback requirements for barracks**
  Concerns were voiced about the setback requirement for the barracks. The Marine Barracks Washington Annex facility seems to be setback quite far, which is not consistent with the setting on 8th St north of the Southeast Freeway. There is concern about the aesthetics of a "fortress" type facility with fencing and lack of access. The process will acknowledge the importance of keeping with the feel of the community and examine multiple options to incorporate urban design standards into the setback requirements. The Department of Transportation facility on M Street is a good example of how setbacks are integrated with the urban design. Some voiced that they do not want to see street closures. Some residents feel that the area inside a fenced area is "Marine land" and they could never go there. There was discussion of providing security passes and access for neighbors. Some uses, such as retail, need to be separated from the barracks.

- **Security setbacks for other facilities**
  Additional information on setback requirements for other types of facilities (i.e., non-barracks facilities) was requested. National Capital Planning Commission has been working with government agencies to find creative ways to meet security requirements and still have livable spaces, but has had limited success so far. There was some discussion about flexibility in the setback criteria with mixed opinions: some feeling that there may be room for leeway with creative solutions and others feeling that the criteria are rigid and must be met.

- **Identification of unmet needs of the community**
  Shortfalls in meeting community needs should be identified and quantified. The following points were noted by participants.
  - There is a need for additional green space (including vegetable gardens) for people to meet and socialize.
  - There is no need for a community center.
  - There is a need for new utilities.
  - There is a need to improve the 8th St. underpass of the Southeast Freeway for pedestrians. There are plans for adding a mural to the underpass that have already been approved, but more could be done.

- The need for a fire station in the community should be validated; there are plans for a new fire station in SW (on 4th/6th and E Sts.). Also, siting of a fire station needs to be planned so that residents are not impacted.
- Community interest in the Potomac Gardens site for the new barracks.
- One role of the Community Leadership Group should be to identify these needs.

- **Potential Development Sites**

  Many participants were eager to get to the next workshop where potential development sites will be discussed in more detail. The following was noted:
  - It would be helpful to see a list of available properties – at least 10 sites.
  - What is the status/future plan for Van Ness Elementary?
  - Density is greater with fewer available sites in immediate proximity to Marine Barracks Washington so there are fewer opportunities.
  - Once the potential development sites are identified, we can better address how we get to a win-win siting solution.
  - Consider the International Graduate School/Safeway block on 13th/14th St. SE. Could adapt this site for a multi-story Safeway and mixed grocery with other uses.
  - There will be a "leapfrogging" effect as the uses for potential development sites are discussed.
  - The Federal government could use eminent domain, but that is the last possible option and no one has suggested using it – the CIMP takes a different approach in hopes of avoiding condemnation.
  - Are there any uses that could be bumped out of the Navy Yard? The Navy Yard is already maxed out on space. The Navy Yard workforce in increasing by approximately 3,500 and workspace will largely be needed in the neighborhood due to built-out conditions within the Yard. Some facilities could potentially be relocated in the community that would increase Navy Yard space for operational needs.
  - There is more open land to the south of the Southeast Freeway than to the north; the study should look for more opportunities there.

- **Parking**

  A few different issues related to parking were discussed. Overall, the District and the neighborhood plan for increased use of non-motorized transport. There is added parking stress during Nationals ballgames and Friday parades at the Marine Barracks. The additional Navy Yard workforce arriving over the next five years will add parking demand. There were questions about how the parking displaced by development of Square 882 will be accommodated. The businesses along 8th Street and other businesses that may locate in the area need to accommodate parking demand. For Nationals ballgames, the option for parking at RFK stadium and taking shuttle busses to Nationals Stadium has been discontinued for the 2010 season.

- **Economic Health and Social Vitality**
  Project construction could be really good for the community or oppressive if too much becomes enclosed (scale of large building(s) vs. townhouses).The need for the 82-foot standoff for a barracks facility will take up a lot of space, but it could be considered green space, if treated properly. The possibility that neighbors could be given access to buffer zones for use as parks/gardens with proper security measures was discussed. It was noted that it would be great if Barracks Row development could be extended all the way down 8th Street to the Washington Navy Yard (i.e., more local shops, restaurants, etc.) The trend of increase in density of development in the area without addressing transportation, parking, public transportation, lack of parks and recreation, etc. decreases livability.