5 REFERENCES


This page intentionally left blank.
6 LIST OF PREPARERS

Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20317

Timothy Cox
Chief Operating Officer
Joseph Woo
Architect
Donald Dailey
Junior Project Manager

Steven G. McManus
Chief Financial Officer
Judy Mayfield
Office of the Chief Operating Officer

U. S. General Services Administration
National Capitol Region
301 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20407

Nancy Czapek
Director, Property Disposal Division
Victoria Hartke
Director, Property Disposal Division
Gary Porter
Historic Preservation Lead
Amy Hecker
Asset Manager

Tim Sheckler
Project Manager
Denise Decker
NEPA Team Lead
Suzy Hill
NEPA Team Lead

The Staubach Company
575 7th Street, NW Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004

Pamela Wessling
Senior Vice President
Patricia Restrepo
Senior Associate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Vroman</td>
<td>Senior Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenhorne &amp; O'Mara, Inc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9001 Edmonston Avenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Greenbelt, MD 20770</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Joan Glynn</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>B.A., Communication, University of Maryland, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Villanova University, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Griffin</td>
<td>NEPA Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois Institute of Technology, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.A., English Composition, DePauw University, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neetu Singh, E.I.T.</td>
<td>Transportation Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BSc, Civil Engineering and Applied Mechanics, McGill University (Montreal, Canada), 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Berg</td>
<td>Senior Historic Preservation Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.S., U.S. History, University of Maryland, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Christman, P.E.</td>
<td>Senior Transportation Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BCE, Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Edelen Estes</td>
<td>Senior Environmental Scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.S., Environmental Management, University of Maryland University College, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.S., Marine Science, University of South Carolina, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Lux</td>
<td>Environmental Scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.S., Environmental Studies, Ohio University, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.S., Environmental Biology, Ohio University, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Thomas Barrett, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Senior Archeologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D., Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of New Mexico, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A., Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of New Mexico, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.A., Anthropology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 List of Preparers

University of Maryland College Park, 1988
A.A., Humanities, Montgomery College, 1986

EHT Traceries, Inc.
1121 Fifth Street, NW
Washington, DC  20001

Emily Hotaling Eig                  Laura Hughes
President & CEO                     Director of Research & Preservation

Planning Division

Straughan Environmental Services
9135 Guilford Road, Suite 100
Columbia, MD  21046-2579

Alverna R. Durham, Jr.               Fatimah Hasan, AICP
Environmental Planner               Senior Planner

North Carolina A&T State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, M.C.P.
B.S. in Industrial Technology, 1999 in City Planning, 1989

Chimere Lesane-Matthews             Sarah Michailof
Environmental Planner               Environmental Planner

Morgan State University, B.S. in Civil University of North Carolina at Chapel
Engineering, 2001                    Hill
B.A. in Anthropology, B.A. in Biology
1994
Koetter Kim & Associates

394 Boylston Street

Boston, MA  02116

Susie Kim                  Mark Sardegna
Principal                 Project Manager/Associate

Giles Moore               Mark DeShong
Project Manager           Project Manager
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## Federal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton</th>
<th>The Honorable Bob Filner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia-Delegate</td>
<td>Committee on Veterans’ Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20515-5100</td>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20515-3765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Honorable Ike Skelton</th>
<th>The Honorable Robert Andrews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Armed Services</td>
<td>Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, &amp; Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senate</td>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20510</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy</th>
<th>Mr. David S. C. Chu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Health, Education, Labor, &amp; Pensions</td>
<td>(Personnel and Readiness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senate</td>
<td>4000 Defense Pentagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20510</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20301-4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Honorable Duncan Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mark Kehrli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking Member</td>
<td>Division Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Armed Services</td>
<td>FHWA District of Columbia Division Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
<td>1990 K Street, NW, Ste 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20515</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Federal (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Patricia Gallagher</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>National Capitol Planning Commission</td>
<td>401 9th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Fowler</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
<td>1100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Rm 809, Washington, DC 20004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Earl A. Powell III, FAIA</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Commission of Fine Arts</td>
<td>441 F Street, NW, Ste 312, Washington, DC 20001-2728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Abadie</td>
<td>Planning Division, CENAB-PL-P</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1715, Baltimore, MD 21203-1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Dinah Bear</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>Council on Environmental Quality</td>
<td>722 Jackson Place, NW, Washington, DC 20503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Willie R. Taylor</td>
<td>Director, Office of Env. Policy &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>US Dept of the Interior/MS 2340</td>
<td>1849 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Donald S. Welsh</td>
<td>Regional Administrator</td>
<td>US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 3</td>
<td>1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Patricia G. Arcuri</td>
<td>Mr. William Bolger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Regional Director</td>
<td>U.S. National Park Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>200 Chestnut Street, Room 370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 Chestnut Street</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA 19106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA 19106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hector Abreu Cintron</td>
<td>The Honorable James Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 803</td>
<td>of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20004</td>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20515-6026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dave Robertson</td>
<td>Mr. Richard A. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>General Manager and CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments</td>
<td>Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777 North Capitol Street, NE</td>
<td>600 5th Street, NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20002</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District of Columbia</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Marie Sansome</td>
<td>Mr. William O. Howland, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health Administration</td>
<td>DC Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 N Street NE</td>
<td>2000 14th Street, NW, 6th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20002</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Harriett Tregoning</td>
<td>Director DC Office of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Maloney</td>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Patrick J. Canavan</td>
<td>Interim Director DC Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commander Larry McCoy</td>
<td>MPDC Third District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jalan Greene</td>
<td>Acting Director DC Department of Housing &amp; Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commander Hilton Burton</td>
<td>MPDC Fourth District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jerry N. Johnson</td>
<td>Director DC Water and Sewer Authority (WASA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commander Lamar Greene</td>
<td>MPDC Fifth District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. George S. Hawkins</td>
<td>Director DC Department of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Linda K. Argo</td>
<td>Department of Consumer &amp; Regulatory Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# District of Columbia (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert Hamilton, Program Manager</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>51 N Street, NE 3rd Floor Washington, DC 20002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Darrell L. Darnell</td>
<td>Interim Director</td>
<td>2000 14th Street, NW, 8th floor Washington, DC 20009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Health Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Hazardous Material &amp; Toxic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis L. Rubin, Interim Chief</td>
<td>DC Fire and Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>1923 Vermont Ave, NW, Suite 102 Washington, DC 20001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Neil O. Albert</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC Homeland Security &amp; Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 317 Washington, DC 20004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah A. Gist</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Education</td>
<td>825 North Capitol St., NE Washington, DC 20002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John W. Cobert</td>
<td>Smithsonian Institution</td>
<td>750 9th Street, NW Suite 6200 Washington, DC 20560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Deborah Crain</td>
<td>Neighborhood Planning Coordinator, Ward 5</td>
<td>801 North Capitol Street, Suite 4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Emeka C. Moneme</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2000 14th Street, NW Washington, DC 20009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC Office of Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Planning Coordinator, Ward 4</td>
<td>DC Office of Planning</td>
<td>801 North Capitol Street, Suite 4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Goodno, Bicycle Program Specialist</td>
<td>District Department of Transportation</td>
<td>2000 14th Street, NW 7th Floor Washington, DC20009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## District of Columbia Mayor and Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Honorable Adrian Fenty</th>
<th>The Honorable Jim Graham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of the District of Columbia</td>
<td>Council of the District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC  20004</td>
<td>Councilmember, Ward 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Honorable Muriel Bowser</th>
<th>The Honorable Vincent C. Gray</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember, Ward 4</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of the District of Columbia</td>
<td>Council of the District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW</td>
<td>1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC  20004</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Honorable Harry Thomas, Jr.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember, Ward 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of the District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC  20004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Advisory Neighborhood Commissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANC 1A)</th>
<th>Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANC 4C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2905 11th Street, NW</td>
<td>P.O. Box 60847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC  20001</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20039-0847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANC 1B)</th>
<th>Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANC 4D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 73710</td>
<td>143 Kennedy Street, NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC  20056</td>
<td>Washington, DC  20011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANC 4B Continued)</th>
<th>Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANC 5C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6856 Eastern Avenue, NW #314</td>
<td>P.O. Box 77761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20012</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Robert I. Artisst, Sr.</th>
<th>Ms. Joan Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookland Neighborhood Civic Association</td>
<td>Pleasant Hills Civic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353 Otis Street, NE</td>
<td>50 Varnum Street, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20001</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Grace J. Lewis</th>
<th>Mr. Anthony Freeman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Michigan Park Civic Association</td>
<td>National Capital Revitalization Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4945 Sargent Road, NE</td>
<td>1801 K Street, NW, Suite 1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20017</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Yancy Pitts, Jr.</th>
<th>Ms. Barbara Lang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamond Riggs Civic Association</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Underwood Street, NW</td>
<td>DC Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20012</td>
<td>1213 K Street NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Donna Farris Jenkins</th>
<th>Mr. Farleigh Earhart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis View Civic Association</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618 Girard Street, NE</td>
<td>DC Preservation League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20002</td>
<td>401 F Street, NW, Room 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Gail Edwards</th>
<th>Mr. Thompson M. Mayes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Building Industry Association</td>
<td>1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5100 Wisconsin Ave, NW, Ste 301</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John E. Akridge III</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federal City Council</td>
<td>The Greater Washington Board of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156 15th Street, NW #600</td>
<td>SunTrust Conference Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20005</td>
<td>1725 I Street, NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Barbara Zartman, Chairman</td>
<td>Mr. Jim Woodworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of 100 on the Federal Government</td>
<td>Natural Resources Defense Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317 G Street, NW</td>
<td>1200 New York Avenue, NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20005</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Stevens</td>
<td>Mr. Stewart Schwartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C. Marketing Center</td>
<td>Coalition for Smarter Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495 F Street</td>
<td>4000 Albemarle Street, NW, Suite 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20004</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sophie Lynn</td>
<td>Mr. James Caldas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785 Massachusetts Ave., NW</td>
<td>Washington Hospital Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20036</td>
<td>110 Irving Street, NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sanford M. Garfunkel</td>
<td>Ms. Cheryl Cort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center Director</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Medical Center – DC</td>
<td>Washington Regional Network for Livable Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Irving Street, NW</td>
<td>4000 Albemarle Street, NW, Suite 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20422</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Organizations (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jody Burdell</td>
<td>Vice President &amp; Chief Operating Officer</td>
<td>Children’s Hospital</td>
<td>111 Michigan Avenue, NW</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Enrique Brown</td>
<td>Priest in Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Very Reverend David M. O’Connell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>The Catholic University of America</td>
<td>Nugent Hall</td>
<td>620 Michigan Avenue, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. James P. Mumford</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. Patrick Swygert, JD</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>2400 6th Street, NW, Suite 402</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. John T. Butler</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Patricia A. McGuire</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>125 Michigan Avenue, NE</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Lincoln Berry</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Don L. Peterson</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Air Force Association</td>
<td>1501 Lee Highway</td>
<td>Arlington, VA 22209-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ronald K. Andreson</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rick Dean</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Air Force Sergeants Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 50, Temple Hills, MD 20757-0050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Patricia M. Murphy</td>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>Air Force Women Officers Associated</td>
<td>P.O. Box 780155, San Antonio, TX 78278-0155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alan Burton</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>American Logistics Association</td>
<td>1133 15th Street, N.W., Suite 640, Washington, DC 20005-2701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James B. King</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>AMVETS (American Veterans)</td>
<td>4647 Forbes Boulevard, Lanham, MD 20706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joe Barnes (NES)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fleet Reserve Association</td>
<td>125 North West Street, Alexandria, VA 22314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fred Sanford</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Association of Military Surgeons of the United States</td>
<td>9320 Old Georgetown Rd., Bethesda, MD 20814-1653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gerard Farrell</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Commissioned Officers Association of the US Public Health Service, Inc</td>
<td>8201 Corporate Drive, Suite 560, Landover, MD 20785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael V. Maher</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>CWO &amp; WO Association US Coast Guard</td>
<td>c/o James Creek Marina, 200 V Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Cline</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the U.S.</td>
<td>3133 Mt. Vernon Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dave White</td>
<td></td>
<td>Military Chaplains Association of the USA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 7056, Arlington, VA 22207-7056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Rachel Clinkscale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Star Wives of America, Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5510 Columbia Pike, Suite 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, VA 22204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Norb Ryan Jr.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Officers Association of America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 N. Washington Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, VA 22314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Robert Zweiman</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans of the USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811 R Street, NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20009-1659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Al Silvano</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Order of the Purple Heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5413 Backlick Road, Suite B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, VA 22151-3960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Helen F. Hicks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps League</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 3070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrifield, VA 22116-3070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Dick Murray</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association for Uniformed Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5535 Hempstead Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, VA 22151-4094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Tom Green</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps Reserve Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 Potomac Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantico, VA 22134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Richard C. Alexander</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Association of the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Massachusetts Ave., NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Candace A. Wheeler</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Military Family Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 North Van Dorn St., Suite 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, VA 22302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Robert A. McIntosh</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Officers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Constitution Ave., NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address/Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gib Bolton</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>National Order of Battlefield Commissions</td>
<td>2506 King Street, Alexandria, VA 22301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alexander (Rusty) Sloan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Society of Medical Consultants to the Armed Forces</td>
<td>5 Southern Way, Fredericksburg, VA 22406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Davidson</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Naval Enlisted Reserve Association</td>
<td>6703 Farragut Ave., Falls Church, VA 22042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David L. Washington</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>The Retired Enlisted Association</td>
<td>909 N. Washington Street, Suite 301,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Lindell</td>
<td>National President</td>
<td>Naval Reserve Association</td>
<td>1619 King Street, Alexandria, VA 22314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bob Walker</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>United Armed Forces Association</td>
<td>2329 Shore Sands Ct., Apt. 201, Virginia Beach, VA 23451-7309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stephen Pietropaoli</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Navy League of the US</td>
<td>2300 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Timothy Trimble</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>USCG Chief Petty Officers Association</td>
<td>5520-G Hempstead Way, Springfield, VA 22151-4009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ray Bell</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>US Army Warrant Officers Association</td>
<td>462 Herndon Pkwy., #207, Herndon, VA 20170-5235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Edmee J. Hills</td>
<td>National Chair</td>
<td>Veterans’ Widows International Network, Inc</td>
<td>3657 E. South Laredo Street, Aurora, CO 80013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Organizations (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bob Wallace</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Veterans of Foreign Wars</td>
<td>200 Maryland Ave., NE Washington, D.C 20002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cynthia Dawkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans’ Widows International Network</td>
<td>710 Carlough Street Landover, MD 20785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gordon Sullivan</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Association of the U.S. Army</td>
<td>2425 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22201-3326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gordon Sullivan</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Association of the U.S. Army</td>
<td>2425 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22201-3326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cynthia Dawkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans’ Widows International Network</td>
<td>710 Carlough Street Landover, MD 20785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy G Gougle</td>
<td>AFRH-W Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>3700 N. Capitol St., NW #1072 Washington, DC 20011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank McCabe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3700 N. Capitol St., NW #6313 Washington, DC 20011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ewert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3700 N. Capitol St., NW #731 Washington, DC 20011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Pence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3700 N. Capitol St., NW #731 Washington, DC 20011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3700 N. Capitol St., NW #1236 Washington, DC 20011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William D. Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3700 N. Capitol St., NW #1236 Washington, DC 20011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jentarra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3700 N. Capitol St., NW #588 Washington, DC 20011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hughes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3656 Park Place, NW Washington, DC 20010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) Master Plan was issued on May 20, 2005. The public comment period extended from the date of issuance through July 5, 2005. A Public Hearing to present the findings of the EIS and solicit comments on the document was held on June 22, 2005.

In addition, written comments were received from 67 federal and local agencies, community organizations, and individual citizens. Thirty-three (33) citizens spoke at the Public Hearing. Comments received at the Public Hearing were recorded by a stenographer.

Responses to substantive comments are addressed in the following section. Copies of written comments, along with a copy of the Public Hearing transcript, are included in Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>AFRH Home Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Chapter 1, page 1-9, 1.9.1, Impact on Security and Safety of Residents The issue of maintaining the security and safety of the AFRH-W resident community pre-construction, construction and post construction is not discussed within the current draft of the</td>
<td>The Master Plan will include a new secured perimeter that will maintain the security of AFRH-W operations for its residents. Development Zones A, B, and C (formerly Zones 3, 4, 5, and 6) would be open to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: how will this issue be addressed and/or mitigated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>AFRH Home Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>In several areas within the EIS the KHC is referred to as a hospital. Question: Will consideration of KHC as a health center rather than as a hospital have any impact on the final Environmental Consequences contained within the EIS?</td>
<td>The EIS has been revised to indicate that the King Health Center is not a hospital. This change does not affect the conclusions of the EIS. The conclusions of the EIS would not change if the King Health Center was considered a health center rather than a hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan</td>
<td>If land is to be developed under &quot;GOV&quot; zoning, then all government building standards must be applied, including the most up-to-date environmental standards. For example, the EIS should detail that any development on GOV-zoned land would have to be GSA LEED certified.</td>
<td>AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity, including the utilization of tools such as LEEDs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Response to Draft EIS Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Carstensen, James</td>
<td>The impact study talks about having no impact on historic monuments. Considering the historic value of these grounds, we ask what is the rush? What is the rush to lease this precious surrounding land for eight-story condos, massive buildings with huge asphalt parking lots, and the accompanying traffic jams and smog? Once the land is developed it's gone forever. We believe there is a better way. There are ways to generate revenue from the land without destroying it. There are ways to get the Armed Forces Retirement Home the money it needs without building upon one of its most precious resources. Some would have us to believe that this debate is about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wahl, Abby</td>
<td></td>
<td>As stated in Section 1.3, AFRH’s fixed income sources are insufficient to fund campus operations and improvements. Without implementation of the Master Plan, the AFRH Trust Fund will continue to diminish risking the viability of the home for both current and future residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whether to erect six-story buildings or four-story buildings or to put condos here or there. That's a false debate. The issue is this. We need to make sure that the Soldiers Home doesn't fall under further financial neglect. Let's get the home the financial resources it needs but let's not sacrifice this great asset…. What we see is a rush to development. This issue is far too important to take the expedient way out. If we do our children and grandchildren will never see the land as Lincoln saw it. There is a better way. Working together we can do the right thing not only for ourselves, for our community, but for the entire nation and all generations to come.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Catherine McCarthy</td>
<td>150 years of tradition down the tubes, the military veterans squeezed into a few acres of what used to be their beautiful</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and peaceful home. What a shame.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Crandall, Bill</td>
<td>Any development should be guided by firm, well-articulated guidelines mandating exceptionally high architectural quality, design/aesthetics, balance of uses, and good integration into existing neighborhood fabric. Especially in parcel 6 in areas adjacent to residential Petworth and Park View. If profit for the Home is the sole motivation and the highest bidder wins, we could end up with clumsy, ugly, ill-conceived projects that will potentially degrade - rather than enhance - the greater community</td>
<td>AFRH is continuing to work with the community and local agencies on the creation of design criteria which will guide all phases of development on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>DC Office of Planning</td>
<td>The planning/development goals of the McMillan Sand Filtration site can be applied to the AFRH site. These include: 1) providing publicly accessible</td>
<td>Comment noted. The goals of the AFRH-W Master Plan have been established to ensure that the Master Plan is developed in a manner that meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>DHCD understands the need of the AFRH to create a development Master Plan that will be used to sustain the AFRH in the long-term, by replenishing its primary sources of operational funding, the AFRH Trust Fund. You proposed to accomplish this with revenue derived from the sale or lease of surplus parcels of land on the AFRH North Capitol Street Campus. We note that Congress has authorized, as part of the long-term needs of the AFRH while recognizing the importance of the AFRH-W resources and the local community.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, the AFRH to sell or lease any property excess to its needs, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, for the specific purpose of replenishing the AFRH Trust Fund. DHCD applauds and supports the AFRH for developing a Master Plan concept framework that has identified six zones of surplus land around the perimeter of the AFRH Campus that can be developed without compromising the historic landmark character of the historic core of the Campus. DHCD supports the development of infill institutional uses that will be compatible with current AFRH operations located in the designated Zone 1 development area. This specific proposal is common to all four Master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Douglas, David</td>
<td>I am a neighbor. I'm 40 feet from the Soldiers home and the young man from the Hospital Center that said he was a neighbor, that was part of Soldiers Home. That was the apple orchard that I played in. They had another meeting here when they put the three hospitals down there. Veterans and the Hospital Center, and they said that they were going to move the orchard and now that's the parking lot for the cathedral. That's where the orchard was supposed to be. So let me tell you once they start they are not going to stop. You can come in any gate in this place. I taught my son how to run cross-country right in this park. Security got bad and instead of trying to solve the</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>problem they locked the place up. And you can't keep fear out. You have to face fear. You can't just keep locking yourself up. And that's what you have to do. And if you let them start pouring the concrete you are going to lose this place and you need it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Felder, Charles</td>
<td>As with other zones, more comprehensive alternate plans are needed in order to assess the heavily adverse environmental impact of construction on the area of zone #1 and the health hazards to the in-dwelling population.</td>
<td>Construction activities can create fugitive dust from demolition, site grading, construction, wind erosion, and vehicular activities which can cause health related issues to persons in the vicinity of the activities. Measures to mitigate these types of impacts are provided in Section 4.5 of the EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Felder, Charles</td>
<td>Why are the Sheridan and Scott buildings not sensitive areas in regard to air quality, noise and the debris of construction in Zone #1?</td>
<td>Sheridan and Scott are sensitive areas. Mitigation measures outlined in the EIS have been identified to minimize and mitigate impacts to the residents of these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Felder, Charles</td>
<td>Is it necessary for King Health Center to be evacuated to the proposed new King Hospital complex in Zone #1 before development begins in zone #3?</td>
<td>A new King Hospital complex is not proposed in the AFRH Zone (formerly Zones 1 and 2) at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Felder, Charles</td>
<td>When will construction begin on the King Hospital Complex, which will be directly adjacent to the dormitories of Independent Living, Assisted living, COPD, dementia patients and the clinics?</td>
<td>Schedules for construction will be determined after selection of a developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Hafvenstein, Lauri</td>
<td>It is my conclusion that the EIS fails to address the impact of such large-scale development on the city and the surrounding neighborhoods in terms of traffic, air quality, storm runoff, temperature and noise. It fails to address the need for retention of green space and the initiatives by the federal and local government to expand and enhance</td>
<td>Impacts to the human environment have been rigorously evaluated and disclosed in the EIS. Additional information on parks and open space has been added to Section 4.2.4 of the Final EIS. The District of Columbia regulates both the quality and quantity of storm water runoff from proposed development sites. DC storm water regulations are intended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>public use parklands.</td>
<td>to prevent: 1) an increase in the quantity of storm water runoff from development sites, and 2) an increase in pollutants and suspended solids (quality) in surface runoff from proposed development. AFRH will be preparing a sedimentation and erosion control plan measures per DC regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Jackson, Latosha</td>
<td>I, too, like Mr. Douglass who lives 40 feet away from Soldiers Home, have sentimental feelings about allowing such a large development to be built. There are lots of kids in the area and traffic along the side streets will be unbearable. I have lived in the neighborhood 40 years and I am sure money can be raised to help the soldiers in another manner.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Jones, Amina</td>
<td>As a 19 year old college student that is contemplating joining the Armed Forces, I think that with the property that they</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Larson, Michael Maready, Gerald</td>
<td>want to develop should be used for another retirement facility. I know that if I in fact decide on joining the armed forces and one day I will in fact be a senior, I would want somewhere to go when I am too tired to take care of a house or other property that I might own. This estate was created for veterans, people that have served their country well… I say no construction on the soldier’s home.</td>
<td>Maps of the site showing outlined borders of potential development zones, simple square footage estimates, and projected simple financials do not provide the information necessary in order to adequately determine the effect of the proposed master plan upon the historic fabric of the AFRH-W, upon the historic fabric of surrounding areas. The goals and alternatives provided in the EIS are the goals and alternatives for the Master Plan. The EIS includes a rigorous analysis of impacts to resources including historic resources, the community, and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighborhoods, upon surrounding roadways, and upon the local environment. The DEIS (and by extension the Final EIS) is useless without inclusion of the full proposed master plan; it seems impossible to make the determination of effect presented in the DEIS with the bare-bones information about the proposed master plan that has been provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Marlow, Jacquelyn</td>
<td>There should be a balance between the need and the community. The presentation of the proposed building should not contrast what is already established in the neighborhood. This is to say it should not look like downtown DC Chinatown but that it should blend into the style and fashion of the established neighborhood.</td>
<td>Design guidelines are being developed which will prescribe architectural design and building height limits. Residential development in Zone C (formerly Zone 6) would be two to three stories in height in keeping with the Parkview and Petworth neighborhoods. The only place a building may be taller is in the vicinity of the AFRH-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>General McGilvray, Andrew</td>
<td>McGilvray, Andrew</td>
<td>As a matter of law, we must question the accuracy of the DEIS’s characterization that AFRH parcels leased for development (instead of being sold) would remain subject to “GOV” zoning, rather than be subject to the District of Columbia’s municipal commercial/residential zoning. We maintain that the uses proposed in the Master Plan documents are not inherently governmental in nature and, therefore, that D.C.’s municipal commercial/residential zoning authority would apply regardless of whether the land is leased or sold.</td>
<td>It is AFRH's intention to be a conscientious steward of its campus and any development that may take place there. The DEIS's characterization regarding zoning complies with applicable law. AFRH will carefully and assiduously consider land use comments or recommendations submitted by the District of Columbia. To date, AFRH has discussed and/or coordinated its project with the following District of Columbia Government offices: the Mayor, the Council, the Historic Preservation Office, the Office of Planning, the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, and the Department of Public Works. AFRH will continue its ongoing consultation and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>MedStar/WHC</td>
<td>MedStar/WHC fully supports the concept of development of the property being proposed in the plan. As the owner and operator of the medical complex on land immediately to the south across Irving Street, we believe that appropriate development compatible with AFRH and neighboring uses is important for the efficient use of land to benefit the community and City as a whole.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>MedStar/WHC</td>
<td>The clinical and research components of MedStar/WHC’s plan have a unique compatibility with the mission of the home and could assist in providing or</td>
<td>Comment noted. The Master Plan Alternatives are not based on any single proposal. All proposals will be considered as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coordinating development for this important site. In addition, the site would allow the expansion and renovation of WHC facilities, which can become a model for the delivery of medical services.</td>
<td>AFRH goes forward with implementation of the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>MedStar/ Washington Hospital Center</td>
<td>MedStar/WHC has the capacity and will pursue the opportunity to develop the entire property in an integrated and intelligent manner, respectful of the community and AFRH residents and guided by the leadership of AFRH.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>We … urge the Armed Forces Retirement Home to very carefully consider the impacts of the master planning process. In earlier master plans changes were made to the property that we now know dramatically changed the property and affected its historic character. We would not want to see</td>
<td>The AFRH understands the importance of the historic value of the AFRH-W. As the Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts to resources including the historic character of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. General</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>First, as you all know, the draft EIS makes it very clear that there will be under these development alternatives long-term direct, major, and adverse impacts on the historic resources. We think the draft EIS needs to be looked at and modified to address those a little bit more carefully. For example, most of the alternatives that are proposed propose a great level of development and we think that alternatives should be looked at that can achieve some of the goals the Armed Forces Retirement Home is trying to achieve but reduce the level of development and therefore can reduce the impact on historic resources. Particularly in that regard are the views from the Armed Forces Retirement Home. Many of you know that President</td>
<td>The AFRH assessed a range of alternatives that would meet the long-term financial needs of the Home. Views from and to significant historic features of the AFRH-W are a major consideration in the design guidelines being prepared as part of the Section 106 process as mitigation for the adverse impacts that the proposed undertaking may have on the historic resources at the AFRH-W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>One of the draft EIS objectives indicates that the Master Plan will “preserve and improve the essential components of the AFRH-W for residents and the community” However, most EIS findings indicate minimal negative impact on diverse aspects of the environment, indicating few or any areas where the options contribute positively. In general, it appears the draft EIS falls short in showing improvement and preservation of the historical value, the environment, and the city’s absorptive capacity.</td>
<td>As required by the National Environmental Policy Act, the EIS discloses adverse as well as beneficial impacts of the proposed action. As the Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts. Essential components of the AFRH-W, including resident areas, core historic resources such as the U.S. Soldiers’ and Airmen’s Home National Historic Landmark and National Register Historic District, and open-space such as...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>According to the draft EIS, the Master Plan will “Grow the Trust Fund to not only meet the needs of today’s residents, but the needs of future generations as well.” It does not appear that the EIS has adequately addressed quality of life needs of the current residents nor the long term requirements of the AFRH to meet the future (and likely growing) needs of veterans. (Again, I refer to the thoughtful comments of our veterans and concerned community on this matter).</td>
<td>As stated in Section 1.3, AFRH’s fixed income sources are insufficient to fund campus operations and improvements. Without implementation of the Master Plan, the AFRH Trust Fund will continue to diminish risking the viability of the home for both current and future residents. The quality of life for the residents is of the utmost importance to the AFRH and is a key goal of the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This should be the real goal of any proposal and I would encourage their current and future needs to be elevated to the highest priority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>Although, the Master Plan indicates it will “Attract development, at fair market value, that is compatible with the mission of the AFRH”, I am concerned that fair market value does not take into account the need for low income housing or the need to maintain the wonderful diversity of the community. The environmental justice findings indicate that low income and minority populations would not be disproportionately affected by impacts of the alternatives. However, there appear to be no benefits to these groups in terms of housing options. Furthermore, I would like clarification as to how the exact type and cost of new housing and retail space, if any, to be built on the AFRH-W would depend on market conditions and on decisions by the developer(s) and is beyond the scope of this EIS. Residential housing, retail, and office buildings are all compatible uses with the AFRH-W since these types of uses already exist on the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Prather, Marcel</td>
<td>As do many of my neighbors, I find it hard to accept that alternatives which won’t ruin the very nature of the Soldier’s Home as a retirement community and take away one of D.C.’s few remaining open spaces, have all been explored. I also am convinced that no matter which of these development projects is selected, noise and traffic will impact the surrounding neighborhoods profoundly. I urge the planning committee to consider the negative impact all of these development scenarios will have on both the Soldier’s Home residents and our neighborhoods.</td>
<td>The EIS includes a rigorous analysis of impacts to the human environment including noise, transportation, transit, parking, and community services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Quick, George</td>
<td>Proposed plans 2, 3, and 4 call for institution development in the area</td>
<td>The institutional uses referred to in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would consist of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Response to Draft EIS Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>around the Sheridan building. This opens a whole can of worms. Institutional can be anything from a prison to an insane asylum.</td>
<td>additional facilities to serve or complement the AFRH or institutional uses such as schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Richardson, Janisha</td>
<td>I am a resident of Columbia Heights on Princeton Place, NW. I ask that the EIS look into having a public park instead of selling the land to developers. I also ask that the community have strong voice in the development of the land.</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Robert Davaney</td>
<td>4-26: The AFRH-W is zoned GOV, Government and therefore is not subject to local zoning regulations unless portions of the site are sold to private parties. Implementation of the AFRH-W’s Master Plan would result in a considerable change to zoning on the site if segments of the AFRH-W are sold. If the land for development were leased, it</td>
<td>Comment is outside the purview of this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would be subject to zoning. Based on the statement that leased land is not subject to zoning because the AFRH-W is government, this exemption, when applied to Home Residents, has a positive effect because Home Residents will be exempt from DC control and may keep the domicile of their choice. This will allow residents to vote for their Representatives and Senators. A domicile in a “No State Tax state” will have a positive effect on our Home Residents. 4-30: In addition, the presence of the AFRH in the City would bring the benefit of tax revenue from any resident employee, as well as local commercial entities that do business with the AFRH. “ Resident employee,” If the employee is...</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a resident of DC and employed at AFRH, yes, they should pay DC taxes. But if it means a Home Resident employee working in AFRH, that creates an issue. Present policy does not provide for home Residents to work for a salary at AFRH. No effect on the social status of AFRH residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-18: According to the District of Columbia Generalized land Use Map, land use on the AFRH-W is characterized as “federal,” meaning that the land and facilities onsite are occupied by the federal government (DC Office of Planning, 2002). A site occupied by the federal government should be considered a “Federal Instrumentality” and immune from State control. DC has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>characterized AFRH-W as “federal.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-23:</td>
<td>23:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sales and Use Taxes: This District of Columbia imposes sales and use taxes on the purchase or consumption of tangible personal property or services with the District. Sales or use at the AFRH-W are not within the District and taxes should not be collected. This is a positive impact on the social status of Home Residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-24: Individual Income Taxes: Individual income taxes re levied on all individuals who are domiciled in the District. (Black’s law Dictionary describes a domicile as the place a person states that it is where his is to live permanently and when he is absent, he will return.) AFRH-W Employees who are residents of the District would pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>individual income taxes. (Of course, if they live in the district and work at AFRH-W, they should pay DC taxes.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFRH-W residents may be domiciled in another State. Voting rights are not removed from a resident domiciled in another state and the income tax laws of that domiciliary prevail. Full application of 3-24 will have a positive effect on Home Residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-25: In 1851, the Federal Government purchased farmland surrounding the Cottage to form the historic core of what was called the Military Asylum (HFH, 2004). General Scott used some of the $175,000.00 to pay his troops, buy supplies and offered the remainder to Congress to establish the Soldiers Home (ibid).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US Code, Title 24 is entitled “Hospitals and Asylums” and the Armed Forces Retirement Home is established under Title 24. In my opinion, being an inmate in the Asylum is not at all bad. We are definitely not under the control of the District of Columbia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-29: The same area was listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district in 1974. The area designated as Nation Historic Landmark was listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district on February 11, 1974, under the name “U.S. Soldiers’ and Airmen’s Home” (EHT Traceries, 2004).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-31: In 1988, The District State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) determined that the entire 272 acre AFRH-W property is eligible for listing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Shelley, Allison</td>
<td>Please reconsider, this project will forever change the historic nature of this valuable piece of property – one of the very few green spaces left in our city, as well as a historically significant</td>
<td>Under the Master Plan Alternatives studied in the EIS, approximately 182 to 188 acres (67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. As the Master Plan is implemented, the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in the National Register as a Historic District. The rationale for my comments is to ensure that the final EIS is accepted that Home Residents of AFRH-W will keep their rights to declare a domicile of their choice and enjoy the voting rights and taxing authorities of their choosing. Residing at AFRH-W for medical or whatever reason must not mandate that residents forfeit their hard fought-for privileges and rights. It should be resolved that if zoning and various sundy laws are not enforceable on AFRH-W property, why aren’t AFRH-W residents entitled to the same consideration?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Stephens, Arlus J.</td>
<td>The DEIS overlooks the historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence. There should</td>
<td>The AFRH understands the importance of the historic value of the AFRH-W. The AFRH has coordinated with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>landmark. Surely there are more environmentally responsible ways to raise the needed funds. Judging by the comments made at the public hearing, it seems that neighbors and home residents had not been contacted about any of these plans before they were created. Let’s take some time here. It seems reasonable to assess the resources available – including government grants and subsidies for the preservation of open green spaces, before launching into massive, irreversible development that does not enhance the community with needed parks, etc. but surely promises to worsen traffic and parking issues in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts to resources including the mature trees on the facility. After the release of the DEIS, the AFRH took an active role in involving the community through several community meetings and the development of a Planning Committee to review the Master Plan design guidelines. The Planning Committee is comprised of representatives from the community, institutional neighbors, the development industry, and District and Federal planning agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Sullivan, Matthew</td>
<td>I find the proposals contained within the draft EIS to be far too potentially damaging to the environment of NW Washington DC. I believe that the sheer amount of concrete and asphalt alone will disrupt the local ecosystem. The current green space acts as a natural buffer to the heat retention and decreased drainage of the concrete that exists outside the home.</td>
<td>See response to Comment #25. The AFRH will make every effort to avoid and minimize impacts as the Master Plan is implemented. AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Swanson, Lisa</td>
<td>I know some people think there should be no development here at all. I'm with the Sierra Club. You might think I'd say that too but sometimes development in</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an already developed city area if it's done well, if it's done ecologically and with the people in mind, is better than creating a sprawl elsewhere and knocking down trees in a lot of other places.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Sylvia, Elton Sr.</td>
<td>As I look over your Environmental Impact Statement, this plan could be prosperous for the AFRH. Also it could become a financial drain on the budget. I can also see the AFRH-W in the future will lack admission to the home forcing the home to close. My questions… if this should happen would the “US Old Soldier’s Home” become a National Historic Preservation Museum? How about a Granite Wall with all residents that have lived here from 1841 to present, have their names engraved? Our grandchildren and great</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grandchildren would have a great time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valenti, Cliff</td>
<td>Personally, I am against development of any of the property of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (especially zone 6 along Park Place), with the exception of renovation / expansion of existing buildings. I believe redevelopment along Georgia Ave is essential to the quality of life in this area of DC, and any competing development risks over-development.</td>
<td>Comment Noted. Zone A (formerly Zones 3 and 4) is located along North Capital Street and would serve a different market than the planned Georgia Avenue development. It is anticipated that development along Georgia Avenue would occur before the development in Zones B and C (formerly Zones 5 and 6). Development in Zones B and C would be undertaken in later phases if needed to meet the Home’s financial needs. If AFRH decides to pursue its development plans for this site, the alternatives proposed will take into consideration the adjacent historic neighborhoods to the west as well as views into the AFRH-W site. Development in these zones is intended to reflect the character and scale of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valenti, Cliff</td>
<td>The May 2005 draft contains many contradictions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Section 1-9 says Minority / Low Income populations potentially could be disproportionately affected vs. section 2-17 Low Income and minority populations would not be disproportionately affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There may not be sufficient infrastructure to support the additional facilities (1-11) vs. &quot;no direct impacts to water resources&quot; (2-16) and other statements listed throughout (see vii,</td>
<td>Section 1.9 of the EIS provides indicators against which alternatives are assessed to determine if impacts would occur and, if so, what the severity of the impact would be. This section of the document does not illustrate what will happen rather it describes the type of impacts that should be looked for when assessing and describing impacts in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences. Table 2-10 provides a summary of the impacts discussed in Chapter 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Valenti, Cliff</td>
<td>Almost all of the Impact Summary shows a negative effect to the existing community:</td>
<td>See response for comments # 25 and 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• More traffic on roads the draft says are already congested (vii).</td>
<td>As required by the National Environmental Policy Act, the EIS discloses adverse as well as beneficial impacts of the proposed action. As the Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Alt 3A/3B and 4 site access would fail (2-20) North Capital St would fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of mature trees (2-16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adverse effects on aquatic life (2-16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adverse effects to topography (2-16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase noise level (viii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Degraded air-quality (viii)(1-11)(2-20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decreased green space                                                                -rounded 3.1 million $ for public infrastructure, including but not limited to transportation improvements and stormwater management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in city and federal services (2-17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct, long-term adverse impact on archeological / historical significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See response for comments # 25 and 37. As required by the National Environmental Policy Act, the EIS discloses adverse as well as beneficial impacts of the proposed action. As the Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts.

AFRH as part of its development agreements with developers intends to enter into a transportation management plan. At this time, there is insufficient...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2-19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2-19) Says current Lincoln cottage views would be adversely affected, yet the city and federal government have spent allot of money to preserve this historic sight. Only short term interests of developers and profiteers are served by this plan, but the long term interests of Washington DC, residents of Petworth, and residents of the Old Soldiers Home are not represented.</td>
<td>information to develop transportation management strategies as each alternative proposed creates different traffic conditions. The traffic impact study in the EIS is a worst case scenario and will be updated to reflect the alternatives that AFRH will implement. AFRH will encourage developers that present concepts that propose well developed plans that will mitigate adverse environmental impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Van Wye, Brian</td>
<td>Substantial efforts (e.g.: a set aside of jobs) should be made to ensure that DC residents benefit from job opportunities associated with construction and development</td>
<td>Comment is outside the scope of this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Van Wye, Brian</td>
<td>Little effort made to clearly explain alternatives and criteria to evaluate them. Presentation esoteric. Not detailed</td>
<td>Detailed descriptions of the alternatives under consideration are included in Chapter 2 of the EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>description of alternative – brochure had too little info – much less than the presentation.</td>
<td>The AFRH assessed a range of alternatives that would meet the needs of the Home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Walsh, Deborah</td>
<td>I received a flyer two days ago. Why was I left out? This plan is not designed for the good of the internal or external community. This is about people making money and not about the men in this home needing money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Welch, Suzanne</td>
<td>Transitional Housing Corporation The EIS did not adequately address the housing demands and needs pressing on the District today. Affordable housing is in great demand and need, not embassy housing, hotels or high rise condo. Please consider the enclosed Housing in the Nations Capital 2004 by the Urban Land Institute and Fannie Mae Foundation, where residential uses are</td>
<td>The exact type and cost of new housing and retail space, if any, to be built on the AFRH-W would depend on decisions by the developer(s) and is beyond the scope of this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>considered at least 20% should be affordable for sale or for rent housing for low and moderate income families.</td>
<td>The AFRH assessed a range of alternatives that would meet the needs of the Home. The goals and alternatives provided in the EIS are the goals and alternatives for the Master Plan. The development uses identified in the alternatives are compatible with the mission of the AFRH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Cody, Martin</td>
<td>Somewhere in Introduction state what this EIS does not include: 1. No economics of various options and alternatives 2. No input from the “Master Plan” with its goals or alternatives. 3. No priorities are given to various options as benefiting the residents, eg; hospitals, medical schools, cancer research center/clinics are better than residential units (4000 homes/apts) traffic, car parking problems, etc. get last priority to foreign embassies (no value for residents – only money).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Hafvenstein, Lauri</td>
<td>Just how much money must be raised to support the ongoing requirements of the Home plunged into a financial crisis in the 1990s when expenses routinely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AFRH? began to outstrip revenues. In 2002, Congress ordered the Home to hire professional managers with experience in retirement community operations and gave the Home permission to develop its underutilized property in order to replenish the Trust Fund and generate new funding sources.

Since then, a new administration has brought costs under control by consolidating operations, cutting expenses and the number of employees and using vendors to provide high quality services for lower prices. These measures will save the home $1.1 billion over a 5-year period. In 2004, the Trust Fund had a balance of $118 million after adding a one-time $22 million infusion of cash from the sale of a piece of land to Catholic University. While these
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>Share the financial report of AFRH that shows how much revenue is required and how much will be generated with these and other options. Share the projected capacity needs of AFRH (in terms of space and growing numbers of veterans ensuring that quality of life is NOT compromised)</td>
<td>Though sensible growth in areas with existing roads, schools and other See Comment # 45. The AFRH Fiscal Year 2004 Annual Performance And Accountability Report is available on the internet at <a href="http://www.afrh.gov/files/pdf/af">http://www.afrh.gov/files/pdf/af</a> rhannualreport.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Swanson, Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Though sensible growth in areas with existing roads, schools and other See Comment # 45. The AFRH Fiscal Year 2004 Annual Performance And Accountability Report is available on the internet at <a href="http://www.afrh.gov/files/pdf/af">http://www.afrh.gov/files/pdf/af</a> rhannualreport.pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

innovations helped, the Home cannot continue to sell off pieces of its legacy and cost saving measures alone cannot generate the funds needed to pay for new buildings and major renovations which are needed to guarantee a safe and secure home and high quality medical services for future generations of American heroes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>services is preferable to creating sprawl, we do not need to sacrifice increasingly precious green space, useable by all for recreation and other purposes, to development for unsubstantiated need for income. Until the financial situation is explained the &quot;needs&quot; of this entity are justified, further development that compromises the economic and physical health of the neighboring community cannot proceed.</td>
<td><em>Performance And Accountability Report</em> is available on the internet at <a href="http://www.afrh.gov/files/pdf/afrhannualreport.pdf">http://www.afrh.gov/files/pdf/afrhannualreport.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Tulchin, Drew</td>
<td>The EIS does not mention, suggest, or provide financial information as to how sale of land and development thereof is really a solution to the economic challenges of the AFRH Master Plan. The first solution of non-sale should explore other revenue generation schemes, including but not limited to: reduction in costs, better budgeting,</td>
<td>No decisions regarding the lease or sale of land have been made. Additional information on the financial needs of the AFRH and steps already taken to reduce costs is included in Section 1.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increasing contributions from enlisted men, fund-raising, and rental of existing resources. Without a sense of the economic need, there is no way to determine if the suggestions truly would be successful or not. Options other than just sale must be explored, as sale is a short term gain, not a long term sustainable solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>United States Department of the Interior Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance</td>
<td>In addition, the financial needs of the AFRH that have stimulated this proposal are not quantified. Beyond stating the need for increased funds, there is no indication of how much of the facility must be converted to revenue generating development in order to sustain the facility. Without such information, we believe the master plan lacks a sound basis for decision making.</td>
<td>See Comment # 45. The AFRH Fiscal Year 2004 Annual Performance And Accountability Report is available on the internet at <a href="http://www.afrh.gov/files/pdf/afrhanual">http://www.afrh.gov/files/pdf/afrhanual</a> report.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>1.3 and 2.1</td>
<td>Donahue, Kathleen</td>
<td>Alternative 1 is no action but is unlikely to be a viable option. Alternatives 2-4 utilize all of the conceptual development zones and none of the alternatives consider only partial development of the six zones. Not clear why so much development is required because there is no financial information included. The final EIS should have development alternatives that would have less impact on the surrounding area, or a disclaimer about why less development is not financially feasible for AFRH.</td>
<td>AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity, including the utilization of tools such as LEEDs. Under the Master Plan Alternatives studied in the EIS, approximately 182 to 188 acres, or 67 to 70 percent, of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. Additional information on the financial needs of the AFRH and steps already taken to reduce costs is included in Section 1.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>To understand the “essential components of the AFRH-W” it is necessary to have available a listing of these essential components of the AFRH-W. Question: In detail, what are the</td>
<td>Essential components of the AFRH-W including resident areas, core historic resources such as the U.S. Soilders’ and Airmen’s Home National Historic Landmark and National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td>essential components?</td>
<td>Historic District, and open-space such as the golf course, are preserved in the Master Plan Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 1.5 Background should acknowledge the importance of the AFRH-W in the history of the design of the City of Washington. It is notable that the setting and planning of the AFRH-W has been of concern and assigned importance for well over one hundred years. The presence of the “Soldiers Home” at the time of the development of the “MacMillan Plan” in 1902 underscores the dependence upon this park-like setting to continue in a vain similar to the parkland of Rock Creek. It appears to have been the status of The Soldiers Home as a continuing stable presence that allowed the area between Rock Creek and the Anacostia</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property. In addition, under the Master Plan Alternatives studied in the EIS, approximately 182 to 188 acres (or 67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. Design guidelines are being developed which will prescribe building height limits. As the Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts to resources including the mature trees on the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>River to retain or create few park, open space and recreation areas in Northeast Washington. Portions of the proposed Master Plan suggested for development would severely reduce the contribution that the current facility now makes and should make to the park and open space component of the Nation’s Capital.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby</td>
<td>Some important stakeholders were not on your list of individuals and organizations to whom the DEIS was provided. The District of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) was not served with the DEIS. My understanding is that they did not learn of the draft EIS until July 1 and even then only learned of the DEIS through concerned city residents. The comment period for the DEIS should be extended.</td>
<td>The AFRH has coordinated with stakeholders and government agencies throughout the development of the Master Plan and the EIS. The National Park Service Philadelphia Office is responsible for reviewing EISs for the Northeast and National Capital Regions. Notification of the availability of the Draft EIS was sent to the Associate Regional Director of the Office Lands, Resources, and Planning for the National Capital Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0  Response to Draft EIS Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extended so that DPR can complete its own comprehensive planning process in a way that can consider potential use of part of the AFRH property to meet city park needs. In addition, it is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the DEIS. Notice of the DEIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local office responsible for Washington's monumental core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Crandall, Bill</td>
<td>The AFRH needs to seriously and substantially incorporate neighborhood concerns into any development plans. Not just lip service, a pat on the head, and checking 'get community input' off the to-do list.</td>
<td>AFRH has involved the residents of the Home throughout the Master Plan process and will continue to do so. The quality of life for the residents is of the utmost importance to the AFRH and is a key goal of the Master Plan. The AFRH is committed to involving the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

community as it moves forward with implementation of the Master Plan. In addition to the public hearing on the draft EIS that was held in June, AFRH continues to encourage dialogue with the community through ANC meetings, a website developed for the purpose of providing the community with development plans and where the community can register to provide input. The next phase of this involvement will include meeting with the community to review the proposed Master Plan design guidelines. AFRH plans to have three community meetings in the neighborhoods of Parkview, Petworth and Pleasant Hill during the months of October and November this year. It will inform the community through the Department of Planning and various
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>DC Office of Planning</td>
<td>A major suggestion is that the process for including the District government and the general public, particularly the surrounding neighborhoods, should be clearly outlined and adopted for the entire process. Both the District government and surrounding neighborhoods should be afforded ample opportunity to determine how the programmatic targets for each development scenario and any sufficient alterations are massed on the site and local media. AFRH will also directly contact residents that have provided contact details to provide them with information on community meetings. The website set up for the purpose of this community outreach is <a href="http://www.afrhdevelopment.com">www.afrhdevelopment.com</a></td>
<td>See response to comment # 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>respond to concerns/requirements related to historic preservation, adaptive reuse of existing structures, open space, transportation and economic impacts. It has been the District’s experience that community charrettes (workshops) are an effective way to allow residents and other stakeholders to participate and help shape outcomes of planning/development processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Feny, Adrian</td>
<td>As you are aware, there is a number of very active community groups which have weighed in on this proposed development and since the likely footprint is so large, perhaps as large as eight million square feet, it's imperative to continue to not only welcome community input but really to ensure the comments and concerns of those affected are incorporated into the final</td>
<td>See response to comment # 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>O’Brien, Bob</td>
<td>I do think it's premature to submit these proposals without residents having had the opportunities to become more familiar with the plans and the effect it will have on their lives here at Armed Forces Retirement Home.</td>
<td>See response to comment # 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>Lastly, contrary to the stated objective of ensuring “an open, participatory process with the AFRH-W residents and the community”, I do not feel that the community was given the sufficient time or information needed to actively participate in this process and question the earnestness of the AFRH’s intent to engage the community in this process. Few of us knew of the June 22 meeting and even fewer of any prior steps.</td>
<td>See response to comment # 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>refer to the many written and voiced comments supporting this concern. I would like the AFRH to extend and open this process and would also like to ensure that from here out, the AFRH be more transparent and take more active steps to ensure stakeholder participation. I would also like to ensure that a community representative participate in all meetings and that minutes and updates be shared monthly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>Improve transparency: ensuring community representation and monthly updates. Provide three dimensional mapping of proposal. Describe the EIS process in terms of participation and transparency and conduct a survey of stakeholders to measure their perspective of the process</td>
<td>See response to comment # 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Sullivan, Matthew</td>
<td>I would encourage the AFRH to consider slowing down the pace of proposed development. Once an area is sold and developed, it's gone forever. While I have no problem, per se, with development at AFRH, I would like to see a more thought out process that includes community involvement at all phases.</td>
<td>See response for #54. AFRH needs financial return in 2007 so the pace of the proposed development cannot be slowed down. AFRH has elected to phase its development. AFRH plans to solicit offers for development of Zone A (formerly Zones 3 and 4) in the immediate future. Development in Zone B and C (formerly Zones 5 and 6) would be undertaken in later phases if needed to meet the Home’s financial needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Valenti, Cliff</td>
<td>How do the Soldiers feel about this? Every soldier I have talked to either doesn't know about it, or is against it. I am told by long time residents in the neighborhood that the reason public access was closed off at the Old Soldiers Home was because they wanted it to be</td>
<td>AFRH has involved the residents of the Home throughout the Master Plan process and will continue to do so. The quality of life for the residents is of the utmost importance to the AFRH and is a key goal of the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Van Wye, Brian</td>
<td>peaceful and quite for the soldiers, now we're talking about creating a city within a city? The increase from the Lincoln Cottage is certainly going to make it busier around there, but not to the point that creating this huge development will.</td>
<td>After the release of the DEIS, the AFRH took an active role in involving the community through several community meetings and the development of a Planning Committee to review the Master Plan design guidelines. The Planning Committee is comprised of representatives from the community, institutional neighbors, the development industry, and District and Federal planning agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Williams, Virginia</td>
<td>I'm a resident of Petworth and am a bit concerned that the Soldier's Home development decisions are being made.</td>
<td>After the release of the DEIS, the AFRH took an active role in involving the community through several community meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>1.9.2</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Chapter 1, page 1-12, Site Landscaping “…depend on decisions by the developer(s) and is beyond the scope of this EIS”. Question: Should there be a system in place assuring that any “decision” by the developer maintains the visual esthetics philosophy or concept of the AFRH-W? Note: This question relates to one of the</td>
<td>Design guidelines which will be included in the Master Plan will be written to emphasize the importance of the historic landscape and other resources. All proposals for development will be assessed against these guidelines and developers will be required to abide by them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>too fast, and with only one public hearing. For what it’s worth, here’s a recent article in the NY Times that makes the case to proceed slowly, and with care, because 100-year-old trees won’t shade our family picnics if they’re paved over in a quick effort to make a profit. (article included with copy of comment)</td>
<td>meetings and the development of a Planning Committee to review the Master Plan design guidelines. The Planning Committee is comprised of representatives from the community, institutional neighbors, the development industry, and District and Federal planning agencies. The AFRH will make every effort to minimize impacts to the mature trees on the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Felder, Charles</td>
<td>Since the irretrievable loss of the AFRH-W Historic District, which is eligible for listing in the National Register, adversely impacts on all present and future AFRH-W eligible veterans, can modified plans and other sources of income also be investigated through the Master Plan?</td>
<td>AFRH has assessed a range of alternatives which are consistent with the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Adams, Nathaniel Jr.</td>
<td>Senior Citizens who now tire of caring for their regular houses in DC must now relocate in MD or VA for “senior communities.” Could not some of this property become properties for “senior community” establishment, whereby seniors would purchase or lease reduced-</td>
<td>The alternatives studied in the EIS include residential housing. The type and size of this housing has not yet been determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Boylan, Kathy</td>
<td>Fund the Old Soldier’s Home by:</td>
<td>AFRH has assessed a range of alternatives which are consistent with the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Change the requirements to allow homeless veterans and disabled veterans, their monthly checks would help fund the home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Invite Not for Profit groups serving veterans to take over unused buildings and pay rent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Allow U.S. Park Service to take over land for park. Park Service would then pay for mowing and other land, tree, and pond care.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Demand that the Federal Government pay to maintain the Armed Forces Home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Stop the war in Iraq and use the money for funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Use the home to serve some of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the thousands of seriously wounded soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. Also serve the needs of the many who are returning from war suffering from a mental disorder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Close Walter Reed and use the money for the Soldier’s Home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Byke, Emil</td>
<td>I attended Mr. Cox briefing of the DEIS on June 15. What I perceived is that Mr. Cox’s main issue is how to increase revenue for the Home Trust Fund – I have two simple solutions which would not cost the Fund</td>
<td>The increase of payroll deductions is outside the scope of this EIS. Reuse opportunities are being considered for many of the buildings on site including the LaGarde Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Congress in 1995 passed a bill to increase donations from active duty personnel the sum of fifty cents to one dollar per month – all that needs to be done is to have Dept of Defense order it to be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Catherine McCarthy</td>
<td>Why so many housing units? Are we to become just another small sub division of DC?</td>
<td>The alternatives assessed in the EIS were developed with varying mixes of office, commercial, and residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>David Douglas</td>
<td>Please, please, be a good steward… keep the green space, we need the OXYGEN!</td>
<td>Under the Master Plan Alternatives studied in the EIS, approximately 182-188 acres (67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Edward Strites</td>
<td>Please preserve our Grant Building and have developers include it for their plans. Include opportunities for the able bodied residents to be employable on part-time/full-time basis by the developers/contractors and for future</td>
<td>Comment noted. Reuse opportunities are being considered for many of the historic buildings on site including the Grant Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Friesel, Larry</td>
<td>work opportunities after development is over. Provide projects</td>
<td>Comment noted. The AFRH Zone (formerly Zones 1 and 2) has been designated for development of additional facilities to serve the residents of the AFRH, if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>educational/medical/recreations opportunities to residents to ensure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quality of life improvement, enticement thereby.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Friesel, Larry</td>
<td>… there should be more plans to build at least one more dormitory in addition to the Scott and Sheridan buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There has been mention made of a parking garage. I believe, this would be an outstanding addition to concentrated the parking, rather that spread the parking around in different parking areas The location should be at the end of the Sheridan building across the street from the existing security office or location, in the parking area that is now in that</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Friesel, Larry</td>
<td>The parking garage should be at least five stories height and have at least 2 elevators to transport the people using the facility.</td>
<td>Comment noted. A change in the resident age is outside the scope of this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Friesel, Larry</td>
<td>I was in attendance to most of the meetings if not all and it is apparent that everyone has an opinion as to what and how this land is used. Again, the over 150 year historic usage should always be emphasized to the Veterans and not offices and parks that have limited value to the residents.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Friesel, Larry</td>
<td>The Sherman Building – the front of the building has been renovated and restored, but the first 2 floors in the</td>
<td>Comment noted. Retention and reuse of historic buildings is considered in all of the Master Plan Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>George, Michael R.</td>
<td>middle of the building has been ignored or left to storage and general deterioration. This building, historically has been built as a dormitory, but is now office space, storage and hobby rooms on the third floor. More and better usage of this building is sorely needed. If funds are available to do the necessary work on the front 3 floors and the relocation of the security offices, then funds should be there for the 2 floors in the middle of the building.</td>
<td>Use of the AFRH-W property for a cemetery would not generate the funds needed to meet long-term AFRH needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Jones, Timothy</td>
<td>Return to an increased agricultural use of land; studies have shown that the most profitable farms are close to urban centers. A certified USNA organic farm will reduce AFRH costs of operation and</td>
<td>These alternatives would not generate the funds needed to meet long-term AFRH needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Josephine Soboleski</td>
<td>Security Safety Serenity For such a “vast” undertaking – are these truly a part of the “master plan?” I hope so.</td>
<td>The AFRH has considered security, safety, and quality of life in developing the Master Plan Alternatives shown in the EIS. The Master Plan will include a new secured perimeter that will maintain the security of AFRH-W operations for its residents. Development in Zones A, B, and C (formerly Zones 3, 4, 5, and 6) would be open to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>McLaughlin, Amy</td>
<td>Please re-work your plan to consider a park, running/biking path and green spaces that would be accessible to neighbors. I would be willing to pay an</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>annual fee to have access to this land as I am sure others would. This could be a potential source of revenue.</td>
<td>property. The Master Plan will include circulation plans including pedestrian walkways within the AFRH-W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Michael Longwell</td>
<td>The one solution to solving the AFRH financial problems was not addressed. This solution would raise the $.50 a month deduction form active duty military (enlisted and warrants) to $1.50 ($1.00 is already authorized but not implemented). This solution would generate an additional $14 million per fiscal year exceeding by $3 million in any of the proposed plans. This solution (a very viable and realistic one) would generate more revenue without leasing or selling of any land. This solution would be paid for by the very service members who on day may be living here. It makes a lot of common sense.</td>
<td>AFRH has assessed a range of alternatives which are consistent with the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Patricia McClinton</td>
<td>I am against #6, put in near North Capitol Street.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Development in Zones B and C (formerly Zones 5 and 6) would be undertaken in later phases if needed to meet the Home’s financial needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Van Wye, Brian</td>
<td>Public parks and green spaces must be a part of this plan if AFRH expects community support. Walkways across the property (E-W) should be incorporated</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property. The Master Plan will include circulation plans including pedestrian walkways within the AFRH-W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>2.0 General</td>
<td>Van Wye, Brian</td>
<td>Retail should be part of the final design on both east and west sides of AFRH</td>
<td>Retail components have been included in each of the Master Plan Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Adams, N.M. Jr</td>
<td>Instead of new construction for &quot;condos,&quot; why not utilize existing vacant dormitory building and greatly &quot;under-</td>
<td>Reuse of existing buildings on the AFRH-W is considered under all of the Master Plan Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>All eight character areas obscure historic views and open spaces from within the AFRH-W. The sequestered golf course is almost the only open space and cannot be seen from off the compound. What are the possible ways to consider expanding the open space areas within the EIS span of control?</td>
<td>The building heights in each of the alternatives have been established with the sites viewsheds in mind. The development zones shown in the Master Plan Alternatives include open space which will be designed to enhance the AFRH-W campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>used&quot; dormitories. Contracts could be awarded to reduce each building to bare walls and floors; followed by subsequent complete &quot;up-scale&quot; re-furbishment to the maximum levels attainable (both interior and exterior). Once down, such apartments could be sold at the highest &quot;market-rates&quot; which are now prevalent. Such an effort would result in the large income levels which you are seeking and should be compatible with the neighborhood complaints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>After scoping, might modified alternative plans be formulated to develop fewer zones, in the event that overall adverse effects of developing all zones are too severe?</td>
<td>The AFRH plans to solicit offers for development of Zone A (formerly Zones 3 and 4) in the immediate future. Development in Zones B and C (Zones 5 and 6) would be undertaken in later phases if needed to meet the Home’s financial needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>The golf course driving rage is considered an essential component of a golf course. Will the golf driving range be maintained or relocated? If relocated, where?</td>
<td>Until the design plans are developed it is not known if the driving range will be relocated. If the driving range is relocated, a separate NEPA document would be prepared to assess the environmental impacts of that action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>The uniquely strategic location of the AFRH-W on secure government property serves as a military and Homeland Security vantage point as a point of protection for the Capital of the United States. The property has been used in the past to station defensive</td>
<td>The need for the AFRH-W to serve a military or homeland security function has not been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Is there any construction, improvements, modifications, etc. contemplated or contained within the Master Plan for any area not currently designated within a zone?  Note: There is no mention in the document relating to the environmental impact on any of these areas. Example: Part of the golf course is within Zone 4. To maintain the credibility of a golf course requires a minimum of nine holes. If the credibility of the course is to be retained,</td>
<td>There is no development contemplated for the areas not designated within a zone. Two golf course holes will be affected by the development in Zone A (formerly Zones 3 and 4). These two holes will be relocated closer to the Scott Building for the convenience of the AFRH residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenncott, Christine Mcgilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby</td>
<td>where will the two dislocated holes be moved and what will be the environmental impact of this construction?</td>
<td>As the Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts to resources including the mature trees on the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenncott, Christine</td>
<td>Retention of all of the existing mature trees in the historic character areas are particularly essential for historic-preservation purposes. All development alternatives must be crafted in such a way as to preserve the mature trees.</td>
<td>AFRH has assessed a range of alternatives which are consistent with the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2002 and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>McGilvray, Andrew, Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby Stephens, Arlus J.</td>
<td>another, but merely slight variations on a single theme. More effort should be made to provide true alternatives with a variety of financial and real estate options to solve the underlying concern namely the budget of the AFRH.</td>
<td>purpose and objectives of this proposed action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby</td>
<td>The location of a park in Zone 6 in the AFRH EIS would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Colombia Heights and to planned dense residential development along Georgia Avenue, as well as dense development planned for the rest of the AFRH site. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northwest and northeast D.C. Among the alternatives, the DEIS has</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet</td>
<td>For parcels, or portions of parcels, which have historic significance or character, the development plan must spare them from development, possibly including through alternatives such as land trusts or sale of certain parcels, or portions, for use a parkland. Both options should be added as viable alternatives that allow for revenue but also conservation.</td>
<td>The AFRH understands the importance of the historic value of the entire AFRH-W campus. As the Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts to resources including the historic character of the site. The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Brown, Rebecca</td>
<td>I strongly feel that there are alternatives not yet considered for receiving the finances needed. Other than acquiring funds directly from the US Congress, there are options for retaining greenspace. Please see the <a href="http://www.lta.org/conserve/options.htm">http://www.lta.org/conserve/options.htm</a> for information on conservation easements.</td>
<td>Conservation easements would not generate the level of income needed to sustain the AFRH Trust Fund and viability of the Home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Brown, Rebecca</td>
<td>I am extremely supportive of opening the property for access to the community. The fences and barbed wire around the land is not only unfriendly and eyesore, it fosters neighborhood discontent. To have this land so close but inaccessible is a huge disservice to the community. Community gardens, playgrounds and walking trails would</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Brown, Rebecca</td>
<td>increase the goodwill between the neighbors and the AFRH.</td>
<td>See response to Comment #25. AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity, including the utilization of tools such as LEEDs. Under the Master Plan Alternatives studied in the EIS, approximately 182 to 188 acres (or 67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Carstensen, James</td>
<td>If development is indeed needed, I would welcome environmentally friendly green buildings with thoughtfulness of the viewsheds and keeping as much open space as possible.</td>
<td>We examined the plan for this land drawn up by a few executives and consultants. We don't see anything in the document that talks about national parks. We don't see anything in reference to recreational trails or recreational areas or even parks for the performing arts like the Virginia's Wolf Trap or Chicago's Ravinia. We don't see the talk of the The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property. Recreational uses, even where user fees are charged, would not generate adequate revenue to meet the long-term needs of the AFRH. Under the Master Plan Alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>need to preserve open space for the retired soldiers, the entire community of Washington, and the nation.</td>
<td>studied in the EIS, approximately 182 to 188 acres (or 67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Crandall, Bill</td>
<td>Any development should strive to preserve a reasonable amount of managed green space that is accessible to the public.</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>Despite the bulk proposed, the proposed uses and the general development zone locations are likely workable. But the fact that the EIS alternatives range from a no-build option to options in excess of six million square feet of new construction suggests that there are alternatives in between – and consideration of all alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse effects is the intent of Section 106.</td>
<td>The AFRH assessed a range of alternatives that would meet the needs of the Home and the purpose and objectives of this proposed action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>George, Michael</td>
<td>I'm a home resident and I'm against Use of the AFRH-W for a cemetery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>getting rid of our land. They tell us it's for the trust fund. Nobody ever sees this trust fund. If they want to do something with the land make a national cemetery out of it. If they got to take it from us make it a cemetery for the Soldiers Home. They're running out of cemeteries. That will work.</td>
<td>would not generate adequate revenue to meet the long-term needs of the AFRH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Glance, Jason Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew</td>
<td>The AFRH needs money, but the Washington DC campus is not operating at full capacity. In order to rectify this, the current residents of the AFRH in Gulfport should be relocated to Washington and the entire Gulfport campus should be sold for development. The historical and environmental value of the Washington DC campus clearly makes it the asset to preserve. The historical value of the Gulfport campus is negligible, but its commercial value is</td>
<td>The AFRH-Gulfport provides a critical resource for housing retired military personnel in the southeast region of the U.S. While this site is temporarily not operational due to damages it sustained as a result of Hurricane Katrina, the Gulfport facility is expected to be operational again. AFRH is not considering a disposition of this asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Hafvenstein, Lauri</td>
<td>Any plan to alter the Armed Forces Retirement home property must include a provision to preserve the natural beauty and restful, restorative nature of the landscape and its views. This is, according to the Deputy General Counsel for the National Trust for Historic Preservation “integral to the Monument’s historic context and interpretation”.</td>
<td>Design guidelines which will be included in the Master Plan will be written to emphasize the importance of the historic landscape and other resources. The building heights in each of the alternatives have been established with the sites viewsheds in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Hafvenstein, Lauri</td>
<td>Long-time residents here talk of</td>
<td>Resident gardens will not be eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Hafvenstein, Lauri</td>
<td>anticipating the progress of the gardens tended by residents of the AFRH each summer, a ritual that dates back some 150 years. Sadly, it is all too easy to imagine how different the neighborhood will be if those historic gardens are replaced by high-rise buildings.</td>
<td>under any of the Master Plan Alternatives. The gardens may be relocated closer to the AFRH-W residences so that they are more accessible to the Home’s elderly residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Hafvenstein, Lauri</td>
<td>Why are there only two alternatives—no development or large-scale development with buildings up to eight stories completely surrounding the periphery of the property?</td>
<td>The AFRH assessed a range of alternatives that would meet the needs of the Home and the purpose and objectives of this proposed action. The No-Action Alternative has been studied, as required by NEPA, to provide a baseline for assessing the magnitude of environmental effects of the action alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has there been any exploration of alternatives, such as a land swap or partial development of areas that are less historically significant?</td>
<td>A land swap is not consistent with the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act. The AFRH understands the importance of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Hafvenstein, Lauri</td>
<td>Has there been any consideration given to opening some of the property to public access for parks and recreation?</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Hamilton, Heather B.</td>
<td>I am extremely disturbed that there is no plan to preserve community green space. Any community development, particularly when it is getting rid of what little green space we have in our community, should be mandated to maintain at least 10% of the space as parkland accessible to the community. It's bad enough that the children at Park H...</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Hoffman, Sandra</td>
<td>Among the alternatives that are considered, like prior speakers, I'd like to urge the Armed Forces Retirement Home to work with the DC government and federal government to find alternatives for funding or for land use including possibly exchanges of land with other federal agencies where perhaps you can find a site that would be more appropriate for development and then perhaps this can become a park. Maybe that's a way to work things out.</td>
<td>A land swap is not consistent with the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act. AFRH needs a stable source of revenue in the Trust Fund to adjust to variations in operation and capital expenses. In 2004, AFRH generated $92 million in revenues from military fines and forfeitures, monthly payroll deductions from enlisted military personnel, resident fees, and interest earned by the Fund and donations. The fines and forfeitures have increased due to the war in Iraq, but cannot be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 110.           | 2.0/General        | Kenngott, Christine | Option 1, do nothing, would be my choice. But since that is not financially sustained as a viable long-term source of revenue. The 1% interest earned by the Fund and the payroll deductions from enlisted military personnel cannot be increased without an act of Congress. In 2004, the operating expenses for the Home were $38 million net and this year with the increase of the site population by approximately 50% with the additional residents from Gulfport those expenses are expected to be higher. Without an aggressive strategy to augment its revenue stream and built its Trust Fund, AFRH’s financial stability is bleak as the fund balance will get depleted to pay for operating and capital expenses. | The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>McFadden, Marion Mollegen</td>
<td>I request that the development contain a large green space buffer zone between the edge of the property and any housing, commercial, or embassy buildings. Since the neighborhood has no other parks (other than the small Parkview baseball field at Princeton and Warder), the view is precious. However, the large iron gate separating the AFRH from the neighborhood has always been a source of frustration; we can see the beautiful grounds, but only through bars.</td>
<td>Design guidelines which will be included in the Master Plan will be written to emphasize the importance of green space within the development. The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property. Under the Master Plan Alternatives studied in the EIS, approximately 182 to 188 acres (or 67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>MedStar/ Washington Hospital Center</td>
<td>My mother used to tell stories of family picnics at the Old Soldiers Home in the 1940s. While I realize that the park grounds will not be wholly opened to the public, I believe the development creates a positive opportunity for permitting the local community to better enjoy the campus. By creating open space accessible to the public between Park Place Northwest and the development, down past the duck pond, the project could accomplish its financial goals while buffering the noise and traffic dangers and adding sorely needed, accessible greenspace.</td>
<td>remain in open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Murphy, J. Dahl</td>
<td>Think our congress and lawmakers should support our retired troops. That the AFRH is low on money is inconceivable. Suggest congress put the home’s support in the US yearly budget. Do not support development of any part of the home and therefore want alternative #1 to take affect. Do not touch this historic site for the gains of developers and real estate moguls. Comment noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>The National Trust is particularly concerned about the limited range of alternatives explored in the DEIS. Because of the potential impacts that would occur as a result of the high level of the historic value of the AFRH-W. As the AFRH assessed a range of alternatives that would meet the long-term financial needs of the Home. The AFRH understands the importance of the historic value of the AFRH-W. As the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of development currently proposed in the DEIS alternatives, we strongly urge the AFRH to develop additional alternatives that would involve less construction in order to reduce the adverse impacts on historic resources, as required by 36 C.F.R. §§ 800.6(a) and 800.1(a). For example, using Figure 4-1 as a starting point, DEIS at 4-37, we recommend developing alternatives that would reduce the overlap between Development Zones and Intact Character Areas.</td>
<td>Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts to resources including the historic character of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>O’Brien, Bob</td>
<td>We seem to have four proposals on the agenda, all of which have been developed with little or no input by the residents. As I see it, this meeting and the previous one on the same subject only summarize the proposals being submitted to EPA. At the first meeting I</td>
<td>See response to comment #54. The AFRH-W does not have a preferred alternative. All of the Master Plan Alternatives were assessed in the Draft EIS to provide a thorough comparison of the environmental impacts associated with each alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>Comment noted. Consider and address additional options: non development, more conservative development options and combinations of several development and nondevelopment options</td>
<td>The AFRH assessed a range of alternatives that would meet the long-term financial needs of the Home and the purpose and objectives of this proposed action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Quick, George</td>
<td>The suggested plan to destroy the Home is ridiculous. The proposed purpose of the plan is to raise money to pump up the AFRH fund. This is neither desirable nor necessary. There would be no shortage of funds if non-disabled veterans were no longer accepted as residents. There would be no shortage</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Swanson, Lisa</td>
<td>of funds if a reasonable users fee were assessed each resident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>While the draft EIS appears to consider a range of options for the effects of developing spaces on the AFRH-W, the potential development options proposed to generate revenue does not include the potential of opening this middle-city green space to the public without further extensive development. The current AFRH-W website proudly promotes &quot;a city within a city&quot; with amenities that the Petworth, Park View and other adjacent neighborhoods have been lacking for years: an auditorium for films and live entertainment, a golf course and driving range, stocked fish ponds, community garden space, a bar and restaurant or space for a large catered event, a bowling alley, craft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Taylor, Joseph</td>
<td>Recommendations: Sell off the Le Guard Medical Facility. Drop the 60 year old age limit. Level fees so that all Residents pay the same. Reduce medical staff. Cut the current staff level even more. Many</td>
<td>See response to comment #45. Appropriate levels of operational changes have been made at the Home over the last several years to improve the financial status of the facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

studios, magnificent and modest buildings of historical interest, and superb vistas within a landscape relatively untouched for almost two centuries. With sound management and promotion, by opening access gates to the public, all of these amenities could provide additional commercial and recreational resources for the surrounding residential neighborhoods, apart from the larger-scale development planned at Georgia Avenue/New Hampshire Avenue, with none of the short- or long-term adverse effects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residents would rent space for storage and we have lots of empty space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>The Potomac Conservancy</td>
<td>Creating an urban parkland would offer residents and the public a respite from the congestion of the metropolitan area. The unique historical nature of AFRH-W and its monuments would draw citizens to the area. The federal land converted to open space would then be available to the general public. The residents of AFRH-W would also receive physical and mental benefits by use of the open space. The retention of open space would also maintain the scenic viewsheds of the historical buildings and the greenspace for the residents and neighbors. Organizations abound who can aid AFRH-W in creating an urban park.</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property. The development zones shown in the Master Plan Alternatives include open space which will be designed to enhance the AFRH-W campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>The Potomac</td>
<td>The Potomac Conservancy recommends</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property. The development zones shown in the Master Plan Alternatives include open space which will be designed to enhance the AFRH-W campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>The Potomac Conservancy</td>
<td>The sale of the land to developers would be a quick fix to a long-term problem. The sale is a one-time event and may not solve AFRH-W’s financial difficulties. A more sustainable long-term solution needs to be addressed. The environment, cultural, and historic negative impacts resulting from...</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservancy</td>
<td>consideration of additional alternatives that incorporated a mix of uses, public open space, and historic preservation. The Potomac Conservancy advocated a mixed-use development that provides some community open space, particularly saving the community garden. This proposal would mitigate the environmental impacts from the DEIS alternatives.</td>
<td>to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property. Resident gardens will not be eliminated under any of the Master Plan Alternatives. The gardens may be relocated closer to the AFRH-W residences so that they are more accessible to the Home’s elderly residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>2.0/General</td>
<td>Tubman, Michael</td>
<td>Nor does the draft EIS afford any opportunities for greater public access to green areas. On p. 3-17, the draft EIS identifies the need for more public parks and green spaces as part of the land use plan of The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. Later, on p. 4-23, the draft EIS concludes that Master Plan Alternatives would &quot;conserve open space on the site,&quot; but it does not include any opportunity for public access to this open space. On p. 4-38, the draft EIS acknowledges that the use of the Soldier Home as public parkland is compatible with the traditional residential neighborhoods surrounding it. I would feel more comfortable supporting any of</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. 2.0/General</td>
<td>Valenti, Cliff</td>
<td></td>
<td>the Master Plan Alternatives if some public access was given to the existing green areas within the Soldiers Home property, thereby making the Master Plan Alternatives consistent with the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>AFRH has considered alternatives allowed under current law to provide the additional revenues needed for the home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. 2.1</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other alternatives to generating revenue for the Old Soldiers Home need to be discussed. Our Federal Government has the responsibility to make sure our soldiers are adequately funded in their retirement. Giving up their gardens and green space or their prescription drugs should not even be an issue. Granted, this proposal is the easiest out for the financial woes of the AFRH, but it's a band-aid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completed primarily by or on behalf of AFRH Development. No major changes to the Sheridan Building are proposed as part of the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. 127.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Chapter 2, page 2-4, Zone 1 Zone 1 is designated for institutional uses compatible with the AFRH-W operations…. In detail, please define and explain the institutional uses?</td>
<td>See response to comment # 125. Institutional uses in the AFRH Zone (formerly Zones 1 and 2) would consist of facilities that would directly serve the residents of the AFRH-W or compatible uses such as educational facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>Dense new institutional and commercial uses that generate a great deal of traffic should be concentrated and focused in Development Zone 3 established in the Master Plan. North Capitol Street and the existing North Capitol Street entrance have more capacity to be able to accommodate the traffic that these new institutional/commercial uses will generate.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Hamilton, Heather B.</td>
<td>Development of proposed new medical uses should be concentrated on the Development Zone 4 located on Irving Street directly adjacent to the existing hospital complexes located south of Irving Street NW. Traffic generated from these new medical uses should enter at a new entrance located at the existing First Street and Irving Street intersection that currently serves traffic from the hospital complexes south of Irving Street.</td>
<td>See response to comment # 37. Development in Zones B and C (formerly Zones 5 and 6) would be undertaken in later phases if needed to meet the Home’s financial needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly oppose the proposal for retail shops on parcel 6. Retail shops will only make the streets between the developed parcel and Georgia Avenue a corridor for additional foot and automobile traffic, and therefore drug traffic, which will increase the violence level in our already-violent neighborhood. By the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>time that the new development is completed, the shops at the Georgia Avenue metro, only 3 blocks away, will have been completed. There is no need to add additional retail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>2.1.2 and 2.1.3</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby Stephens, Arlus J.</td>
<td>The DEIS mentions any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but that standard does not actually appear to be consistently applied in the document. That error must be corrected. For example, alternatives 2 and 3A suggest development in Zone 6 that is not at all in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood's architecture. The existing neighborhood is comprised entirely of rowhouse architecture, with a maximum of three stories in height.</td>
<td>See response to comment # 37. Residential development in Zone C (formerly Zone 6) would be two to three stories in height in keeping with the Parkview and Petworth neighborhoods. The only place a building may be taller is in the vicinity of the AFRH-W entrance at the end of Illinois Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>2.1.2 and 2.1.3</td>
<td>Brown, Rebecca</td>
<td>I am thoroughly against more medical buildings in zone 5. It would add no</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4</td>
<td>District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>needed services to the immediate residential community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential uses of a scale compatible with the low-rise townhouse development in the adjacent Park Place and Petworth neighborhoods should be located in the Development Zones 5 and 6 identified in the Master Plan. The existing Park Place and Rock Creek Church road streets are both rather narrow and small scale streets. The traffic generated by new townhouse scale residential development can be more easily handled on Park Place and Rock Creek Church road as they are presently configured.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4</td>
<td>District of Columbia Department of Housing and</td>
<td>Particular attention should be paid to the details of the residential developments to be constructed around (to the north and south of) the two large fishing ponds</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>located at Park Place and Irving in the southwest corner of the Campus. These two ponds have some of the most intact undisturbed landscaping on the entire AFRH Campus. The existing landscaped character of these ponds should be respected and preserved to the maximum extent possible by the new residential developments that will be built next to them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 2.1.4</td>
<td>Brown, Rebecca</td>
<td>If new residences are added, I would strongly advocate for them to be built with a similar design to the current character of the neighborhood and to include some low-impact commerce. While Georgia Avenue is slated for improvement, currently there are few services (shops, restaurants, etc) in the area.</td>
<td>See response to comment # 37. Residential development in Zone C (formerly Zone 6) would be two to three stories in height in keeping with the Parkview and Petworth neighborhoods. AFRH is continuing to work with the community and local agencies on the creation of design criteria which will guide all phases of development on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 2.1.4</td>
<td>Carstensen, James</td>
<td>Simply stated - I am opposed to any and all additional development of zone 6 along Park Place, NW in the AFRH proposal. Any additional development should be conducted at the already developed areas along North Capitol Street and Michigan Avenue.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The AFRH plans to solicit offers for development of Zone A (formerly Zones 3 and 4) in the immediate future. Development in Zones B and C (formerly Zones 5 and 6) would be undertaken in later phases if needed to meet the Home’s financial needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 2.1.4</td>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td>The Department believes there is a need to develop an alternative that specifically address the park and open space value and contribution to the City as a whole. In our judgment, the areas identified as 5 and 6 should be considered critical components of an overall park, open space, and landscape component of this retirement home and the city as well. To allow these two areas to be developed for either housing or for embassies would excessively hem in the current</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property. Development in Zones B and C (formerly Zones 5 and 6) would be undertaken in later phases if needed to meet the Home’s financial needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and further use of the golf course and ponds to a point that their future would be threatened. We recommend that a new alternative be developed which would create a public park including the golf course. In order to relieve AFRH-W from the maintenance costs, consideration should also be given to transferring the new park to the District of Columbia or the National Park Service for management.</td>
<td>In order to meet the National Capital Planning Commission’s goal to reduce the dependency of vehicles within the District through minimization of parking, one parking space for each resident or employee is not feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 2.1.4</td>
<td>Hamilton, Heather B.</td>
<td>Any residential or institutional/embassy development should be required to provide parking for each resident/employee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 2.1.4</td>
<td>McFadden, Marion Mollegen</td>
<td>Also, unlike some of my neighbors, I request that if any housing is created, the AFRH require that at least 15% of the</td>
<td>The type of residential housing including income level will be determined by the market and is not prescribed in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>units be affordable to low- to moderate-income families. The rapid gentrification of Parkview and Petworth have priced out many potential buyers and renters who grew up in the area and would like homes of their own. I request that preference for these units be given to long term DC residents.</td>
<td>Master Plan. The AFRH will assess proposals submitted through a formal Request for Proposal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 2.1.4</td>
<td>Tubman, Michael</td>
<td>In many of the alternatives (2,3A, 4), the EIS proposes to use zone 6 for residential development with some retail space as well. In Alternative 2, the EIS refers to areas &quot;compatible with the residential development west of Rock Creek Church Road.&quot; It should be noted that compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods would require open streets. Gated neighborhoods would not be compatible with the existing openness and community atmosphere of the</td>
<td>The Master Plan will include a new secured perimeter that will maintain the security of AFRH-W operations for its residents. Development Zones A, B, and C (formerly Zones 3, 4, 5, and 6) would be open to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>surrounding Park View and Petworth neighborhoods. Moreover, current residents should have access to any new retail developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Friesel, Larry</td>
<td>Proposal #3B seems to be the best alternative in my opinion. The historic use of this land for more than 150 years should be persevered, and of the utmost thought in changes or planning for the land.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>NCPC</td>
<td>With this primary objective in mind, the Commission staff review of the DEIS finds either alternative 3A or 3B appear to best achieve that objective while still maintaining significant and important qualities of the existing facility campus</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Tubman, Michael</td>
<td>Alternative 3B also holds potential in its suggestion for the development of an embassy in zone 6. This could be a positive addition to the neighborhood,</td>
<td>According to the DC Metropolitan Police, additional police patrols would not be required for embassies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>offering the neighborhood prestige and potential commercial customers of local shops. However, p. 4-22 recognizes a need for increased police presence only in the event of demonstrations. The FEIS should recognize that foreign missions would require a greater constant police presence both at the site and in the surrounding neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Valenti, Cliff</td>
<td>Every option, except the &quot;no action&quot; option, is huge in scale, even 3B, which shouldn't even be on the table since the State Department has clearly stated they have no interest in putting Embassies and such at the sight.</td>
<td>Embassies were considered in conformance with the Foreign Missions and International Organizations element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>I am particularly concerned that the financing alternatives eliminated from the detailed study (section 2.2, p. 2-15) were not given full consideration and I am requesting that they be revisited. In</td>
<td>See response to comment # 45. The AFRH assessed a range of alternatives that would meet the needs of the Home and the purpose and objectives of this proposed action. AFRH needs a stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>addition, I would also like to encourage the Armed Forces Retirement Home to examine other options that may yet to have been considered. Among those mentioned at the June 22 meeting were: requesting U.S. Congress to create a line item and support for recurrent funding; examining opportunities to exchange land with the DC government; environmental easements; establishing a land trust, etc.</td>
<td>source of revenue in the Trust Fund to adjust to variations in operation and capital expenses. In 2004, AFRH generated $92 million in revenues from military fines and forfeitures, monthly payroll deductions from enlisted military personnel, resident fees, and interest earned by the Fund and donations. The fines and forfeitures have increased due to the war in Iraq, but cannot be sustained as a viable long-term source of revenue. The 1% interest earned by the Fund and the payroll deductions from enlisted military personnel cannot be increased without an act of Congress. In 2004, the operating expenses for the Home were $38 million net and this year with the increase of the site population by approximately 50% with the additional residents from Gulfport those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>The Potomac Conservancy</td>
<td>The Potomac Conservancy strongly suggests that the AFRH-W consider other alternatives to the sale or lease of the land to developers in order to create a more long-term, environmentally-sound, sustainable solution to the economic difficulties. We question why other alternatives to land development are not seriously analyzed in the DEIS, instead of merely being included in a quick paragraph mentioning other suggested sources of income. These alternatives do not appear to be fully</td>
<td>expenses are expected to be higher. Without an aggressive strategy to augment its revenue stream and built its Trust Fund, AFRH’s financial stability is bleak as the fund balance will get depleted to pay for operating and capital expenses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Draft EIS text was in error. The first paragraph under Master Plan Alternatives has been deleted in the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Chapter 2, page 2-18, Economy, Employment, and Income Under the column master Plan Alternatives, the first paragraph appears to be in error. Question:  If this paragraph is not in error, what is the rationale supporting the statement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Chapter 2, page 2-19, Historic Properties Under the heading Master plan Alternatives, the indication is that the alternatives 2 through 4 will have direct long term adverse impacts. The properties and structures contained within the confines of the AFRH-W have a broad and resonating effect on and from the military customs, traditions and culture.</td>
<td>Reuse opportunities are being considered for approximately nine structures in Zone A (formerly Zones 3 and 4). Another reuse opportunity includes, but is not limited to, the Grant Building and the Forwood Building. Most of the historic buildings onsite will be preserved with implementation of the Master Plan. In addition, as the Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Question: What specific reuse is planned within the Master Plan? What mitigation measures are possible to preserve the historic culture of the AFRH-W for future military generations?</td>
<td>minimize impacts to the historic character of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 2, page 2-20, Air Quality</td>
<td>Two types of impacts to air quality can affect human health. First construction activities can create fugitive dust from demolition, site grading, construction, wind erosion, and vehicular activities. These impacts can be mitigated through emission controls on construction equipment and covering/wetting exposed soils to reduce fugitive dust. The AFRH will require contractors involved in onsite construction to take these measures to minimize impacts on air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Arguto, William</td>
<td>Page 3-35, Character Area 5: Pasture,</td>
<td>There are no prime or unique farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>states that “The Pasture represents the natural agricultural landscape that was once vitally important to the self-sustaining farming activities on the site and illustrates the 19th century pastoral appearance of its once active farming lands.” Prime and unique farmland impacted by the project should be delineated regardless of the current state of cultivation. These efforts should be coordinated with the National Resources Conservation Service. Impacts to prime and unique farmland should be avoided. However, if this is not possible, the Final EIS should explain the implications of developing the prime and unique agricultural land with respect to the Farmland Protection Policy Act as well as describe the mitigation measures for those impacts.</td>
<td>soils, as defined by the Farmland Protection Policy Act, located on the AFRH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>Arguto, William</td>
<td>Page 3-3 of the Wetlands Section states that the largest drainage area on the AFRH-W, approximately 105 acres, drains into two ponds in the southwest corner of the site via a paved flume. The second largest drainage area, approximately 65 acres, flows north to south through the center of the campus via a paved flume and storm sewers. “Prior to any disturbance of these areas, a Jurisdictional Determination (JD) from the USACE would be needed to determine if these features are considered waters of the U.S. and therefore under the USACE’s jurisdiction.”</td>
<td>Comment noted. The AFRH will seek a Jurisdictional Determination prior to undertaking activities which may impact Waters of the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>Arguto, William</td>
<td>The DEIS states that portions of forested areas, mature trees, and meadow habitats would be replaced with developed areas. The Final EIS should provide a complete Information on terrestrial plants and animals is included in the EIS. Under the Master Plan Alternatives studied in the EIS, approximately 182 to 188 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>description of the terrestrial habitat resources in the study area. Complete species lists for mammals, birds, amphibians, reptiles, and plants present in the study area should be provided. The composition and characteristics of each community type should be summarized and the functions and total acreage indicated. In addition, the species should be mapped relative to habitat locations and species density.</td>
<td>(67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. Therefore the site’s carrying capacity for wildlife will not be substantially altered by the Master Plan Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>Arguto, William EPA</td>
<td>Although it was noted on page 3-7 that crappie, bass, and catfish are species found in the two fishing ponds, the fish and benthic invertebrates in the ponds within the study area should be surveyed. An analysis of both fish and benthic communities should be conducted to determine the quality and function of the aquatic biota. The</td>
<td>Best Management Practices for stormwater management will be utilized in all new development to ensure quality and quantity control of stormwater. Quality control measures will be designed to ensure that water quality in the fishing ponds is not impaired by the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>The purpose of the survey is: 1) to detect impairment of aquatic biota, 2) to assess the relative severity of the impairment, 3) to prioritize sites for more intensive evaluations, and 4) to define baseline conditions and documenting recovery from impairment following mitigation actions. The loss of forested areas and open spaces combined with an increase in impervious surfaces lends itself to more pollutants entering the ponds. Reduced nutrients to streams, affects food supply for fish, etc. Therefore, specific mitigation measures must be outlined to alleviate adverse effects to the aquatic biota present in the ponds.</td>
<td>Demographic information on the AFRH-W residents has been added to Section 3.2.1 and impacts to this population have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments

8-107
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 23.02”         |                   |           | “There should be sufficient demographic data available at AFRH-W to treat the population as a separate entity for the purposes of this study. 

(1) How would the same data (i.e. Population, Race, Median Household Income, Poverty Status) appear if AFRH-W was displayed separately as a separate column to facilitate a closer observation of the population most affected by the proposed Master Plan? 

(2) Why were the Social Characteristics and Economic Characteristics not included as a distinct table for tract 23.02 (and separately for the AFRH-W) to provide a more complete and accurate picture of the population most affected by the proposed Master Plan? |
<p>|                |                   |           | Response |
|                |                   |           | “been expanded in Section 4.2.1.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153. .</td>
<td>3.2.1 and 4.2.1</td>
<td>Felder, Charles</td>
<td>Why under the EIS, are the residents of the AFRH-W not considered a distinct, unique and viable population affected by all environmental issues; or as a local community; or as a minority population to be considered under Executive order #12898?</td>
<td>Demographic information on the AFRH-W residents has been added to Section 3.2.1 and impacts to this population have been expanded in Section 4.2.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154. 4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Arguto, William EPA</td>
<td>As indicated in the DEIS, the AFRH-W is a National Register-Eligible Historic District. The master plan alternatives would have direct, long-term, major, adverse impacts to cultural resources and the historic district. The pristine areas that characterize the AFRH-W area and that are associated with and represent historical significance will be lost due to the proposed development. Additionally, new construction would likely alter the historic context of individual buildings and building</td>
<td>Figure 3-8 provides a map of historic resources outside of the AFRH-W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>groups. Cultural landscape features would be disrupted or lost entirely. In addition, the proposed alternatives could potentially affect historic properties outside of the AFRH-W. The historic properties outside of the AFRH-W are discussed within the DEIS. However, a map depicting their location in relation to the AFRH-W would be helpful in determining their proximity to cultural resources within the AFRH-W site. Although a Programmatic Agreement is being developed that will identify mitigation measures as well as design guidelines for the defined character areas, the loss of cultural areas is great and permanent. The DEIS does not propose scaling down the proposed developed areas to retain some (or all) of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>3.3.3</td>
<td>Larson, Michael Maready, Gerald</td>
<td>The Area of Potential Effect as presented in the DEIS appears to be too small to adequately determine the effect of the proposed master plan upon the National Register listed and eligible sites in the vicinity. The methodology used to determine the boundaries of the APE is neither described nor justified in the text of the DEIS. The boundaries of the APE should be expanded to include all of Petworth, and a new determination of effect should be prepared to reflect the expanded APE. In order for the public to fully understand the extent of the Area of Potential Effect, the methodology and justification for its expansion should be clearly explained.</td>
<td>The Area of Potential Effect (APE) was delineated to include all resources that could be affected directly by construction or indirectly visually, by noise, or other impacts such as traffic. The DC Historic Preservation Office has concurred with the APE. The AFRH-W Resource Identification and Evaluation is available at the AFRH and at the DC Historic Preservation Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>understand the implications of the proposed master plan, the <strong>full text</strong> of the <em>AFRH-W Resource Identification and Evaluation</em> should be included in the text of the Final EIS, in one of the appendices at the very least.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Chapter 3, page 3-52, 53, Noise - The last paragraph describes the “land uses near the AFRH” as Category B. Category B is described as “moderately sensitive land uses, including residents, churches and hospitals”. This EIS has given no consideration to the environmental consequences on the specific AFRH-W population whose average age is 77 years and who reside in assisted care and long term care nursing home environment. What would be the Noise Level Results (Table 3-10) if the area within the Land Use Category A is land for which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to serve its intended purpose. Existing noise levels in the interior of the AFRH-W (sampling points 4 and 7) are below the levels noise abatement levels for Category A as shown in Table 3-9. The Master Plan Alternatives would not result in noise levels above Category A at these same points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>DC Office of Planning</td>
<td>apartments of the AFRH-W were designated as Activity Category A rather than Category B which is the current category assignment for the “land uses near the AFRH-W”?</td>
<td>The AFRH is committed to remediation of environmental conditions within the AFRH-W and has taken steps to cleanup known sources of contamination. Based on research for the Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, there is no evidence to suggest that unexploded ordinance or medical waste are located on the grounds of the AFRH-W.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFRH-W has considerable issues with regard to hazardous waste and corollary contamination. First and foremost, the AFRH-W currently does not have an operations and maintenance (O & M) program in place to manage wastes and other environmental contaminants. Secondly, it is not currently identified as a RCRA hazardous waste generator in the draft EIS even though EHA has it listed with an EPA ID number. Furthermore, the following contaminants or areas of concern have been identified with the past and current operation of the AFRH.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AFRH-W:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 out of service USTs (underground storage tanks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 abandoned USTs near Buildings 46 and 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 active USTs associated with Buildings 52, 56, and 64 storing diesel fuel for emergency generators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Possible perchloroethylene ground contamination associated with former laundry in Building 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Former hazardous materials/petroleum use areas in Buildings 73, 76, and 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Surplus pesticides stored in Building 77. Conceivably, DDT and chlordane could be housed there given the age of the units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Spent solvents, paint thinners, paint waste, drummed lead paint debris, possible hydraulic fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Known asbestos containing materials (ACM) throughout the facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also a distant possibility that, given the opening date of the facility (1851), there could be some ordnance issues. Although AFRH-W is neither a fort, nor lies in the "circle of forts" area that comprise much of the formerly-used defense sites (FUDS), it may still be possible to unearth munitions during any required excavations in addition to medical waste and attendant equipment/supplies/bottles, etc. given its pre- and post-Civil war status. As a result, we recommend that an anecdotal review of requisite documents, photographs, etc. be conducted should a...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.0 General</td>
<td>Carpenter, Gracie</td>
<td>Not one of the proposed alternatives will have a “minor” impact on this area. All changes will be very “major” in affecting AFRH-W, being permanent. Traffic into and out of AFRH-W will increase tremendously. I don’t believe any roads surrounding AFRH-W can carry the additional cars, i.e., quantity, size, frequency. Sound level testing was not done near the Sheridan Building because of ongoing road work on N. Capitol Street. I think it still needs to be done because even once construction begins on hopefully a parking garage for AFRH-W, the noise level will still be high for those of us who live on that side of AFRH-W. A sound barrier of some light or heavy geophysical study be contemplated for any ordnance/medical waste debris, etc.</td>
<td>The EIS includes a rigorous analysis of impacts to resources including transportation, transit, and parking. While AFRH-W residents have historically been affected by noise from North Capitol Street, the proposed action will not appreciably affect noise levels after construction is complete. Site landscaping in the new development, including the type of potential trees, is outside the scope of this EIS. No large forested areas would be removed under the Master Plan Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>4.0 General</td>
<td>Cody, Martin</td>
<td>Add: Section on “Resident Impact” from reduced walking area, grass, flowers, garden elimination, and construction dust, noise of equipment, traffic, CO2, etc.</td>
<td>The impacts described in the EIS are impacts to the “human environment.” Therefore, all of the impacts described in the EIS comprise the collective impacts on the AFRH-W community’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sort would be on order. But instead of constructing concrete, perhaps tree around the perimeter would work towards reducing noise levels, be aesthetically pleasing to look at, and would also help in making air quality better. Soil erosion is a concern. With the shallow tree root system here, care needs to be taken to perhaps replant trees with stronger root systems, ones that won’t blow over with the first strong winds. Forested areas should only be removed minimally. We have fox and deer on the grounds also. Please leave some areas undisturbed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>The discussion under the various subheadings within Chapter 4 presents a multitude of mitigation measures. Will the mitigation measures presented in the final copy of the EIS be a required part of any contract entered into with a developer to construct any or all of the planned development zone sites under the Master Plan? Will the mitigation measures presented in the final copy of the EIS be a required part of the final copy of the Master Plan for the AFRH-W?</td>
<td>Following circulation of the Final EIS, the AFRH will issue a Record of Decision. This Record will document all mitigation measure which will be taken as the Master Plan is implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Chapter 4, page 4-19 first paragraph Under the alternatives, there is a potential increase in population to approximately 7,500 persons. With this extreme in population, as well</td>
<td>The Master Plan will include a new secured perimeter that will maintain the security of AFRH-W operations for its residents. Development Zones A, B, and C (formerly Zones 3, 4, 5, and 6) would</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>as the interim increase in the worker population during any construction period, what specific security measures are to be taken to protect the environment?</td>
<td>be open to the public. Projected increase in population is over the development period of 10 years. The Security and Access Plans in the Draft Master Plan outlines security measures to all Character Areas and addresses needs of AFRH residents. AFRH will include provisions in Development Agreements to ensure the security of the environment and residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Cumulative Impact” is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking

The impacts described in the EIS are impacts to the “human environment.” Therefore, all of the impacts described in the EIS comprise the collective impacts on the AFRH-W community’s environment. Additional information on cumulative impacts has been added to the Final EIS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>The impacts described for the No Action Alternative form the baseline against which the impacts of the Master Plan Alternatives are measured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>All of the impacts described in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, are impacts to the human environment, and thus, are the impacts to the residents of the AFRH-W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comments on EIS Section 4.0/General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Cultural Impact Assessment be completed and included as a part of the final copy of the EIS? What will be the specific measures included within the EIS to evaluate the cultural impact within the AFRH-W resident community?</td>
<td>The draft Master Plan contains Security/Access Plans that discuss the security of each of the Character areas on AFRH-W grounds and access to AFRH-W post development of Zones A, B, and C (formerly Zones 3, 4, 5, and 6). The Master Plan will include a new secured perimeter that will maintain the security of AFRH-W operations for its residents. Development Zones A, B, and C would be open to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>DC Office of</td>
<td>The impact of future development on surrounding neighborhoods and District</td>
<td>The draft EIS includes a rigorous analysis of impacts to resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>facilities is of utmost concern. Cumulative impacts of all proposed development on the surrounding area should be adequately addressed. Impact analyses should be conducted for transportation, traffic, transit and parking networks, as well as libraries, schools, recreation centers and other services.</td>
<td>including transportation, transit, parking, and community services. Additional information on cumulative impacts has been added to the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>Meredith Lathbury Potomac Conservancy</td>
<td>The Potomac Conservancy recommends, in any case, that mitigation and conservation efforts be implemented to preserve the environmental integrity of the area. In order to mitigate the environmental impacts of the current and proposed development, modern techniques need to be implemented. For example, reduction of impervious surfaces will decrease the amount of polluted runoff. In addition, incorporating rain gardens will filter the polluted water.</td>
<td>See response to comment #6. The AFRH will make every effort to avoid and minimize impacts as the Master Plan is implemented. In addition, AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity. Best Management Practices for stormwater management will be utilized in all new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polluted runoff from current impervious surfaces which will then help to protect the quality of the fish ponds and channeled streams. Retention of mature trees will improve air quality and protect local fauna. (And also be consistent with National Capitol Planning commission’s program to protect older growth trees and overall vegetation). Reducing fertilizer and pesticides and only adding these chemical at certain times on the golf course will ensure increased water quality. The utilization of green building techniques such as green rooftops will help mitigate other negative effects occurring from development. In general, there are an abundance of common sense, environmentally-sound methods to be implemented in order to ensure the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>Environment: It does not appear that the draft EIS sufficiently considered either green development approaches or the cumulative effect of the AFRH development and the already approved nearby development on the community and broader environment. It also appears that traffic and air quality impact were underestimated.</td>
<td>See response to # 39. AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity. The EIS includes a rigorous analysis of impacts to resources using standard professional techniques. Traffic and air quality modeling has been used to predict future conditions under each draft of the Master Plan Alternatives. Additional information on cumulative impacts has been added to the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>Stephens, Arlus J.</td>
<td>Both residents of the AFRH and neighbors who live to the west of the</td>
<td>See response to comment #37. The development alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home benefit, much as President Lincoln did when he lived in the Anderson cottage, from the relative calm and quiet provided by the green campus of the Home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able to walk past the property and to see its green expanses when looking out their windows or down their streets. In this way, the AFRH has provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its residents no matter their income because it does not look like a poor neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty and calm neighboring the west side of the campus integrate the neighborhood fabric and incorporate open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>Swanson, Lisa</td>
<td>The EIS does not consider the cumulative effects of slated development at Georgia Avenue/New Hampshire Avenue or the potential development of the Macmillan Sand Filtration site.</td>
<td>Cumulative impacts of development on Georgia Avenue and the McMillan Sand Filtration site were considered in the traffic analysis. Additional information on cumulative impacts has been added to the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>Swanson, Lisa</td>
<td>Other statements have addressed the changing but overwhelmingly residential characteristics of the immediate neighborhood. For the purposes of any development within the District of Columbia, the environmental impact considerations must include not only the perimeter neighborhoods, but also the Anacostia and Potomac rivers and the Chesapeake Bay.</td>
<td>The primary impacts to the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers and the Chesapeake Bay would come from untreated and unregulated stormwater runoff from the proposed development. The AFRH is committed to providing adequate stormwater management and using low-impact development techniques to minimize impacts such that there is negligible to no impact to these distant resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>4.0/General</td>
<td>Swanson, Lisa</td>
<td>If you look at the map of the District of Columbia this is huge. This is a huge, prominent green space that needs a lot of attention. Anything that happens here will have a lot of effect not just on the perimeter neighborhood, on the Chesapeake Bay, the Potomac River, all of the greater environment that we're not really talking about tonight, so we can't forget about that.</td>
<td>See response to comments #4, #170, #171. Design guidelines which will be included in the Master Plan will be written to emphasize the importance of green space within the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Stephens, Arlus J. Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David</td>
<td>The DEIS does not consider the heat-retention impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadows, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surfaces will have on temperatures in the surrounding area. The dominant green space on the current AFRH campus has a cooling effect that will be radically</td>
<td>Under the Draft Master Plan Alternatives, impervious surfaces on the AFRH-W would increase between 34 and 37 acres. Approximately 182 to 188 acres (or 67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. Because the region surrounding the AFRH is urbanized, the additional impervious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby</td>
<td>altered if heat-retaining buildings, parking lots, and roads are constructed where grass and trees now stand. The increased temperatures will result in higher cooling bills, particularly burdensome for the elderly poor, or an increased frequency of dangerous summer conditions for those who cannot afford air conditioning, again particularly the elderly poor. Increased temperatures will also worsen the impact of the increased automotive exhaust associated with the proposed development by promoting local ground-level ozone formation. It will also have a deleterious effect on those neighbors with respiratory conditions. Similarly, the mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the area on the AFRH-W would have a minor effect on air temperature. Impacts to air quality are assessed in Section 4.5 of the EIS. AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>Arguto, William EPA</td>
<td>immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The AFRH will seek a Jurisdictional Determination prior to undertaking activities which may impact Waters of the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Page 4-10 states that “Where possible, the open channel systems on the AFRH-W campus should be utilized to alleviate additional loads on the combined sanitary/stormwater sewer system.” However, jurisdiction determination of the channel systems may prevent utilization as a stormwater management system. It is the recommendation of the EPA to discourage the utilization of non-tidal wetland systems for stormwater treatment and management. Numerous studies have shown that siting these facilities in wetlands leads to the degradation of aquatic ecosystems by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contributing to thermal pollution and downstream warming. Furthermore, an in-stream stormwater management and water quality treatment facility will alter hydrology, and increase erosion and sedimentation rates. Retaining stormwater and changing the natural flow rate will alter the natural level of the water table and change the surrounding wetlands vegetation. Water temperature, habitat composition, and food availability are all directly affected when streamside vegetation is lost. Stormwater management structures in wetlands will not prevent pollutants such as fertilizers, pesticides, spills, sediment, and urban contaminants such as bacteria, heavy metals and petroleum from automotive activities, from entering the surface waters since the structures are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>Arguto, William EPA</td>
<td>Page 4-13 states, “The stormwater storage requirement for the site can be satisfied with stormwater management ponds, underground storage pipes or concrete structures built in conjunction with quality control structures, or a variety of urban Best Management Practices (BMPs).” Although low impact best management practices such as bioretention facilities, infiltration trenches, dry wells, and rock trench level spreaders are proposed to reduce the already in the surface water. Wetlands are important components to the aquatic ecosystem that provide flood flow desynchronization, maintenance of water quality, habitat and nutrient uptake functions. EPA’s mandates include the preservation of these environmentally significant values and functions.</td>
<td>Best Management Practices for stormwater management will be utilized in all new development to ensure quality and quantity control of stormwater. The AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>Stephens, Arlus J.</td>
<td>Many residents in the area to the west of</td>
<td>See response to comment #14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>The Potomac Conservancy</td>
<td>The destruction of open space in an urban setting creates numerous problems. First, the addition of impervious surfaces will create increased</td>
<td>See response to comment #176. Best Management Practices for stormwater management will be utilized in all new development to ensure quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby</td>
<td>AFRH use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. AFRH enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The draft EIS has not considered how dense construction on the AFRH property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area, or simply what will be the effect to drainage systems, natural or man made. A raised water table could result in a serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income.</td>
<td>The majority of development on the AFRH-W would occur on the eastern portion of the property. Given the topography on the AFRH-W, most of the additional surface water runoff created from the increase in impervious area would flow east and away from the neighborhoods located adjacent to the western boundary of the AFRH. Surface water runoff created from the increase in impervious area on the western and eastern portions of the site would be subject to stormwater management to ensure that there are no impacts to groundwater recharge or flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2.2</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>run-off and lead to the degradation of the fish ponds, and channeled streams. The streams and runoff eventually add to the overall decline in our major waterways such as the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay.</td>
<td>and quantity control of stormwater. Therefore there will be negligible to no impacts to on- or off-site surface water resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The golf course is intended to remain a permanent part of the facility outside of the zoned development area. Past and present storm water run-off adversely affects several fairways and greens. The third hole fairway, and most heavily, the area of the eight green. Mitigating measures are estimated to greatly reduce further storm water and waste water run-off with minor long term adverse effects. Even a minor increase of run-off and pollution will severely damage the Best Management Practices for stormwater management will be utilized in all new development to ensure quality and quantity control of stormwater to minimize any impacts to resources such as the golf course. At this time, there is no cross compound construction expected as part of the development. Utilities will be connected to the street utilities closest to the development. For example, development in Zone A (formerly Zones B and C) will be connected to utilities off of North Capitol Street.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2.2</td>
<td>DC Office of Planning</td>
<td>eighth hole, making it unplayable both short and long term. Cross compound construction will create new structures, pipe lines and impede access to the golf course both short and long term.</td>
<td>Best Management Practices for stormwater management will be utilized in all new development to ensure quality and quantity control of stormwater. The AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular, we strongly support implementation of the low impact development (LID) practices such as bio-retention, infiltration trenches (where the soils are suitable), dry wells, rock trench level spreaders, and vegetative controls outlined in the report. However, in addition to the above list of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180. 4.1.2.2</td>
<td>District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)</td>
<td>Maximum use should be made of environmentally sensitive “green” building and site design strategies (such as permeable parking lot paving and green building roofs) in order to minimize the increase in the amount of new impervious pavement and building tops generated by proposed development in the six development zones of the Master Plan.</td>
<td>The AFRH will seek developers who place emphasis on low-impact development and environmental sensitivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181. 4.1.2.2</td>
<td>Donahue, Kathleen</td>
<td>Tables 4-4, 4-5, and 4-6 highlight various issues related to storm water runoff. Unlike table 4-3, no baseline is provided to indicate how the values</td>
<td>Baseline impacts for the No Action Alternative have been added to Section 4.1.2.2 of the Final EIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

best management practices, we recommend that the developers also look into the feasibility of green roofs because of the numerous environmental benefits that can be achieved from such systems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182.</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Arguto, William EPA</td>
<td>To determine the baseline value of the habitat and the severity of the potential impacts from the proposed project, EPA recommends that a baseline Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP) be completed on the study area using the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services’s Habitat Evaluation Procedure. If the impacts of the wildlife and terrestrial habitat are unavoidable, the HEP will help to determine the type of mitigation measures which would be considered appropriate for the potential impacts. Measures to avoid potential adverse impacts to these resources should be evaluated and implementation and</td>
<td>Because the Master Plan Alternatives studied in the EIS, approximately 182 to 188 acres (67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space, the AFRH does not believe a full HEP analysis is warranted for the proposed action. As the Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts to resources including the mature trees on the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Donahue, Kathleen</td>
<td>Although this section addresses reduction in green space and wildlife habitat, it does not address the issue of human/animal contact caused by the reduction of habitat. This could increase levels of road kill from animals entering developed areas from green space. I believe the impact on terrestrial biota would be higher than stated in the DEIS.</td>
<td>Under the Master Plan Alternatives, the majority of the proposed development would occur in and around portions of the site which have been previously developed. Approximately 182 to 188 acres, or 67 to 70 percent, of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. Wildlife on the AFRH-W has adapted to living in an urban environment and there would be minimal change in the conditions under which wildlife currently live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Kenngott, Christine</td>
<td>A call for a more thorough assessment of impact to wildlife is in order. To simply say this is an urban area so impact is</td>
<td>Under the Master Plan Alternatives, the majority of the proposed development would occur in and around portions of the site which have been previously developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimal is absolutely false.</td>
<td>developed. Approximately 182 to 188 acres (or 67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain as open space. Wildlife on the AFRH-W has adapted to living in an urban environment and there would be minimal change in the conditions under which wildlife currently live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185. 4.1.3</td>
<td>Kenngott, Christine</td>
<td>At the current time, the mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.</td>
<td>The AFRH-W is largely open space with mature trees forming landscaping features primarily in the Chapel Woods Character Area. This is located in the AFRH Zone (formerly Zone 2) which is reserved for AFRH use. Development alternatives are being considered in Character areas classified as Modern Impact, Pastures and Cultivated Field. No large forested areas would be removed under the draft Master Plan Alternatives. Removal of mature trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186.</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Songer, Melissa</td>
<td>I would call for a more thorough assessment of impacts to wildlife. To simply say this is an urban area so impact is minimal is absolutely false. As a Smithsonian research biologist who has studied urban ecosystems, I am sure impact to such an area is not minimal and will be trying to pursue a study which will prove it if development of Zone 6 proceeds. This area should be off-limits. Preserving this area will be some protection for wildlife that will be affected by the development.</td>
<td>Under the Master Plan Alternatives, the majority of the proposed development would occur in and around portions of the site which have been previously developed. Approximately 182 to 188 acres, or 67 to 70 percent, of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. Wildlife on the AFRH-W has adapted to living in an urban environment and there would be minimal change in the conditions under which wildlife currently live. Development in Zones B and C (formerly Zones 5 and 6) would be undertaken in later phases if needed to meet the Home’s financial needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187.</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Stephens, Arlus J.</td>
<td>The DEIS did not make clear that any development would include retention of all mature trees. Keeping these trees is needed.</td>
<td>See response to comment #185.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>188.</td>
<td>4.1.3 and 4.3.2</td>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td>The AFRH-W presents special and unique values to the overall setting of the Nations Capital in that it provides viewpoints from which the National Capital can be seen, as well as having a significant presence when viewed from many locations. Thus, we believe that the FEIS should define specific building height limits and levels of mature tree growth preservation. Certainly the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts to resources including the mature trees on the facility.</td>
<td>Design guidelines are being developed which will prescribe building height limits. As the final Master Plan is implemented, the AFRH will make every effort to further avoid and minimize impacts to resources including the mature trees on the facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>189.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Within Section 4.2 Social Environment the only consideration is given to Population and Housing with no mention of the Social or Economic Characteristics outline in the Fact Sheet for Census Tract 23.02 (that tract in which the AFRH-W is located). Reference to Question (2) under Chapter 3, page 3-11. Why is no consideration given to the consequences of the proposed alternatives on the social environment and the Social and Economic Characteristics of the “Ground Zero: impact area of the alternatives (Sheridan</td>
<td>Demographic information on the AFRH-W residents has been added to Section 3.2.1 and impacts to this population have been expanded in Section 4.2.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

indication of the general extent of development and landscaping of the area should be envisioned in the FEIS in order to indicate the scope of impacts and extent of mitigation necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190.</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Donahue, Kathleen</td>
<td>Social Environment - States that the affect of the change to the views from the Park View neighborhood would have long term, moderate, and adverse from the perspective of those residents who may prefer to look out on open space. I can attest, as one of those residents, that the affects to my view would be severe or highly noticeable or major. No mitigation measures are included in this section. Development proposals could require the maintenance of significant green space in this area along with development, so that only some of the traditional views are disrupted.</td>
<td>Design guidelines are being developed which will prescribe architectural design and building height limits. Residential development in Zone C (formerly Zone 6) would be two to three stories in height in keeping with the Parkview and Petworth neighborhoods. Approximately 182 to 188 acres, or 67 to 70 percent, of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. Development in Zones B and C (formerly Zones 5 and 6) would be undertaken in later phases if needed to meet the Home’s financial needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Tubman, Michael</td>
<td>Park View residents enjoy a view of the trees and green areas of the Soldiers Home. The draft EIS recognizes the loss of this viewshed on p. 4-19,</td>
<td>Design guidelines will be put in place to mitigate impacts to viewsheds to the extent possible. The AFRH is working with a community planning group to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments

8-143
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>192.</td>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby</td>
<td>Unfortunately no mitigation measures are mentioned for this loss. The FEIS should include the option of mitigating at least some of this loss of the historic &quot;park view&quot; of the neighborhood. The proposed development will have disproportionate negative health effects on minority populations. Specifically, air pollution problems are local as well as regional in scope. The nearby neighborhoods would experience the largest change in air quality from the increased traffic and other pollution sources associated with the proposed development. Further, local air pollution is linked to increased incidence of respiratory illness. Three different recent studies being published this month in Epidemiology find a significant link between daily ground-</td>
<td>The EIS assesses the Master Plan Alternatives conformity with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). According to the EPA, the primary NAAQS standards “are designed to establish limits to protect public health, including the health of &quot;sensitive&quot; populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly.” The EIS acknowledges that the Alternatives would all result in emissions of nitrogen oxide above the “de minimus” (or conformance) level. Therefore, the AFRH will be required to conduct a General Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>level ozone in cities and mortality rates in the next 3 days. Ozone is formed when pollutants, such as car exhaust mix with heat and sunlight. Editors of Epidemiology have made the rather unprecedented comment that together these studies point to an &quot;urgent need to reduce public exposure to ambient ozone by all possible means.&quot; To that fact must be added that communities of color across the nation are experiencing disproportionately high levels of asthma and other respiratory illness. The deteriorated local air quality will also worsen these health problems in this predominantly African American neighborhood. The heat-retention effect of the loss of current AFRH green space will also promote additional local ground-level ozone formation. Finally, determination to ensure that the proposed project is consistent with the Metropolitan Washington State Implementation Plan (SIP). The project will be brought into conformance one of four ways:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- By showing that the emission increases caused by an action are included in the SIP
- By demonstrating that the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments agrees to include the emission increases in the SIP
- Through offsets (decreases in emissions in one area to make up for increases in emissions elsewhere)
- Through mitigation (such as limiting hours of operation or incorporating emissions control technology)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>193.</td>
<td>4.2.2.2</td>
<td>Van Wye, Brian</td>
<td>Stormwater Impact should be very strongly controlled – no net impacts</td>
<td>The AFRH is committed to providing adequate stormwater management and using low-impact development techniques to minimize impacts such that there is negligible to no impact to these distant resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194.</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>Catherine McCarthy</td>
<td>Any thoughts as to the increase in crime to come with the influx of thousands of people working and living on the grounds and what will be done to ensure our safety?</td>
<td>The Master Plan will include a new secured perimeter that will maintain the security of AFRH-W operations for its residents. Development Zones A, B, and C (formerly Zones 3, 4, 5, and 6) would be open to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195.</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>DC Fire &amp; Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>The contents of this plan will have an impact on the DC Fire and EMS Department. However, the impact amounts to the normal daily operating</td>
<td>The development will comply with District of Columbia codes related to fire department access, fire detection, suppression systems, and emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>practices that are already set in place by the department. Basically, your plan is proposing to sell or lease the land that the AFRH currently occupies for future urban development purposes. This will offer more potential building structures that the DC Fire and EMS Department will be responsible for in the area of incident mitigation, emergency response, and fire inspections. Understanding the fact that the city is on an upward growth path, this proposal renders minimal impact to the fire service as long as all structures and occupancies are erected according to the current codes and standards set forth by the District of Columbia, especially in the area of fire department access, fire detection and suppression systems, and</td>
<td>planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>Absorptive capacity of DC infrastructure. It is of huge concern that the DC police department is already operating with limited resources. I am concerned that the capacity of the DC infrastructure to absorb increased demands has not been adequately considered.</td>
<td>Impacts to community services including the DC Metropolitan Police Department are described in Section 4.2.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.</td>
<td>4.2.3 and 4.4</td>
<td>Fenty, Adrian</td>
<td>Upon reviewing the draft environmental impact statement and discussing the proposed development with community leaders in the surrounding neighborhoods it is clear to me that any development of the campus of the Armed Forces Retirement Home will have a large impact on the communities around the site, especially those in Ward 4 where I represent.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kennott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David</td>
<td>I am particularly concerned about the possible impact the new development may have on traffic flow in concert with our existing infrastructure and the historic preservation issues associated with the property which were just so eloquently addressed. Development of this property provides a rare opportunity to create and make available open park space for community use as well and it could influence the economy by incorporating some of those values.</td>
<td>Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the DEIS has not adequately taken into account the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital adequately. In particular, there appears to have been an marked inattention to the Parks and Open Element and the Preservation and Additional analysis of the projects consistency with the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan has been added to Section 4.2.4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>199.</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>DC Office of Planning</td>
<td>Historic Features Element.</td>
<td>The proposed developments along Georgia Avenue and at the McMillan Sand Filtration Site were taken into consideration in the analysis of the transportation system and traffic levels in the vicinity of the AFRH-W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>DC Office of Planning</td>
<td>As the site development process progresses, more information should be provided regarding development areas that will be leased and/or sold for private use.</td>
<td>Comment noted. No decisions regarding the lease or sale of land have yet been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>Hoffman, Sandra</td>
<td>The second question I have is the federal elements of the comprehensive plan for national capital provide the guiding criteria for this development from what I understand from the EIS. One element of the federal elements is to enhance park and open space system of the national capital region and to ensure adequate park and open space for future generations. We are currently seeing very dense residential development throughout Columbia Heights. We are very soon going to be seeing groundbreaking on two large projects on Georgia Avenue and we hope and expect to see much</td>
<td>The AFRH is continuing to assess ways to allow public access onto portions of the AFRH-W, including access to the ponds on the southwest portion of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.5</td>
<td>Valenti, Cliff</td>
<td>Under the &quot;no action&quot; plan, it says there more of that along Georgia Avenue and Sherman Avenue and I think the neighbors very much welcome that kind of dense residential development. I may be speaking for myself but so far we've been able to work things out with planning. Everyone is going to work for the neighborhood. Those developments are within two to six blocks of this space. As I said, we are already experiencing a lack of parkland for recreation in this part of the city. This is one of the few large remaining open spaces available in central DC so my question is why isn't a sizeable park part of the development plan for this site and in particular I would think that Area 6 looks like it would be particularly appropriate.</td>
<td>As stated in Section 1.3, the need for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will be an adverse economic impact to the AFRH-W because of insufficient funding this statement is intellectually dishonest. A &quot;no-action&quot; option would have a neutral effect (no effect) on the current financial situation.</td>
<td>Proposed Action is the fact that AFRH’s fixed income sources are insufficient to fund campus operations and improvement. The balance of the Trust Fund is shrinking because the level of financial demands to maintain AFRH and to keep up with the investments required. Immediate steps are needed to stem the depletion of the Trust Fund and to create sources of other income necessary to provide immediate support, and to sustain the retirement home long-term. The No Action Alternative would leave the Home without a means of creating new revenue and the Trust Fund would continue to be diminished. Thus there would be a substantial negative impact on the economic viability of the Home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>The Master Plan repeats the idea that the AFRH represents the transition between the residential uses to the west and southwest and the institutional uses to the east and southeast. It may be fruitful to compare the AFRH with a neighboring institutional campus, the Catholic University of America. Leaving aside the 49 acres of the former Harewood estate recently transferred from AFRH to Catholic (because nothing has yet been built upon it), the university campus totals less than 144 acres in area, compared with AFRH’s 272 acres. Catholic is considered a fairly densely developed campus. The campus presently (as of the 2002 campus plan) has 2,325,367 total square feet of built area. At 0.37 FAR, this is significantly denser than AFRH, and in</td>
<td>The Alternatives proposed treat each of the delineated zones as distinctively different and uniquely influenced by their Character areas in which the zones are located. AFRH compares each of the zones to a like comparative landmark. AFRH has divided its campus into four zones. Development proposals for the AFRH Zone (formerly Zones 1 and 2) are the same across all alternatives. Character areas in these zones include Chapel Woods, Formal Meadow and Central Grounds or the historic core. Development in the AFRH Zone, located in the Modern Impact Character Area compares is located across Catholic University (zoned R-5-A up to 1.0 FAR). The FAR in the AFRH Zone is 0.45 to 0.8 less than the allowable FAR of 1.0 for Catholic University. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the absence of any historic preservation regulation of the campus, whatever historic landscapes and vistas that might have once existed at Catholic have since been reduced to the green lawns surrounding the buildings. The exception is the playing fields at the north end of the campus which are analogous to the golf course that would be retained at AFRH. If this same level of density were applied to the larger AFRH campus, it would total less than 4.4 million square feet – or millions of square feet less than AFRH intends to add under any scenario – with similar, if not more dramatic consequences to the landscape and historic structures. The proposed density for AFRH ranges from 0.63 to 0.85 FAR overall, but it would be concentrated in certain areas. And comparable landmark for Zone A which is located in the Modern Impact, Pasture and Hospital Complex Character Areas are Georgetown University and Washington Hospital Center, zones for up to 1.8 and 3.4 FAR, respectively. Development alternatives for these zones propose FARs ranging from 1.75 to 2.64, still significantly lower than the allowable FAR for comparable development areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>these figures do not necessarily account for the additional area required for parking; Catholic now accommodates 1,939 spaces, whereas the AFRH Master plan calls for 7,500 to 16,000.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Design Framework is, frankly, contradictory on the intended character of the campus. It points out an opportunity to reinforce the “sharp contrast” between the edges of the proposed “urban” construction and the remaining open landscape (“one becomes a backdrop for the other”) – then twice states that there is no need or desire for “a hard urban edge,” and yet suggest how “an urban edge in a landscape could be addressed.” With regard to protecting the setting of the significant buildings and the overall character of the property, the Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Framework is absolutely correct in stating that “buildings should be subtly integrated into the existing landscape.” It is difficult to imagine, however, how an additional six to eight million square feet of construction, expressed as buildings ranging from four to ten stories in height, can be accommodated subtly. The plan proposes more than quadrupling, if not more than sextupling, the present built area. This seems more along the lines of the “staggering mass” of large buildings added in accordance with the 1947 and 1953 master plans – resulting in the demolition of historic buildings and the interruption of views and axial relationships, but fortunately never completely realized (see page 18). It is clear that at some point a balance between open space retention – as both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>historic landscapes and as bucolic setting for the buildings – and the built area itself will reach an unfortunate tipping point. We fear that, instead of subtly inserting buildings into the landscape, what is proposed is essentially to shrink the campus and build around it something that is very different in character. The possible parcelization shown on page 27 imperils a substantial portion of the Chapel Woods, as well as the formerly cultivated area (Character Area 7) located along Rock Creek Church Road and serving as a buffer to the neighborhood to the west. While in form, the built environment might relate to the remaining large pieces of open space in the manner suggested by the photograph of the very urban Park Squared Gardens, London on page 20,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>the new development would mostly be segregated from such spaces by the proposed new security perimeter.</td>
<td>While we appreciate the candor of the general determination of effects, there is relatively little analysis of what the particular effects might be. With the exception of the “Urban Design Framework Diagram” on page 22 of the Master Plan – which shows that nearly all of the identified primary views would be adversely affected – there is no attempt to relate the plan to the previous surveys of cultural resources. There is no examination of which buildings might be demolished or expanded. The figures for new floor area are proposed in addition to the existing contributing and non-contribution structures, but it is not clear how the new construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would occur in relation to the old. Such analysis is expected in an EIS, and some proposed mitigation of adverse impacts would be appropriate. A finding of “long-term, major effects” is, in a sense, facile because it does not state any probable effects in particular. We refer you to Hector Abreu’s comments on the Master Plan sent to Gary Porter on June 27, especially reuse and prioritization analysis of the sort he suggests in his point #13 and better graphic representation of what build-out might look like as suggested in points #8 and #9 (or as rendered in an axonometric massing model of the campus which would include both building bulk and parking facilities). In doing so, the Character Area Guidelines (pages 30 - 33) should be applied. Acknowledging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>significant adverse effects appears to be directly contrary to the Master Plan’s first objective: “Maximize development on the AFRH-W while maintaining the historic character of the site and retaining significant existing open space.” And “significant existing open space” is ambiguous in that it might suggest simply the preservation of “significant” amount of open space as opposed to the preservation of significant open spaces.</td>
<td>Alternative developments proposed on the west side of the campus in Zones B and C (formerly Zones 5 and 6) range in FAR from .98 for Alternatives 3A and 4 to an FAR of 2.3 for Alternative 2. Comparatively, Park View and Petworth on the west side of the campus are zoned R4 – equivalent to 1.2-1.8 FARs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Response to Draft EIS Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>proposes to create instead a “city in the garden.” The development zones have the potential to exceed the density of the surrounding rowhouse neighborhoods (the highest-density alternative could, if spread over the entire campus, nearly cover the entire property one story deep – but each of the options concentrates the vast majority of the built area on substantially less than half of the property, with heights up to ten stories, or perhaps twelve or thirteen – see page 27).</td>
<td>Further, approximately 60% - 70% of the site will remain undeveloped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>new fence line across the campus will adversely affect these aspects. The Character Area Guidelines take a good initial stab at this problem.</td>
<td>will have an adverse effect on historic views and landscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Hafvenstein, Lauri</td>
<td>The EIS also fails to address the unique role that the AFRH has played in the development and life of the Columbia Heights and Petworth communities. These local neighborhoods of historic row houses—including those in <em>Park View</em>, where I live—were laid out in the early part of the 20th century to take advantage of views to the open space along the western edge of the property. The very character of the area is defined by the beauty and quiet that residents and passersby enjoy each day.</td>
<td>Section 4.3.2 of the draft EIS recognizes that AFRH is the park referenced in the name Parkview. And describes the impact the proposed development would have on the relationship between the neighborhood and the AFRH-W. The Final Master Plan will be sensitive to existing landscape conditions and open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Hafvenstein, Lauri</td>
<td>We are standing on sacred ground and once the cement is poured it can't be brought back. I have read the EIS and I</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>do not feel that enough attention has been given to the adverse impact to the historic landscape. I think that this impacts not just the neighboring community but the city and indeed the entire nation. Are we developing this land for the nation? It appears that we are not. There are untold hundreds of thousands that have not yet discovered Lincoln's Cottage. Nor have they yet found the first Arlington Cemetery behind the cottage where soldiers from the First Battle of Bull Run and other conflicts are buried. We should think of the land surrounding these sacred sites no differently than the space around Washington's Mount Vernon or Jefferson’s Monticello.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>McGluray, Andrew</td>
<td>In addition I think the EIS really doesn't consider seriously enough the impact on what they call the historic character areas and Arlus was speaking about one of these earlier. And what's really bizarre to me, if you look at the map of the parcels proposed for development in the EIS and then you look at the map of what are considered the historic character areas, it's almost a perfect overlap. It's like they've picked essentially the areas with the most historic significance as those to sell off and I realize there may be some reasons for some of that but it doesn't seem like something that's very wise and they really ought to look at at least avoiding the areas that are considered to have historic character.</td>
<td>Character Areas 1 through 7 are intact or retain historical integrity. Character Area 8, identified as the Modern Impact Area, has been compromised, or lacking in historical integrity. As presented in the Master Plan Alternatives, the majority of new construction is proposed within Character Area 8, a compromised Character Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>The DEIS acknowledges that each of the proposed Master Plan alternatives (excluding the No Action Alternative) will have “direct, long-term, major, adverse” impacts on the Home’s historic resources. DEIS at vii, and 4-34 to 4-35. Perhaps the most substantial impact on historic resources, including the National Monument, will be the result of the scale, height, and density of the new construction. The magnitude of the development proposed in the Draft EIS ranges from a total of 6.055 million square feet, at the minimum, to a maximum total of 8.745 million square feet, located in 6 identified zones. As indicated in the DEIS, this level of development would change the setting and views from the National Monument, the National Historic Landmark and</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic</td>
<td>National Register-listed portions of the campus; would result in the loss of National Register-eligible cultural landscapes; and would alter the historic context of buildings and obscure the relationship between the buildings and the landscape. Anyone who has visited the site is keenly aware of the importance of the views from the Home toward Washington’s monumental center, including views of the United States Capitol Building and the Washington Monument. These same views undoubtedly inspired President Lincoln as they continue to inspire and renew the residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home and visitors to the Lincoln Cottage today.</td>
<td>Signatories and Consulting parties to develop a programmatic agreement have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>development within the Intact Character Areas be limited to adaptive reuse of historic structures and that any new construction be strictly compatible with the contributing properties in the historic district. Another concern with the DEIS is the limited extent to which it explores the potential mitigation of the adverse impacts on historic resources. The DEIS indicates that AFRH has initiated consultation with the DCHPO as required pursuant to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and that a programmatic agreement is being developed to identify mitigation measures, including preservation design guidelines to be incorporated into the final Master Plan. The National Trust submitted a request to be a consulting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>213.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>The National Trust also encourages the AFRH to revise the DEIS to explore and disclose the cumulative impacts of the proposed Master Plan alternatives on historic resources. Currently, the DEIS simply indicates that the alternatives would result in “long-term, major, adverse, cumulative impacts” on historic resources, DEIS at 4-39, but it does not analyze or explore what those cumulative impacts are, nor whether</td>
<td>Additional information on cumulative impacts has been added to the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

party in the section 106 process in September 2004. The National Trust strongly encourages AFRH to consult with DCHPO and other consulting and interested parties concerning the development of those mitigation measures prior to finalizing the EIS, so that the mitigation measures can be disclosed through the EIS process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>We're also concerned about the level to which the draft environmental impact statement looks at mitigation efforts to try to protect these historic resources. And we'd like to see it explore in more depth so that the public can have access to that information, some of these mitigation efforts. Some of this will be</td>
<td>See response to comment # 212.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

they could be minimized or mitigated. In order to determine whether such cumulative impacts can be avoided or mitigated, it is essential that these impacts be explored and disclosed in the EIS. This discussion will be particularly helpful in the section 106 consultation process, and will assist in the development of alternatives or modifications to the project that will avoid or mitigate adverse effects, as required under 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>215.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Finally we are also concerned about the cumulative impacts of the development that's proposed and we don't think the draft EIS goes quite far enough in looking at what those cumulative impacts would be. For instance, the cumulative impacts are things like parking needs over time, street construction, and things like that that over the long term will have even greater impacts so we'd like to see the EIS address those.</td>
<td>See response to comment # 213..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>While the AFRH may be preserving some of the historic buildings, the plan appears to ignore the overall historic integrity as it does not reflect or consider the value of preserving the surroundings to these historic buildings. As stated at the June 22 meeting, development will permanently change the historic value unique to the AFRH. In addition, the proposal appears to be inconsistent with existing architecture and therefore not preserving the historic quality of the community. For example, while the draft claims that options will be consistent with neighboring architecture, the plans propose buildings (6-8 stories). This is NOT consistent with the existing architecture.</td>
<td>Design guidelines are being developed which will prescribe architectural design and building height limits. Residential development in Zone C (formerly Zone 6) would be two to three stories in height in keeping with the Parkview and Petworth neighborhoods. The only place a building may be taller is in the vicinity of the AFRH-W entrance at the end of Illinois Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217.</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>The Potomac Conservancy</td>
<td>Third, the development of a historically open space will change the character of</td>
<td>Under the Master Plan Alternatives studied in the EIS, approximately 182 to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the community and degrade the environment. The meadow, pastures, and community garden will be destroyed to create a glut of buildings and parking lots. These open areas are a link to the subsistence history of AFRH. The current residents enjoy the walkways and vista of greenery.</td>
<td>188 acres (or 67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. No development is planned for the Formal Meadow. Construction in the Pasture is to be arranged in a manner to preserve a substantial portion of the open grassland as a park that, along with the grove of trees, will serve as a natural buffer between the historic Hospital Complex and the proposed new development area. Proposed Alternatives for the community gardens is small scale, no more that four stories in height and compatible with the residential neighborhoods of Parkview and Petworth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 218.          | 4.3.2 and 4.8      | AFRH Master Plan Committee | Chapter 4, page 4-35, Character Area 3: Chapel Woods  
It is logical to assume that with spills of oil, gas, etc, the Auto Craft Shop has | The Auto Craft Shop is a non-contributing resource within the historic Chapel Woods Character Area. Until the design plans are developed it is not |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experienced some soil contamination. A stated objective of the AFRH-W master Plan is “Preserve and improve the essential components of the AFRH-W for the residents and the community”. If the Auto Craft Shop falls within the definition of “essential components of the AFRH-W then it is logical to expect that the shop will be relocated to another area within AFRH-W. What specific measures will be taken to ensure that soil contamination is eliminated at the new location? Where within the master plan is the designated location of the relocated Auto Craft Shop? Where will the Motor Homes, Campers and other large vehicles associated with the Auto Craft Shop be relocated?</td>
<td>known if the Auto Craft Shop will be directly affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219.</td>
<td>4.3.3 and 4.11</td>
<td>Donahue, Kathleen</td>
<td>The DEIS addresses the adverse affects of developments on historic viewsheds, the historic cultural landscape, and the historic district. It cannot be emphasized enough that once a historic place is destroyed, it cannot be replaced.</td>
<td>Section 4.11, Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources, describes impacts that will be permanently lost with implementation of the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Does the data in tables 4-10 through 4-16 accurately reflect a twelve month period as opposed to reflecting only the specific period of the actual measurements which were taken at the specified times? Do the vehicle trips discussed under each alternative accurately reflect the 17,000 additional vehicles referred to elsewhere in the EIS?</td>
<td>The data in Tables 4-10 through 4-18 are based on models which take into account the number of vehicles that will travel to and from the site during peak hours on any given day. Yes. The models take into account that not everyone arrives at or leaves a site at the same time. Therefore, although parking may be provided for between 8,000 and 17,000 vehicles, not all of these vehicles will enter or leave the site during one peak hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan</td>
<td>What will be the environmental impact</td>
<td>Existing parking spaces will be replaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>when all parking spaces located within the development zones currently reserved for residents, employees and visitors are removed from their current location and moved to a new location? Where and when will the parking facilities be relocated and what will be the environmental impact of this relocation?</td>
<td>if affected by new development. Until designs are developed, it is unknown if parking spaces will be affected and where new parking will be located. The location and type of new parking for residents would be sympathetic to the needs of elderly residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>What initiatives are in place or planned to accommodate vehicle traffic and parking when the Lincoln Cottage is open to the public?</td>
<td>The National Trust, in cooperation with the AFRH leads the effort to restore and develop Lincoln’s Cottage. Presently, the Cottage is not open to the public and is planned to open in several years time. AFRH is currently in negotiations with the National Trust to make accommodations for among other things vehicular traffic and security management plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>223.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby Stephens, Arlus J.</td>
<td>The impact on traffic is vague and unexplored. It requires more details, specifics, and cost information. There is no information about the impact on the community of the number of peak-hour trips suggested in terms of cost to the city of Washington DC to address, the damage to the local infrastructure, and the overall impact on the surrounding community.</td>
<td>Mitigation to minimize traffic impacts would include roadway improvements that would be partially financed by the developers selected by the AFRH-W. In addition, as part of any development agreement, AFRH would require a developer to prepare a transportation management plan detailing strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Barreto, Carlos and Sandra Kenngott, Christine McGilvray, Andrew</td>
<td>The transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between the affected AFRH property and Georgia and New Hampshire Avenues. The impact of the level of increased traffic considered is unlikely to be limited to</td>
<td>The intersections studied in the EIS were determined in consultation with the District Department of Transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pansegrow, David Tufu, Adan and Janet Wahl, Abby Stephens, Arlus Hoffman, Sandra</td>
<td>the main streets currently studied in the EIS. More specifically, the neighborhoods to the west of the AFRH property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational services provided by streets in Petworth and Park View. In addition, the District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from automobiles on city streets. Bringing a large number of automobiles into narrow residential streets will likely increase the mortality rate in the area to the west of AFRH, particularly because of the relatively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Catherine McCarthy</td>
<td>What will be the traffic pattern(s) on the home grounds and who will control it? How will the increase in traffic, on the grounds, impact foot traffic and those on BPVs?</td>
<td>Traffic patterns for the proposed development will be separated from traffic patterns on the areas retained for AFRH-W usage. The Master Plan will include circulation plans including pedestrian walkways within the AFRH-W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Catherine McCarthy</td>
<td>Who will be responsible for the upkeep of the roadways on the home grounds?</td>
<td>The AFRH will be responsible for the upkeep of roadway on land retained for its use. Agreements with developers will dictate responsibility for roadway maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227.</td>
<td>4.4 4.2.3</td>
<td>Donahue, Kathleen</td>
<td>Transportation section is woefully inadequate in addressing the affects of the proposed development on public transportation needs and infrastructure. This topic is not addressed in either 4.4 or 4.2.3. New residents would undoubtedly use automobiles but many</td>
<td>Additional information on impacts to Metrorail and Metrobus has been added to the Final EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Ewert, Mark</td>
<td>I also found that the EIS does not account for a huge amount of people that might be on this property. The people who might be patients and visitors to the medical facility, the people who might be visitors to the hotel and conference center, the people who would</td>
<td>The formulas used to model future traffic take into consideration the type of development (hotel, medical, retail) and thus are developed to take into account the number of people utilizing the facility and their travel patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shoppers in the proposed retail spaces, and the visitors to the national monument are not accounted for. I created some formulas for those. They are in the letter that I have sent so I won't go over those formulas for the interest of time but there could be up to 50,000 people on this piece of property. That's the size of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, so if we think that our surfaces around this area can withstand this environment, can withstand 50,000 people all at once, I would be very much surprised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Grandy, Timothy</td>
<td>Rock Creek Church Road volume Two lanes of traffic that cannot be expanded. The DC government has refused to provide any type of traffic calming measures along this road, including the</td>
<td>The traffic analysis in Section 4.4 has been revised to reflect the new traffic patterns at Harewood Road and North Capitol Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Grandy, Timothy</td>
<td>The Upshur Street Gate The one-way streets currently used to calm traffic flow in the neighborhoods</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>near the Rock Creek Church Road and Upshur Street intersections, causes traffic to stack up on Upshur Street during the morning and evening rush hours, result in a land locking effect for residents north of Upshur Street, and east of Third Street desiring to go east.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Grandy, Timothy</td>
<td>The street patterns of the proposed new development should work in with the established city grid and planning. This includes the use of green spaces, parks, and vistas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Grandy, Timothy</td>
<td>Office development of the property will contribute a 9-5 traffic component and the hospital will create traffic within these hours from patients visiting the medical center.</td>
<td>Traffic patterns associated with office and medical development have been taken into consideration in the traffic analysis in Section 4.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>MedStar/Washington Hospital Center</td>
<td>The major street arteries adjacent to the site, such as North Capitol Street and</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irving Street and Michigan Avenue provide excellent access to the site. A relatively high density could be accommodated so long as</td>
<td>No decisions on the development of the AFRH have been made and no developers have been selected. The traffic analysis included in the draft EIS are based on the broad types of development included in the draft Master Plan Alternatives. Traffic levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residential areas to the northwest are protected. The characteristics of the site, with large open spaces, lend itself to appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>urban development appropriate so as to counteract urban sprawl. Metro’s Red Line is sufficiently close to the site that shuttle bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>service benefiting all in the immediate community would reduce traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>MedStar/Washington Hospital Center</td>
<td>The traffic impact identified in Alternative 2 overstates the projections Washington Hospital Center developed by a factor of 2.</td>
<td>No decisions on the development of the AFRH have been made and no developers have been selected. The traffic analysis included in the draft EIS are based on the broad types of development included in the draft Master Plan Alternatives. Traffic levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We believe the Environmental Impact Analysis of ALT 2 overestimated total peak hour trip generation by a factor of 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2+ forecast 21,269 trips vs. 8,983 trips. The principal reasons for the overestimation were: Use of junior/community college ratio for the area designated as medical education. This overstates the need by 6 times. Does not account for replacement of existing trips (WHC move to AFRH takes traffic away from WHC campus). Does not account for full impact of internal capture and transit - 2 Metro stops and 5 bus routes directly serving adjacent land use. Does not recognize shift change hours for medical facilities vs. office users that mirror rush hour, i.e., clinical facility staff arrive before a.m. peak hour and leave before p.m. peak hour</td>
<td>represent the worst case scenario for each alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>The lack of a nearby metro station will result in an already taxed road system being further overburdened.</td>
<td>The traffic impacts described in Section 4.4 take into account the distance of the metro stations and, therefore, the potential for low mass transit usage. Petworth Metrorail Station – Green Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking demand for ALT 2 was overestimated by a factor of 2. Note that NIH with a daytime population of 17,000 only provides 8,000 spaces on its 300 acre campus. Suggest that prior to assigning final traffic impact, a more refined analysis be undertaken to more accurately predict future growth parameters – note also that the full development programs is spread over a 15-20 year time frame. This allows for adjustments to be made in roadway configuration, mass transit utilization, internal traffic management, and development staging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Patykewich, Leslie</td>
<td>Conduct a rigorous and unbiased parking and traffic study that considers nearby approved development</td>
<td>See response to comments #234 and #235. The EIS uses accepted professional standards for assessing the impacts of traffic and transportation and takes into consideration planned development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Rooney, Thomas</td>
<td>The DC Office of Planning has stated there will be no major highway. This is from some of their own propaganda. DC will have no major highway improvements to 2025, and that's from the Regional Plan to 2025, the year 2000</td>
<td>See response to comments #234, #235, and #236. Mitigation to minimize traffic impacts would include roadway improvements which would be financed by the developer selected by the AFRH-W. In addition, as part of any development agreement, AFRH would</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>update to constrain long-range plans. So the long-range plan is there is no money to improve the roads. Well, back in 2001 when we got this information some from workshops they were doing on McMillan the North Capitol and Michigan Avenue intersection was a level of service D in a range going to F, failure. The Office of Planning's solution to the coming traffic crisis was, &quot;The developers will have to coordinate mitigation with other major traffic generators to solve traffic issues.&quot; From that gobbledygook it seems that DOT is not responsible for the traffic and the developer is going to be responsible for the traffic but how does a developer be responsible for the traffic when in the EIS statement they admit that North</td>
<td>require a developer to prepare and implement a transportation management plan detailing strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitol and Michigan, Harewood Road and Michigan, and First Street and Michigan all will be rated F? Currently they're rated D so we are only one step from F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So all of this additional traffic will have a humongous impact. On page 441 labeled &quot;Trip Generation&quot; is expected from the development AM peak hours 11,310 vehicles. That's per hour. PM peak hours, 9,960 vehicles, that's per hour. So that is not workable. Everything will clog down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interestingly enough, the DC DOT put out a little pamphlet the other day, mailed it around to residents about what to do when we get attacked by terrorists or whatever, how are we going to get out of the city. Well, I happen to notice on the map on the back that if you live in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this area of Brookland or any place in between on North Capitol and Michigan you either go out Georgia Avenue or Rhode Island Avenue and somehow North Capitol is left off. You don't go out North Capitol. And I guess they're recognizing from their own propaganda here that it will be completely unusable and that's now, not in the future sometime. I just wanted to point out quickly that this EIS is not in a development vacuum. There is a development proposed for the McMillan Reservoir which is horrendous. It doesn't take into account the current development going on or expansion on the campus of the Medical Center and they're building a 1500-car parking building right now on the corner of First and Michigan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Stephens, Arlus J. Hoffman, Sandra</td>
<td>Moreover – and of particular concern to those neighbors left out of the communications loop in Wards 1 and 4 - - the transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between the affected AFRH property and Georgia and New Hampshire Avenues, NW.</td>
<td>The scope of the transportation analysis was approved by the DC Department of Transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on some of the proposed development plans, the impact of the increased traffic will not be confined to the main streets currently studied in the EIS. The neighborhoods to the west of the AFRH property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational services provided by streets in Petworth and Park View.

In addition, the District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from automobiles on city streets. Bringing a large number of automobiles into narrow residential streets will likely
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase the mortality rate in the area to the west of AFRH, particularly because of the relatively large number of elderly and children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Sullivan, Matthew</td>
<td>The effect of increased traffic is not sufficiently explored in the EIS. More detail and study, including of potential mass transit hubs, needs to be included in the final EIS.</td>
<td>The EIS uses accepted professional standards for assessing the impacts of traffic and transportation. No decisions on the development of the AFRH have been made and no developers have been selected. The traffic analysis included in the draft EIS is based on the broad types of development included in the draft Master Plan Alternatives. Traffic levels represent the worst case scenario for each alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Swanson, Lisa</td>
<td>The EIS notes the relatively poor public transit options nearby. Though the entrances to the site are barely within</td>
<td>The Master Plan will include circulation plans including pedestrian walkways within the AFRH-W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>walking distances of Metrorail stations, they are underserved by buses, with one route running along the northwest gates, two along the south, and none along the eastern perimeter. Thus the development options evaluated rely on acres of parking; Plan 2, the most extensive, considers building 17 thousand parking spaces. Yet there is no inclusion in any options for bikeways and pedestrian walkways to or within the existing perimeter. The Washington Post of 22 June included an article proposing extensive new development (though in a completely different type of site at a Metrorail station, and outside the Beltway) designed to discourage the use of cars (&quot;Mini-City Plan Discourages Use of Cars,&quot; Metro, June 22). This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Swanson, Lisa</td>
<td>And the second thing that jumped out at me was this number that's come up a couple times, 17,000 parking spaces. I think the Home Depot maybe has 500 or 800, something like that, so 17,000 is phenomenal and that to me is a huge problem. The statement mentioned that there are three Metro stations close by. I think they're walkable, not everybody thinks they're walkable, but this area is completely underserved by buses, as the previous guy mentioned or someone else did, two near the hospital, one on Rock Creek Church, zero buses on North Capitol. So if somebody is planning on needing</td>
<td>The parking spaces listed under each of the Master Plan Alternatives are worst case scenarios. The AFRH would require a developer to prepare a transportation management plan detailing strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Tulchin, Drew</td>
<td>17,000 parking spaces they are thinking about a lot of traffic and I know that's the maximum. Today's Washington Post has a story that I hope everybody would look at. The title alone is exciting to me, &quot;Mini-city Plan Discourages Use of Cars.&quot; There is a plan underway right now in Vienna, Virginia, to completely rethink the use of cars in an urban area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Tulchin, Drew</td>
<td>The increase in as many as 50,000 people on this space does not consider reasonable physical space for parking, attractive building, and quality of life for work or living. We expect federal standards of parking of 1:5 ratio and other federal requirements be established for mitigation.</td>
<td>Until designs are developed, the number of parking spaces required is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Valenti, Cliff</td>
<td>Traffic considerations do not include increases from the Lincoln Cottage, or the hotel planned for the sight, not to</td>
<td>See response to comment #222. The traffic analysis did consider increased trips from the Lincoln Cottage and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.0 Response to Draft EIS Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>EIS Section Number</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mention that it is far enough away from the metro station that most people aren’t going to walk, but drive. Additionally, it does not include an assessment of how traffic will be impacted from the new projects already slated for Georgia Avenue, Columbia Heights, and Petworth.</td>
<td>surrounding planned development. Traffic associated with the Lincoln Cottage would arrive throughout the day and not during peak hours when traffic congestion is at its worst. In accordance with accepted professional standards, peak hour traffic is analyzed to determine the worst-case traffic impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Van Wye, Brian</td>
<td>Traffic congestion must be anticipated and mitigated so that impact is zero or negligible.</td>
<td>Mitigation to minimize traffic impacts would include roadway improvements which would be financed by the development of the AFRH-W. In addition, as part of any development agreement, AFRH would require a developer to prepare a transportation management plan detailing strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Donahue, Kathleen</td>
<td>The topic of air temperatures is not addressed in the DEIS. The reduction of green space and increase in heat-</td>
<td>Under the Master Plan Alternatives, impervious surfaces on the AFRH-W would increase between 34 and 37 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Maclin, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Increased temperatures will worsen the impact of the increased automotive exhaust associated with the proposed development by promoting local ground level ozone formation.</td>
<td>Under the Master Plan Alternatives, impervious surfaces on the AFRH-W would increase between 34 and 37 acres. Approximately 182 to188 acres (67 to 70 percent) of the AFRH-W would remain in open space. Because the region surrounding the AFRH is urbanized, the additional impervious area on the AFRH-W would have a minor effect on air temperature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>The Potomac Conservancy</td>
<td>Second, the proposed development adds to the problem of poor air quality in the metropolitan area. The proposal will</td>
<td>Air quality impacts from vehicular traffic have been assessed in Section 4.5 of the EIS. As stated in this section,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>AFRH Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>add 3,000 to 5,000 additional vehicles in the morning and evening commutes. The increase in vehicles adds to the already poor quality of air in the region through emission of pollutants. Traffic and parking is already a problem in this area. The stationary sources proposed to the land on AFRH-W will also increase levels of pollutants emitted into the air.</td>
<td>none of the Master Plan Alternatives would exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards for mobile sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Felder, Charles</td>
<td>Chapter 4, page 4-62, Noise Proposed Action Alternatives 2, 3A, 3B, and 4. What are the specific plans to protect AFRH-W residents from short and long range noise pollution?</td>
<td>Noise impacts to AFRH-W residents would occur confined to the period of construction activities. Mitigation measures for construction noise impacts are provided in Section 4.6 of the EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How long a period will the short term construction be that will seriously affect the health, life spans and peaceful lives of the residents? Is there any way at present to assess any</td>
<td>Noise impacts to AFRH-W residents would occur confined to the period of construction activities. The period of construction is approximately 10 years; however, it should be noted that this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>EIS Section Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mitigating measures?</td>
<td>construction will not be continual and will take place in different locations on campus with varying distances from resident facilities. Mitigation measures for construction noise impacts are provided in Section 4.6 of the EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Donahue, Kathleen</td>
<td>The existing workload of WASA could be impacted by the installation of new public water and sewer lines for the development. The ongoing replacement of existing lead service lines may be slowed as a result, prolonging exposure of city residents to unsafe lead levels.</td>
<td>New water and sewer lines within the AFRH-W would be constructed by the developer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Chesapeake Bay Field Office
177 Admiral Cochrane Drive
Annapolis, MD 21401

December 1, 2004

Ms. Robin W. Griffin
Greenhouse & O'Mara, Inc.
9001 Edmonton Road
Greenbelt, MD 20770

RE:  Master Plan at the U.S. Armed Forces Retirement Home, Washington, DC

Dear Ms. Griffin,

This responds to your letter, received October 26, 2004, requesting information on the presence of species which are federally listed or proposed for listing as endangered or threatened in the above referenced project area. We have reviewed the information you enclosed and are providing comments in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Except for occasional transient individuals, no proposed or federally listed endangered or threatened species are known to exist within the project impact area. Therefore, no Biological Assessment or further section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is required. Should project plans change, or should additional information on the distribution of listed or proposed species become available, this determination may be reconsidered.

This response relates only to federally protected threatened or endangered species under our jurisdiction. Limited information is currently available regarding the distribution of other rare species in the District of Columbia. However, the Nature Conservancy and National Park Service (NPS) have initiated an inventory of rare species within the District. For further information on such rare species, you should contact Marcus Koonsen of the DC Natural Heritage Program at (202) 342-1443 ext. 216.

An additional concern of the Service is wetlands protection. Federal and state partners of the Chesapeake Bay Program have adopted an interim goal of no overall net loss of the Basin's remaining wetlands, and the long term goal of increasing the quality and quantity of the Basin's wetlands resource base. Because of this policy and the functions and values wetlands perform, the Service recommends avoiding wetland impacts. All wetlands within the project area should be identified, and if alterations of wetlands is proposed, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, should be contacted for permit requirements. They can be reached at (410) 962-3670.
We appreciate the opportunity to provide information relative to fish and wildlife issues, and thank you for your interest in these resources. If you have any questions or need further assistance, please contact Maricela Constantino at (410) 573-4542.

Sincerely,

G. Andrew Moser
Program Supervisor, Threatened and Endangered Species
Armed Forces Retirement Home

Master Plan Environmental Impact Statement

Scoping Summary

This document provides a summary of actions undertaken by the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) to provide Federal and local agencies, the public, and potentially affected parties an opportunity to participate in a process called “scoping.” During this process, AFRH solicited comments on the scope of the issues, probable impacts, and possible alternatives to be considered in the AFRH – Washington Master Plan.

This document includes a summary of the scoping process, a description of the Public Scoping Meeting, a summary of comments received during the scoping process, and copies of scoping materials including:

- Notice of Intent
- NOI Letter with Address List
- NOI Proof of Publication: Washington Post
- Letter to AFRH Residents
- Public Notice Post Card
- Town Hall Presentation
- Public Meeting Presentation
- Public Meeting Attendance Sheets
- Public Meeting Comment Sheet
- Public Meeting Handout
- Public Meeting Displays
- Public Comments – Letters And Comment Forms

AFRH issued a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on August 17, 2004. The NOI described the proposed action and set September 17, 2004 as the deadline for submitting scoping comments. The NOI was published in the Federal Register as well as in the Washington Post.

NOI letters were mailed to 185 Federal and local agencies, public officials, community groups, special interest groups, and area residents. The letters included information on the Public Scoping Meeting and provided instructions for submitting comments to AFRH. Postcards announcing the public meeting were distributed by hand to all properties abutting the AFRH.

A Town Hall meeting was held on September 8, 2004 for residents of the AFRH-Washington. Tim Cox presented information on the proposed Master Plan and the EIS scoping process. Residents were given the opportunity to ask questions. Comment forms were provided to those who wished to make formal scoping comments.
Public Scoping Meeting (Open House)

Date & Time: September 9, 2004
Location: AFRH – Washington, Sherman Building
Project Team Attendees:

Tim Cox, AFRH
Steve McManus, AFRH
Joseph Woo, AFRH
Sheila Abarr, AFRH
Don Dailey, AFRH
Craig Wallwork, GSA
Nancy Czapek, GSA
Denise Decker, GSA

Stephen Schwartz, GSA
Thomas Otto, GSA
Pamela Weisling, AEW
Bill Petragallo, AEW
Emily Eig, EH Traceries
Joan Glynn, G&O
Elizabeth Estes, G&O
Emily Lux, G&O

On Thursday, September 9, 2004, the AFRH held an Open House for the AFRH residents from 3:30 to 5:30 p.m and for residents and the public from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. Approximately 53 people attended the meeting. Poster boards were displayed showing the project location; draft master plan concept; a history of the AFRH; the EIS process; the Section 106 process; and environmental features to be addressed in the EIS. Project team members were available to explain the proposed project and to answer questions. An informational brochure on the project was provided to meeting attendees. A PowerPoint presentation was also run providing details on the master plan and the NEPA and Section 106 processes.

Comment forms were available for attendees to complete. Tape recorders were also available for those who wished to record audio comments rather than submit written comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Via Tape Recorder | Robert Hill, AFRH Resident | • Would like things to stay basically intact even while striving to keep the home alive  
• Hopes environmental changes are not too drastic or severe  
• Would like views at north end to still be ornate and beautiful  
• Understands there will be buildings everywhere at north end  
• Would like to still be able to see the American flag on the flagpole; this is very important |
| 9/14/04    | James F. Caldas, Medstar  | • MedStar/WHC fully supports the concept of development of the south land not otherwise needed by AFRH. Appropriate development compatible with AFRH and neighboring uses is important for the efficient use of land to benefit the community and City as a whole.  
• City has limited large tracts of land for development; a variety of possibilities should be considered that maximize the benefits to the community both financially and substantively; because of the character of the land use south of Irving, medical, educational, research and other related institutional uses should be considered; MedStar/WHC intends to pursue this opportunity  
• The major street arteries provided excellent access to the site; a relatively high density should be accommodated as long as residential areas are protected; the characteristics of the site, with large open spaces, make urban density appropriate so as to counteract urban sprawl  
• Metro’s Red Line is sufficiently close to the site that shuttle bus service benefitting all in the immediate community would reduce traffic  
• The clinical and research components of MedStar/WHC’s plan have a unique compatibility with the mission of the home and could assist in providing or coordinating development for the important site.  
• The site would allow the expansion and renovation of the WHC facilities, which can become a model for the delivery of medical services in a post-9/11 world in an urban center vulnerable to terrorist attacks  
• From an environmental and historic preservation standpoint, the AFRH property is large enough to address issues that are likely to be considered. Development should occur at the southeast, south, west, and northwest portions of the property as generally outlined by AFRH.  
• Would like to receive a copy of the EIS |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | Ken Collier, AFRH Resident | • Safety and security – staffing and training seem inadequate presently; there are multiple examples of unidentified individuals roaming buildings and grounds. Also residents are checked at gate, but delivery trucks, etc. are waved through.  
• Many examples of grounds of safety hazards; trip hazards; too hot water; faulty furniture. |
|      | Loroy G. Cougle, Associated Training Systems (Two comment forms) | • What affect will increased population density have on the pond & water flow (to and from the pond)?  
• What structures, facilities, etc. should be prohibited to protect the integrity of the water quality and flow?  
• What impact will increased population density have on the wildlife living within the confines of the home?  
• Will the environmental study be completed before the master plan is developed? If not, will a supplemental environmental study be completed and subjected to public review? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|            | Mark Ewert                    | • Green space and view of the AFRH property greatly increases the value of my home, both financially and in my quality of life  
• Not opposed to the idea of developing parts of the home; however, is concerned about the details of that development and how it will affect home and surrounding neighborhood  
• Right across the street, residential development is suggested. If this occurs, the following design concepts would reduce the impact of the new development:  
  - Not disturbing the stone and brick fence. New homes where the driving range now exists might reasonably be accessed using the existing (now blocked) entrance from Rock Creek Church Road just above where Illinois Avenue meets it  
  - The height and size of new buildings be restricted to reflect those of the surrounding neighborhood. This would mean that buildings are not over 4 - 5 stories tall and that single buildings are not massive in square footage  
  - Low income housing (projects) not be built here, as this would decrease property values and would not improve our neighborhood  
  - The new buildings be built a respectable distance from the existing fence so that they do not loom over Rock Creek Church Road  
  - Larger and specimen trees in the area to be developed be avoided and built around as much as possible  
  - The architectural style of the new buildings reflects the historic nature of the site and some of the historic buildings in the vicinity (on the AFRH property)  
Disappointed with lack of publicity for public scoping meeting |
|            | Hal Grant, NAVS               | • Would like a copy of the EIS  
• Would like a map/sketch of proposed areas for disposal and development |
|            | William Jentara, AFRH Resident| • Would like copy of the EIS |
|            | Frank McCabe, AFRH Resident   | • The walking trails throughout the open areas should be considered as physical and mental therapy for the residents and thereby preserved  
• The Grant Building should be renovated and used for the relocation of residents of the Piper and LaGarde Buildings |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9/9/04   | Wilfred McCarty                        | • Good to have green plot of land in the middle of the District. If there is ever a terrorist attack or national emergency, this is a good place for government officials, the Mayor, police, firemen, troops to establish temporary headquarters or get first aid. During the naps it was used by troops to come in, set up tents, and help. Guards can be put at the gates. LaGerde Hospital could be used in emergencies.  
• Good to have breathing space in the District  
• Once land is sold and the money spent you have nothing  
• If it is at all possible get funds from corporations, and they get a tax break |
| 9/28/04  | Jim Paunkey, AFRH Resident (Gulfport)  | • On the draft master plan concept, do the areas designated for residential development include Scott Hall?  
• Does 'Resident' mean resident or does it include staff or housing for other than authorized residents? |
| 9/15/2004| Donald M. Peace                        | • Sale of AFRH-W property not in the long term best interests of the home; advocates long term lease with reversion to home  
• Does not support replacing the LaGerde Building due to age of the building; LaGerde should serve its purpose for another 10 to 15 years; cost not justified by savings in transportation cost  
• Presence of commercial development or real estate persons in the decision making process is a concern; understands if their participation is purely advisory, but not in a decision making role  
• Generally agrees with the concept of and objectives of the master plan  
• Concerned that perpetuation of the home for its historical purpose will be in jeopardy if further transfer of real estate holdings occurs |
|          | John E. Price, AFRH Resident           | • Parking is a problem  
• Management works and parks in their own area so they are unaware of the conflict  
• Lower ranked employees, tenants, visitors, guests and of course residents are left to battle over the few decent parking spots left  
• If all activities from the south end of the campus (King Health center, etc.) are consolidated along with various new tenants to the north end of the campus, where are of these people going to park? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commenter, AFRH Resident</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9/9/04     | Mimi Rivkin, AFRH Resident | • One development plan should expand and improve the golf course with a nice club house as a private "city golf club"; approach a well known golfer to redesign and sponsor it; this may eliminate some building areas but would be an incentive to other residential, hospital, and "mission" tenants  
• Turn homes on "generals' row" into bed and breakfast inns, cocktail lounge, commissary, shops, meeting rooms, pharmacy, CVS, outlet shops, etc. |
| 9/14/04    | Mimi Rivkin, AFRH Resident | • The plans to construct a new long term health center joining the Scott and Sheridan buildings at the point of their right angle should eventually be beneficial to the residents as well as being economical  
• Construction will take place directly within the living, eating, and activity areas of the elderly residents in both buildings, many of whom have respiratory problems. During construction, which will surely take over a year, the air will be fouled with dust and debris, reaching into windows and vents; and noise will be intolerable. This pollution could severely affect the health of residents – especially since independent living residents have no on-site emergency, pharmaceutical system evenings, weekends and holidays.  
• When will construction begin and what plans do you have to protect or relocate approximately 800 residents during the period of construction? |
|            | Leroy Smith, AFRH Resident | • Get funding from defense contractors (e.g. Lockheed Martin)  
• Give presentation to contractors  
• Establish logo showing partnership  
• Get donations annually  
• Possible logo “We serve for those who served” |
|            | William D. Woods, AFRH Resident | • Should use land on AFRH for extension of the Soldiers Home Cemetery  
• The Master Plan, if carried out, would cause more congestion forever  
• Instead of turning the land over to developers, better steps can be taken in the national interest |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2004</td>
<td>Angela Washington</td>
<td>• Resident of Parkview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not informed of scoping meeting; requests extension of scoping period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• and a second public scoping meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Following should be considered in the scoping process:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Height restrictions for structures erected across from existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• existing residential homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effects of new infrastructure on existing infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preservation of green space on the north and west boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Damage to existing foundations of residential homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Health effects on residents as a result of such a massive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• undertaking; liability for future illnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Efforts to control dust and dirt that might invade residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Noise pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reasonable timetables for construction and residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• inconvenience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effort to identify through historic research anything additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• on the site that has not yet been officially identified as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• preservable due to its history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effort at a cooperative-mix to leave residential areas as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• unencumbered as possible in keeping with the established “Parkview”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Redrawing the location of structures such as cultural, foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• missions, institutional and commercial to areas such as the east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• and south side of the campus where residential areas would not be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• substantially impacted by such entities operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- For residential, if there is construction along the north and west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• sides of the campus, structures should be set back far enough from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the street and spaced apart from one another to adhere to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• “Parkview” theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preservation of the existing trees, etc. on the structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Runoff, drainage and erosion concerns on existing homes and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• personal property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effect on existing parking and traffic issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/04</td>
<td>Local Residents</td>
<td>• Not informed of scoping meeting; requests extension of scoping period and a second public scoping meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• EIS should consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Air pollution brought by increased traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Noise pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Groundwater runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- View sheds being destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Trees being removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Wildlife being displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Geological disruption to the area due to digging, blasting, pounding, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Interference with historical landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Archeological resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social and economic resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Health concerns and inconvenience of construction on adjacent communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Architectural integrity with existing structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Height restrictions on any new potential structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Public/community access to green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential structural or foundational damage to historic properties or neighboring structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Security impacts on adjacent communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential introduction of hazardous materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential impacts on utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Green space and open space being permanently altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact of adding further congestion to neighborhoods that are already among the most densely-populated areas of the East Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/04</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>• Request participation as a consulting party for the master planning project under Section 106 of the NHPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Request opportunity to comment on any documents prepared under NEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Urge AFRH to proceed with great sensitivity when changing the nature of the historical treasure represented by the entire campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Master plan should balance the needs of the AFRH with the property's natural beauty and unique historic value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offers to lend technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9/17/04 | National Capital Planning Commission          | • Within the District all federal planning and actions affecting federal interest must be reviewed by the NCPC  
• North Capital Street corridor is an important viewshed landmark and gateway to the Nation’s Capital, and improving the potential and use activity and transportation infrastructure along this important gateway into the city is a policy goal of the NCPC Comprehensive Plan  
• The proposed Master Plan should adhere to the Comprehensive Plan and the NCPC submission requirements  
• Substantial removal of vegetation would not be supported by the Comprehensive Plan  
• Impervious surfaces should be limited  
• Design of roads, parking, pedestrian surfaces, and building pattern development should be determined in association with the Commission  
• Prior to exceeding property, use for federal or non-federal public activities, including use for Foreign Missions, should be explored  
• If exceeded, future use should be coordinated with surrounding development patterns and land uses and planning should contribute effectively to existing community development goals  
• Master planning effort should verify participation, in consultation with local preservation offices and provide for an opportunity for public involvement.  
• Effort should anticipate preparation of management plans to provide in-depth procedures for the treatment of historic resources within the existing recorded historic district of the AFHR  
• Request that NCPC be identified in the EIS as a cooperating agency |
I appreciated the opportunity to attend the AFRH-Washington Master Plan Scoping Meeting held on September 18th and have the following comments to offer regarding the proposed plan:

1. MedStar/VHC fully supports the concept of development of the south land not otherwise needed by AFRH. As the owner and operator of the medical complex on land immediately to the south across Irving Street, N.W., we believe that appropriate development compatible with AFRH and neighboring uses is important for the efficient use of land to benefit the community and City as a whole.

2. This City has limited large tracts of land for development. When large parcels become available for use, a variety of possibilities should be considered that maximize the benefits to the community both financially and substantively. Because of the character of the land use south of Irving, medical, educational, research and other related institutional uses should be considered. MedStar/VHC intends to pursue this opportunity.

3. The major street arteries adjacent to the site, such as North Capitol Street, Irving and Michigan Avenue provide excellent access to the site. A relatively high density should be accommodated so long as residential areas to the north west are protected. The characteristics of the site, with large open spaces, make urban density appropriate so as to counteract urban sprawl. Metro's Red Line is sufficiently close to the site that shuttle bus service benefiting all in the immediate community would reduce traffic.

4. The clinical and research components of MedStar/VHC's plan have a unique compatibility with the mission of the home and could assist in providing or coordinating development for this important site. In addition, the site would allow the expansion and renovation of the VHC facilities, which can become a model for the delivery of medical services in a post-9/11 world in an urban center vulnerable to terrorist attacks.

5. From an environmental and historic preservation standpoint, the

https://collabsite.sfh.gov/himtraffic.com
AFRH property is large enough to address issues that are likely to be considered. Development should occur at the southeast, south, west and northwest portions of the property as generally outlined by AFRH.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would appreciate receiving a copy of the environmental impact statement when it becomes available.
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Name: Ken Collier
Address: Box 475 AFRH w
Affiliation: Resident
Phone: 888-029-1754

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

Safety & Security - Staffing & Training seem inadequate presently. There are multiple examples of unidentified individuals roaming buildings & grounds. Also, residents are checked at gate, but delivery trucks, etc., waved through.

Many examples on grounds of safety hazards: tripping, too hot water, etc. about this one.

This info is only submitted as a Tool for planning, not a complaint.

Please send comments to:
Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20011

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Name: Robert G. Conole
Address: 3700 North Capitol St., NW, Washington, DC 20015
Affiliation: Associated Training Systems
Phone: 202-972-4108

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

☐ Yes □ No

Comments:

What effect will increased density have on the pond, water flow (to & from the pond), also what structures, facilities, etc. should be provided to protect the integrity of the water quality & flow. Also what impact of the wild life living within the confines of the home will increased population density have.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20011

craig.wallwork@afrh.gov

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Name: Lewis G. Coughlin
Address: 3700 North Capitol Street, NW #1072 Washington, DC 20011
Affiliation: Associated Training Systems
Phone: 202-887-4101

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action
when it becomes available?  
☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments
Will the environmental study be completed
before the master plan is developed. If so
will a supplemental environmental study
be conducted to substantiate the public review.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20011
craig.wallwork@afh.gov

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Name: MARK EWING
Address: 401 ROCK CREEK CHURCH RD NW WASH DC 20011
Affiliation: NEIGHBOR
Phone: (202) 722-8885

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED SHEET

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3703 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20011

comments@afrih.gov

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
Environmental Impact Statement
for the Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Comments

My home on Rock Creek Church Road faces the AFRH driving range. As a resident of the Petworth neighborhood and neighbor to AFRH, I have a number of concerns about the development of parcels of AFRH land. Right now the green space and view of the AFRH property greatly increases the value of my home, both financially and in my quality of life. I am not opposed to the idea of developing parts of the Retirement Home land. However, I am concerned about the details of that development and how it will affect my home and the surrounding neighborhood. For instance right across the street and from me, residential development is suggested. If this comes about the following design concepts would reduce the impact of this new development for my neighbors and me:

• Not disturbing the stone and brick fence, which surrounds this part of the AFRH. This would mean that new homes where the driving range now exists might reasonably be accessed using the existing (now blocked) entrance from Rock Creek Church Road just above where Illinois Avenue meets it.

• The height and size of new buildings be restricted to reflect those of the surrounding neighborhood. This would mean that buildings are not over 4-5 stories tall and that single buildings are not massive in square footage.

• Low income housing (projects) not be built here, as this would decrease property values and would not improve our neighborhood.

• The new buildings be built a respectable distance from the existing fence so that they do not loom over Rock Creek Church Road.

• Larger and specimen trees in the area to be developed be avoided and built around as much as possible.

• The architectural style of the new buildings reflects the historic nature of the site and some of the historic buildings in the vicinity (on the AFRH property).

I appreciate being invited to the Public Scoping Meeting and realize that any development is subject to comprehensive design and approval process involving many parties and agencies. I will look forward to hearing more comprehensive details about the project as it develops.

I must say at the outset that I was very disappointed in the lack of publicity for the Scoping meeting. There was only one other member of the public there when I visited on the evening of September 9. In addition, the postcard I received gave no indication that the meeting could only be accessed from the one unmarked entrance to the AFRH, on Rock Creek Church Road. No directions were given and the only address given was one on North Capitol Street (which was not useful). This might give the impression that there was little concern for surrounding neighbors reaching the meeting and that a process was being carried out merely to fulfill the requirements of the NEPA process. I trust this was
not the case and that better directions (and publicity) will be given for future public events.

At the meeting I saw a mock up of a master plan on a placard. I would like to have a copy of that map, which showed the areas under consideration for development and their potential development types. This could be made available electronically or in hard copy. Please let me know how I can get a copy of this preliminary design concept.

Your good neighbor,

Mark Smith
(please see attached sheet with contact information)
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Name: Hal Grant
Address: 3005 Hempstead Way, Springfield, VA 22151
Affiliation: NAVS
Phone: 703-750-1342 Ext. 3005

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments

Would also like a map/sketch of proposed areas for disposal and development.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20011

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Name: William Jentarra
Address: 3700 N. Capitol St. NW #588
Affiliation: AFRH-W
Phone: 202-723-2355

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20011
craig.wallwork@afrh.gov

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
### Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Frank McCall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>AFRH-W 79 3700 W Capitol St NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation:</td>
<td>AFRH-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>631-3 SCOTT AVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Comments**

1. The walking trails throughout the area should be considered as physical and mental therapy for the residents and thereby encouraged.
2. The social center should be renovated and used for the recreation of residents of the Piper and the Guard Bldgs.

Please send comments to:

Arm ed Forces Retirement Home  
Attention: Craig Wallwork  
3700 North Capitol Street, NW.  
Washington, DC 20011  
craig.wallwork@afh.gov

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
Note: forwarded message attached.

Do you Yahoo!?
Express yourself with Y! Messenger! Free. Download now.

included message:

From: "WILFRED MCCARTY" <macsan400@yahoo.com>
To: "knapsack Mac" <macsan400@yahoo.com>
Cc:
Subject: Environmental Impact Statement
Sent Date: Sep 9, 2004 11:55 AM
Priority: Normal
Attachments:

Environmental Impact Statement 9 Sept 2004
Name Wilfred "Mac" McCarty AFRH-W 400 3700 N. Capital St. N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20011-8400

Environmentally (if there is such a word) it is good to have this green plot
of land in the middle of the District. If there is ever a terrorist attack or
national emergency this is
a good place for government officials, the Mayor, police, firemen, troops to
establish
a temporary headquarters and get emergency first aid. During the riots it
was used by
troops to come in, set up tents, and help. Guards can be put at the gates.
The beautiful LaGarde Hospital building could be used in emergency
It is good to have this breathing space in the District. Once land is sold
and the
money spent you have nothing. The District would lose breathing space if
commercial
buildings are put up here.
If it is at all possible to get funds from corporations (and they get a tax
break) I would prefer this route or some other way to get funds.
I have been at the home since 1967. I came for medical reasons and now
that I
am 80 need it more. I appreciate the home and love the home and hate to
see
us lose this breathing space.
A German 88 shell and tried to share the same space in the Battle of the Bulge.
After being operated on I was sent back to same unit. We liberated Mauthausen
Concentration Camp in Austria a few days before VE day and stayed there for
five weeks burying the dead etc. We stayed so the Russians would not take
over this area.
Respectfully yours, Wilfred "Mac" McCarty

Do you Yahoo!?
I thank you for illustrating a few gray areas—but am wondering about the 'residential' designations, particularly in the lower left of the "Alternatives" illustration, and the gray area above it (over the fishing ponds) labeled 'Residential or Foreign Missions'—

'Residential' as indicated in the gray area to the center right—I'm unfamiliar with the location described, and wondered if it includes Scott Hall.

Does 'Resident' mean Resident or does it include Staff or housing for other than authorized residents.

Thanks

Jim Pankey, USN (Ret.)
wildspirit@cableone.net
Resident, AFRM Gulfport
Comments: My concerns are three fold:
1. I feel that sale of AFRH-W property is not in the long term best interests of the home, for both financial and perpetuation reasons. I advocate long term lease with reversion to the home at conclusion.
2. I do not feel that replacing the LaGarde Building with another facility in closer proximity to the Dormitory buildings is a wise move in the near term. The LaGarde facility due to its recency of construction should serve its purpose for another 10 to 15 years. To justify the cost of a new facility on the basis of savings in transaction costs, I feel is a false economic decision.
3. The presence of commercial development or real estate persons in the decision making process concerns me. I can understand their participation in a purely advisory capacity, but not in the decision making process. The axe they have to grind is not the axe of AFRH-W.

OTHER THAN ABOVE, I GENERALLY AGREE WITH THE CONCEPT OF AND OBJECTIVES OF THE MASTER PLAN AS PROPOSED. MY CONCERNS ARE THAT THE PERPETUATION OF THE HOME FOR ITS HISTORICAL PURPOSES WILL DEFINITELY BE PUT IN JEOPARDY IF THERE IS FURTHER TRANSFER OF TITLE TO THE HOME'S REAL ESTATE HOLDINGS.

Sincerely,

Sept 15, 2004

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20014
craig.wallwork@afrih.gov

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Name: John E. Price
Address: AFRH 726
Affiliation: Member - Resident
Phone: 202-545-0763

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes ☒ No

Comments

Parking is a problem management works and parks in their own area so they are unaware of the conflict. Lower ranked employees, tenants, visitors, guests and of course residents are left to battle over the few decent parking spots left. If all activities from the south end of the campus (e.g., health center, etc.) are consolidated along with various new tenants to the north end of the campus just exactly where are all of these people going to park? ? ? ?

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20011
craig.wallwork@afrh.gov

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
Suggestions for planning

Sept 9, 2004

(1) Could one development plan be considered to expand and improve the golf course, with a nice club house, as a private 'city golf club'? Would it be possible to approach a well known golfer to redesign and sponsor it? It might eliminate some building areas, perhaps in the southeast portion (rather than over the hills leading to the Scott) but would be an incentive to other residential, hospital and 'mission' tenants.

(2) Many of us have looked longingly at those big white elephant homes on 'generals' row' and wished that they could be turned into Bed and breakfast inns, cocktail lounge, commissary, shops, meeting rooms, pharmacy, CVS, outlet shops, etc.

Sincerely,

Mimi Rivkin, Resident AFRH-W
Sheridan 3312
202-722-4050
To: The COO, CFO and administrators of the Environmental Impact Study
CC: Capt. Ulmer, Capt. Soares, Mr. Dickerson, Dr. Rader
From: Mimi Rivkin

This regards a negative environmental impact on the elderly residents of the AFRH-W.

The plans to construct a new long term health center joining the Scott and Sheridan buildings at the point of their right angle should eventually be beneficial to the residents as well as being economical.

The construction will take place directly within the living, eating and activity areas of the elderly residents in both buildings, many of whom have respiratory problems. During construction, which will surely take over a year, the air will be fouled with dust and debris, reaching into windows and vents; and noise will be intolerable. This pollution could severely affect the health of residents—especially since independent living residents have no on-site emergency, pharmaceutical system, evenings, weekends and holidays.

When will construction begin, and what plans do you have to protect or relocate approximately 800 residents during the period of construction?

I will appreciate a response at your earliest convenience, as I would like to inform the Resident Advisory Council, and subsequently reassure the residents.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the environmental impact study.

Respectfully,

Mimi Rivkin
Resident, Sheridan 3312
202-722-4050

AFRH-W (470), Washington DC, 20011-8400
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Name: Larry Smith
Address: AFRH resident
Affiliation: 
Phone: 202-723-0716

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments
Suggestion would be to go after companies that make
defense weapons, tanks, etc... These companies all
take money from the defense department. The money
would be used for the AF. A presentation should be
presented to these companies. Constant contact should
be taking place with it to possibly receive money. By
utilizing money from defense companies, money could be
obtained as early as one year. Once an agreement is made,
a long should be created representing the partnership. The
agreement should be made annually. The defense companies
would be more happy to give money, if possible five could
be "we serve for those who served." One possible partnership
to check into is Cordier & Martin.

Please send comments to:

Cordier & Martin

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20011

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Scoping Comments

Name: William J. Woods
Address: USSAN-1236 3700 N. Capital St. N.W. Wash, D.C.
Affiliation: Resident
Phone: 202 682 8033

Would you like to receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

X Yes
□ No

Comments

After some thought I think the land can better serve the AFRH and in the National Interest as an extension to the Soldier's Home Cemetery that will soon be closed. In the past the Home has provided land to organ North Capital Street the Washington Medical Center, Children's Hospital, Veterans Hospital and recently, 49 Acre's to Catholic University.

In an already congested City, the Master Plan, if carried out would cause more congestion forever!

Instead of turning the land over to developers, better steps can be taken in the National Interest.  

Sincerely,

Bill Woods

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20011

craig.wallwork@afnh.gov

Comments must be postmarked by September 17, 2004.
September 16, 2004

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Craig Wallwork
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Re: Motion to Hold A Second Meeting Due to Inadequate Notice to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Master Development Plan for the Armed Forces Retirement Home in Washington, DC. (Reference No. 69 FR 51231-02)

Written Comments (Reference No. 69 FR 51231-02)

Dear Mr. Wallwork:

I am a homeowner in Parkview, a community of homes which abut the north and west boundaries (Rock Creek Church Road and Park Place, N.W) of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (also called “Old Soldiers’ Home”). True to its name, I and other neighbors in this established community have for several years and for generations in many cases, enjoyed the vast scenic view of green space that is presented year round from the windows and the porches of our residential homes. These views include, but are not limited to, the unencumbered viewing of wild life such as flocks of ducks and geese that have lived for years in the Home while also providing the neighborhood the pleasure of watching our honored former soldiers enjoy daily peaceful walks over the acreage or working in their garden plots during the growing season.

MOTION

Within the past week, I was informed that a “public scoping meeting” was held on September 9, 2004. However, after speaking with “potentially interested individuals” in the surrounding community, no one was apparently notified by “direct mail correspondence” that the meeting was scheduled to occur. Thus, several residents that
would be interested in the environmental impact of any potential development were unaware of the meeting because we were not notified properly. Thus, pursuant to the guidelines published in the “Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement” published in the 69 FR 51231-02, the requirements of Notice, which include the basic right of notice and the opportunity to be heard appear to not have been met. I and other interested residents that could be affected by any plan to develop the Old Soldiers’ Home were not given the basic opportunity to participate in the process. Specifically, we were precluded from learning and hearing first hand about the process and were not able to orally address any environmental concerns. Accordingly in the interest of fairness, not to mention the law, I am requesting that the Armed Forces Retirement Home pursuant to the established guidelines set forth in the applicable federal rules and regulations hold another meeting where notice is properly given to all that are interested. Thus, this letter also officially serves as a Motion to Hold A Second Meeting Due to Inadequate Notice to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Master Development Plan for the Armed Forces Retirement Home in Washington, DC.

A second meeting properly noticed would provide all that are interested the opportunity to be personally present, briefed on the issues, the opportunity to orally comment and to timely present any written comments. Moreover, a second meeting, with all who have an interest in the development present, would show the good faith of the Home in involving the community in the planning process. I am requesting that the Armed Forces Retirement Home respond in writing to my motion according to the dictates of the law.

WRITTEN COMMENTS

Notwithstanding the fact that I was not properly noticed, and therefore do not have a complete understanding of what occurred at the September 9, 2004 meeting, I am submitting comments in accordance with the Notice that was published in the August 18, 2004 Federal Register.

The following are the points I want to be included and earnestly considered in the scoping process:

1. Height restrictions for any structures that might be erected across from existing residential homes.

2. Effects of new infrastructure on the existing infrastructure.

3. The preservation of the maximum amount of green space on the north and west boundaries (in light of the fact that this area is called “Parkview.”)

4. Damage to existing foundations of residential houses.
5. The health effects on the residents as a result of such a massive undertaking; Liability for any future illness to residents resulting from such undertaking.

6. Efforts to control the dust and dirt that might invade residential homes.

7. Noise pollution

8. Reasonable timetables for construction and residential inconvenience.

9. An effort to identify through historical research anything additional on the site that has not yet been officially identified as preservable due to its history.

10. An earnest effort at a cooperative-mix to leave residential areas as unencumbered as possible in keeping with the established “Parkview” concept.

11. Redrawing the location of structures such as cultural, foreign missions, institutional and commercial to areas such as the east and south side of the campus where residential areas would not be substantially impacted by such entities operations.

12. With regard to residential, if there is construction along the north and west sides of the campus, that structures be set back far enough from the street and spaced apart from one another to adhere to the “Parkview” theme.

13. Preservation of the existing trees, etc. on the structure.

14. Runoff, drainage and erosion concerns on existing homes and personal property.

15. The effect on existing parking and traffic issues.

In the spirit of a cooperative effort that includes “interested individuals” who live in the Parkview community, I sincerely hope you will give sincere consideration to the above. Finally, I am awaiting a decision on my Motion. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Angela Washington
Mr. Craig Wallwork  
Armed Forces Retirement Home  
3700 North Capitol Street NW  
Washington, DC 20011  

Dear Mr. Wallwork:

We are writing this letter in regard to the “Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement” entered into the Federal Register on August 18, 2004 (Volume 69, Number 159).

First, we are requesting that the comment period for this item be extended 60 days and that another Public Scoping Meeting be held. We became aware of the Master Plan Concept for the Armed Forces Retirement Home as the result of one person in our neighborhood attending the September 9, 2004 Scoping Meeting.

We believe that few people in the neighborhood know about this plan even now. Those of us who are aware of it have not had enough time to discuss it with neighbors, make people in the neighborhood aware of what is going on, or assess all the factors that should be part of the scope of the process. We do not believe the managers of this process have made enough effort to make the neighborhood aware of the plan.

The Federal Register entry states that the scoping “will be accomplished through a public scoping meeting” and “direct mail correspondence.” We are not aware of any direct mailings or broader advance notification to residents about this process. As residents of the community where the property in question is located, we believe that we qualify as “interested individuals,” and we do not feel that there was a reasonable effort made to inform us of the September 9, 2004 Scoping Meeting. The poor attendance from the neighborhood at the meeting speaks for itself — people were not aware of the meeting and therefore did not attend. We believe action is needed to uphold the integrity of the process and to ensure that people affected by the plan can participate.

In the event you reject our request, and we hope you do not, we want to include some suggestions of what to include in the scoping to ensure that we are not shut out of this process.
We believe you should consider the following:

- air pollution brought about by increased traffic,
- noise pollution,
- groundwater runoff,
- viewsheds being destroyed,
- trees being removed,
- wildlife being displaced,
- geological disruption to the area due to digging, blasting, pounding, etc.,
- interference with historical landmarks,
- archeological resources,
- social and economic resources,
- health concerns and inconvenience of construction on adjacent communities,
- architectural integrity with existing structures,
- height restrictions on any new potential structures,
- public/community access to green space,
- potential structural or foundational damage to historic properties or neighboring structures,
- security impacts on adjacent communities,
- potential introduction of hazardous materials,
- potential impacts on utilities,
- green space and open space being permanently altered, and
- impact of adding further congestion to neighborhoods that are already among the most densely-populated areas of the East Coast.
We sincerely hope that you will consider our request for greater involvement in this process. As residents who have lived in close proximity to the property in question for years, we feel we would be greatly affected by any development and therefore should be included in the scoping and planning process. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

[Handwritten addresses and signatures]
John K. Hughes  3656 Park Place N.W.
Ellen M. Hughes  3654 Park Place N.W., 20016
John M. Hughes Jr.  3670 Park Pl. N.W. 20016
Edith J. Tucker  3680 Park Pl. N.W. 20016

Elaine M. Burgess  3660 Park Pl. N.W. 20016
Kathleen Boylan  503 Rock Creek Church Rd. NW, Wash, D.C.
Art Laffin  503 Rock Creek Church Rd. NW, Wash, D.C. 20016
Mr. Craig Wellwork
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Wellwork:

We are writing this letter in regard to the “Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement” entered into the Federal Register on August 18, 2004 (Volume 69, Number 159).

First, we are requesting that the comment period for this item be extended 60 days and that another Public Scoping Meeting be held. We became aware of the Master Plan Concept for the Armed Forces Retirement Home as the result of one person in our neighborhood attending the September 9, 2004 Scoping Meeting.

We believe that few people in the neighborhood know about this plan even now. Those of us who are aware of it have not had enough time to discuss it with neighbors, make people in the neighborhood aware of what is going on, or assess all the factors that should be part of the scope of the process. We do not believe the managers of this process have made enough effort to make the neighborhood aware of the plan.

The Federal Register entry states that the scoping “will be accomplished through a public scoping meeting” and “direct mail correspondence.” We are not aware of any direct mailings or broader advance notification to residents about this process. As residents of the community where the property in question is located, we believe that we qualify as “interested individuals,” and we do not feel that there was a reasonable effort made to inform us of the September 9, 2004 Scoping Meeting. The poor attendance from the neighborhood at the meeting speaks for itself — people were not aware of the meeting and therefore did not attend. We believe action is needed to uphold the integrity of the process and to ensure that people affected by the plan can participate.

In the event you reject our request, and we hope you do not, we want to include some suggestions of what to include in the scoping to ensure that we are not shut out of this process.
We believe you should consider the following:

- air pollution brought about by increased traffic,
- noise pollution,
- groundwater runoff,
- viewsheds being destroyed,
- trees being removed,
- wildlife being displaced,
- geological disruption to the area due to digging, blasting, pounding, etc.,
- interference with historical landmarks,
- archeological resources,
- social and economic resources,
- health concerns and inconvenience of construction on adjacent communities,
- architectural integrity with existing structures,
- height restrictions on any new potential structures,
- public/community access to green space,
- potential structural or foundational damage to historic properties or neighboring structures,
- security impacts on adjacent communities,
- potential introduction of hazardous materials,
- potential impacts on utilities,
- green space and open space being permanently altered, and
- impact of adding further congestion to neighborhoods that are already among the most densely-populated areas of the East Coast.
We sincerely hope that you will consider our request for greater involvement in this process. As residents who have lived in close proximity to the property in question for years, we feel we would be greatly affected by any development and therefore should be included in the scoping and planning process. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Title]
September 17, 2004

Mr. Craig Wallwork
Project Manager
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 N. Capitol St. NW
Washington, DC 20001-8400
Fax: (202) 730-3335

RE: Armed Forces Retirement Home Master Plan
Request to Participate as a Consulting Party

Dear Mr. Wallwork:

As co-steward of the President Lincoln and Soldiers' Home National Monument, the National Trust for Historic Preservation (National Trust) is deeply interested in the future of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH). The collaborative relationship between the National Trust and AFRH has been very positive thus far, and we look forward to continuing that relationship throughout the upcoming master plan development. Accordingly, we hereby request participation as a consulting party for the master planning project under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 16 U.S.C. § 470f, pursuant to 36 C.F.R. §§ 800.2(c)(5) and 800.3(c)(3). In addition, we would like the opportunity to comment on any documents prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C § 4332(2)(C). Finally, we request participation in any stakeholder meetings that the AFRH may convene as part of the master planning process.

The National Trust wishes to participate in the Section 106 review process because the future of the President Lincoln and Soldiers' Home National Monument is inextricably intertwined with that of the AFRH. While the National Monument includes only the Lincoln Cottage (President Lincoln's summer retreat) and the surrounding 2 1/2 acres, the entirety of the AFRH campus is integral to the Monument's historic context and interpretation. The National Trust applauds the commitment by AFRH to promote and support the National Monument in the midst of its campus, and to protect the integrity of the campus's larger historic core. In addition, the National Trust recognizes the critical need to rebuild the AFRH Trust Fund, thereby allowing the AFRH to perform its primary mission. Therefore, we support the efforts of AFRH to meet its fiscal and planning goals via the properly managed new uses of AFRH properties. At the same time, the National Trust urges the AFRH to proceed with great sensitivity when changing the nature of the historical treasure represented by the entire campus. A master plan that balances the needs of the AFRH with the property's natural beauty and unique historic value has the best chance for success.

In addition, as the AFRH proceeds in the master planning process, the National Trust offers to lend technical advice on matters of historic preservation, as Trust staff time permits.

Recipient of the National Humanities Medal

1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW - Washington, DC 20036
September 17, 2004
Page 2

The National Trust has extensive experience with historic preservation standards, laws, and compliance, as well as a long history of participating in master planning processes. As a consulting party, we wish to be an asset to the master plan development.

Please send any notices of meetings and documents for review and comment to both of the following individuals:

Thompson M. Mayes
Deputy General Counsel
National Trust for Historic Preservation
1785 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036

Sophia Lynn
Project Manager, President Lincoln and Soldiers’ Home National Monument
AFRHI-1315
3700 N. Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011-8400

Anticipating that the campus will undergo many profound changes in the next five to ten years, the National Trust wishes to work closely with the AFRH on all issues regarding the President Lincoln and Soldiers’ Home National Monument and historic preservation for the overall site. The National Trust is privileged to enjoy such a productive collaboration with the Armed Forces Retirement Home. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thompson M. Mayes
Deputy General Counsel

cc: Timothy Cox
Richard Moe
Lisa Burcham, SHPO
IN REPLY REFER TO:
NCPC File No. 1206/MP69
SEP 17 2004

Mr. Craig Wallwork
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, Box 1303
Washington, D.C. 20011-8400

Dear Mr. Wallwork:

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the scoping of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a proposed Master Plan for the Armed Forces Retirement Home campus located at 3700 North Capitol Street, NW, in Washington, DC. The EIS is being prepared, as a federal regulation requirement, on the whole of the 270-acre facility including its 93 structures and its historic district. These scoping comments are limited to the Commission’s role as the central planning agency for the federal government in the National Capital Region and express our general views on planning and environmental issues. However, it is important to note that the Commission is taking this opportunity to highlight to the Armed Forces Retirement Home management that within the District all federal planning and actions affecting federal interest must be reviewed by the National Capital Planning Commission.

With the above as background, the Commission staff’s comment for scoping the federal EIS document notes the following issues concerning the proposed master plan evaluation.

I want to emphasize that the Armed Forces Retirement Home is located adjacent to the North Capitol Street corridor and is an import viewed landmark and gateway to the Nation’s Capital. The facility is a prominent element to the future planning of the surrounding cityscape. Improving the potential land use activity and transportation infrastructure along this important gateway into the city is a policy goal of the Commission’s Comprehensive Plan. The Master Plan effort should create a desirable facility environment and location that attracts uses compatible to the existing surrounding residential neighborhoods and which should add to the economic vitality of the District of Columbia. To foster this kind of cooperation and coordination, the Commission has adopted project submission guidelines that provide for public participation in NCPC’s planning and plan review activities. These guidelines promote intergovernmental cooperation and public participation in the planning of federal workplaces within
the region. They require federal agencies to coordinate their plans and projects with local, regional, and non-federal plans and programs for the development of the District. The proposed Master Plan should be anticipated to be achieved adhering to both the Comprehensive Plan goals and the project submission requirements of the Commission.

Additionally, NCPC staff stresses the substantial removal of vegetation in any proposed Master Plan would not be supported by the Comprehensive Plan objectives of the recently drafted new policies of the Commission. We strongly request that assessment of land area be directed toward limited impervious pavement areas and that the most compatible form of access design of all roads, parking, pedestrian surfaces, and building pattern development be determined in association with the Commission.

I also underscore that if any lands are considered for excessing from the campus by your planning efforts; the disposition of the excess federal property should ensure its future use is coordinated with surrounding development patterns and land uses, and that its planning contributes effectively to existing community development goals. Use by, or shared use between, new federal activities and non-federal public activities should be explored before the property is determined to be excess. This would include, as a reminder to the Armed Forces Retirement Home management, the potential of a Foreign Missions function as discussed by your personnel and the U.S. Department of State in the Spring of 2004 as based on the analysis provided by NCPC in the study Foreign Missions in the District of Columbia, prepared in 2003.

NCPC staff also emphasizes that NCPC is committed to supporting historic preservation through its policies, review process, and special studies as noted in its federal project and master plan review process. The Commission's goals in its planning documents Extending the Legacy, and the Museums and Memorials Master Plan, all describe aspects regarding the Armed Forces Retirement Home that are to be accomplished and provides a framework for historic preservation planning issues. A federal agency's master plan is a primary tool for assessing historic resources, developing long term goals and plans, coordinating with other public and private entities, and implementing new planning methods and technologies. NCPC anticipates your master planning effort will verify participation, in consultation with local preservation offices, and provide an opportunity for public involvement. Furthermore, this effort should anticipate preparation of management plans to provide in-depth procedures for the treatment of historic resources within the existing recorded historic district of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.
We appreciate your consideration of our comments at this stage of the project planning. The Commission staff requests, at this point, in conformance to the Commission's requirements regarding potential project reviews under its Environmental and Historic Preservation Policies and Procedures, that the National Capital Planning Commission be identified in the proposed EIS as a federal cooperating agency, in conformance with the guidance issued by the President's Council on Environmental Quality. Additionally, the staff reminds your consultants and planning staff that a federal or District of Columbia agency, before preparing construction plans the agency originates, shall advise and consult with the Commission as the agency prepares plans and programs in preliminary and successive stages. Please place the Commission on the distribution list pertaining to all further project planning. If you have technical questions concerning the information related in this letter, you may contact Mr. Eugene Keller, in the Office of Urban Design and Plans Review, at (202) 482-7251.

Sincerely,

Patricia E. Gallagher, AICP
Executive Director
Appendix B
Armed Forces Retirement Home – Washington
Master Plan
Air Quality Assessment

The air quality analysis for the AFRH was performed in accordance with guidelines set forth by 23 CFR Part 771, 49 CFR Part 622, the Clean Air Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as they appropriately apply. The analysis addresses both mobile and stationary sources of air pollutant emissions anticipated to change as a result of development of the Master Plan Alternatives.

1.1.1 Mobile Source Analysis

The analysis of mobile sources for the AFRH-W focuses on CO because it is localized and directly relates to traffic volumes and patterns which will be affected by future site development. This analysis was prepared in accordance with guidance set forth by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) A Modeling Methodology for Predicting Pollutant Concentrations near Roadway Intersections (EPA 1995).

To determine if the alternatives would violate NAAQS, a worst-case scenario was identified by reviewing the design year traffic volumes and levels of congestion associated with each of the major intersections in the study area. Because the North Capitol Street NW and Harewood/Fort Street NW intersection was identified as the intersection/interchange with the highest traffic volume and level of service under all of the alternatives, it qualified as the worst-case scenario for the air quality analysis. The steps taken to perform this analysis include the following:

- Identify air quality receptor locations based on project maps that would represent locations near the North Capitol Street, NW and Harewood/Fort Street, NW intersection where exposure to CO was most likely to occur;
- Determine the background CO concentrations from the CO measurements for the air quality receptor locations identified;
- Obtain the basic regional emission rates generated by Mobile6 from the Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments (EPA, 2001);
- Using CAL3QHC, calculate final CO concentrations for each receptor location for each development alternative;
- Compare final CO concentrations to the 1 hour and 8-hour NAAQS for CO to determine if any violations would occur.
1.1.2 Background CO Levels

Background CO concentrations were obtained from the District of Columbia Department of Health for the District of Columbia’s monitoring station at the Verizon Telephone Building on 21st Street, NW. That monitoring site was chosen for this analysis because it was the closest monitoring station to the AFRH-W. The background CO monitoring levels used from this site were measured in 2003. The maximum 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations for 2003 were used as the background concentrations for 2016 and 2030 because it is assumed emission control programs will likely curtail any increases in background concentrations. Table 1 presents the background CO concentrations used for this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1-Hour Concentration</th>
<th>8-Hour Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Background CO Concentrations

Traffic Data

The traffic data used for this air quality analysis included average daily traffic volumes (ADTs), peak-hour volumes, and percent daily distributions, represented as diurnal traffic curves, for both the Master Plan Alternatives and the No Action Alternative. The diurnal curve was developed using data obtained from a 24-hour traffic monitoring station located on New Hampshire Avenue, just north of the District of Columbia, as this is the 24-hour traffic monitoring station for a major arterial road located closest to the AFRH-W. The diurnal curve, shown as daily distribution percentages is presented in Table 2. The peak hour traffic volumes by alternative are presented in Table 3. North Capitol Street, NW and Harwood/Fort Street, NW intersection traffic data used was used in the analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>% of Total Traffic</th>
<th>Required Duration (in Basic Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12m - 1am</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1am-2am</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2am-3am</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3am-4am</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4am-5am</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5am-6am</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6am-7am</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7am-8am</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8am-9am</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9am-10am</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am-11am</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11am-12n</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12n-1pm</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm-2pm</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pm-3pm</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pm-4pm</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4pm-5pm</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm-6pm</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6pm-7pm</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm-8pm</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8pm-9pm</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9pm-10pm</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10pm-11pm</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11pm-12m</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Statement</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harewood westbound</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harewood eastbound</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol southbound departure</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol northbound approach</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>2,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol northbound departure</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol northbound departure</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>2,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol southbound approach</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Drive westbound after the ramp to North Capitol</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Drive Westbound before the ramp to North Capitol</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Drive eastbound</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Drive westbound ramp to North Capitol northbound</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.3 Emission Factors

The emission rates associated with individual vehicles are influenced by factors such as ambient air temperature, engine temperature, operation mode, average speed, and maintenance. The average emission rate for a fleet of vehicles operating on a highway is further influenced by the composition of the fleet, vehicle type, and vehicle age. The fleet emission rate reflects changes in vehicle, engine, and emission control system technologies; changes in applicable regulations and emission standards; and realistic driving patterns. Mobile source emission factors were provided by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) and represent output from the latest version of the EPA Mobile Source Emission Factors Model, MOBILE6, released in October, 2002 for the year 2016. For this analysis, winter months were evaluated because vehicle CO emission rates increase with decreasing ambient temperature.

CO emissions factors generated by MOBILE6 are shown in Table 4. Running emissions factors are influenced by speed, and roadway speeds were based on field measurement. The average speed on Harewood Street and Fort Drive was determined to be 25 miles per hour (mph), and the speed on North Capitol Street was 35 mph. The emission factor for vehicles traveling 1 mph was used as the idling emissions factor.

Table 4. CO Emission Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Location</th>
<th>Emission Factor (g/mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harewood westbound</td>
<td>15.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harewood eastbound</td>
<td>15.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol southbound departure</td>
<td>15.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol northbound approach</td>
<td>15.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol northbound departure before the ramp from Fort Drive</td>
<td>15.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol northbound departure after the ramp from Fort Drive</td>
<td>15.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Capitol southbound approach</td>
<td>15.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Drive westbound after the ramp to North Capitol</td>
<td>15.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


CAL3QHC Analysis

The mathematical model used to estimate future CO concentrations is the current version of the EPA’s CAL3QHC dispersion model, released in June 1993. The CAL3QHC dispersion model is a microcomputer-based modeling methodology developed to predict the level of CO or other inert pollutant concentrations for motor vehicles traveling near roadway intersections.

The CAL3QHC program requires that roadways be modeled as segments known as links. Links can be either free-flow links (for vehicles moving at a constant velocity) or queue links (for idling vehicles). Each can be one of four types of links based on the roadway geometry (at-grade, fill, bridge, or depressed). The required inputs for free-flow links are the endpoints, traffic volume, the emission factor, source height, and mixing zone width. A queue link is defined as a straight segment of roadway with a constant width and emission source strength, where vehicles are idling for a specified period of time. Required inputs for queue links are the endpoints, approach traffic volume, emission factor, average cycle length, average red time length, number of travel lanes, clearance lost time, source height, signal type (pre-timed actuated, or semi-actuated), and arrival rate.

CAL3QHC also requires the input of meteorological factors. These factors are average timing, surface roughness coefficient, settling velocity, deposition velocity, wind speed, mixing height, stability class, and wind angle range. The values used for these factors are summarized in Table 5.

The maximum 1-hour CO concentrations are modeled using the highest 1-hour traffic volumes. To estimate the maximum 8-hour average CO concentration, daily traffic
distributions (diurnal curve), peak-hour traffic volumes, and DHVs were used to separate
the ADTs into hourly traffic volumes. Hourly time segments were analyzed to determine
the receptor-specific CO concentrations. The highest eight consecutive hourly
concentrations were averaged to obtain the 8-hour average CO concentration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Variable</th>
<th>Assumption/Provided Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Averaging Time</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Roughness</td>
<td>175 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settling Velocity</td>
<td>0 cm/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposition Velocity</td>
<td>0 cm/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Height</td>
<td>0 m (at grade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Type</td>
<td>1 for Pretimed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Signal Length</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Red Time Length</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Lost Time</td>
<td>4 s – default value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrival Rate</td>
<td>3 (average progression) – default value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Speed</td>
<td>1.0 m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Direction</td>
<td>0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Stability Class</td>
<td>D(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixing Height</td>
<td>1,000 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Wind Directions</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Direction Increment Angle</td>
<td>10°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Increment Multiplier</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Increment Multiplier</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. CAL3QHC Input Assumptions

ANALYSIS RESULTS

Twelve air quality receptor locations were selected to represent sensitive air quality
locations within the study area. Each receptor is located near sidewalks adjacent to the
North Capitol Street, NW and Harewood Street, NW intersection. Traffic associated with
each of the proposed development alternatives at the North Capitol Street, NW and
Harewood Street, NW intersection was analyzed. Both the 1-hour and 8-hour CO levels
were predicted and the results were compared to the National Ambient Air Quality
Standard (NAAQS) for CO. Table 6 presents the results of the 1-hour analysis using projected AM and PM hourly peak traffic volumes for the build year. For the 1-hour analysis, the AM and PM maximum CO concentrations among all alternatives were identified. For the projected hourly peak-traffic volume, results indicated the range of CO concentrations in the AM hour would be 11.0 to 11.6 ppm. The range of CO concentrations for the PM hour would be 11.2 to 11.7 ppm. None of the maximum CO concentrations for the peak AM and PM hours would exceed the NAAQS of 35 ppm.

Table 7 presents the results of the 8-hour analysis. Using the projected peak hour traffic volume and a general traffic volume hourly distribution, traffic volumes for the peak 8-hour traffic period were identified for input in the CAL3QHC model. The model results indicate for the peak 8-hour period, the range of the average CO concentrations for all alternatives would be 3.9 to 4.1 ppm. The maximum concentration of 4.4 ppm would not exceed the 9 ppm NAAQS.

Table 6. Peak Hour Analysis Results for CO (ppm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>Meets NAAQS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1-hour maximum CO concentrations include a background concentration of 10.9 ppm.
Table 7. 8-hour Analysis Results for CO (ppm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Site System</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Conformance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.4 Stationary Source Analysis

Additional site development at the AFRH-W site would increase energy demands and air pollutants emitted by on-site facilities required to accommodate this demand. According to The Master Plan, Steam System Evaluation (February 2005), approximately 50 percent of the existing system capacity is available to accommodate the increased demand, however, it would be insufficient to serve the needs of all of the development proposed under the Master Plan Alternatives. Therefore modifications to the system, primarily increased boiler capacity, would be required.

An analysis was conducted to determine whether:

- additional boiler capacity would require a major source air quality permit to construct under the New Source Review process, and
- the project would be required to undergo a formal review under the General Conformity Rule.
1.1.4.1 New Source Review (NSR)

Under provisions of the Clean Air Act, new major stationary sources of air pollution and
major modifications to major stationary sources must have an air pollution construction
permit. The process for obtaining the permit is called New Source Review (NSR).
Under the NSR process, permits for sources located in attainment areas are referred to as
Prevention Of Significant Air Quality Deterioration (PSD) permits; while permits for
sources located in non-attainment areas are referred to as Non-Attainment Area (NAA)
permits. As the Washington DC area does not meet NAAQS for ozone, depending on its
intensity, implementation of the Master Plan would require review of a NAA permit since
the new development would emit oxides of nitrogen (NOx) and volatile organic
compounds (VOCs).

Analysis of Permitting Requirements for Additional Boiler Capacity

To determine whether uncontrolled potential-to-emit (PTE) emissions under each of the
Master Plan Alternatives would require a major source construction permit, the following
steps were undertaken:

- estimating existing and future facility-wide energy demands,
- estimating annual PTE emissions for each alternative using EPA AP-42 pollutant
  emissions factors for natural gas fired boilers, and
- comparing annual estimated PTE emissions to NSR significant net emission
  increase permitting thresholds.

Table 8 presents the estimated energy demand for each alternative based upon proposed
uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Postal</th>
<th>PUBS</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Dining</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>7,520,000</td>
<td>1,225,000</td>
<td>1,455,000</td>
<td>10,200,000</td>
<td>367.2</td>
<td>2,765.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3A</td>
<td>4,230,000</td>
<td>1,825,000</td>
<td>1,455,000</td>
<td>7,051,000</td>
<td>270.4</td>
<td>3,146.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3B</td>
<td>4,135,000</td>
<td>1,945,000</td>
<td>1,455,000</td>
<td>7,535,000</td>
<td>271.3</td>
<td>3,178.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>1,945,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>1,455,000</td>
<td>7,845,000</td>
<td>282.4</td>
<td>3,992.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:
1. Commercial GSF was assumed to include Institutional, Research and Development, Retail, Medical, and
Office.
2. Residential GSF was assumed to include Residential, Hotel, and Embassies.
3. The 60,000 lb/hr of steam (30,000 lb/hr as redundancy) discussed in the Steam System Evaluation is capable of supporting 1,455,000 square feet. Thus the boiler potentials are calculated off of this amount. Conservatively, the existing facility was assumed to be 100% residential.
4. These values are calculated from a heating value of 36 BTU/GSF/hr.
5. Commercial GSF was assumed to require maximum boiler usage for 12 hours/day and half of the year (2,190 hours). Residential GSF was assumed to require maximum boiler usage for 24 hours/day and half of the year (4,380 hours). The annual hours reflect the relative proportion of residential to commercial space.

Calculation Methodology

Emissions estimates were calculated based on U.S. EPA provided AP-42 emission factors for natural gas burning in a boiler. The hourly emission estimate was multiplied by the Annual Hours from Table 8 to determine the annual PTE emissions. Calculation methodology used for Alternative 4 is presented below.

- AP-42 emission factor = 190 lb of NOx/10^6 ft^3
- Gas Heating Rate = 1,020 BTU/ft^3
- Hourly Gas Volume = 282.4 MMBTU/hr / 1,020 BTU/ft^3
  = 276,882.4 ft^3/hr
- Emission Rate = 190 lb of NOx/10^6 ft^3 x 276,882.4 ft^3/hr
  = 32.6 lb of NOx/hr
- Hours of Operation = 2,190 hrs/year x (1,390,000 gsf commercial / 7,845,000 gsf total) + 4,380 hrs/year x (6,455,000 gsf residential / 7,845,000 gsf total)
  = 3,992.0 hrs/year
- Annual Emission Rate = 3,992.0 hrs/year x 52.6 lb of NOx/hr
  = 105.0 tons/year

The annual PTE emissions for applicable criteria air pollutants (tons/year) are presented in Table 9.
Table 9. Annual PTE Emissions for Applicable Criteria Pollutants (tons/yr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3A</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3B</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Source Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Source Threshold</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only Alternative 1 would exceed the NSR threshold for NOx and would therefore be classified as a NSR major source. Development under Alternative 4 may require a NAA permit. If additional restrictions on hours of operation per year are imposed on Alternative 4, or if NOx control technology is incorporated into the engineering design for the new boiler, Alternative 4’s PTE NOx emissions could also fall below the 100 ten per year NSR major source threshold.

1.1.4.2 Federal Air Conformity Analysis

In addition, in non-attainment areas such as Washington, DC, new stationary sources must be evaluated under the provisions of the General Conformity Rule to determine if its emissions would:

- Cause or contribute to new violations;
- Increase the frequency or severity of existing violations; or
- Delay timely attainment or interim emission reductions.¹

An analysis to determine whether construction of any of the Master Plan Alternatives would require a formal conformity analysis under the General Conformity Rule was also performed. Pursuant to the General Conformity Rule, all reasonably foreseeable emissions associated with energy requirements for the proposed boiler in the four Master Plan alternatives were quantified and compared to the applicable annual *de minimus* emissions.

levels to determine potential air quality impacts. As Washington, DC is non-attainment for ozone, de minimus levels of 25 tons per year have been established for NOx and VOC.

Methodology

For purposes of conducting the General Conformity Rule analysis, the alternatives were evaluated for the additional new boiler capacity that would be required to support the proposed facilities. This analysis only takes into consideration the increase in boiler capacity.

Data for the proposed additional new boiler capacity was derived from the Steam System Evaluation (February 2005.) Estimates for BTU requirements for additional capacity required by the four Alternatives are presented in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Commercial (MMBTU/hr)</th>
<th>Residential (MMBTU/hr)</th>
<th>Total (MMBTU/hr)</th>
<th>Impact Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>7,530,000</td>
<td>1,225,000</td>
<td>8,745,000</td>
<td>314.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3A</td>
<td>4,230,000</td>
<td>1,825,000</td>
<td>6,055,000</td>
<td>218.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3B</td>
<td>4,135,000</td>
<td>1,945,000</td>
<td>6,080,000</td>
<td>218.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>1,945,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>6,390,000</td>
<td>230.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:

1. Commercial GSF was assumed to include Institutional, Research and Development, Retail, Medical, and Office.
2. Residential GSF was assumed to include Residential, Hotel, and Embassies.
3. These values are calculated from a heating value of 36 BTU/GSF-hr.
4. Commercial GSF was assumed to require maximum boiler usage for 12 hours/day and half of the year (2,190 hours). Residential GSF was assumed to require maximum boiler usage for 24 hours/day and half of the year (4,380 hours). The annual hours reflect the relative proportion of residential to commercial space.

From the Steam System Evaluation Report (February 2005), it was determined that there would be an estimated 58.2 MMBTU/hr excess capacity from the existing boilers that would be available for future expansion. The total new boiler capacity for each Alternative is shown in Table 11 below. These numbers were derived by subtracting the 58.2 MMBTU/hr excess boiler capacity from those listed in Table 10.
Table 11. Total New Energy Capacity Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Capacity (GMTU/hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>256.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3A</td>
<td>159.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3B</td>
<td>160.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>171.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emission estimates were calculated based on U.S. EPA provided AP-42 emission factors for natural gas burning in a boiler. The hourly emission estimate was multiplied by the Annual Hours from Table 8 to determine the annual emissions. The annual PTE emissions for applicable criteria pollutants (tons/year) are presented in Table 12.

Table 4-12. Annual PTE Emissions for Applicable Criteria Pollutants (tons/yr) for Additional Boiler Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>NOₓ</th>
<th>VOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3A</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3B</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR Significance Level</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

The NSR significant net emission increase level for NOₓ and VOC applicable to a severe ozone non-attainment area is 25 tons per year. The annual PTE NOₓ emissions estimated for all four Master Plan alternatives indicate that emissions would exceed the annual de minimus NOₓ threshold of 25 tons per year. In accordance with the General Conformity Rule, if the direct and indirect emissions of a criteria pollutant (or its precursors) are
above the de minimus level, a formal general conformity determination would be required for that pollutant.

Additionally, the annual PTE VOC emissions estimated for all four Master Plan alternatives indicate that emissions would not exceed the annual de minimus VOC threshold of 25 tons per year. Therefore, the Federal action which is contemplated is expected to have a minimal VOC air quality impact and no further analysis would be required.

**Air Quality Mitigation**

The effects of increased NOx emissions can be mitigated as follows:

*Option 1: Incorporation of NOx Emission Reduction into the Initial Engineering Design*

By implementing Option 1, NOx emissions controls can be incorporated into the initial engineering design in order to reduce annual PTE NOx emissions to below the 25 ton per year de minimus threshold. By implementing this option, no formal general conformity determination would be required to be performed. Additionally, Alternative 4, including the total boiler capacity would have annual PTE NOx emissions reduced to be below 100 tons per year. As a result, Alternative 4 would no longer require that a major source NSR construction permit be obtained.

Potential NOx emission control options include:

- Take limits on permitted hours of operation per year
- Incorporate NOx control technology

NOx control technology options for boilers include low NOx burners, selective catalytic reduction (SCR) and selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR) control technologies. Maximum control efficiencies expected from each technology are as follows:

- 80 percent for low NOx burners
- 94 percent for SCR and
- 70 percent for SNCR

With the incorporation of any of these NOx control technologies, annual NOx PTE emissions for all four alternatives would be reduced to a level that is below the
established 25 ton per year de minimus threshold and no major source NSR construction permit would be required.

**Option 2:** Perform a General Conformity Determination for NOx for all four alternatives and also obtain a Major Source NSR Permit for Alternative 4 Only

If Option 1 is not chosen, annual NOx PTE emissions would be above the 25 ton per year de minimus threshold so that a formal conformity determination is required for all four alternatives. The same NOx controls measures as outlined in Option 1 above would need to be assessed. However, Alternative 4 annual PTE NOx emissions show that it is also classified as a "major source" (i.e., annual PTE emission greater than 100 tons per year) under the NSR regulations. Therefore, Alternative 4 would be required to obtain an NSR major source construction permit and the NSR regulations would impose Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) control requirements for NOx which is SCR control technology. LAER requirements do not have to consider economic feasibility, only technical feasibility of all possible NOx control options.
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MR. COX: If people in the back want to take seats there is plenty of seats on the sides, plenty of seats in the front, so please come down.

Good evening and welcome to the Armed Forces Retirement Home public hearing on the environmental impact statement for the Armed Forces Retirement Home Campus Master Plan. I'm Tim Cox, the Chief Operating Officer for the Armed Forces Retirement Home. With me presenting tonight are Craig Wallwork with General Services Administration, Craig, and Joan Glynn, a consultant from Greenhouse & O'Hara.

Before I begin the official part of our program, I just want to say personally that I'm really pleased to see all of you here. You will learn more about AFRH, Armed Forces Retirement Home, and why we're here, why we are looking at this development, and this is just a start of our collaborative process with all of you and I hope many more too because we want to do what's best not just for us and the residents, which is most important to me, but we also want to be the best neighbors that we can be to all of you and that's very important to us too.

We're first and foremost a retirement home. You'll find out in my presentation how long we have been here, what we do, but we also want to be able to continue to be a neighbor like we have for the past 150 years. This process tonight is a formal hearing so you'll give your presentation and we'll go through what goes on tonight. But I do want you to know that my team, the team you meet here, are here to make this a collaborative process and do the best we can for all of us involved so we really appreciate your interest, your patience.
tonight in waiting a little longer for everyone to come in, and then your contributions that you will give us tonight. I really appreciate that.

AFRH is an independent establishment of the executive branch of the federal government which provides residences, nursing home, and related services to former military enlisted personnel at two locations, Washington, DC, this site, and Gulfport, Mississippi, is our sister home. AFRH in Washington, DC, was established in 1851 as the Old Soldiers Home and it currently serves nearly 1,000 military veterans.

The campus features private rooms, bank, chapels, convenience store, post office, laundry, barber shop and beauty salon, dining room, golf course, fishing ponds, 24-hour security, and staff presence. The 272-acre site is currently developed with over 100 structures including the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Landmark District.

AFRH is currently in the process of preparing a master plan to guide future use of the AFRH Washington campus. In carrying out our social and environmental responsibilities AFRH is committed to ensuring that proper consideration is given to the environment when undertaking such a major project. As part of that consideration this meeting is an important opportunity for you both as a vested community member and an individual citizen to provide your comments on the draft EIS. We appreciate you making time in your evening to participate with us.

The following presentation will explain the purpose and the need for the proposed master plan and the findings of our draft EIS. During the presentation you will also be given an update on the Section 106 consultation process for historic preservation. Following this presentation you will have the opportunity to provide comments on the draft EIS and Section 106 process.

All comments received either through oral comments tonight or through
A record of decision identifying the alternative it selects for implementation.

APRH will not be considering new policy or regulatory changes during this meeting. The written comment period ended July 2005. Comments on the Section 106 process will be accepted through the Section 106 consultation. If you have not already done so, you may sign up to speak at the welcome table in the back of the room. Please note tonight's meeting will be recorded so that we have a complete record of all the comments given.

Before we begin, I'd like to go over tonight's agenda. We will be talking about the NEPA process, Section 106 process, purpose and need for our action, objectives, master plan alternatives, impacts, next steps, and public comments. The public hearing is being conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, commonly referred to as NEPA.

NEPA provides for the consideration of environmental issues in federal agency planning and decision-making. NEPA states federal agencies including AFRH must prepare an EIS for actions that may have significant environmental impacts and consider a reasonable range of alternatives, use a systematic interdisciplinary approach in analyzing environmental impacts, and factor environmental considerations into decisions.

AFRH will use findings in the EIS as we prepare development guidelines for the site. Throughout the development process AFRH will continue to look for ways to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on the human and natural environment. This chart outlines the NEPA process. To date we have published the notice of intent August 18, 2004, held a public scoping meeting September 9, 2004, published a draft EIS May 20, 2005, and tonight we are holding our public hearing. We anticipate the final EIS will be distributed for a 30-day public review period in late August 2005 and the record of decision will be final in September 2005.
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires that federal agencies, including AFRH, take into account their effects on any district, site, building, structure, or object listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Section 106 review ensures that preservation values are factored into federal agency planning and decisions. AFRH is in consultation with Section 106 with the DC State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Section 106 requires that AFRH provide the public, agencies, and other interested parties the opportunity to comment on the AFRH actions impacting historic properties. AFRH is combining the public environment procedures for Section 106 and NEPA in line with Section 106 regulations. Though comments on the draft RIS are due by 6 July comments on the Section 106 process will be accepted throughout our consultation process with the DC State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Since the home’s beginning operational funding has come from active military personnel. A permanent trust fund was established nearly 150 years ago and is renewed monthly by active duty payroll deductions. Prizes and forfeitures from the armed services and the monthly withholding have provided the principal support for the home throughout its history.

In recent years the principal of the trust fund has been shrinking. Congress through the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 gave the AFRH with approval of the Secretary of Defense authority to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of property that is excess to the needs of AFRH. Proceeds from such transactions will enable the AFRH trust fund to be replenished. These additional revenues are needed to support a sustainable retirement home for our retired military personnel.

To implement this authority and plan for its own facilities, AFRH is currently preparing a master plan for the DC campus that will guide the long-
term use and development of the site by AFPH and others. The objectives of the AFPH master plan alternatives are to preserve and improve the essential components of the AFPH for the residents and the community, to provide sufficient revenue to support the AFPH's goal of resident-focused care while replenishing the depleted trust fund, to grow the trust fund to not only meet the needs of today's residents but also the need for future generations of heroes as well, to attract development at fair market value that is compatible with the mission of the AFPH, and to ensure an open participatory process with the AFPH residents and the community at large.

I will now hand the presentation over to Craig Wallwork from General Services Administration, which is advising AFPH on the redevelopment process. Craig will be talking to you about the master plan alternatives which have been developed and studied in the draft EIS. Craig.

MR. WALLWORK: Thank you. Good evening. Several alternatives for the AFPH master plan are studied in the draft EIS. Potential development under each alternative was defined after taking into consideration compatibility with the AFPH mission, compatibility with historic resources and existing environmental conditions, compatibility with surrounding land uses, and analysis of real estate market conditions in the area.

Development zones as shown on the slide were defined to guide development of the master plan alternatives. It should be noted that private or governmental development on the AFPH site would occur primarily through leases or sales. The decision to lease or sell would be based on economic analysis and is not part of the EIS.

As required by NEPA, the EIS also studies the impacts of no-action alternatives. Under the no-action alternative or Alternative 1 a master plan for AFPH would not be adopted and no new construction on the site would occur; therefore, there would be no additional revenue from development on the site so would not meet the financial needs of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.
Under alternative 2 approximately 8.7 million gross square feet of new development would occur on the AFRH campus. It has the greatest density of any of the alternatives. As with all the build alternatives it has a mix of uses but has more medical and educational space than the other alternatives.

Development in Zone 1 would consist of institutional uses compatible with the AFRH operations or AFRH facilities. Zone 2 would be developed with new residential units for AFRH use, lease, or sale. Zone 3 would be designated for educational use while Zones 4 and 5 would be developed with compatible medical uses and Zone 6 would contain residential development compatible with the residential developments west of Rock Creek Church Road. This zone would also potentially include small-scale retail development to serve the residential areas.

Under alternatives 3A and 3B approximately six million gross square feet of new development would occur on the AFRH. This alternative has a similar mix of uses as is found in alternative 2, is less dense, and has a greater emphasis on office and research and development space as compared to alternative 2. As with alternative 2 development in Zone 1 would consist of institutional uses and Zone 2 would be developed with new residential units for AFRH use, lease, or sale. Zone 3 would be designated for residential, office research, retail, and hotel uses and Zone 4 would be developed with compatible medical uses.

There are two developments under options for Zones 5 and 6 under alternative 3. Under alternative 3A Zone 5 would contain residential development while Zone 6 would contain residential and institutional uses. Under 3B zones 5 and 6 would be developed for embassies in support of foreign missions and international organizations element of the comprehensive plan for the national capital developed by the National Capital Planning Commission.

Under alternative 4 approximately 6.4 million gross square feet of new development would occur on AFRH. This alternative places a greater emphasis
on residential uses than do alternatives 2 and 3. Again, as with other alternatives, development in Zone 1 would consist of institutional uses and Zone 2 would be developed with new residential uses for AFRH use, lease, or sale. Zones 3, 4 and 5 would be developed with residential, office, and retail users. Zone 6 would contain development compatible with residential development west of Rock Creek Church Road.

Jean Lynn, our environmental contractor, will now present the alternatives and findings of the draft EIS. Joan.

JEAN LYNN: Good evening. Each of the master plan alternatives studied in the EIS would result in impacts to the human environment. The alternatives would all disturb soils and topography on the site through site grading and excavation. Existing ponds would not be directly affected by the new development; however, concrete storm water channels may need to be realigned.

Development will increase impervious surface or hard, nonporous surfaces on the site by 14 to 17.5 acres which would increase storm water runoff. Best management practices for storm water management would be incorporated into the site design to mitigate for storm water impacts.

Under all of the master plan alternatives inventoried areas, mature trees, and meadow habitats could be replaced with developed areas but guidelines can be put in place to mitigate these potential impacts. Because the site is located in an urban area impacts to wildlife would be minimal.

The social impacts from the master plan alternatives would primarily be beneficial. The master plan alternatives would be for the most part consistent with the comprehensive plan for the national capital. The alternatives are consistent with the federal environment, parks and open space, and natural features components of the comprehensive plan.

Alternative 3B would support the foreign mission and international organizations component of the plan. All of the alternatives would impact historic features including the historic landscape. These impacts would be
mitigated through a programmatic agreement with the DC State Historic Preservation Office, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other parties. Because the AFPH is federally owned it is not subject to zoning by the District of Columbia.

The alternatives would result in beneficial increases in housing stock within the District of Columbia resulting in long-term increases in the city's population. The increase in population along with the increase in office and commercial space would result in increased demands for community services. There is adequate capacity in neighborhood schools to handle the increase in population and development under the master plan alternatives would result in increased cost for service from police, fire, and EMS services.

Implementation of the master plan alternatives would result in short-term beneficial gains from construction spending and construction employment. Long-term beneficial impacts would occur from new jobs for local residents from the plan development. The master plan alternatives could accommodate between 1,000 and 16,000 employees on the site.

Implementation of the master plan alternatives would have long-term beneficial impacts on city revenues through the increase in real property, personal property, franchise, sales and use, and individual income taxes. It is estimated that the alternatives could generate between $31 and $47 million in real property taxes.

In addition, implementation of the master plan alternatives would provide revenues to replenish the AFPH trust fund. Impacts to low-income and minority populations were assessed in accordance with the Executive Order 12898. Adverse impacts from air quality, traffic, noise would occur and could be felt by area residents; however, these impacts are not anticipated to be disproportionately high for low-income or minority populations.

A phase 1A archeology survey was prepared for the site. The survey concluded that the AFPH has a moderate potential for prehistoric and historic
archaeological resources. A phase 1B archaeology survey would be needed prior to any site construction to determine the presence or absence of archaeological resources.

The master plan alternatives would not alter or destroy buildings associated with the President Lincoln and Soldiers Home National Monument, the US Soldiers’ and Airmen’s Home National Historical Landmark, and national register listed historic district. New construction could alter the viewsheds (7) to and from these resources.

In addition, new construction could adversely affect the historic landscape of the national register-eligible AFRM historic district. In addition, the historic context of individual buildings or building groups could be altered. New construction on the AFRM could affect the views to and from the historic properties outside the site including the National Gate Lodge and East Grounds, the Petworth and Park View neighborhoods, and the United States Soldiers’ and Airmen’s Home National Cemetery.

AFRM has initiated consultation through the Section 106 process with the DC State Historic Preservation Office, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other parties. AFRM is working with the State Historic Preservation Office and Advisory Council to identify consulting parties to participate in the consultation process. As a result of this consultation, a programmatic agreement is being developed that identifies mitigation measures to be implemented as well as preservation design guidelines for the defined character areas in the AFRM.

A detailed transportation analysis was also undertaken to determine the effects to the local transportation network and associated traffic levels from new development on the AFRM. The traffic analysis looked at future roadway conditions without the proposed development and then conditions were assessed with the new development. The master plan alternatives would generate between
3,780 and 11,300 peak hour trips and would have major impacts on intersections in the vicinity of the APRH.

Under the master plan alternatives, the North Capitol Street-Michigan Avenue intersection, the North Capitol Street-Barkwood Road intersection, and the Irving Street and First Street intersection across from the Washington Hospital Center could operate under unacceptable conditions. Impacts could be mitigated through roadway improvements, signal modifications, and transportation management plans.

The Washington, DC, metropolitan region is a nonattainment area for ozone which means the level of pollution is higher than government standards. Based on the air quality analysis performed for the DIS mobile sources or traffic would not exceed national ambient air quality standards.

Under all of the alternatives new stationary sources such as boilers would require a formal general conformity determination under the Clean Air Act. Alternative 4 would exceed the new source review thresholds for nitrogen oxide and would therefore require a nonattainment area permit. Air quality impacts could be mitigated through emission controls or equipment.

Construction activities would have short-term adverse impacts on air quality and noise levels in the area; however, long-term impacts to noise levels from increased traffic and site operations would be negligible. The master plan alternative would require new utility connections and would result in increased utility usage. Once complete the new development would generate solid waste and possibly medical waste. All waste would be handled in compliance with local, state, and federal laws.

With that I'll now hand the presentation back to Tim Cox, who will explain the procedures for commenting tonight.

MR. COX: Now we will open the floor to those of you who would like to make formal comments. I will call people to speak in the order in which they
have signed up to speak. Again, if you have not done so you may sign up at the welcome table at the back of the room.

In order to accommodate everyone tonight, the 40 people thus far that have signed up, I ask that you limit your comments to three minutes, please. We have a time set up in front to let you know when you've reached that three-minute mark. When you come forward please state your name. Spell it slowly for the record. Remember, AFPH will not be addressing your comments this evening. All comments will be responded to in the final EIS.

We also have written comments that can be made to us through 6 July 2005. With that we have our portable microphones: yes! Okay, I see one there. Steve, and one over there. Good. John, thank you. Council members had signed up and I see Councilmember Vincent Orange. He may not be here yet.

MS. PERRINS: Good evening. My name is Linda Perrins. I'm here from the Office of Councilmember Vincent Orange and as I stated at the side there, we are here to participate and to assure that this would be an open process with input from all persons that are interested in making sure that whatever happens at this site is compatible with the needs of the residents as well as the environment.

So I will not be able to speak on the Councilmember's behalf other than to say that we are here. Any assistance we can provide, please do not hesitate to contact our office. Our number is: 202-724-8928 and we look forward to being here throughout the entire process. Thank you.


MR. GRAHAM: Delighted to be here. Hello, everybody. I've just arrived, as you could probably tell, but I'm very, very pleased to be here. I'm very pleased for the opportunity for all of us to be here tonight. If you're a resident in the neighborhoods surrounding this great home could you raise your
hand if you live not on the grounds here but you live around? Pardon me. Some of you will understand. If you live in Ward 1 would you raise your hand?

I want to especially thank all of our residents for coming out here tonight because they make the point that I'm just simply going to repeat but your presence here tonight makes the point that whatever happens here we must be assured meaningful, bona fide community neighborhood engagement on these issues.

And people who live in the District of Columbia have gotten accustomed to the sometimes uneasy relationship that we have with our great federal government and we know there are times of ebb and tide between the District of Columbia and the issues that we care about and the issues the federal government cares about. But what we have here tonight is a dramatic and very, very significant show of this message, that what happens on these grounds is important for a number of reasons but one of the key reasons for the significance of these actions is the impact on our neighborhoods. And I'm privileged to represent the great neighborhood of Park View, which is adjacent to this development.

I know my distinguished colleague Mr. Fenty is on the way and he will talk to the issues of Petworth and other neighborhoods that are in Ward 4. But that's the message, include us, involve us, give us meaningful engagement, and you'll find us to be responsible partners in what will be appropriate use of these lands.

Thank you very much.

MR. GXX: I've received word that Councilman Fenty is on his way so we'll just put him one of the people back and the next person after that is Jim Caldas.

MR. CALDAS: Good evening. My name is Jim Caldas and I am the president of the Washington Hospital Center, your neighbor across the street. Washington Hospital Center is owned by MedStar Health. I have some general comments and then some specific comments related to traffic impact.
MedStar and the Washington Hospital Center fully support the concept of development of the property being proposed in this plan. As the owner and operator of the medical complex on land immediately to the south across Irving Street we believe that appropriate development compatible with APRN and neighboring uses is important for the efficient use of land to benefit the community and city as a whole.

This city has limited large tracts of land for development. When large parcels become available for use a variety of possibilities should be considered that maximize the benefits to the community both functionally and substantively. Because of the character of the land use south of Irving medical, educational, research, and other related institutional uses should be considered.

The major street arteries adjacent to the site such as North Capitol and Irving Streets and Michigan Avenue provide excellent access to the site. A relatively high density could be accommodated so long as residential areas to the southwest are protected. The characteristics of the site with large open spaces lend themselves to appropriate high-density development and counteract urban sprawl.

Metro's red line is sufficiently close to the site that shuttle bus services benefiting all in the immediate community would reduce traffic. The clinical and research components of MedStar Washington Hospital Center's plan have the unique compatibility with the mission of the home and could assist in providing or coordinating development for this important site.

In addition the site would allow the expansion and renovation of the Washington Hospital Center's facilities, which can become a model for the delivery of medical services. MedStar Washington Hospital Center has the capacity and will pursue the opportunity to develop the entire property in an integrated and intelligent manner respectful of both the neighboring community.
and the community of residents at AFPH and will be guided by the leadership of AFPH.

With regard to the traffic analysis, we believe that the environmental impact analysis of alternative 2 overestimated total peak hour trip generation by a factor of two plus. Am I out of line?

MR. COX: You are.

MR. CALDAS: Let me just summarize by saying that we will submit the points which indicate, we think, that the traffic impact is overestimated as outlined in alternative 2. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment.

MR. COX: Thank you, sir.

MR. COX: Next on our list is Mr. James Carstensen.

MR. CARSTENSEN: You have to forgive me. As a federal employee it was hard enough to write my comments for a five-minute speech. Now, I've to go down to three so I'll try to make my point and get away quick. I'm speaking for several people in the Petworth and Park View communities who have taken great interest in this project. We know that we have to make one thing clear from the outset, that this proceeding, this proposed land lease, is about money.

The Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund in recent years has been depleted. The people of the Soldier's Home want a revenue stream and they deserve one. The people who live here have served and sacrificed for our country and for that they deserve our thanks, our dedication, and our commitment to ensure that they continue to get the kind of retirement lifestyle that they deserve.

The ground we stand on today is precious ground not only for the Armed Forces Retirement Home but for the entire community and indeed the nation. President Lincoln spent a quarter of his presidency here. He walked these grounds. He saw graves being dug for Union troops, he shaped thoughts about the Emancipation Proclamation here, and he talked with soldiers who lived here at the time.
The impact study talks about having no impact on historic monuments. Considering the historic value of these grounds, we ask what is the rush. What is the rush to lease this precious surrounding land for eight-story condos, massive buildings with huge asphalt parking lots, and the accompanying traffic jams and smog? Once the land is developed it’s gone forever.

We believe there is a better way. There are ways to generate revenue from the land without destroying it. There are ways to get the Armed Forces Retirement Home the money it needs without building upon one of its most precious resources. Some would have us to believe that this debate is about whether to erect six-story buildings or four-story buildings or to put condos here or there. That’s a false debate. The issue is this. We need to make sure that the Soldiers Home doesn’t fall under further financial neglect. Let’s get the home the financial resources it needs but let’s not sacrifice this great asset.

We examined the plan for this land drawn up by a few executives and consultants. We don’t see anything in the document that talks about national parks. We don’t see anything in reference to recreational trails or recreational areas or even parks for the performing arts like the Virginia’s Wolf Trap or Chicago’s Ravinia. We don’t see the talk of the need to preserve open space for the retired soldiers, the entire community of Washington, and the nation.

What we see is a rush to development. This issue is far too important to take the expedient way out. If we do our children and grandchildren will never see the land as Lincoln saw it. There is a better way. Working together we can do the right thing not only for ourselves, for our community, but for the entire nation and all generations to come. Thank you.

MR. COX: Next speaker, Mark Swert and after Mark it will be Thompson Hayes.
MR. EWERT: My name is Mark Ewart and I appreciate the chance to speak and I appreciate this process. I want to start by honoring the thousand men and women who served in the Armed Forces that live here and also the military personnel for decades and decades who contributed to the upkeep of this house out of their military paychecks.

I also respect the need to raise additional funds to continue supporting this house. I want to talk chiefly about problems that I find with the EIS document but I want to start by talking a little bit about problems that the EIS document finds with the master plan. I would encourage all of you to read the document. It's full of warnings and cautions. If you just skip the executive summary and actually read the document it's very illustrative.

But I also found that the EIS does not account for a huge amount of people that might be on this property. The people who might be patients and visitors to the medical facility, the people who might be visitors to the hotel and conference center, the people who would be shoppers in the proposed retail spaces, and the visitors to the national monument are not accounted for. I created some formulas for those. They are in the letter that I have sent so I won't go over those formulas for the interest of time but there could be up to 50,000 people on this piece of property. That's the size of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, so if we think that our surfaces around this area can withstand this environment, can withstand 50,000 people all at once. I would be very much surprised.

I'll limit my comments there except to say that I certainly hope that the master plan will be reconsidered, that there will be a new EIS, that the public and the residents of this house will be involved, and with this new plan especially the national monument and its surrounding will be respected. I certainly hope that everyone understands that part of the concern of everybody in this room is the best thing for the APRH, for the residents, and the surrounding community. Thank you very much.
MR. COX: A brown Ford, Maryland license plate NNK 593, your lights are on.

TOM, thank you.

MR. MAYES: Well, I'm relieved that's not my car. I am Tom Mayes. I am with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The National Trust is a congressionally chartered nonprofit organization dedicated to the preservation of our nation's resources.

We have a special relationship with the Armed Forces Retirement Home because we are the co-steward, restorer, and operator of the President Lincoln and Soldiers Home National Monument. In that role we just celebrated together with the Armed Forces Retirement Home the restoration of the exterior of the cottage.

We applaud the commitment of the Armed Forces Retirement Home to the preservation of these critical resources, particularly the national monument. We do, however, recognize the critical need of the Armed Forces Retirement Home to raise additional revenue for its residents which they do so greatly deserve. As stewards of the President Lincoln and Soldiers Home National Monument, however, we are deeply interested in the future of the site as a whole particularly as the master plan may affect the development and the historic character of the national monument over time.

We therefore urge the Armed Forces Retirement Home to very carefully consider the impacts of the master planning process. In earlier master plans changes were made to the property that we now know dramatically changed the property and affected its historic character. We would not want to see that happen again. In that regard we have three particular concerns about the draft EIS.

First, as you all know, the draft EIS makes it very clear that there will be under those development alternatives long-term direct, major, and adverse impacts on the historic resources. We think the draft EIS needs to be
looked at and modified to address those a little bit more carefully. For example, most of the alternatives that are proposed propose a great level of development and we think that alternatives should be looked at that can achieve some of the goals the Armed Forces Retirement Home is trying to achieve but reduce the level of development and therefore can reduce the impact on historic resources.

Particularly in that regard are the views from the Armed Forces Retirement Home. Many of you know that President Lincoln enjoyed those views and was undoubtedly inspired by those views as many of you all have been. We want to make sure that the development alternatives that are looked at are done in a way that they will minimize the impact on those views over the long term.

We're also concerned about the level to which the draft environmental impact statement looks at mitigation efforts to try to protect these historic resources. And we'd like to see it explore in more depth so that the public can have access to that information, some of these mitigation efforts. Some of this will be done through the Section 106 process but typically in the Section 106 process when it's combined with the NEPA process those mitigation efforts are disclosed so that you all and we can be aware of them and participate in talking about them.

Finally we are also concerned about the cumulative impacts of the development that's proposed and we don't think the draft EIS goes quite far enough in looking at what those cumulative impacts would be. For instance, the cumulative impacts are things like parking needs over time, street construction, and things like that that over the long term will have even greater impacts so we'd like to see the EIS address those.

In closing let me just say that we appreciate the Armed Forces Retirement Home's commitment to the preservation of its historic resources and we look forward to working with you all and with the State Historic Preservation
Office as we look for ways to protect these important historic resources. Thank you.

MR. COX: Thank you, Tom.

Next on my list, Cliff Valent, runner up, then Lauri Haafenstein. Welcome, glad you’re here.

MR. VALENT: Nice to meet you.

MR. COX: Thank you, you too.

MR. VALENTI: Hi, I’m Cliff Valent and I’d like to say that I read the master plan. I hope you guys did too. It’s very interesting. It will put you to sleep. But anyway I found that there were a number of contradictions in the plan. For example, in Section 14 it says that minority low-income populations would be disproportionately affected yet in 3-17 it says low-income and minority populations would not be disproportionately affected.

Someone had said that the traffic considerations were understated. I think they’re overstated if anything. Traffic considerations do not include increases from the Lincoln Cottage or the total plan for the site. Not to mention that it’s far enough away from the Metro station that most people aren’t going to walk. Additionally it does not include an assessment of how traffic will be impacted from the new projects already started on Harriet Avenue like a four-story condo building that’s going up there and other projects in Columbia Heights and Petworth. Those need to be considered for the area roads around here.

Many sections are too general to have any real meaning. When you look in the detail sections they really don’t tell you anything more than what the summary sections say. Under the No-Action Plan it says there will be an adverse economic impact on the retirement home; however, I think this is an
Intellectually dishonest statement. A no-action option would have no effect on the current financial situation.

Now, other alternatives for generating revenue need to be considered. Our federal government and American citizens in general have a responsibility to make sure our soldiers are adequately funded in their retirement. Giving up their gardens and green space or prescription drugs, for that matter, should not even be an issue.

Granted, this proposal is the easiest out but it's a Band-Aid. All of the impact summaries show a negative impact on the existing community, more traffic on roads that are already congested. It says that routes would fail, Capitol Street would fail, removal of matured trees, adverse effects on aquatic life, adverse effects on topography, increased noise level, decreased air quality, decreased green space, increase in city and federal services, direct long-term adverse impacts on archeological things. It says the cottage views would be adversely affected.

Only short-term interests of developers seem to be served by this plan. The long-term interests of the residents of 280, the residents at Petworth, and the residents of the Old Soldiers home do not seem represented.

Every option except the no-action plan is huge in scale and shouldn't even be on the table because I read a newspaper article that said the foreign missions and the embassies the State Department isn't even interested in those.

Well, I'm out of time but anyway I think everybody knows my position. Thank you.

MR. CON: Lauri Havenerstein. Next up then is Sandra Kottman. Glad to have you tonight.

MS. NAFVERSTEIN: Thank you very much.

Hi, my name is Lauri Havenerstein and I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important issue. I'm a resident of the neighboring community
and I would like to disclose up front that I own property that includes one of the parcels for proposed development and as such I obviously share the concerns for traffic and for quality of life in the neighborhood.

But I prefer to focus my comments tonight on my concern for the preservation of the historic value of this property. I think that anyone who had the opportunity, as I recently did, to visit the Lincoln Sanctuary, and I encourage anyone who isn’t aware of this book by Matthew Piersker that talks about the historic significance of this property. I encourage you to get it and read it. You can get it at Amazon and any number of book stores.

I’d like to echo the comments that Mr. Christiansen made that we are standing on sacred ground and once the cement is poured it can’t be brought back. I have read the EIS and I do not feel that enough attention has been given to the adverse impact to the historic landscape. I think that this

impact not just the neighboring community but the city and indeed the entire nation. Are we developing this land for the nation? It appears that we are not.

There are untold hundreds of thousands that have not yet discovered Lincoln’s Cottage. Nor have they yet found the first Arlington Cemetery behind the cottage where soldiers from the First Battle of Bull Run and other conflicts are buried. We should think of the land surrounding these sacred sites no differently than the space around Washington’s Mount Vernon or Jefferson’s Monticello. Thank you.

MR. COX: If I could ask Sandra just to hold on a second I see Councilman Adrian Foxy is here so, Councilmember, if you would come please. I’d appreciate it.
MR. PONTY: First of all I want to say I am glad to be back on campus. Most of you may recall that this area of DC was actually in Ward 4 when I was first elected and I was very proud to represent the veterans here at the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home. I want to thank you all once again for your service to the country. After redistricting I no longer represent the area on campus but, of course, Rock Creek Church Road is squarely within Ward 4 so I obviously still have an interest.

And most people who are off-campus don’t realize that most of the people who live here at the Soldiers’ and Airmen’s Home vote right here in the District of Columbia right over on Hartwood Road at Precinct 34 and are very active members of the District of Columbia local community. So I want to thank everyone first of all.

I have a formal written statement, which I will submit for the record as follows. My name is Adrian Ponty, District of Columbia Councilmember representing Ward 4. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the proposed future development of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, Washington. Upon reviewing the draft environmental impact statement and discussing the proposed development with community leaders in the surrounding neighborhoods it is clear to me that any development of the campus of the Armed Forces Retirement Home will have a large impact on the communities around the site, especially those in Ward 4 where I represent.

As you are aware, there is a number of very active community groups which have weighed in on this proposed development and since the likely footprint is so large, perhaps as large as eight million square feet, it’s imperative to continue to not only welcome community input but really to ensure the comments and concerns of those affected are incorporated into the final version of the environmental impact study and ultimately the master plan for the project.
I am particularly concerned about the possible impact the new development may have on traffic flow in concert with our existing infrastructure and the historic preservation issues associated with the property which were just so eloquently addressed. Development of this property provides a rare opportunity to create and make available open park space for community use as well and it could influence the economy by incorporating some of those values.

I therefore firmly believe that any successful project at the Armed Forces Retirement Home hinges on buy-in from the community inside the gates and also buy-in from the surrounding communities. I look forward to working with all parties to facilitate this involvement and to ensure the formation of a true partnership as this very important project moves forward. Thank you very much and I'll be happy to work with the Armed Forces Retirement Home and certainly the community as this goes forward. Thank you very much.

MR. COXX: Thank you. Sandra Hoffman and on deck is Robert O'Brien.

Welcome, thanks for coming.

MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you for allowing me to testify this evening. I have specific questions that address many of the similar concerns that have been raised already tonight. My name is Sandra Hoffman. I live at 37th and Taylor Northwest, about six blocks west of Soldiers Home. I have some very specific things that perhaps are examples of how the home could impact us.

Because of the significant lack of recreational park space in this area children throughout our neighborhood frequently are using our streets as places to play, to ride their bikes. It's a significant recreational resource. This is a neighborhood of single-family homes with many children and many families who are expecting children as well.

The proposed development plan on this site will significantly increase traffic which I would expect will reduce the use of streets as a
relatively safe place for recreation as they are being currently used and I'm interested in hearing how the plan expects to replace that recreational resource that will be removed from our community.

The second question I have is the federal elements of the comprehensive plan for national capital provide the guiding criteria for this development from what I understand from the ACS. One element of the federal elements is to enhance park and open space system of the national capital region and to ensure adequate park and open space for future generations.

We are currently seeing very dense residential development throughout Columbia Heights. We are very soon going to be seeing groundbreaking on two large projects on Georgia Avenue and we hope and expect to see much more of that along Georgia Avenue and Sherman Avenue and I think the neighbors very much welcome that kind of dense residential development. I may be speaking for myself but so far we've been able to work things out with planning. Everyone is going to work for the neighborhood.

Those developments are within two to six blocks of this space. As I said, we are already experiencing a lack of parkland for recreation in this part of the city. This is one of the few large remaining open spaces available in central DC and my question is why isn't a sizeable park part of the development plan for this site and in particular I would think that Area 6 looks like it would be particularly appropriate.

Among the alternatives that are considered, like prior speakers, I'd like to urge the Armed Forces Retirement Home to work with the DC government and federal government to find alternatives for funding or for land use including
possibly exchanges of land with other federal agencies where perhaps you can find a site that would be more appropriate for development and then perhaps this can become a park. Maybe that’s a way to work things out.

MR. O'BRIEN: Robert O'Brien. Next up then, Ted Mariani.

MR. O'BRIEN: I'm Bob O'Brien, and I'd like to talk a little bit about this thing. We seem to have four proposals on the agenda, all of which have been developed with little or no input by the residents. As I see it, this meeting and the previous one on the same subject only summarize the proposals being submitted to EPA. At the first meeting I attempted to have it clarified as to which proposal the administration was favoring or was more in favor of than others. I was not successful on that. But I find it difficult to believe that they do not have a distinct opinion about which of these plans should be the one to be accepted.

The next remark I was going to make, when I look at it it appears to be too derogatory. I will not make it; however, I do think it's premature to submit these proposals without residents having had the opportunities to become more familiar with the plans and the effect it will have on their lives here at Armed Forces Retirement Home. Thank you.

MR. O'BRIEN: Ted, then next up is Michael George.

MR. MARIANI: My name is Ted Mariani. I'm an architect and engineer representing Medstar Health Institution just to the south of the home and they have an interest in developing the property. We have a great deal of concern that the EIS dramatically overstated the transportation impacts of the development in alternative 2.

As Mr. Culdas said, it was a factor of two times what it will really be. The principal reasons for this were the study indicated that the land that is indicated for educational purposes, which is graduate medical education, was treated like it was a community college. This gives you a factor of six times of what you would really have. Also it failed to account for the fact that a lot
of the users would be moved over from the Hospital Center so you’re double-counting the traffic which would be taken away from the streets because of that.

They failed to recognize the fact that in a medical facility shift changes occur at nonpeak hours. People come to work before 7:00 and they basically leave before 3:00 so you do not have the peak hour impacts.

Another issue was the parking that is indicated in the GIS calls for over 16,000 parking spaces. Now, that’s really more than twice that you would ever really need on this campus for the development under alternative 2. Just to give you an example, the NIH, which is significantly larger than anything that would be developed on this campus, only has 8,000 spaces.

So I just want to suggest that before the master plan proceeds much further there should be a much more rigorous transportation analysis and this is good for everybody, not only the potential users of the site but for the community to understand the real impacts of the transportation and the parking requirements. And that should be undertaken, I think, as soon as possible because right now what you’re seeing is something that is so dramatic that it just frightens people and that’s not the reality of the situation. Thank you very much and we will submit a written statement for the record.

MR. COX: Thank you, Michael George and then D. E. Douglas.

MR. GROCK: I’m a home resident and I’m against getting rid of our land. They tell us it’s for the trust fund. Nobody ever sees this trust fund. If they want to do something with the land make a national cemetery out of it. If they got to take it from us make it a cemetery for the Soldiers Here. They’re running out of cemeteries. That will work.


MR. DOUGLAS: David Douglas.

MR. COX: I have D.E.

MR. DOUGLAS: David, right. Thank you.
MR. COX: You’re welcome. Thomas Rooney up next. Thank you, Mr. Douglas, glad you’re here.

MR. DOUGLAS: More than welcome. I’d like to thank the soldiers for coming out. My name is David Douglas and, talking about a neighbor, I am a neighbor. I’m 40 feet from the Soldiers Home and the Young man from the Hospital Center that said he was a neighbor, that was part of Soldiers Home. That was the apple orchard that I played in.

They had another meeting here when they put the three hospitals down there. Veterans and the Hospital Center, and they said that they were going to move the orchard and now that’s the parking lot for the cathedral. That’s where the orchard was supposed to be. So let me tell you once they start they are not going to stop.

You can come in any gate in this place. I taught my son how to run cross-country right in this park. Security got bad and instead of trying to solve the problem they locked the place up. And you can’t keep that out. You have to face fear. You can’t just keep locking yourself up. And that’s what you have to do. And it you let them start pouring the concrete you are going to lose this place and you need it. Thank you.

MR. COX: Thomas Rooney and then Lisa Swanson. Hi there, glad to have you here.

MR. ROONEY: My name is Thomas Rooney. I’m a long time resident, 50 years plus, of Brookland, which is just down Michigan Avenue from here. I’ve been involved in a lot of things in the city here, including McMillan Park across the way, our Metro stop, and a number of other things. What I’d like to talk to you in a few comments about the traffic that’s listed in the EIS statement.

First of all the DC Office of Planning has stated there will be no major highway. This is from some of their own propaganda. DC will have no
major highway improvements to 2025, and that's from the Regional Plan to 2025, the year 2000 update to constrain long-range plans.

So the long-range plan is there is no money to improve the roads. Well, back in 2001 when we got this information from workshops they were doing on McMillan the North Capitol and Michigan Avenue intersection was a level of service D in a range going to F, failure.

The Office of Planning's solution to the coming traffic crisis was, "The developers will have to coordinate mitigation with other major traffic generators to solve traffic issues." From that gobbleygook it seems that DOT is not responsible for the traffic and the developer is going to be responsible for the traffic but how does a developer be responsible for the traffic when in the EIS statement they admit that North Capitol and Michigan, Harwood Road and Michigan, and First Street and Michigan all will be rated F? Currently they're rated D so we are only one step from F.

So all of this additional traffic will have a humongous impact. On page 447 labeled "Trip Generation" is expected from the development 635 peak hours 11,310 vehicles. That's per hour. 7PM peak hours, 3,366 vehicles, that's per hour. So that is not workable. Everything will clog down.

Interestingly enough, the DOT put out a little pamphlet the other day, mailed it around to residents about what to do when we get attacked by terrorists or whatever, how are we going to get out of the city. Well, I happen to notice on the map on the back that if you live in this area of Brookland or any place in between on North Capitol and Michigan you either go out Georgia Avenue or Shule Island Avenue and somehow North Capitol is left out. You don't go out North Capitol.

And I guess they're recognizing from their own propaganda here that it will be completely unusable and that's now, not in the future sometime. I
just wanted to point out quickly that this RIS is not in a development vacuum. There is a development proposed for the McMillan Reservoir which is horrendous. It doesn't take into account the current development going on or expansion on the campus of the Medical Center and they're building a 1500-car parking building right now on the corner of First and Michigan.

It doesn't take into account the six or seven acres that were up for development at the corner of Irving and Michigan and they are still up for development. The Hilton hotel was going to build a convention center and hotel there but now it's up for grabs, six or seven additional, and Catholic University owns two or three city blocks that are up for development. So I just wanted to point out the traffic here is going to be a huge and unsolvable issue.

MS. COX: Lisa Swanson and Arlus Stephens. Thank you for coming.

MS. SWANSON: Thank you. Hi, I'm Lisa Swanson. I run, I bike to work. I recently acquired a dog through marriage who likes to walk around here. I'm a member of the executive committee of the Sierra Club in the District of Columbia although I'm not speaking for them today. We'll prepare a statement later but I live across the street on Illinois Avenue so I'm here in that capacity.

I can't talk about everything in the environmental impact statement, of course, so I'm glad other people are talking about other parts of it but two things stand out. If you look at the map of the District of Columbia this is huge. This is a huge, prominent green space that needs a lot of attention.

Anything that happens here will have a lot of effect not just on the perimeter neighborhood, on the Chesapeake Bay, the Potomac River, all of the greater environment that we're not really talking about tonight, so we can't forget about that.
And the second thing that jumped out at me was this number that’s come up a couple times, 17,000 parking spaces. I think the Home Depot maybe has 500 or 800, something like that, so 17,000 is phenomenal and that to me is a huge problem. The statement mentioned that there are three Metro stations close by. I think they’re walkable, not everybody thinks they’re walkable, but this area is completely underserved by buses, as the previous guy mentioned or someone else did, two near the hospital, one on Rock Creek Church, zero buses on North Capitol.

So if somebody is planning on needing 17,000 parking spaces they are thinking about a lot of traffic and I know that’s the maximum. Today’s Washington Post has a story that I hope everybody would look at. The title alone is exciting to me, “Mini-city Plan Discourages Use of Cars.” There is a plan underway right now in Vienna, Virginia, to completely rethink the use of cars in an urban area.

I’ll just read you one little section of what the planners had in mind there. To invite the potential residents not to own cars include showers in offices for bike riders, personalized traffic trouble-shooters for residents, handy zipper or flexcars, these very short-term rentals that the District has available, free smart cars, free company cars. Instead of assuming 1.6 parking spaces per condo they’re going to cut that down to 1 and basically force people to think about getting out of their cars.

I bring this up because I think not to think like that in any kind of development that will impact such a huge area on the map would be a missed opportunity to think differently about how space is developed. I know some people think there should be no development here at all. I’m with the Sierra Club. You might think I’d say that too but sometimes development in an already developed city area if it’s done well, if it’s done ecologically and with the people in mind, is better than creating a sprawl elsewhere and knocking down trees in a lot of other places.
Thanks.

MR. COX: Arius is next and then on deck is Vonnie Cruel. Thank you.

MR. STEPHENS: Hi, good evening, everybody. My name is Arius Stephens. I'm a neighbor. I'd like to thank Mr. Cox and I'd especially like to thank all the men and women who are residents here at ABH Washington not only for their welcoming us here tonight but also for their service to our country.

I have a couple of quick points. First all of this could be remedied very quickly if the Defense Department found it in their hearts to put a line item in their budget which would just fund the home. The last I heard they were getting quite a lot of money. Secondly I want to speak to the environmental impact statement. I believe the methodology was flawed in that there was not enough input from residents and also from the neighbors to the home and I'm speaking in particular with respect to Sections 5 and 6.

Abraham Lincoln, when he would come up here took up Rock Creek Church Road, which, if I'm not mistaken, actually bore that name back in the 19th century, and he rode up right where you ride up today. I don't know if Park Place and Randolph Street were there but Rock Creek Church Road was there.

Destroying that parcel, which all of these alternatives except for number 1 do, is a shame but short of that I think the environmental impact is great and better alternatives could be proposed if there was a dialogue with the community which I respectfully submit there really has not been any such dialogue.

One of those possibilities discussed earlier is to maintain some kind of green space and I personally support that. I understand that parts of Parcel 6 still have an agricultural use and they've had that use dating back to the 19th century when the residents here were self-supporting food-wise and I would submit that that should be protected. Thank you all very much.

MR. COX: Vonnie Cruel and then next up Frances Clarke. Vonnie Cruel? Is Vonnie here? Okay, I'll circle and just come back. Frances Clarke?
Frances Clarke: Well circle that one too. Andrew McIlroy? Andrew? Thanks for coming.

MR. MCGILROY: Evening, everyone, and in particular good evening to the residents of this Soldier's Home who are here. As everyone else has said, we really value the service that you've given to our country and those of us who live in the neighborhoods adjacent to the property really feel that we have an ax to grind in terms of our interest in seeing this property not just blindly developed with only an eye towards the short-term gain of some money that really doesn't solve the long-term problem that the ARPA is facing.

I just wanted to make a couple of points and I'll be actually submitting many more points in writing but it seems to me that one thing that has not been done is to consider the impact of the Lincoln Cottage as a coming tourist attraction, which apparently is what the National Trust has in mind for it, and not just in terms of looking at overall traffic and then averaging it out over a year but the fact that that traffic may be concentrated on a certain number of weekends a year, a certain number of times on Saturday mornings, or whatever that would significantly increase traffic volume. And then if you add into that the number of cars from new residents for condominiums or apartments that are also going to be feeding into Rock Creek Church Road or Park Place you could have a very bad situation for the existing neighborhoods nearby.

In addition I think the ARPA really doesn't consider seriously enough the impact on what they call the historic character areas and Atlas was speaking about one of these earlier. And what's really bizarre to me, if you look at the map of the parcels proposed for development in the ARPA and then you look at the map of what are considered the historic character areas, it's almost a perfect overlap.

It's like they've picked essentially the areas with the most historic significance as those to sell off and I realize there may be some reasons for some of that but it doesn't seem like something that's very wise and they really
ought to look at at least avoiding the areas that are considered to have historic character.

In addition there is a factor I don't think has really been considered which is something I think is called the heat island effect that in urban you have buildings and concrete that absorb the sun's rays and then basically hold heat and keep an area hotter than what otherwise would be. And, as Sandy was saying to me earlier today when we spoke, her plants bloom two weeks later up here than they did when she lived in Dupont Circle because it's cooler up here in part because the Soldiers Home in here with all this green space and if you pour the amount of development that this plan talks about into that green space that is potentially a huge impact on the climate of this little part of Washington, DC, potentially a lot more heat and more insalubrious summers. And I'll wrap it up very quickly but I think the NPS has to address that.

Finally let me just read you a quick quote from the comprehensive plan for the national capital area which supposedly guides this development process. And it says that, "The federal government has to manage property in a way that promotes the national capital region as a leader in environmental stewardship and preserves, protects, and enhances the quality of the region's natural resources, providing a setting that benefits the local community, provides a model for the country, and is worthy of the nation's capital," and I submit to you that the plans that we've seen do not do that.

Finally the community both inside and outside of the Soldiers Home gates has to have a substantive role in the planning process for any development. Thank you very much.

MR. COX: Tim Dennis, next up there, Angela Washington.

MR. DENNIS: Good evening. My name is Tim Dennis. I am an architectural historian with the DC Historic Preservation Office and our role is related to the Section 106 process. To summarize very briefly what Section 106
is all about, the Congress at some time in the past decided that it didn't make a lot of sense to have federal projects destroying or otherwise adversely affecting historic resources unnecessarily.

And so the National Historic Preservation Act now has a process by which federal projects, those carried out by federal agencies or with federal funding or federal permits, go through a review process. This process puts the responsibility of compliance on the federal agency and it makes the agency responsible for, first of all, seeing if historic properties are present and how they might be affected and then considering how those effects, if adverse, can be avoided, minimized, and/or mitigated. And it gives the federal agency a certain responsibility for self-criticism in review. Also, though, every state and Indian tribes and some of the territories have preservation offices. The District of Columbia is essentially a state for the purposes of Section 106.

So we review projects and we're reviewing this master plan which we received a couple of weeks ago. In addition, particularly on a project of this magnitude and this significance, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, which is the overarching federal agency responsible for Section 106, is already involved and will undoubtedly be involved in depth. This is really just the beginning of the public consultation process. This is the agency saying here's generally what we want to do.

In the master plan the agency has acknowledged that there'll be significant adverse effects by any of the alternatives but the no-build alternative. And what that means is that we will have a consultation which means essentially working meetings.

And I encourage the audience to request as you're making comments about the site or in lieu of or in addition to to request being a consulting party. Typically consulting parties are groups because they end up being working meetings. It's hard to get all your questions asked and answered in a forum like this.
But typically in DC the consulting party sessions and the consulting parties usually include ANC's and other neighborhood groups, historic preservation groups. Certainly in this case the residents both of the home and beyond the boundaries of the home and the National Trust will obviously be involved as will probably the National Park Service and any other group that sees themselves being affected.

That's essentially the procedure and we'll get that underway. I don't mean to hold you up but I got a couple other things. I think at first glance we certainly see the home's need and desire to gain more revenue and it does seem like there are avenues to place more development on this property.

I appreciate all the comments that were made earlier very eloquently about the significance of this property because it is really a significant campus with remarkably significant buildings, not to mention the adjoining neighborhoods. And I think that whatever happens here has to be seen in the context of placing new construction within an existing campus.

And what we would really not like to see is that campus becoming something other than a campus or being reduced to a much smaller campus with something else that's completely unrelated. And so at the outset I have to admit that we have some concerns about the bulk proposed.

And it seems like if you look at the alternatives you go from a no-build option up to 6 million to 8 million square feet, which is quite substantial, and it seems like there's a lot of daylight between the no-build option and 6 million square feet. And I say that simply by way of suggesting that there are probably other alternatives that should be considered within at least the Section 106 process to see if we really covered all our bases and that's what Section 106 is really about.

So my final comment is that I think a further step, perhaps the next step, is to have the consultants for the home suggest how at build out this might be masked essentially in two dimensions try to present three-dimensional
an axonometric picture of the campus with the bulk of the buildings and how the parking facilities would lay out. And that would give everybody a pretty much better picture of what's actually being suggested. Thanks.

MR. COKE: Angela Washington, that next up is Alexey Volynets.

MS. WASHINGTON: Good evening. I'm Angela Washington and I'm a resident in the Park View area and, of course, I have a bias and interest in this development. I live on Park Place and I have a bird's-eye view of Zone 6 basically. And for many years, about 10 years, I have watched the soldiers garden every summer from spring to the fall in that garden and I love to watch that.

And I'm quite sure everybody along that street who drives down the street and lives on Princeton St., whoever you are, you enjoy that also. I've also been given fruit, watermelons, what have you, from soldiers. I've also watched deer, wildlife run through there. I've watched raccoons, you name it, run through that park. So there is wildlife there, not even minimal.

Also my problem is you have in your master plan you want to respect the character of the adjacent community. And I'm really concerned and I'm concerned with the whole plan but in Zone 6 from your map you have alternatives of doing nothing, residential, and you want it compatible with the area. And I hear condos. That area from Park Place to, I guess, Georgia Avenue and beyond is basically single-family homes, maybe townhouses. You're talking about putting eight-story, fourteen-story condos. That doesn't fit in with the structure.

Also we have alternatives for institutional and embassies. That doesn't fit in with the structure. I can't imagine having an embassy across the street from me, at night parties, noise, large parking lots, lights. It's unconceivable. And I just want that put in the record, Zone 6, a park sounds great. If you have to develop develop something useful for the community. That's my view; I think that's your view also, not embassies, not institutions, not condos.
Because I want you to also know if you go to the top, because I’ve had tours from the residents here, where we are right now, and you look west what do you see? The best landscaped view in the world. You can see clear to the cathedral. That will be gone with embassies, condos, for you all, you residents. That beautiful view will be gone.

So please consider what you’re doing to the community to the west. I can understand developing to the south and to the east. Nothing’s on K Street. You’re not facing residents. You’re facing a commercial or medical on that side. Maybe that’s fine if you have to build and raise revenue. But please, Zone 6 reconsider.

Thank you.

MR. COX: Alexey? Next up then is Joseph Martin. Thank you, glad you’re here.

MS. VOLYNETS: Hi, my name is Alexey and I’m a Petworth resident, and many speakers discussed ways in which this development can negatively affect the neighborhood. In other words, basically this development will decrease the overall quality of life in the neighborhood and potentially even impact the property values and the rejuvenation of the neighborhood that recently has been developing pretty quickly.

So I believe that this plan has to have something that tries not only to mitigate the negative impact but to bring some active benefits to the community and a park would be one of those things and a park with a nice playground for kids and others. And I believe that this park actually would be beneficial for the home as well because in any city you can see that if there is a nice, good park, you can look at Rock Creek Park or Central Park in New York, it increases not only the quality of life but it will help you to increase the price that you will get for your new developments as well.

So at the end I believe that a park will be beneficial for the home and will be beneficial for the neighborhood. Thank you.
MR. COX: Joseph Martin?

MR. MARTIN: I'm going to pass.


Thanks for being here.

MR. ARNOLD: Well, I’ve been very impressed by all of the prepared remarks and all of the thoughtful comments that everybody’s made. I don’t have any prepared remarks or probably as thought out a response as a lot of people have had but I just would like to echo the neighbors in the Old Soldiers Home as well as the neighbors outside that we might be losing the forest for the trees here.

Everybody has been talking about the number of parking spaces and the amount of traffic and, I mean, they’re not small when you get to that point but I’m not sure that as a group we’ve even considered the value of development at all except in terms of getting money for the Old Soldiers Home and I think that’s fine but perhaps there is another way to think of that need for revenue and ways to fulfill that need for revenue and think about what we want to do with this wonderful resource before we even got to the number of parking spaces and the number of cars. I mean, that seems to be so far in the minute that this community hasn’t even had input yet on whether we want that at all.

And I for the record would just like to echo the majority of neighbors in that we’re not convinced yet that this is the best thing for the larger neighborhood as well as the immediate neighborhood of the Old Soldiers Home. And we hope that this input period will help the developers to rethink the whole idea and to reconsider such large development and perhaps consider parks and more gentle ways of using the space and, to quote my punning husband, we want parks, not parking spaces. Thank you.
MR. COX: Bill Crandall? Next up then is Jeff Taggart.

MR. CRANDALL: Thank you. My name is Bill Crandall. I don’t really have any prepared comments. Everyone else has articulated many things very well. But I did want to say that I think that in this case as in a lot of cases the argument is often framed as open space versus big box concrete development, which is often what we get, especially when the process is driven by money and by the interests of the people doing the building.

And I just think that the answer is to be obviously somewhere in the middle. It’s unlikely that there will be no building and it would be a real shame if there was clumsy blunt instrument over-building and thoughtless building that only served the developers. So I think that the real key is the quality of any development that comes and the diversity of that development and how well integrated it is into the community, how well it serves the residents of the home and also the residents of the communities around the home, and how thoughtful in design it is. How nice it is to look at.

I mean, if it’s a bunch of parking lots with big buildings no one’s going to be very happy about that except the people who built it. So I think that one of the best ways to ensure a better outcome is to make sure that the community has their say, which they’re having tonight, and I hope that they’ll continue to have over time. And I think that’ll just bring us to a better result and so I hope that continues and that’s about all I wanted to say.

Thank you very much.

MR. COX: Jeff Taggart?

MR. TAGGART: I’m going to pass and then make a written submission.

MR. COX: Thank you, Jeff. Drew Taldrin (f),

MS. STEPHANSON: He left but he’s my roommate so can I speak in his place?

MR. COX: You take his place? Yes, you just can come up, and spell and state your name for me, please.
MS. STEPHANSON: My name is Sheri Stephanon.

MR. COX: Thank you, Sheri, for coming here.

MS. STEPHANSON: Hi, there. I wasn't planning on talking either but I've been pretty compelled by the comments that I've heard so far and decided I needed to have a little input. I actually haven't read the EIS yet but I will and I appreciate the thoughtful comments of everyone who's come up so far and raised so many important issues.

I want to highlight a couple of things that I'm not hearing. One thing is, I don't know if anyone read in the Sunday's editorial of the Washington Post they were talking about development, some activities that are happening in or near Seattle, Washington. I used to live out there.

There are lots of really innovative ways being proposed in Seattle and other places around the country to preserve land while simultaneously raising revenues in thin case for maintaining the Soldiers Home. The things that haven't been brought up today are land trusts. These are things called conservation easements where they pay farmers to preserve open space and agricultural land.

I don't have an exhaustive list but the point is there are lots of really innovative mechanisms out there for preserving land and raising money at the same time and I would like to see that considered in this plan as an option. As other people have mentioned, the options go from nothing to lots of development and there really are lots of spaces in between where we can still see preserving some of the open space values of the land.

The other thing I haven't heard at all, only a couple of times has there been any mention of the impact to the low-income residents of the neighborhood. No one's really talking about that and I think it's something that we need to talk about and, like I say, I haven't read the plan so maybe this is in there. I don't know but anywhere in the proposed residential
development does it state that a certain portion of that has to go towards low-income housing?

I'm new to this area but I imagine that some of the older residents are feeling the increased value, the dramatic increase in value, of housing which is of a benefit but also we all know it tends to push people out. So I think that's something that if housing does end up in the final plan there needs to be some consideration for providing low-income housing for residents. I'll leave it there. Thanks.


MR. ANDERSON: Good evening. My name is Avia Anderson. I actually hadn't intended to speak tonight but I feel the need to speak as a native Washingtonian and a member of this neighborhood from all of my life. I recognize that there is a funding shortage. Much of what I have to say will mirror comments that have been made before but I feel they need to be emphasized again.

The funding shortage, I certainly agree with the gentleman that spoke earlier that said that this administration needs to simply add a line item that addresses the funding shortage. If we can send our family and friends off to war we can certainly fund a place for them to retire.

I mean, there are creative means of funding these shortages. They can utilize the current funds for our soldiers that are in the armed forces now. And I don't know why I'm speaking to this because I'm actually a real estate agent and so it's speaking against me but I'm more concerned about the people at large.

I'm concerned about the impact that it will have on the real estate here and the people here. The heat, I can't stand the heat and you're talking about an abundance of redevelopment here on this site. That doesn't include the
site that's planned at Kennedy Street or the one planned at Loomis Street where
the old Lincem of the War was. That's more condominiums.

It's only 64 miles radius to the District of Columbia. What are we
going to do with all these people? The traffic, the congestion, it just makes
absolutely no sense to me. What it does not address in any of the plans is the
positive interaction between young people and the retired veterans that are
already on this campus or that will come to this campus. If they're going to
put something on this campus that includes young people bring the young people
together with the elderly so that we can benefit from what the elderly have to
give to the young people. That's why this country is on its way down.

MR. COX: Dean Kern from Joyce Covington, Dean, thanks for coming
tonight.

MR. KERN: Thank you.

MR. COX: Welcome.

MR. KERN: My name is Dean Kern. I'm a resident of Luray Place over
by the southern five development. I've only been here a year. I grew up
outside of DC but moved in last year. And I'm not afraid of progress. I want
to see this area developed. I would love to see much of what has been discussed
here and I have a lot of trust and faith in the process and that a lot of the
details will get worked out.

And I doubt I'll be involved in that but I figured at least one
person ought to come up here and say that this development ought to happen. I
think it would improve a lot in this neighborhood in regard to the resources
available to police the neighborhood. Well, I don't know but there are a
couple of things I would like to see, and number one is when I first moved here
I'd jog around this property and was able to do so because one of the lanes of
North Capital was blocked off for construction.

But I thought it was such a pity that the place is barb wired off and
fenced in and I remember seeing some of the soldiers and thinking to myself I
would love to just run over there and say hi to them and being feasted off from
being able to do that.

I'd like to see a place to walk a day because I have one and I love
her and I love walking my dog. I'd love to see a park. I'd love to see a place
for kids to play and if it's an improvement to go from the streets to a parking
lot so be it. I'd love to have a place to have a beer, to buy some sandwiches,
and I think that it's fun to live in this city. I would love to have a place to
walk to rather than have to drive wherever I'm going in order to buy some
things. So bring it on. Build it.

MR. CON: Joyce Cleavinger? George Bailey and on desk is Sherilyn
Adams after George. George, thank you for coming tonight, pleasure to meet you.

MR. BAILEY: And nice to meet you. Hello, my name is George Bailey
and I came to Washington because I enjoy the great community here and it can be
a greater community. I hope that this potential development will make it a
greater community and not a lesser community. I'm plain spoken here and I don't
have prepared remarks but there are some things that I think should be
questioned or we need answers on some possible problems with the environmental
impact statement or potential developments here.

First as a general principle I believe this is public land, all
public land, we're discussing here and that public land should be used for
public purposes. I agree there is now presently a problem with the financial
endowment for our great veterans who have retired here and I give you
compliments and thanks for your services.

There are also many in my family who are veterans and will be
retiring soon or are in that age. There actually should be a plan that includes
more facilities for retiring veterans here and increasing services for veterans.

I would hope that that would be some option that they look into that
is possible to be financed and to be responsibly financed while also being a
good stewardship for the land here in DC. We're all important citizens here
that have a right and responsibility to speak up for a good stewardship of the land in our neighborhoods. I am also a neighbor in this area.

I have a vision that there could be smart growth in this area which includes green buildings. If you have to take away green space, and there's a question whether that's really necessary, but if it is necessary do build green buildings, buildings that are environmentally responsible, both environmentally and ecologically and energy efficient buildings. What better compliment could you give to our retired veterans that we are now responsible for having a clean environment and energy independence right here in DC as much as possible.

Another thing I would have to say is there has to be caution with the vision. Be very cautioned that there are not sweetheart deals in such types of potential developments. There have been things that have an appearance of bad stewardship, bad in that there are deals that could be construed to be not in the public interest but in private interests. I'm very much for public and private cooperation. Yes, we need to use both public goods and private initiative to meet our great needs.

One thing that also is very obvious with the plans is that if you all look at your maps they have parcels, one, two, three, four, five and six. All the alternatives seem to be you do all of them or none of them. An alternative could be you can do one or two or three or four or five or six but not all of them, just sufficient to meet the needs for the future, to have a strong stewardship for our veterans' homes here. So I hope that can be looked into better. Thank you very much.

MR. COX: Thank you, George. Sherilyn Adams? Next on deck then is Lewis Mannen. Sherilyn, thanks for coming.

MS. ADAMS: Thanks. I live right next to the cemetery and I've been living there for about 10 years. I learned about this meeting through a community e-newsletter and this meeting right now is my second source of information about this so I have not read the report. I didn't know that there
was a report. In fact my questions primarily surround the question about how open is the process.

In the e-mail that was sent around it talked about conversations were being had with unnamed developers. My question is who are these developers? How come they've not named? Have they already been promised some stake in the development? How will the final alternative be determined? What are the criteria to select the plan? What are the criteria to select the developers?

Have the developers had any kind of success doing this kind of development in the past? Is it the reason that we're having all six of these plots developed because these developers have come together and they say this is the way to do it and if we don't do all of it we're not going to do any of it?

Now will this affect the property values of the existing properties around the area that's to be developed? How will this impact the taxes that the homeowners pay? Will the campus be a gated community? Will you all be creating a gated community within a community which would definitely have a negative impact on the surrounding community?

Once whatever is created is created will people have easy access to get into the retail facilities or will it be just for those that are living inside the gated area? And what is being built into the plan to benefit the residents of the wider community? Like people have talked a lot about parks and recreation. I live right next to a graveyard. I walk around the campus a lot to exercise.

It's beautiful. It's green, and I have to be honest, I've never been on the campus. And when I drove in today I was amazed at how beautiful this place is. I said no wonder developers want to get their hands on this thing. I understand. What I'd really like to see is more members of the community having an opportunity to see what it's like and not on it.

And I think my problem, the reason I never came on it before, is because I do drive up and down North Capitol all the time and I see the barbed
wire so it doesn't look like as an inviting place for me but maybe it could be. So I really hope that this isn't a done deal and this meeting is just a formality. Step one, two, three, four, five, six, okay, this is the step where the community gets to hear what's going on. We did that, check. Next? I hope that's not what the case is. So that's my two cents. Thank you.

MR. COX: Lewis Maiden? Next up then in John Zoltner. Thanks for coming. We appreciate it.

MR. MAIDEN: I was born in Washington, DC, and my grandparents and great-grandparents all played around here. We should think about this place like this, Washington, DC, as America's jewel box. This is one of the jewels. Think about the children that are going to be coming here real soon with no legs and no arms that should see this place the way it is. Forget our view but think of what it is. Give those children something when they come home like the soldiers that we honor that have it now, make it better. Maybe there should be a cemetery on the other side but it stinks. I haven't read the plan, don't want to see the plan. I think the plan look good in the trash. Protect America's jewel box, Washington, DC, and the ones that are in it. This right here is one of them. And put your greed in your pocket and go on home. God bless you and thank you all for coming out.


MR. ZOLTNER: Hi, I'm John Zoltner. I'm a 20 year resident of the District. I'm new to Petworth but started working with youth on juvenile probation in Petworth out of St. Gabriel's Church in 1987 and a lot of people have talked about the financial resources and maybe there are other ways to get those resources for ARM.

I just want to call attention to the fact that I haven't seen anywhere any kind of analysis of what amount of money is needed to restore that trust fund to a level that would be sufficient to maintain a well-functioning
soldiers home and I think that's important because in the absence of any kind of amount or a goal then what we switch to is just trying to get as much money as possible and, looking at what we can tell of the master plan from the environmental impact statement, this is clearly a plan to get as much money as possible.

And I'm sure a lot of interests and a lot of people will make money off the implementation of that plan but I think a lot of people have said clearly today that we value the Soldiers Home, we value the soldiers, and this is a resource that is unlike just about anything else that's in the District and pretty soon it can be gone if the community doesn't get a chance to give our input into what can happen.

And one thing that's curiously missing, I think, in everything I've read is there's very little in this plan about the quality of life for the soldiers and airmen and there's very little that talks what that's going to be like besides taking parcels here and there and obviously they're going to be living in a much smaller space and I'd like to see some detailed planning, not seeing what I can judge from looking at the environmental impact statement but I'd like to see the master plan and hear a lot more detail from AFRH about what they plan to do.

And again, I would second that I hope that this isn't just a checkmark being checked because a lot of people in the community and in the home itself have a strong interest in this project and it's really going to affect our lives.

Thanks.

MR. COX: Cathy Boylin? After Cathy, David Jamroz (?). Again, welcome. Thank you again for your time, appreciate it.
MS. BOYLIN: Hi, I'm Cathy Boylin. I live at 303 Rock Creek Church Road Northwest so I'm diagonally across the street from the beautiful garden that the soldiers here tend. We are the Catholic Worker. Ironically the Catholic Worker are pacifists and really in the long vision of pacifists our work is to make sure that there are never again any more old soldiers. We love the people but we're trying to abolish war. We think war is the crime, not the people who fought it or are being victimized in it or whatever.

One of the things that we do every Thursday is make a meal for about 100 people and we take it down to the parks right by Lafayette Park, by the church that President Bush attends, and lots of the people who line up every Thursday for food from us are homeless veterans. Then we go around the corner and we are at McPherson Square where about 70 people line up for food there and most of them are homeless veterans.

I would like you to remember that there are at least 10,000 seriously wounded young men and women from this current slaughter and they're talking about closing Walter Reed Hospital. I wonder if that is because they have development on their minds at the expense of the old soldiers and the young soldiers who are the victims of people's violence, mistakes, and I call it other things but anyway I'd like us to consider, and I don't know if there could be changes, how to make money for the old soldiers.

I agree with the people who say the federal government should have a budget allotment. If they can give Halliburton unbidded loans to build prisons in Guantánamo Bay they certainly can find the money to pay to keep this home open and to take in some of the veterans who are living in the parks or in the shelters that are closing down and then use their check. Whatever the check is that they get, that could be the rent to live here at the building and then they could have a stipend. I don't know but I'm sure there's a lot of things they could do.
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Craig Wallwork, Project Manager
Armed Forces Retirement Home
1700 North Capitol St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20011

The Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Armed Forces Retirement Home - Washington Master Plan (AFRH-W), dated May 2003. Please give the following comments, offered pursuant to our special expertise, careful consideration in completing the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

The DEIS inadequately describes the anticipated effect of the proposed action, namely the significant loss of open space in the largely developed area of Washington DC. The simple statement in Section 1.3 that the AFRH is a 272-acre undeveloped site does not begin to recognize its traditional value as open space to the community at large. In addition, the financial needs of the AFRH that have stimulated this proposal are not quantified. Beyond stating the need for increased funds, there is no indication of how much of the facility must be converted to revenue generating development in order to sustain the facility. Without such information, we believe the master plan lacks a sound basis for decision making.

Section 1.5 Background should acknowledge the importance of the AFRH-W in the history of the design of the City of Washington. It is notable that the setting and planning of the AFRH-W has been of concern and assigned importance for well over one-hundred years. The presence of the “Soldiers Home” at the time of the development of the “MacMillan Plan” in 1902 underscores the dependence upon this parklike setting to continue in a vein similar to the parkland of Rock Creek. It appears to have been the status of The Soldiers Home as a continuing stable presence that allowed the area between Rock Creek and the Anacostia River to retain or create few park, open space and recreation areas in Northeast Washington. Portions of the proposed Master Plan suggested for development would severely reduce the contribution that the current facility now makes and should make to the park and open space component of the Nation’s Capital.

The Department believes there is a need to develop an alternative that specifically addresses the park and open space value and contribution to the City as a whole. In our
judgment, the areas identified as 5 and 6 should be considered critical components of an overall park, open space, and landscape component of this retirement home and the city as well. To allow these two areas to be developed for either housing or for embassies would excessively hem in the current and future use of the golf course and ponds to a point that their future would be threatened. We recommend that a new alternative be developed which would create a public park including the golf course. In order to relieve AFRH-W from the maintenance costs, consideration should also be given to transferring the new park to the District of Columbia or the National Park Service for management.

We do not agree that the Development Design and the Site landscaping should depend upon decisions by the developer(s) and are beyond the scope of the FEIS. The AFRH-W presents special and unique values to the overall setting of the Nations Capital in that it provides viewpoints from which the National Capital can be seen, as well as having a significant presence when viewed from many locations. Thus, we believe that the FEIS should define specific building height limits and levels of mature tree growth preservation. Certainly the indication of the general extent of development and landscaping of the area should be envisioned in the FEIS in order to indicate the scope of impacts and extent of mitigation necessary.

Please contact David Murphy, National Park Service, National Capital Region at (202) 619-7405 for questions or further coordination related to these comments. Thank you for the opportunity to review the DEIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Michael T. Chezik
Regional Environmental Officer

cc:
D. Murphy, NFS-NCR, Washington, D.C.

OEPC redraft 7/6/05
Donald Dailey  
Armed Forces Retirement Home  
3700 North Capitol Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20017

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Redevelopment of AFRC-W

Dear Mr. Dailey:

The Potomac Conservancy, a regional non-profit organization dedicated to protecting the Potomac River and its surrounding areas, appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) concerning the Armed Forces Retirement Home in Washington, DC (AFRC-W). The Potomac Conservancy is concerned about the short and long-term environmental degradation that would result from the proposed development of AFRC-W land. We submit the following suggestions for your consideration:

The Potomac Conservancy recommends consideration of additional alternatives that incorporate a mix of open space, public open space, and historic preservation.

The Potomac Conservancy advocates a mixed-use development that provides some community open space, particularly saving the community garden. This proposal would mitigate the environmental impacts from the DEIS alternatives. Each of the alternatives proposed in the DEIS evokes serious questions of environmental degradation. The destruction of open space in an urban setting creates numerous problems. First, the addition of impervious surfaces will create increased run-off and lead to the degradation of the fish pools and channeled streams. The streams and run-off eventually add to the overall decline in our major waterways such as the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay.

Second, the proposed development adds to the problem of poor air quality in the metropolitan area. The proposal will add 3,000 to 5,000 additional vehicles in the morning and evening commutes. The increase in vehicles adds to the already poor quality of air in the region through emission of pollutants. Traffic and parking is already a problem in this area. The stationary sources proposed for the land on AFRC-W will also increase levels of pollutants emitted into the air.

Third, the development of a historically open space will change the character of the community and degrade the environment. The meadows, pastures, and community garden will be destroyed to create a plan of buildings and parking lots. These open areas are a link to the subsistence history of AFRC-W. The current residents enjoy the walkways and views of privacy. Removal of mature trees will undermine the park-like atmosphere of the land.

Finally, the sale of the land to developers would be a quick fix to a long-term problem. The sale is a one-time event and may not solve AFRC-W’s financial difficulties. A more sustainable long-term solution needs to be addressed. The environmental, cultural, and historic

Protecting the health, beauty, and enjoyment of the Potomac

Regional Non-Profit Environment Organization
The Potomac Conservancy strongly suggests that the AFRH-W consider other alternatives to the sale or lease of the land to developers in order to create a more long-term, environmentally-sound, sustainable solution to the economic difficulties.

We question why other alternatives to land development are not seriously analyzed in the DEIS, instead of merely being included in a quick paragraph mentioning other suggested sources of income. These alternatives do not appear to be fully analyzed. For example, creating an urban parkland would offer residents and the public a respite from the congestion of the metropolitan area. The unique historical nature of AFRH-W and its monuments would draw citizens to the area. The federal land converted to open space would then be available to the general public. The residents of AFRH-W would also receive physical and mental benefits by use of the open space. The retention of open space would also maintain the scenic values and the greenspace for the residents and neighbors. Organizations abound who can aid AFRH-W in creating an urban park.

The Potomac Conservancy recommends, in any case, that mitigation and conservation efforts be implemented to preserve the environmental integrity of the area.

In order to mitigate the environmental impacts of the current and proposed development, modern techniques need to be implemented. For example, reduction of impervious surfaces will decrease the amount of polluted runoff. In addition, incorporating rain gardens will filter the polluted runoff from current impervious surfaces which will then help to protect the quality of the fish ponds and channeled streams. Retention of mature trees will improve air quality and protect local fauna. (And also be consistent with the National Capitol Planning Commission’s program to protect older growth trees and overall vegetation). Reducing fertilizer and pesticides and only adding these chemicals at certain times on the golf course will ensure increased water quality. The utilization of green building techniques such as green rooftops will help to mitigate other negative effects occurring from development. In general, there are an abundance of common sense, environmentally-sound methods to be implemented in order to ensure the natural integrity of AFRH-W. Creating an model environmentally-healthy redevelopment will demonstrate what a sustainable, low-impact, in-fill development can be.

In conclusion, the Potomac Conservancy recommends the AFRH-W reconsider its limited choice of alternatives and analyze other more environmentally-sound and less controversial options. The AFRH-W has a wonderful opportunity to become self-sustaining while also creating a lasting natural haven for the residents and the public. We appreciate your consideration of these recommendations and the Potomac Conservancy would be happy to answer any questions relating to these suggestions.

Sincerely,

Meredith Laubli
Vice President of Conservation,
General Counsel
IN REPLY REFER TO:
NCPC File No. MP60
JUL 9 2003

Mr. Craig Wallwork
Project Manager
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011-8400

Dear Mr. Wallwork:

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) concerning proposed new master plan for the redevelopment of the Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington (AFRH-W). The DEIS is being prepared, as a federal regulation requirement, on the whole of the existing facility, including all of its various structures, and contains the identified federal Historic District located there. These DEIS comments focus on the Commission's role as the central planning agency for the federal government in the National Capital Region and express our general views on planning and environmental issues.

The Commission anticipates that the master plan effort will create a desirable facility environment and location that attracts users compatible to the existing surrounding residential neighborhoods and which should add to the economic vitality of the District of Columbia. Most important, the purpose of the proposed action is to create a master plan for the AFRH-W that will sustain the facility and its primary source of funding, the AFRH Trust Fund for continued operation of the AFRH-W. With this primary objective in mind, the Commission staff review of the DEIS finds either alternative 3A or 3B appear to best achieve that objective while still maintaining significant and important qualities of the existing facility campus.

However, the staff review notes four areas of master plan evaluation that require additional focus and clarity regard implementation through completed environmental review and master plan guideline development.
The DEIS notes that additional site development at the AFRII-W under the master plan alternatives would increase energy demands and air pollutants emitted by on-site facilities required to provide the operational energy. According to The Master Plan, Stream System Evaluation (February 2005), approximately 50 percent of the existing AFRII-W boiler system capacity is available to accommodate the increased demand; however, it would be insufficient to serve the needs of all of the development proposed under any master plan. Therefore modifications to the system, primarily increased boiler capacity, would be required. The resulting necessary boiler capacity revisions indicate that the annual potential to emit (PTE) NOx emissions estimated for all the alternatives would exceed the annual de minimus NOx threshold of 28 tons per year. In accordance with the federal General Conformity Rule, if the direct and indirect emissions of a criteria pollutant (or its precursors) are above the de minimus level, AFRII would have to prepare a formal general conformity determination for that pollutant. This requirement should be specified and further details provided within the final NEPA determination of the AFRII-W final decision on master plan development.

As discussed under the master plan alternatives, a majority of the study intersections are expected to operate at LOS F or better. Alternative 2 adds significantly more traffic in the study area roadways as compared to Alternatives 3A, 3B, or 4. Consequently under Alternatives 3A, 3B and 4 less delay is added to the study area intersections. However, Commission staff notes that intersections of North Capital Street/Harwood Road and Irving Street/31st NW/Site access are expected to operate at LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours. Staff emphasizes that the Commission would expect, as part of the final decision determination under NEPA, that the AFRII-W will further elaborate and specify necessary binding guidelines for any development agreement which would require a developer to prepare a transportation management plan detailing strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle use and that also would, if necessary, physically improve the above noted intersections or their signalization.

NCPC staff stresses that the substantial removal of vegetation in any proposed plan would not be supported by the Comprehensive Plan objectives of the new policies of the Commission. We strongly request that a final NEPA determination specify additional guidelines toward specific mitigation efforts under the guidance of a prepared tree and open space conservation plan regarding access roadway alignments, maintaining open space, and integration of public space with development areas. Green space preservation should be maintained within every development zone of the plan as a component of its development. Specifically NCPC notes that the National Capital Comprehensive Plan policies strongly
emphasize the preservation and maintenance of open space for the AFRH reservation at page 104 of the Plan.

NCPC staff supports the initial historic preservation and cultural resource review within the DEIS and believes its imperative that the guideline objectives maintain the full support of the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Officer (DCSHPO) to address the issues noted in the NEPA review. Particularly, NCPC staff emphasizes that all eight character areas of the AFRH-W Historic District could be directly affected by the master plan implementation. The 272 acres of the AFRH-W, part of the AFRH-W since 1873, would potentially be affected by the construction of new buildings and would be reduced in size by the private development of some areas of the AFRH-W. Cultural landscape features such as roads, paths, tree lines, and streams could be disrupted or lost entirely. New construction could significantly alter the historic context of individual buildings and building groups, and could obscure the relationship between buildings. In the context of viewschande analysis, views to and from the site as well as views through the site should be fully evaluated. Staff re-emphasizes that a fully evaluated and consulted programmatic agreement developed under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) must be carried forward by the AFRH-W to address these important and adverse effects to the significant AFRH-W District.

Additional issues of the Section 106 process must include the U.S. Soldiers’ and Airmen’s Home National Historic Landmark (NHL) and National Register-listed Historic District and the President Lincoln and Soldiers’ Home National Monument. The National Historic Landmark and Historic District could be affected by the construction in Zones 1 and 2, and possibly by new construction in Zones 3, 4 and 5 of the master plan. Other adjacent historic resources, such as the National Register-listed properties that include the Adams Memorial, the Rock Creek Church Yard and Cemetery, and Saint Paul’s Episcopal Church and other potentially eligible properties, might also be affected by the master plan development. The eligibility of properties described as potentially eligible in the draft should be resolved through consultation with the DCSHPO before the final document is released.

NCPC asks to participate in the Section 106 consultation leading to the development of the programmatic agreement. NCPC concurs with the objective of completing development guidelines within the agreement consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for avoidance and minimization of effects to historic resources. NCPC staff also emphasizes that provisions of Section 106 of the Act apply to the master plan undertaking.
Your consideration of our comments at this stage of the environmental review is most timely and I look forward to examining the final EIS when available. Please place the Commission on the distribution list for all further environmental considerations of the AFRH-W master plan. If you have technical questions concerning the information related in this letter, you may contact Eugene Keller or Nancy Witherell, in the Office of Urban Design and Plans Review, at (203) 482-7251 or 482-7239, respectively.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patricia H. Gaffney, AICP
Executive Director
Chapter 1, page 1-1, 1.1 Introduction

... Proposed Master Plan for its campus...

**QUESTION:** When will the Master Plan for the campus be available for review?

**Note:** There is a legitimate question which may be raised concerning the integrity and validity of the EIS “to analyze the potential impacts from the proposed Master Plan” without full knowledge of the contents of the Master Plan.

Chapter 1, page 1-3, 1.4 Project Objectives

Preserve and improve the essential components ...

**QUESTION:** Is there any construction, improvements, modifications, etc. contemplated or contained within the Master Plan for any area not currently designated within a zone?

**Note:** There is no mention in the document relating to the environmental impact on any of these areas.

**Example:** Part of the Golf course is within zone 4. To maintain the credibility of a golf course requires a minimum of nine holes. If the credibility of the golf course is to be retained, where will the two dislocated holes be moved and what will be the environmental impact of this construction.
Chapter 1, page 1-3, 1.4, Project Objectives

To understand the "essential components of the AFRH-W" it is necessary to have available a listing of these essential components of the AFRH-W.

QUESTION: In detail, what are the essential components?

Chapter 1, page 1-9, 1.9.1 Impact on Security and Safety of Residents

The issue of maintaining the security and safety of the AFRH-W resident community pre construction, construction and post construction is not discussed within the current draft of the EIS.

QUESTION: How will this issue be addressed and/or mitigated?

Chapter 1, page 1-12, Site Landscaping

"... depend on decisions by the developer(s) and is beyond the scope of this EIS".

QUESTION: Should there be a system in place assuring that any "decision" by the developer maintains the visual esthetics philosophy or concept of the AFRH-W?

Note: This question relates to one of the stated objectives of the EIS (pg 1-3) "Preserve and improve the essential components of the AFRH-W for the residents and the community."
Chapter 2, page 2-3, figure 2-1

QUESTION: Why is the Sheridan Building included in Development Zone 1?

Chapter 2, page 2-4, Zone 1

Zone 1 is designated for institutional uses compatible with the AFRH-W operations.

QUESTION: In detail please define and explain the institutional uses?

Chapter 2, page 2-18 Economy, Employment, and Income

Under the column Master Plan Alternatives the first paragraph appears to be in error.

QUESTION: If this paragraph is not in error, what is the rationale supporting the statement?

Chapter 2, page 2-19, Historic Properties

Under the heading Master Plan Alternatives the indication is that the alternatives 2 thru 4 will have direct long term adverse impacts. The properties and structures contained within the confines of the AFRH-W have a broad and resonating effect on and from the military customs, traditions and culture.

QUESTION: What specific reuse is planned within the Master Plan? What mitigation measures are possible to preserve the historic culture of the AFRH-W for future military generations?
Chapter 2, page 2-20, Air Quality

Under the Master Plan alternatives discuss causes of both long term and short term adverse impacts to air quality.

**QUESTION:** What mitigating measures and/or contingency plans are in place to cope with AFRH-W residents who currently have respiratory problems? What system will be in place to measure the net result of this adverse impact on the incidences of respiratory ailments (i.e. COPD) on AFRH-W residents?

Chapter 3, page 3-11, Table 3-2

On page 3-9 first paragraph “The AFRH-W is located within Census Tract 23.02”

There should be sufficient demographic data available at AFRH-W to treat the population as a separate entity for the purposes of this study.

**QUESTION:**

1. How would the same data (i.e. Population, Race, Median Household Income, Poverty Status) appear if AFRH-W was displayed separately as a separate column to facilitate a closer observation of the population most affected by the proposed Master Plan?

2. Why were the Social Characteristics and Economic Characteristics not included as a distinct table for tract 23.02 (and separately for the AFRH-W) to provide a more complete and accurate picture of the population most affected by the proposed Master Plan?
Chapter 3, Page 3-52,53, Noise

The last paragraph describes the "land uses near the AFRH" as Category B. Category B is described as "moderately sensitive land uses, including residents, churches and hospitals". This EIS has given no consideration to the environmental consequences on the specific AFRH-W population whose average age is 77 years and who reside in an assisted care and long term care nursing home environment.

QUESTION: What would be the Noise Level Results (Table 3-10) if the area within the parameters of the AFRH-W were designated as Activity Category A rather than Category B which is the current category assignment for the "land uses near the AFRH-W".

Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences

The discussion under the various sub headings within Chapter 4 presents a multitude of mitigation measures.

QUESTION: Will the mitigation measures presented in the final copy of the EIS be a required part of any contract entered into with a developer to construct any or all of the planned development zone sites under the Master Plan?

QUESTION: Will the mitigation measures presented in the final copy of the EIS be a required part of the final copy of the Master Plan for the AFRH-W?
Chapter 4, Page 4-18, Social Environment

Within Section 4.2 Social Environment the only consideration is given to Population and Housing with no mention of the Social or Economic Characteristics outlined in the Fact Sheet for Census Tract 23.02 (that tract in which the AFRH-W is located). Reference to Question (2) under Chapter 3, Page 3-11.

**QUESTION:** Why is no consideration given to the consequences of the proposed alternatives on the social environment and the Social and Economic Characteristics of the "Ground Zero" impact area of the alternatives (Sheridan and Scott buildings at the AFRH-W)?

Chapter 4, page 4-19 first paragraph

Under the alternatives there is a potential increase in population to approximately 7500 persons.

**QUESTION:** With this extreme in population, as well as the interim increase in the worker population during any construction period, what specific security measures are to be taken to protect the environment?

Chapter 4, page 4-35, Character Areas

All eight character areas obscure historic views and open spaces from within the AFRH-W. The sequestered golf course is almost the only open space and cannot be seen from off the compound.

**QUESTION:** What are the possible ways to consider expanding the open space areas within the EIS span of control.
Chapter 4, page 4-35, Character Area 3: Chapel Woods

It is logical to assume that with spills of oil, gas, etc. the Auto Craft Shop has experienced some soil contamination. A stated objective of the AFRH-W Master Plan is "Preserve and improve the essential components of the AFRH-W for the residents and the community". If the Auto Craft Shop falls within the definition of "essential components of the AFRH-W" then it is logical to expect that the shop will be relocated to another area within AFRH-W.

**QUESTION:** What specific measures will be taken to ensure that soil contamination is eliminated at the new location? Where within the master plan is the designated location of the relocated Auto Craft Shop? Where will the Motor Homes, Campers and other large vehicles associated with the Auto Craft Shop be relocated?

---

Chapter 4, page 4-36, Character Area 8: Modern Impact Area

**QUESTION:** Where in the Master Plan is the designated area for the driving range?

---

Chapter 4, Page 4-39, 4.4 Transportation

**QUESTION:** Does the data in tables 4-10 through 4-16 accurately reflect a twelve month period as opposed to reflecting only the specific period of the actual measurements which were taken at the specified times?

**QUESTION:** Do the vehicle trips discussed under each alternative accurately reflect the 17,000 additional vehicles referred to elsewhere in the EIS?
Chapter 4, page 4-62, Noise Proposed Action Alternatives 2, 3A, 3B, and 4

**QUESTION:** What are the specific plans to protect AFRH-W residents from short and long range noise pollution?

**Parking**

**QUESTION:** What will be the environmental impact when all parking spaces located within the development zones currently reserved for residents, employees and visitors are removed from their current location and moved to a new location?

**QUESTION:** Where and where will the parking facilities be relocated and what will be the environmental impact of this relocation?

**Land Use**

**QUESTION:** After scoping, might modified alternative plans be formulated to develop fewer zones, in the event that overall adverse effects of developing all zones are too severe?
Cumulative Impact

"Cumulative impact" is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

**QUESTION:** Will the final copy of the EIS address the issue of cumulative impact of the Master Plan on the immediate confines of the AFRH-W community?

**QUESTION:** What specific base line data will be used or established against which to measure effects of any cumulative impact on the immediate environment and the cultural impact on the resident community?

Cultural Impact Assessment

When economic, social and natural or physical environments are interrelated then the EIS will discuss all these effects on the human environment. The Master Plan will definitely have an impact on the human environment within the AFRH-W.

**QUESTION:** In what section of the EIS will the Cultural Impact Assessment be completed and included as a part of the final copy of the EIS?

**QUESTION:** What will be the specific measures included within the EIS to evaluate the cultural impact within the AFRH-W resident community.
King Health Center

In several areas within the EIS the KHC is referred to as a hospital.

**Question:** Will consideration of KHC as a health center rather than as a hospital have any impact on the final Environmental Consequences contained within the EIS?

Military Requirements

The uniquely strategic location of the AFRH-W on secure government property serves as a military and Homeland Security vantage point as a point of protection for the Capitol of the United States. The property has been used in the past to station defensive equipment and materials and serve as a landing and staging area.

**QUESTION:** What has been the response of the appropriate Defense Department agencies to the potential loss of ability to use the AFRH-W for purposes of national defense?

Lincoln Cottage

**QUESTION:** What initiatives are in place or planned to accommodate vehicle traffic and parking when the Lincoln Cottage is open to the public?

**QUESTION:** What initiatives are in place or planned to control visitor access to the AFRH-W grounds?
Mr. Craig Wallwork, Project Manager
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Re: Armed Forces Retirement Home - Washington Master Plan (CEQ # 20050199)

Dear Mr. Wallwork:

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Armed Forces Retirement Home in Washington, D.C. As a result of this review, EPA has assigned this DEIS a rating of EC-2 (Environmental Concerns/Insufficient Information), which indicates that we have environmental concerns regarding the proposal and that there is insufficient information in the document to fully assess the environmental impacts of the project. A copy of EPA’s ranking system is enclosed for your information.

EPA understands that the purpose of the proposed project at the Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington (AFRH-W) is to create a master plan that will sustain the AFRH-W and its Trust Fund which is its primary source of funding. As stated within the DEIS (page i), AFRH and the U.S. Congress have identified the need for revenue which could be created by development of the AFRH-W. Also noted in the DEIS is that “Private or governmental development on the AFRH-W would occur primarily through leases or sales. The decision to lease or sell will be made based on economic analysis, and is not part of this DEIS.”

General

Although EPA recognizes the purpose and need for the proposed project, it is not certain that the extensive degree of development proposed is justified as current use and projected future use of the property is not included in the DEIS. The DEIS states that the “site is currently underutilized” but does not provide an analysis of the possible reasons for this other than the presumed assumption that there is undeveloped open space that can be developed to support community needs/amenities as well as provide revenue. It is not apparent that the residents were polled to determine what their needs are as well as if there is the demand to occupy the site with residents and tenants to support residential/hotel/medical/institutional/retail, etc. development that is proposed. Also, aside from the Grant Building and the King Hospital Complex, it is not certain whether other existing buildings would benefit from renovation/demolition, etc. which
may then help to support and increase revenue. An assessment and inventory of existing buildings as well as their uses would provide a baseline and may serve to decrease the build alternatives which would reduce environmental and cultural resource impacts.

To have a better understanding of the potential environmental impacts that may result from the proposed alternatives, EPA has the following comments which we would like to see addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

**Cultural Resources**

As indicated in the DEIS, the AFRH-W is a National Register-Eligible Historic District. The master plan alternatives would have direct, long-term, major, adverse impacts to cultural resources and the historic district. The pristine areas that characterize the AFRH-W area and that are associated with and represent historical significance will be lost due to the proposed development. Additionally, new construction would likely alter the historic context of individual buildings and building groups. Cultural landscape features would be disrupted or lost entirely.

In addition, the proposed alternatives could potentially affect historic properties outside of the AFRH-W. The historic properties outside of the AFRH-W are discussed within the DEIS. However, a map depicting their location in relation to the AFRH-W would be helpful in determining their proximity to cultural resources within the AFRH-W site.

Although a Programmatic Agreement is being developed that will identify mitigation measures as well as design guidelines for the defined character areas, the loss of cultural areas is great and permanent. The DEIS does not propose scaling down the proposed developed areas to retain some (or all) of the intact character areas nor to preserve the open space/meadows or the historic cultural landscape. Thus, of the alternatives proposed, there is no significant difference in the degree of impact.

Page 3-15, Character Area 3: Pasture, states that "The Pasture represents the natural agricultural landscape that was once vitally important to the self-sustaining farming activities on the site and illustrates the 19th century pastoral appearance of its once active farming lands." Prime and unique farmland impacted by the project should be delineated regardless of the current state of cultivation. These efforts should be coordinated with the National Resources Conservation Service. Impacts to prime and unique farmland should be avoided. However, if this is not possible, the FEIS should explain the implications of developing the prime and unique agricultural land with respect to the Farm and Protection Policy Act as well as describe the mitigation measures for those impacts.
Page 3-3 of the Wetlands Section states that the largest drainage area on the AFRH-W, approximately 105 acres, drains into two ponds in the southwest corner of the site via a paved flume. The second largest drainage area, approximately 65 acres, flows north to south through the center of the campus via a paved flume and storm sewers. "Prior to any disturbance of these areas, a Jurisdictional Determination (JD) from the USACE would be needed to determine if these features are considered waters of the U.S. and therefore under the USACE's jurisdiction."

Page 4-10 states that "Where possible, the open channel systems on the AFRH-W campus should be utilized to alleviate additional loads on the combined sanitary/stormwater sewer system." However, jurisdiction determination of the channel systems may prevent utilization as a stormwater management system.

It is the recommendation of the EPA to discourage the utilization of non-tidal wetland systems for stormwater treatment and management. Numerous studies have shown that siting these facilities in wetlands leads to the degradation of aquatic ecosystems by contributing to thermal pollution and downstream warming. Furthermore, an in-stream stormwater management and water quality treatment facility will alter hydrology, and increase erosion and sedimentation rates. Retaining stormwater and changing the natural flow rate will alter the natural level of the water table and change the surrounding wetlands vegetation. Water temperature, habitat composition, and food availability are all directly affected when streamside vegetation is lost. Stormwater management structures in wetlands will not prevent pollutants such as fertilizers, pesticides, spills, sediment, and urban contaminants such as bacteria, heavy metals and petroleum from automotive activities, from entering the surface waters since the structures are already in the surface water. Wetlands are important components to the aquatic ecosystem that provide flood flow desynchronization, maintenance of water quality, habitat and nutrient uptake functions. EPA's mandates include the preservation of these environmentally significant values and functions.

Low Impact Development

Page 4-13 states, "The stormwater storage requirement for the site can be satisfied with stormwater management ponds, underground storage pipes or concrete structures built in conjunction with quality control structures, or a variety of urban Best Management Practices (BMPs)." Although low impact best management practices such as bioretention facilities, infiltration trenches, dry wells, and rock trench level spreaders are proposed to reduce the effects of stormwater, it is important to note that stormwater ponds and other stormwater facilities do not replicate natural systems, which greatly slow water before it reaches streams, wetlands and other waters. Development results in the loss of trees and other vegetation, the compaction of soils by heavy equipment and the creation of vast stretches of connected impervious areas. These combined factors are extremely difficult to compensate for using traditional practices. Prior to the development of any structural stormwater practices on a site, significant reductions in stormwater quantity and quality impacts can be made through enhancements to site design.
result, site design goals and planning practices should be used to minimize stormwater impacts. The following web sites will provide you with goals and practices and additional information: http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps3ld_hydr.pdf; http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/iddattpdf; http://www.brmndatabas.org; http://www.txnpsbook.org; http://www.epa.gov/ednrmrl.

Terrestrial Biodiversity

The DEIS states that portions of forested areas, mature trees, and meadow habitats would be replaced with developed areas. The FEIS should provide a complete description of the terrestrial habitat resources in the study area. Complete species lists for mammals, birds, amphibians, reptiles, and plants present in the study area should be provided. The composition and characteristics of each community type should be summarized and the functions and total acreage indicated. In addition, the species should be mapped relative to habitat locations and species density.

To determine the baseline value of the habitat and the severity of the potential impacts from the proposed project, EPA recommends that a baseline Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP) be completed on the study area using the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s Habitat Evaluation Procedure. If the impacts of the wildlife and terrestrial habitat are unavoidable, the HEP will help to determine the type of mitigation measures which would be considered appropriate for the potential impacts.

Measures to avoid potential adverse impacts to these resources should be evaluated and implementation and mitigation plans to minimize impacts should be developed. Where such impacts cannot be avoided, adequate compensation developed through habitat assessment must be implemented.

Aquatic Biota

Although it was noted on page 3-7 that crappie, bass, and catfish are species found in the two fishing ponds, the fish and benthic invertebrates in the ponds within the study area should be surveyed. An analysis of both fish and benthic communities should be conducted to determine the quality and function of the aquatic biota. The purpose of the survey is: 1) to detect impairment of aquatic biota, 2) to assess the relative severity of the impairment, 3) to prioritize sites for more intensive evaluations, and 4) to define baseline conditions and documenting recovery from impairment following mitigation actions.

The loss of forested areas and open spaces combined with an increase in impervious surfaces lends itself to more pollutants entering the ponds. Reduced nutrients to streams, affects food supply for fish, etc. Therefore, specific mitigation measures must be outlined to alleviate adverse effects to the aquatic biota present in the ponds.
Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. If you need additional assistance, the staff contact for this project is Karen DelGrosso; she can be reached at 215-814-2765.

Sincerely,

/S/

William Argano
NEPA Team Leader

Enclosure
July 6, 2005

BY E-MAIL AND FAX: (202) 739-3335

Mr. Donald Dailey
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 N. Capitol St. NW
Washington, DC 20011-8400

Re: Armed Forces Retirement Home - Washington Master Plan for Development
Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Dailey,

The National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States (the “National Trust”) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed Master Plan for Development at the Armed Forces Retirement Home. We hope the following comments will assist the Armed Forces Retirement Home in strengthening the DEIS with regard to historic resources.

The National Trust is a congressionally-chartered nonprofit organization with approximately 270,000 members nationwide, seven regional offices and 26 historic sites open to the public. The National Trust and the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) have a special relationship regarding the President Lincoln and Soldiers’ Home National Monument, which consists of 2.3 acres within the AFRH campus. The National Monument includes the historic Lincoln Cottage, where President Lincoln spent fourteen months during the critical years of the Civil War. The National Trust and the Armed Forces Retirement Home entered into a cooperative agreement to enable the National Trust to research and restore the Lincoln Cottage and to interpret the Cottage for the public. Together we celebrated the completion of the exterior restoration of the Lincoln Cottage earlier this year. All plans for the restoration of the Lincoln Cottage and for the program of public visitation have been and will continue to be developed in close cooperation with the Armed Forces Retirement Home and the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office (DCHPO).

The National Trust applauds the commitment by AFRH to promote and support the National Monument in the midst of its campus and to make this nationally significant historic site available to the public. The National Trust also recognizes the critical need for AFRH to generate revenue to support the goal of resident-focused care and to rebuild the AFRH Trust Fund, thereby allowing the AFRH to perform its primary mission. Therefore, we support the

Protecting the Irreplaceable
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concepts of meeting these fiscal and planning goals through compatible new income-generating uses of the AFRH campus.

As steward of the President Lincoln and Soldiers’ Home National Monument, the National Trust is deeply interested in the future of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, particularly as the future Master Plan may affect the historic character of the President Lincoln and Soldiers’ Home National Monument. The future of the National Monument is inextricably intertwined with that of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. As indicated in the DEIS, the Home’s historic resources include a wide variety of historic structures, significant views and historic landscapes. While the National Monument includes only the Lincoln Cottage (President Lincoln’s seasonal retreat) and the surrounding 2.3 acres, the National Monument is also included within a larger National Historic Landmark District, and the whole 272-acre AFRH campus is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, with 122 contributing resources. The entire historic district is integral to the Monument’s historic context and interpretation.

It is important to keep in mind that strict federal stewardship responsibilities apply to nationally significant historic properties such as these. For example, Section 110(1) of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires that all federal agencies, prior to approving any action that may directly and adversely affect a National Historic Landmark (NHL), must undertake, “to the maximum extent possible,” such “planning and actions as may be necessary to minimize harm” to the NHL. 16 U.S.C. § 470h-2(f). In addition, Section 110(a) of the Act requires that federal agencies manage and maintain the historic properties under their jurisdiction or control in a manner that gives “special consideration to the preservation of [their] historic, archaeological, architectural, and cultural values,” for properties such as the AFRH campus, which have national significance. Id. § 470h-2(a)(2)(B).

The National Trust is concerned by the potential for development within the AFRH campus to adversely affect historic resources at AFRH. As indicated in the DEIS, many of the existing buildings and developments on the AFRH campus that diminish its overall historic and natural characteristics are the result of master plans that were developed in 1947 and in 1953. DEIS at 3-36. Given the Home’s past history of development, we request that the AFRH pursue the following actions before finalizing the Environmental Impact Statement:

- Identify and assess development alternatives that promote less density and disruption
- Disclose in full potential impacts to historic resources; and
- Assess and publicize all available mitigation to minimize destruction of historic resources.

The DEIS acknowledges that each of the proposed Master Plan alternatives (excluding the No Action Alternative) will have “direct, long-term, major, adverse” impacts on the Home’s historic resources. DEIS at viii, and 4-34 to 4-35. Perhaps the most substantial impact on historic resources, including the National Monument, will be the result of the scale, height, and density of the new construction. The magnitude of the development proposed in the Draft EIS ranges from a total of 6.055 million square feet, at the minimum, to a maximum total of 8.745 million
square feet, located in 6 identified zones. As indicated in the DEIS, this level of development would change the setting and views from the National Monument, the National Historic Landmark and National Register-listed portions of the campus; would result in the loss of National Register-eligible cultural landscapes; and would alter the historic context of buildings and obscure the relationship between the buildings and the landscape. Anyone who has visited the site is keenly aware of the importance of the views from the Home toward Washington’s monumental center, including views of the United States Capitol Building and the Washington Monument. These same views undoubtedly inspired President Lincoln as they continue to inspire and renew the residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home and visitors to the Lincoln Cottage today.

The National Trust is particularly concerned about the limited range of alternatives explored in the DEIS. Because of the potential impacts that would occur as a result of the high level of development currently proposed in the DEIS alternatives, we strongly urge the AFRH to develop additional alternatives that would involve less construction in order to reduce the adverse impacts on historic resources, as required by 36 C.F.R. §§ 800.6(a) and 800.1(a). For example, using Figure 4-1 as a starting point, DEIS at 4-37, we recommend developing alternatives that would reduce the overlap between Development Zones and Intact Character Areas. Alternatively, mitigation measures (not spelled out in the DEIS) should ensure that development within the Intact Character Areas be strictly compatible with the contributing properties in the historic district.

Another concern with the DEIS is the limited extent to which it explores the potential mitigation of the adverse impacts on historic resources. The DEIS indicates that AFRH has initiated consultation with the DCHPO as required pursuant to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and that a programmatic agreement is being developed to identify mitigation measures, including preservation design guidelines to be incorporated into the final Master Plan. The National Trust submitted a request to be a consulting party in the section 106 process in September 2004. The National Trust strongly encourages AFRH to consult with DCHPO and other consulting and interested parties concerning the development of those mitigation measures prior to finalizing the EIS, so that the mitigation measures can be disclosed through the EIS process.

The National Trust also encourages the AFRH to revise the DEIS to explore and disclose the cumulative impacts of the proposed Master Plan alternatives on historic resources. Currently, the DEIS simply indicates that the alternatives would result in "long-term, major, adverse, cumulative impacts" on historic resources, DEIS at 4-39, but it does not analyze or explore whether those cumulative impacts are, nor whether they could be minimized or mitigated. In order to determine whether such cumulative impacts can be avoided or mitigated, it is essential that these impacts be explored and disclosed in the EIS. This discussion will be particularly helpful in the section 106 consultation process, and will assist in the development of alternatives or modifications to the project that will avoid or mitigate adverse effects, as required under 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(a).
Mr. Donald Dailey
July 6, 2005
Page 4

The National Trust commends AFRH for its continuing commitment to protecting the integrity of the campus historic core. At the same time, the National Trust requests that the AFRH proceed with great sensitivity when changing the nature of the historic treasures represented by the entire campus. A master plan that balances the needs of the AFRH with the property's natural beauty and unique historic value has the best chance for being a model of smart development, and will ensure that the quality of life for the residents of the campus is maintained.

In addition, as the AFRH proceeds in the master planning process, the National Trust would be pleased to lend technical advice on matters of historic preservation, as staff permits. The National Trust has extensive experience with historic preservation standards, laws, and compliance, as well as a long history of participating in master planning processes. As a consulting party, we wish to be an asset to the master plan development.

The National Trust is privileged to enjoy a productive collaboration with the Armed Forces Retirement Home. We look forward to continuing to work with AFRH in the preservation of the significant historic resources of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Thompson M. Mayes
Deputy General Counsel

Cc: Timothy Cox
Richard Moe
Lisa Burcham, SHPO
Tim Denne, DCHPO
Armed Forces Retirement Home Statement
District of Columbia Councilmember Adrian M. Fenty, Ward 4
June 22, 2005

Good evening. My name is Adrian Fenty, District of Columbia Councilmember representing Ward 4. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the proposed future development at the Armed Forces Retirement Home - Washington. Upon reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and discussing the proposed development with community leaders in the surrounding neighborhoods, it is clear to me that any development of the campus of the Armed Forces Retirement Home will have a large impact on the communities around the site, especially those in Ward 4.

As you are aware, there are a number of very active community groups which have weighed in on this proposed development, and since the likely footprint of this development is so large (perhaps as large as over 8 million square feet), it is imperative to continue to not only welcome community input, but ensure the comments and concerns of those affected are incorporated into the final version of the Environmental Impact Study, and ultimately, the Master Plan for the project. I am particularly concerned about the possible impact the new development may have on traffic flow in concert with our existing infrastructure, and the historic preservation issues associated with the property. Development of this property provides a rare opportunity to create and make available open park space for community use, and it could influence the economy by incorporating retail and affordable housing units in the Master Plan.

I therefore firmly believe that any successful development project at the Armed Forces Retirement Home hinges on buy-in from the surrounding communities. I look forward to working with all parties to facilitate this involvement and to ensure the formation of a true partnership as this very important project moves forward. Thank you very much, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.
July 5, 2005

Craig Wallwork
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street
Box 1303
Washington, DC 20011-8400

Dear Mr. Wallwork:

The comments below are in regard to the April 2005 draft Master Plan for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) and the related draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). (Page references below are to the draft Master Plan.)

The State Historic Preservation Officer acknowledges that both documents characterize the full implementation of any of the Master Plan Alternatives as having "direct, long-term, major, adverse effects" on the AFRH-W Historic District, plus "indirect, long-term, adverse effects" on the President Lincoln and Soldiers' Home National Monument and the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Historic Landmark. We understand that Hector Abreu of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has reviewed the Master Plan draft. Assuming that the Advisory Council will continue consultation to resolve (avoid, minimize and/or mitigate) adverse effects on historic properties, we would advise you to contact potential consulting parties, including at least the National Park Service, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the District of Columbia Preservation League, the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City, the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions, and civic associations for the neighborhoods surrounding AFRH, the United States Commission of Fine Arts, the District of Columbia Office of Planning, the National Capital Planning Commission, and any other groups who may request party status.

While we appreciate the candor of the general determination of effects, there is relatively little analysis of what the particular effects might be. With the exception of the "Urban Design Framework Diagram" on page 22 of the Master Plan—which shows that nearly all of the identified primary views would be adversely affected—there is no attempt to relate the plan to the previous surveys of cultural resources. There is no examination of which buildings might be demolished or expanded. The figures for new floor area are proposed in addition to the existing contributing and non-contributing structures, but it is not clear how the new construction would occur in relation to the old. Such analysis is expected in an EIS, and some proposed mitigation of adverse impacts would be appropriate. A finding of "long-term, major effects" is, in a sense, facile because it does not state any probable effects in particular. We refer you to Hector Abreu's comments on the Master Plan sent to Gary Porter on June 27, especially reuse and prioritization analysis of the sort he suggests in his point #13 and better graphic representation of
what build-out might look like as suggested in points #8 and #9 (or as rendered in an axonometric massing model of the campus which would include both building bulk and parking facilities). In doing so, the Character Area Guidelines (pages 30-33) should be applied. Acknowledging significant adverse effects appears to be directly contrary to the Master Plan’s first objective: “Maximize development on the AFRH-W while maintaining the historic character of the site and retaining significant existing open space.” And “significant existing open space” is ambiguous in that it might suggest simply the preservation of “significant” amounts of open space as opposed to the preservation of significant open spaces.

Our greatest concern about the draft Master Plan is the bulk proposed. The AFRH has had a low-density campus character since its founding in the mid nineteenth century. The campus is presently a “garden in the city,” as characterized on page 20 of the Master Plan; at best, the Design Framework proposes to create instead a “city in the garden.” The development proposed is of greater scale than what exists around the AFRH, and the development zones have the potential to exceed the density of the surrounding rowhouse neighborhoods (the highest-density alternative could, if spread over the entire campus, nearly cover the entire property one story deep—but each of the options concentrates the vast majority of the built area on substantially less than half of the property, with heights up to ten stories, or perhaps twelve or thirteen—see page 27).

The Master Plan repeats the idea that the AFRH represents the transition between the residential uses to the west and southwest and the institutional uses to the east and southeast. It may be fruitful to compare the AFRH with a neighboring institutional campus, the Catholic University of America. Leaving aside the 49 acres of the former Harewood estate recently transferred from AFRH to Catholic (because nothing has yet been built upon it), the university campus totals less than 144 acres in area, compared with AFRH’s 272 acres. Catholic is considered a fairly densely developed campus. The campus presently (as of the 2002 campus plan) has 2,325,367 total square feet of built area. At 0.37 FAR, this is significantly denser than AFRH, and in the absence of any historic preservation regulation of the campus, whatever historic landscapes and vistas that might have once existed at Catholic have since been reduced to the green lawns surrounding the buildings. The exception is the playing fields at the north end of the campus which are analogous to the golf course that would be retained at AFRH. If this same level of density were applied to the larger AFRH campus, it would total less than 4.4 million square feet—or millions of square feet less than AFRH intends to add under any scenario—with similar, if not more dramatic consequences to the landscape and historic structures. The proposed density for AFRH ranges from 0.63 to 0.85 FAR overall, but it would be concentrated in certain areas. And these figures do not necessarily account for the additional area required for parking; Catholic now accommodates 1,939 spaces, whereas the AFRH Master Plan calls for 7,500 to 16,000.

The Design Framework is, frankly, contradictory on the intended character of the campus. It points out an opportunity to reinforce the “sharp contrast” between the edges of the proposed “urban” construction and the remaining open landscape (“one becomes a backdrop for the other”)—then twice states that there is no need or desire for “a hard urban edge,” and yet suggests how “an urban edge in a landscape could be addressed.” With regard to protecting the setting of the significant buildings and the overall character of the property, the Design
Framework is absolutely correct in stating that “buildings should be subtly integrated into the existing landscape.” It is difficult to imagine, however, how an additional six to eight million square feet of construction, expressed as buildings ranging from four to ten stories in height, can be accommodated subtly. The plan proposes more than quadrupling, if not more than sextupling, the present built area. This seems more along the lines of the “staggering mass” of large buildings added in accordance with the 1947 and 1953 master plans—resulting in the demolition of historic buildings and the interruption of views and axial relationships, but fortunately never completely realized (see page 18). It is clear that at some point a balance between open space retention—as both historic landscapes and as bucolic setting for the buildings—and the built area itself will reach an unfortunate tipping point. We fear that, instead of subtly inserting buildings into the landscape, what is proposed is essentially to shrink the campus and build around it something that is very different in character. The possible parcelization shown on page 27 imperils a substantial portion of the Chapel Woods, as well as the formerly cultivated area (Character Area 7) located along Rock Creek Church Road and serving as a buffer to the neighborhood to the west. While in form, the built environment might relate to the remaining large pieces of open space in the manner suggested by the photograph of the very urban Park Square Gardens, London on page 20, the new development would mostly be segregated from such spaces by the proposed new security perimeter.

Naturally, security measures will be another issue. The nature of a campus is in the relationships that exist between buildings and landscapes. Views and passage through the landscape are very important to the character of campuses and to this very historic one. Creating a new fence line across the campus will adversely affect these aspects. The Character Area Guidelines take a good initial stab at this problem.

Despite the bulk proposed, the proposed uses and the general development zone locations are likely workable. But the fact that the EIS alternatives range from a no-build option to options in excess of six million square feet of new construction suggests that there are alternatives in between—and consideration of all alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse effects is the intent of Section 106.

We look forward to future consultation through the Section 106 process and strongly encourage additional development of alternatives that will minimize adverse effects.

Sincerely,

Lisa Burcham
State Historic Preservation Officer
July 5, 2005

Mr. Craig Wallwork
Project Manager
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capital Street NW
Washington, DC 20041

Dear Sir:

Based upon a review of the document submitted by you to the DC Fire and EMS Department’s Office of the Fire Marshal in relation to the environmental impact statement of the proposed master plan for the Armed Forces Retirement Home, the following comments are being brought forth.

The contents of this plan will have an impact on the DC Fire and EMS Department. However, the impact amounts to the normal daily operating practices that are already set in place by the department. Basically, your plan is proposing to sell or lease the land that the AFRH currently occupies for future urban development purposes.

This will offer more potential building structures that the DC Fire and EMS Department will be responsible for in the area of incident mitigation, emergency response, and fire inspections.

Understanding the fact that the city is on an upward growth path, this proposal renders minimal impact to the fire service as long as all structures and occupancies are erected according to the current codes and standards set forth by the District of Columbia, especially in the area of fire department access, fire detection and suppression systems, and emergency planning.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard Fleming
Fire Marshal, AD/FC
June 24, 2005

Mr. Craig Walkow
Project Manager
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20011-3400

RE: Draft Environment Impact Statement for Armed Forces Retirement Home Master Plan

Dear Mr. Walkow:

The District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is providing these comments in response to your letter of May 13, 2005 on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) Master Plan. DHCD has completed its review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and has the following comments to offer regarding the four proposed Master Plan development alternatives presented and analyzed:

1. DHCD understands the need of the AFRH to create a development Master Plan that will be used to sustain the AFRH in the long-term, by replenishing its primary source of operational funding, the AFRH Trust Fund. You propose to accomplish this with revenue derived from the sale or lease of surplus parcels of land on the AFRH North Capitol Street Campus. We note that Congress has authorized, as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, the AFRH to sell or lease any property excess to its needs, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, for the specific purpose of replenishing the AFRH Trust Fund.

2. DHCD applauds and supports the AFRH for developing a Master Plan concept framework that has identified six zones of surplus land around the perimeter of the AFRH Campus that can be developed without compromising the historic landmark character of the historic core of the Campus.

3. DHCD supports the development of infill institutional uses that will be compatible with current AFRH operations located in the designated Zone I development area. This specific proposal is common to all four Master Plan development alternatives presented.
4. Dense new institutional and commercial uses that generate a great deal of traffic should be concentrated and focused in Development Zone 3 established in the Master Plan. North Capitol Street and the existing North Capitol Street entrance have more capacity to be able to accommodate the traffic that these new institutional/commercial uses will generate. Development of proposed new medical uses should be concentrated on the Development Zone 4 located on Irving Street directly adjacent to the existing hospital complexes located south of Irving Street NW. Traffic generated from these new medical uses should enter at a new entrance located at the existing First Street and Irving Street intersection that currently serves traffic from the hospital complexes south of Irving Street.

6. Residential uses of a scale compatible with the low-rise townhouse development in the adjacent Park Place and Petworth neighborhoods should be located in the Development Zones 5 and 6 identified in the Master Plan. The existing Park Place and Rock Creek Church Road streets are both rather narrow and small scale streets. The traffic generated by new townhouse scale residential development can be more easily handled on Park Place and Rock Creek Church Road as they are presently configured.

7. Maximum use should be made of environmentally sensitive "green" building and site design strategies (such as permeable parking lot paving and green building roofs) in order to minimize the increase in the amount of new impervious pavement and building tops generated by proposed development in the six development zones of the Master Plan.

5. Particular attention should be paid to the details of the residential developments to be constructed around (to the north and south of) the two large fishing ponds located at Park Place and Irving in the southwest corner of the Campus. These two ponds have some of the most intact undisturbed landscaping on the entire AFRH Campus. The existing landscaped character of these ponds should be respected and preserved to the maximum extent possible by the new residential developments that will be built next to them.

Please contact Mr. James Thackaberry, Project Manager in the Development Finance Division, at (202) 442-2141 if you have any questions regarding these comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jami Greene
Director

cc: Mr. Timothy Cox, Chief Operating Officer
Office of the Director

July 6, 2005

Mr. Craig W. Wallwork
Project Manager
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20013

Dear Mr. Wallwork:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington (AFRH-W). This letter provides coordinated comments from District of Columbia government agencies, including the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development, Department of Health, and Office of Planning. Generally, the District government understands the constraints and needs of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) to creatively generate alternative revenue to continuously renew its budget to support ongoing operations. The District offers the following comments on the Draft EIS as categorized below:

**Development Process and Community Engagement**

A major suggestion is that the process for including the District government and the general public, particularly the surrounding neighborhoods, should be clearly outlined and adopted for the entire process. Both the District government and surrounding neighborhoods should be afforded ample opportunity to determine how the programmatic targets for each development scenario and any sufficient alterations are massed on the site and respond to concerns/requirements related to historic preservation, adaptive reuse of existing structures, open space, transportation and economic impacts. It has been the District's experience that community charrettes (workshops) are an effective way to allow residents and other stakeholders to participate and help shape outcomes of planning/development processes.

**Revitalization/Economic Development**

District revitalization/economic development priorities within the area include: 1) Georgia Avenue/Great Street land assemblage, retail improvement/attraction and redevelopment; 2) McMillan Sand Filtration Site redevelopment potential, and 3) cumulatively, the impact of all proposed area development on the transportation, traffic, transit and parking networks. Additionally, the planning/development goals of the McMillan Sand Filtration site can be applied to the AFRH site. These include: 1) providing publicly accessible recreation/open space; 2) preserving and adaptively reuse of site features; 3) creative development of the site, such as incorporating historic features, civic elements, and green buildings; 4) mitigating neighborhood impacts; and 5) maximizing revenue-producing opportunities on both private and non-profit components of the site.
Impact on Public Infrastructure/Services

The impact of future development on surrounding neighborhoods and District facilities is of utmost concern. Cumulative impacts of all proposed development on the surround area should be adequately addressed. Impact analyses should be conducted for transportation, traffic, transit and parking networks, as well as libraries, schools, recreation centers and other services.

Zoning

As the site development process progresses, more information should be provided regarding development areas that will be leased and/or sold for private development. The land areas sold to private developers will be subject to the District's land use and zoning regulations.

Environmental Health

The mitigation measures outlined in the Draft EIS report address both the short- and long-term impacts of the increased stormwater runoff that would be generated as a result of increased imperviousness from the development. In particular, we strongly support implementation of the low impact development (LID) practices such as bio-retention, infiltration trenches (where the soils are suitable), dry wells, rock trench level spreaders, and vegetative controls outlined in the report. However, in addition to the above list of best management practices, we recommend that the developers also look into the feasibility of green roofs because of the numerous environmental benefits that can be achieved from such systems.

AFRH-W, has considerable issues with regard to hazardous waste and corollary contamination. First and foremost, the AFRH-W currently does not have an operations and maintenance (O & M) program in place to manage wastes and other environmental contaminants. Secondly, it is not currently identified as a RCRA hazardous waste generator in the draft EIS even though EHA has it listed with an EPA ID number.

Furthermore, the following contaminants or areas of concern have been identified with the past and current operation of the AFRH-W:

- 3 out of service USTs (underground storage tanks)
- 3 abandoned USTs near Buildings 46 and 76
- 3 active USTs associated with Buildings 52, 56, and 64 storing diesel fuel for emergency generators
- Possible perchloroethylene ground contamination associated with former laundry in Building 46
- Former hazardous materials/petroleum use areas in Buildings 73, 76, and 77
- Surplus pesticides stored in Building 77. Conceivably, DDT and chlordane could be housed there given the age of the units
- Spent solvents, paint thinners, paint waste, drummed lead paint debris, possible hydraulic fluid
- Known asbestos containing materials (ACM) throughout the facility
It is also a distant possibility that, given the opening date of the facility (1851), there could be some ordnance issues. Although AFRH-W is neither a fort, nor lies in the "circle of forts" area that comprise much of the formerly-used defense sites (FUDS), it may still be possible to unearth munitions during any required excavations in addition to medical waste and attendant equipment/supplies/bottles, etc. given its pre- and post-Civil war status. As a result, we recommend that an anecdotal review of requisite documents, photographs, etc. be conducted should a light or heavy geophysical study be contemplated for any ordnance/medical waste debris, etc.

The following minor corrections should be made on pages 7-3 and 7-4 of the distribution list: "Mr. Marie Sansome" should be corrected to "Ms. Marie Sansone", and Mr. Denzil Noble is no longer with the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs. We recommend that the changes be reflected in the final EIS.

Additionally, the D.C. State Historic Preservation Office has submitted its comments to you under separate cover, from Lisa Burcham, State Historic Preservation Officer. Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS. We look forward to working with you throughout the site development process. Should you have any questions, you may contact Rosalynn Taylor, Associate Director for Neighborhood Planning, at (202) 442-8970 or Derrick Woody, Special Assistant, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development, at (202) 727-2981.

Sincerely,

Ellen McCarthy
Director

cc: Stan Jackson, Deputy Mayor, Planning and Economic Development
    Derrick Woody, Special Assistant, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development
    Rosalynn Taylor, Associate Director for Neighborhood Planning
    Lisa Burcham, D.C. State Historic Preservation Officer
    Marie Sansone, Senior Deputy Director, Environmental Health Administration, Department of Health
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: NATHANIEL M. ADAMS, JR.  
Address: 4429 GEORGIA AVE, NW, WASH, DC 20011  
Affiliation: COMMUNITY RESIDENT  
Phone: (H) 202/723-9094 // (PAGER) 202/336-2064 
(FAX) 202/291-4397  
Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?  

Comments  

— SENIOR CITIZENS WHO NOW TIRE OF  
CARING FOR REGULAR HOUSES IN D.C.  
MUST NOW RELOCATE IN MARYLAND OR  
VIRGINIA FOR "SENIOR COMMUNITIES"  
— COULD NOT SOME OF THIS  
PROPERTY BECOME "PROPERTIES FOR  
"SENIOR COMMUNITY" ESTABLISHMENT,  
WHEREBY SENIORS WOULD PURCHASE  
OR LEASE REDUCED-SIZE RESIDENCES  

Please send comments to:  
Armed Forces Retirement Home  
Attention: Donald Dailey  
3700 North Capitol Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20011  
donald.dailey@afih.gov  

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.  
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
Comments: Instead of new construction for "condos", why not utilize existing vacant dormitory building and greatly "under-used" dormitories. Contracts could be awarded to reduce each building to bare walls and floors; followed by subsequent complete "up-scale" refurbishment" to the maximum levels attainable (both interior and exterior). Once down, such apartments could be sold at the highest "market-rates" which are now prevalent. Such an effort would result in the large income levels which you are seeking and should be compatible with the neighborhood complaints. Please advise earliest concerning this idea.

Respectfully,

M.M. Adams Jr

D.C. USA (Act)
Mr. Donald Dailey (donald.dailey@afih.gov)
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Re: Response to Draft EIS for AFRH-Washington Plan

July 5, 2005

Dear Mr. Dailey:

Thank you for the opportunity to present my comments on the AFRH Washington Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). My comments on the DEIS are as follows:

1) In conversation with area residents, many residents and civic organizations were not adequately represented at the past June meeting nor have been provided information about AFRH’s plan to develop.

2) It appears the draft for development does not consider recreation and preservation of potential park land as an option. This includes not serving ample notice to a potential major player such as the District of Columbia Parks and Recreation. In addition, we have been informed that our local office of the National Parks Recreation offices was not served notice. It bewilders me why this area of development has not been considered.

3) During the June public meeting, there was no disclosure of dollar amounts of how much AFRH needs to continue offering veteran home services. Nor is this disclosed in the draft. If you are considering public participation, comments, input, etc., then, certainly this should be a more open process where the residents and concerned parties are informed what are the numbers to be met and propose alternatives. All of our drafted comments are just superfluous until we know how to meet AFRH’s needs.

4) What strikes me most shocking is that these parcels which have historic significance or character, the development plan must spare them from development, possibly including through alternatives such as land trusts or sale of certain parcels, or portions, for use a parkland. Both options should be added as viable alternatives that allow for revenue but also conservation. It appears that if AFRH is not interested in preserving a land which hosts Lincoln’s cottage and was the first Soldiers’ burial grounds, then, National Parks Service would indeed in preserving a piece of our history.
5) The very character of a residential neighborhood with existing number of trees is being proposed to be destroyed. Retention of all of the existing mature trees in the historic character areas are particularly essential for historic-preservation purposes. All development alternatives must be crafted in such a way as to preserve the mature trees.

6) The proposal of 17,600 in one of the alternatives seems almost preposterous in a residential neighborhood. Concrete kingdoms are found all across US urban cities, however, this plan is again not addressing the history, character of the land nor the neighborhood or for that matter, the residents of the home.

7) I fully believe that other true alternatives to the proposed development plan must be explored. The four “alternatives” listed in the DEIS are not really different from one another, but merely slight variations on a single theme. More effort should be made to provide true alternatives with a variety of financial and real estate options to solve the underlying concern – namely the budget of the AFRH.

8) The historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence is overlooked. There should be more detail regarding Section 106 impacts including consideration of knowledgeable sources on the subject, such as Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (federal entity) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. It appears that the Trust needs to make more input on its significance.

9) Is AFRH saying that there will be little or no traffic impact on a neighborhood that is mainly seniors, children and families? 17,600 spaces means a lot of traffic, potentially use of neighboring streets for parking, re zoning, new lights, stop signs, etc. The impact on traffic is vague and unexplored. It requires more details, specifics, and cost information. There is no information about the impact on the community of the number of peak-hour trips suggested in terms of cost to the city of Washington DC to address, the damage to the local infrastructure, and the overall impact on the surrounding community. The transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between the affected AFRH property and Georgia and New Hampshire Avenues. The impact of the level of increased traffic considered is unlikely to be limited to the main streets currently studied in the EIS. More specifically, the neighborhoods to the west of the AFRH property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational services provided by streets in Petworth and Park View. In addition, the District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from automobiles on city streets. Bringing a large number of automobiles into narrow residential streets will likely increase the mortality rate in the area to the west of AFRH, particularly because of the relatively large number of elderly and children.

10) I am in accordance with your proposed development of zone 6. I have children
(ages 6 and 3) and do not feel that your plan is conducive for the raising of children. Nor am I in agreement to have towering buildings in front of what is a beautiful and scenic area with lagoons, ponds, and horticulture by AFRH’s residents. The plan does not take into account that BUILDINGS will lower over what is not row houses. The DEIS mentions any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but that standard does not actually appear to be consistently applied in the document. That error must be corrected. For example, alternatives 2 and 3A suggest development in Zone 6 that is not at all in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood’s architecture. The existing neighborhood is comprised entirely of rowhouse architecture, with a maximum of three stories in height.

11) If land is to be developed under “GOV” zoning, then all government building standards must be applied, including the most up-to-date environmental standards. For example, the EIS should detail that any development on GOV-zoned land would have to be GSA LEED certified.

12) For future reference, AFRH has already proposed developers for these plans (hotel, convention, hospital) without the discussion of who they are. The only evident party prevent that probably has bid this under the table is Washington Hospital Center. Do not forget that one of the SENIOR residents REMEMBERS when Washington Hospital Center made many promises to maintain the neighborhood character and did not do so. If you must develop, develop on the Irving and North Capitol sides which do not affect our neighborhoods so heavily. Just how much money does AFRH need?

13) It appears AFRH has already proposed developers for these plans (hotel, convention, hospital) without the discussion of who they are. The only evident party prevent that probably has bid this under the table is Washington Hospital Center. Do not forget that one of the SENIOR residents REMEMBERS when Washington Hospital Center made many promises to maintain the neighborhood character and did not do so. If you must develop, develop on the Irving and North Capitol sides which do not affect our neighborhoods so heavily. Just how much money does AFRH need?

14) The proposed development will have disproportionate negative health effects on minority populations. Specifically, air pollution problems are local as well as regional in scope. The nearby neighborhoods would experience the largest change in air quality from the increased traffic and other pollution sources associated with the proposed development. Further, local air pollution is linked to increased incidence of respiratory illness. Three different recent studies being published this month in Epidemiology find a significant link between daily ground-level ozone in cities and mortality rates in the next 3 days. Ozone is
formed when pollutants, such as car exhaust mix with heat and sunlight. Editors of *Epidemiology* have made the rather unprecedented comment that together these studies point to an “urgent need to reduce public exposure to ambient ozone by all possible means.” To that fact must be added that communities of color across the nation are experiencing disproportionately high levels of asthma and other respiratory illness. The deteriorated local air quality will also worsen these health problems in this predominantly African American neighborhood. The heat-retention effect of the loss of current AFRH green space will also promote additional local ground-level ozone formation. Finally, the current mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property.

15) The EIS does not consider the heat-retention impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadow, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surface will have on temperatures in the surrounding area. The dominant green space on the current AFRH campus has a cooling effect that will be radically altered is heat-retaining buildings, parking lots, and roads are constructed where grass and trees now stand. The increased temperatures will result in higher cooling bills, particularly burdensome for the elderly poor, or an increased frequency of dangerous summer conditions for those who cannot afford air conditioning, again particularly the elderly poor. Increased temperatures will also worsen the impact of the increased automotive exhaust associated with the proposed development by promoting local ground-level ozone formation. At the current time, the mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.

16) Many residents in the area to the west of AFRH use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. AFRH enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The draft EIS has not considered how dense construction on the AFRH property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area. A rise in the water table seems likely to result from dense development on this land. A raised water table could result in a serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income.

17) In terms of crime, what is proposed to counter the increased level of living, retail, and traffic? Crime is inevitable, however, what measures and coordination are being placed by the District Police and Fire Departments. Will neighborhood safety be considered when it stands, area residents fight crime, theft, burglary, heavy drug trafficking for local streets. Georgia Avenue and surrounding areas?

18) As President Lincoln found this area to be calming so did the residents of this area. It is particularly notable to walk out in the mornings and the evenings, hear the birds, smell the air and feel the breeze of the trees. Both residents of the AFRH and neighbors who live to the west of the Home benefit, much as President Lincoln did when the Anderson cottage was built, from the relative calm and quiet
provided by the green campus of the Home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able to walk past the property and to see it's green expanses when looking out their windows or down their streets. In this way, the AFRH has provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its residents no matter their income because it does not look like a poor neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty and calm will take away something of great value in their lives.

19) Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the DEIS has not adequately taken into account the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital adequately. In particular, there appears to have been an marked inattention to the Parks and Open Element and the Preservation and Historic Features Element. The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear that the capital area is facing increasing demand for open space and park due to increased population and tourism pressure. The Element defines open space as “any land or water surface that is not occupied by buildings, a broad definition that encompasses the vast majority of federal property” (p. 3). Under the Park and Open Space Element directs that federal agencies should:

1. maintain and conserve federal open space as a means of shaping and enhancing urban areas (p. 7);
2. preserve open space that is crucial to the long-term quality of life of a neighborhood or region;
3. conserve and maintain the essential open space character of areas in the region with significant park, open space, cultural or natural qualities that contribute to the setting of the National Capital Region.” The Element specifically includes McMillan Reservoir to the immediate south of Zone 5 as an example.
4. “Conserve portions of military reservations that add significantly to the inventory of park, open space, and natural areas and should, to the extent practicable be used by the public for recreation ... [i.e.] when security considerations permit (p. 8-9).” The Element explicitly includes U.S. Soldier’s and Airmen’s Home as an example of this.
5. “Maintain and conserve trees and other vegetation in the landscaped buffer areas on federal installations in a natural condition.”

The Park and Open Space Element also stresses the importance of connectivity between parks and open spaces in the Capital Region. As already noted, the Element has identified both AFRH and the McMillan Reservoir to its immediate south as areas to be preserved as open space and parkland. Fort Totten to the northeast of AFRH is also an important part of the long-run open space plan for the Capital region. As land is currently configured, links could be made between these three areas through green bikeways. Loss of the AFRH property to development could seriously impair this open space connectivity.

The Parks and Open Space Element highlights the unique role that parks created around
historic sites play in the Capital Region. The federal government is to "establish and preserve historic parks as important legacies of national, historic, architectural and landscape significance. The Anderson cottage and two acres surrounding it have been designated a National Monument because of its importance in Lincoln and other 19th century presidencies. But as the DEIS notes, the importance of the AFRH site does not stop with this. To its immediate north is the first national military cemetery, predating Arlington National Cemetery. The AFRH itself has been in continuous use as a final home for members of the U.S. Armed Services since the middle of the 19th century. It is the U.S. equivalent of Les Invalides in Paris. Its central landscaped core and the agricultural land (now garden) of Zone 6 are essentially unchanged from the 19th century and provide a coherent and important historical context for the National Monument, cemetery and historically important home. The Elements are very clear about the importance of protecting just such landscapes from destruction.

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Federal Plan also commits the federal government to protecting terrain features of the region through careful design. In particular, it notes the importance of maintaining vistas of the monumental core of L'Enfant's city and protecting the escarpments that provide those overviews. As the third highest point in the District of Columbia and one of the only undeveloped ones, the AFRH property is one of the areas that falls under the federal government commitment to protect "topographic bowl features."

The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital Federal Citizens complements the Parks and Open Space Element. The Preservation and Historic Features Element is not limited to preservation of historic structures. A major concern is the "preservation and strengthening historic urban design features, such as the L'Enfant Plan." As part of this the Element commits to "protecting the character of the region's natural features, many of which have historical or cultural significance, such as... the ridge of the topographic bowl, agricultural land... and designed landscapes." All of these elements are present on the AFRH property and the alternatives do not seem to adequately take these into account. In particular plans to develop Zones 5 and 6 will disturb historically agricultural land that was an integral part of the function of both AFRH and the Anderson cottage, as well as disrupt the landscape of the topographic bowl. In particular, the Federal Plan calls for the federal government to "protect the skyline formed by the region's natural features, particularly the topographic bowl around central Washington" and to "protect and enhance the vistas and views, both natural and designed that are an integral part of the national capital's image."

The Preservation and Historic Features Federal Elements set policies regarding federal government stewardship of historic properties and the historic plan of Washington, D.C. Under these Elements federal agencies should:

1. protect the settings of historic properties, including views to and from sites where significant, as integral parts of the historic character of the property (p. 5);
2. protect the reservations that contain historic landscapes and features from incompatible changes or incursion;
3. Protect views ... inward from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl from inappropriate intrusions. Open space should be preserved to allow for public use and enjoyment of these views. (Examples include ... the escarpment north of Florida Ave. NW).

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements directs the federal government to look to redevelopment of surplus federal property as a means of adding to the region's inventory of parks and open space and notes that future acquisitions could occur by purchase, easement, donation or exchange. An alternative that has not been included in the EIS is exchange of land in Zones 5 and 6 for other federal surplus land that could be more appropriately developed. Exchanging this land for land in another location and development there could provide needed financial resources for AFRH. Zones 5 and 6 could then continue to play the important role they currently play in the District's system of federal open space by protecting historic landscapes, providing appropriate context for an important historical site and protecting views of the central core of the capital as directed by the Federal Elements. If the land were transferred to the National Park Service to enlarge the Lincoln Cottage National Monument, this would not only preserve open space but would help protect the historical integrity of the setting for the cottage as a place of retreat and rest, thus preventing the kind of encroachment of inappropriate new development that has so adversely affected the Manassas Battle Field and other major Civil War historic sites. It would also enhance public access to much needed open space in the District as a whole as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, it may serve to substantially mitigate adverse environmental impacts of development on the eastern Zones 2, 3, and 4.

The District of Columbia Parks and Recreation is currently in the middle of a comprehensive planning process. As part of this effort they are conducting a survey of park and recreation needs indicating a significant deficit of park space in the Petworth, Park View, Columbia Heights area. The AFRH property is a uniquely large landscaped open space - one of the few remaining unprotected open space areas in the eastern part of residential Washington DC. The planning process should also be timed to accommodate consideration of the current comprehensive planning process of the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation.

The location of a park in Zone 6 in the AFRH EIS would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Columbia Heights and to planned dense residential development along Georgia Avenue, as well as dense development planned for the rest of the AFRH site. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northwest and northeast D.C.

The open space already provided by AFRH is an integral design element of the adjacent Petworth and Park View row house neighborhoods, developed in the early 1900s. Surrounding streets to the west of the Home were designed to take advantage of vistas of
the open space provided by the Home's property. For example, the vista from Grant Circle down Illinois Ave to Zone 6 is an important anchoring design element in the eastern part of Petworth. The Preservation Element of the Federal Elements directs federal agencies to "protect reciprocal views along rights-of-way and from ... circles (p. 11)." Replacing the vistas of this green expanse that opens out over a view of the federal core of the city with a view of an eight story apartment building would significant harm the integrity of historic city plan in this part of the capital.

Among the alternatives, the DEIS has not considered alternatives that would provide significant parkland for the neighborhood to the west of AFRH. As the name Park View suggests, the neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View adjacent to the western boundary of Soldier's Home were developed in the early 1900s around the presence of the Soldier's Home as open space.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I am confident that adequate and appropriate consideration of the comments of all affected parties will produce a better end result for AFRH, its residents, and the multitude of other city residents who will be affected by the proposed development.

Sincerely,

Adam and Janet Lugo-Tafur - adalturahan@hotmail.com, angeloigremon@hotmail.com
Adam and Zachary Tafur
Carlos and Sandra Barreto - cbarettostarmhouse@yahoo.com
SandraBarreto18@yahoo.com
424 Newton Place Northwest

cc: The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton
Councilmember Adrian Fenty
Councilmember Jim Graham
Leslie Schill, Dept of Parks and Recreation
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Kathy Boylan
Address: 503 Rock Creek Church Rd, N.W.
Affiliation: Dorothy Day Catholic Worker
Phone: 882-9649

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

We do not want the development.

Fund the Old Soldiers Home by

1) opening the home to more soldiers especially homeless veterans whose monthly rent would fund the home.
2) donate, not for profit groups serving veterans to take over unused buildings and pay rent.
3) allow U.S. Park Service to take over land for park. Park Service would then pay for moving + other land, tree + pond care.
4) demand that the Federal Government pay to maintain the Armed Forces Home.
5) stop the war in Iraq & use the money for funding.

 Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afrh.gov

Please send comments to:

#67

Also serve the needs of the many who are returning from Iraq + Afghanistan

For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821

#67 (continued)
1) - Change requirements so to allow homeless veterans, disabled veterans from this war, etc. to live here. This could be used to raise $.

2) - Fund the home by stopping the war, bringing the soldiers home.

3) - Walter Reed - Traffic - 5th + Quincy - Rock Creek.

Serve the needs of the victims of this war. Is there a possibility of a class action suit.

Closing Walter Reed in that to allow d...
VETERANS BENEFITS UNDERFUNDED; JOB TRAINING CUT

At the same time more money is allocated for the Iraq War, the Bush Administration proposes to underfund veterans benefits by $4.3 billion and cut job training by $330 million.

Veterans' Benefits

Veterans' benefits have repeatedly been underfunded, according to major veterans' service organizations. Under the current budget proposal, veterans' benefits would be underfunded by $4.3 billion. In particular, shortages in veterans' health care mean long wait-lists for veterans seeking care, and a backlog in maintenance and improvement of medical facilities.

Job Training

Like veterans' benefits, job training fails to be adequately funded. Under the current budget proposal, funding for job training would follow the trend and be cut again by $330 million, a 5% cut. Funding for job training currently is only about one-third of what it was 25 years ago.

Notes: NPP's estimate is based on the four allocations Congress has made which included funding for the Iraq War and represents funding allocated from FY2002-FY2003. Spending on veterans' benefits and job training are for fiscal year 2006 as proposed by the President to the Office of Management and Budget. Budget of the U.S. Government, FY2006. For more on veterans' benefits and underfunding, see NPP's The Independents' Budget at http://www.npp.org/indies/budget.
In April, Congress passed another $83 billion worth of war-related spending. About $58 billion of it will fund the Iraq War bringing total spending to $205 billion.

D.C. taxpayers’ share for what Congress has allocated for the Iraq War so far is $963.5 million.

With $963.5 million, D.C. could:

- Build 6,606 affordable housing units creating 3,105 new jobs; or
- Hire 18,535 public school teachers; or
- Provide 465,474 students with university scholarships; or
- Hire 17,002 public safety officers; or
- Provide health care coverage to 164,970 uninsured people.

In planning and executing the Iraq War, the administration underestimated the cost. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget stated that the costs would be between $50-$60 billion, and the White House discounted its own economic advisor when he suggested that the war could cost between $100-$200 billion. The cost has now exceeded that sum, and Congress is already considering appropriating another $45 billion for next fiscal year.

The human costs in the District of Columbia are high:

- 3 soldiers killed;
- 8 soldiers wounded.

More than 1,650 U.S. soldiers have been killed and another 12,600 wounded. One in six returning soldiers may suffer from a mental disorder. Tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians have died in the war.

Note: NPP's estimate is based on the law allocation Congress has made which included funding for the Iraq War. State-level taxpayer cost is based on each state's contribution to taxes in the Federal fund's budget, according to IRS data. Local cost is based on state-level costs and relative size and income levels of the city or county. Number of teachers and public safety officers are based on state average salaries plus 25% for benefits and are estimated from the 1999-2003 edition of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas Restroom Guide. Affordable housing costs are based on state housing indices projected from the 1999 and 2000 GSA studies and the number of job created are assuming a long-term job gains brought on by the National Association of Housing Builders. The number of scholarships is based on each state's cost of tuition and fees at the state's flagship university. The cost of health care coverage is based on state average of Medicare costs per person from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Number of soldiers killed is from IRF. Number of soldiers wounded is based on Iraq Coalition Casualty Count and the Dept. of Defense Directorate for Information Operations and Reports. Military Casualty Information. Statistics on remaining soldiers is from CQ's "Combat Casualty in Iraq and Afghanistan, mental health problems, benefits to care." New England Journal of Medicine, July 7, 2004. For more local information and methodology, see NPP's Costs of War at http://www.nationalpriorities.org/2006 and the NPP Estimate page at https://www.nationalpriorities.org/2006.
Dear Mr. Dailey,

The following are my comments on the Armed Forces Retirement Home Environmental Impact Statement.

I am a neighbor at the southwest corner of the property, adjacent to proposed development zone 3.

I strongly feel that there are alternatives not yet considered for receiving the finances needed. Other than acquiring funds directly from the US Congress, there are options for retaining greenspace. Please see the http://www.lta.org/conserve/options.htm for information on conservation easements.

I am extremely supportive of opening the property for access to the community. The fences and barbed wire around the land is not only unfriendly and an eyesore, it fosters neighborhood discontent. To have this land so close but inaccessible is a huge disservice to the community. Community gardens, playgrounds and walking trails would increase the goodwill between the neighbors and the AFRH.

If development is indeed needed, I would welcome environmentally friendly green buildings with thoughtfulness of the viewsheds and keeping as much open space as possible.

I am thoroughly against more medical buildings in zone 5. It would add no needed services to the immediate residential community.

If new residences are added, I would strongly advocate for them to be built with a similar design to the current character of the neighborhood and to include some low-impact commerce. While Georgia Avenue is slated for improvement, currently there are few services (shops, restaurants, etc) in the area.

Thank you for maintaining community involvement throughout this process.

Rebecca Brown
424 Kethyan St., NW
202-682-5664
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Emil T. Byke
Address: AFRH-W 241
Affiliation: 3700 N Capitol St., NW
Phone: Washington, DC 20011-8400

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

I attended Mr. Cox briefing of the DEIS on June 15. What I perceived is that Mr. Cox main issue is how to increase revenue for the Home Trust Fund. I have two simple solutions which would not cost the Fund to accomplish my deficit:

1. Congress in 1995 passed a bill to increase donations from active duty personnel the sum of fifty ($50) to one dollar per month. It all need to be done is to have Out of Service order it to be.

2. Transfer or Lease to the Veterans Administrator. The King Hotel Center specifically the h2 Gerke Building. This building only cost the Fund approximately 65% of our operating budget.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afrh.gov

For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name:  Afamphela
Address:  243 Rock Creek Church Rd NW, Washington, DC 20011
Affiliation:  
Phone:  

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:
The plan will have a negative impact on the area. The environmental impact will increase the air pollution and smoke as the green area is reduced. The population of the District of Columbia has one of the highest rates of childhood asthma in the nation. Likewise, adult population of persons with asthma and other respiratory ailments is above record number. The District was at risk for losing federal money due to the lack of trees on public spaces. It is also that the extensive development will change and require the road to accommodate the high traffic increase. There could be meeting space, wedding reception and the like can raise substantial monies. I would like to see a plan that is a median between the resident (AFRH+ private) and not just in theory.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afrh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: GRACIE L CARPENTER
Address: 3700 N CAPITAL ST NW 1099 WASH DC 20011
Affiliation: Home Resident
Phone: 202-335-9800  202-335-6842-CELL

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments
Some of my additional concerns are attached here:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Please send comments to:

Arm ed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dalley
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dalley@afrh.gov

For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denisa Decker (202) 205-5821
My concerns on the DEIS:

Not one of the proposed alternatives will have a “minor” impact on this area. All changes will be very “major” in affecting AFRH-W, being permanent.

Traffic into and out of AFRH-W will increase tremendously. I don’t believe any roads surrounding AFRH-W can carry the additional cars, ie, quantity, size, frequency.

Sound level testing was not done near the Sheridan Building because of ongoing road work on N Capitol Street. I think it still needs to be done because even once construction begins on (hopefully) a parking garage for AFRH-W, the noise level will still be high for those of us who live on that side of AFRH-W.

A sound barrier of some sort would be on order. But instead of constructing concrete, perhaps trees around the perimeter would work towards reducing noise levels, be aesthetically pleasing to look at, and would also help in making air quality better.

Soil erosion is a concern. With the shallow tree root system here, care needs to be taken to perhaps replant trees with stronger root systems, ones that won’t blow over with the first strong winds.

Forested areas should only be removed minimally. We have fox and deer on the grounds also. Please leave some areas undisturbed.

Sincerely,

Gracie W. Carpenter

GRACIE W. CARPENTER

LS 1113
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: JAMES CHRISTENSEN
Address: 3648 Value Place, NW WASH, DC 20010
Affiliation: NEC-ESR
Phone: 202-518-5875

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments: PLEASE ADD THE ATTACHED AS MY COMMENTS ON THE

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afrh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
My name is James Carstensen. I'm speaking for several people in the Petworth and Park View communities who have taken a great interest in this project. There are likely millions more around the country who would take an interest if they knew more about it.

Let's make one thing clear at the outset. This proceeding, this proposed land lease, is about money. The Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund in recent years has been depleted. The people of the Soldier's Home want a revenue stream, and they deserve one. People who lived here served and sacrificed for their country. For those retired service men and women in the room tonight, we thank you. They deserve our applause. This city, this community, this country, must ensure that they continue to get the kind of retirement lifestyle they deserve. We are here to try to make that happen.

Where we stand today is precious ground not only for the Armed Forces Retirement Home, but for the entire community and indeed the nation. Abraham Lincoln spent a quarter of his presidency here. He walked these grounds. He saw graves being dug for Union troops. He shaped his thoughts about the Emancipation Proclamation here. He talked with soldiers. This institution, the Soldier's Home, had the foresight to make sure this historic cottage where Lincoln and his family lived, will be preserved. As early as 2007, the Lincoln National Monument will open its doors to the world.

So why the rush to lease this precious surrounding land for eight-story condos, massive buildings with huge parking lots, and the accompanying traffic and smog? Once the open land is developed, it's gone forever.

From Maine to Florida, it would be difficult to find an area more densely developed than the areas East and Southeast of where we are standing today. This is not an area of sprawl. Our forefathers developed the area efficiently, near transportation hubs. In many cases they built homes without backyards. My friends, aren't we packed into this area densely enough? There is little green space left in Washington D.C. There are few areas that resemble the pastures and open space Lincoln saw as he commuted to and from the White House each day.

Why are we in such a rush to put concrete and pavement over this area? Are we doing it for the retired men and women of the Soldier's Home? We think not. We see them gardening and walking on this beautiful open space. One questions whether they are in any rush to see this land disappear.

Is this land being developed for the community? No. There are spaces along Georgia Avenue and structures throughout the area that lie in abandonment. There are many other areas that have long since ceased to be open spaces that need to be redeveloped.

Are we developing this federal land for the nation? Once again, the answer is no. There are untold hundreds of thousands that have not yet discovered Lincoln's Cottage. Nor have they yet found the first Arlington Cemetery behind the cottage, where soldiers
from the First Battle of Bull Run and other conflicts are buried. We should think of the
land surrounding these sacred sites no differently than the space around Washington’s
Mount Vernon or Jefferson’s Monticello.

Is there a better way? Yes. There are ways to generate revenue from the land
without destroying it. There are ways to get the Armed Forces Retirement Home the
money it needs without building upon one of its most precious resources.

Some would have us believe the debate is about whether to erect six-story
buildings or four-story buildings; whether to put more condos here or more convenience
stores over there. That is a false debate. The issue is this: We need to make sure the
Soldier’s Home doesn’t fall further into financial neglect. Let’s get the Armed Forces
Retirement Home the money it needs. But let us not sacrifice one of the Home’s greatest
assets in pursuing that cause.

We have examined the plan for this land drawn up by a few executives and
consultants. We don’t see anything in the document that talks about National Parks. We
don’t see any reference to recreational areas or walking trails. We don’t see a discussion
of ways to generate revenue from the land without pawning it. We don’t see talk about the
need to preserve open space for the retired soldiers, the entire community and the nation.

What we see is a rush to development. My friends, this issue is far too important to take
the expedient way out. If we do, our grandchildren will never see the land as Lincoln saw
it.

There is a better way. Working together we can do the right thing, not only for ourselves
and our community, but for the entire nation, and all generations to come.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration of our thoughts and views.

James Carstensen
3648 Park Place, NW
Washington, DC 20010
202-518-8895
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Martin F. Cody, AFRI
Address: 3700 N. Capitol St. NW - 714
Affiliation: WASH, DC 20011-8710
Phone: (202) 241-4421 FAX (202) 241-4430, AD

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

1. ADD: Section on Resident Impact from Reduced walking area, grass, flowers; Garden Elimination & Construction Dust; Noise of Equipment, Traffic, Car etc.

2. Somewhere in Introduction state what this EIS does NOT INCLUDE: (A) No Economics of Various Options & Alternatives; and (B) No input from the "Master Plan" with its goals & Alternatives. (C) No priorities are given to various options as benefiting the residents eg, hospitals, medical schools, cancer research centers (clvides are better than residential units). (D) Noise, traffic, care parking problems etc. and last priority to foreign embassies (we value for residents only money.)

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
To Whom It May Concern,

1. The AFRN needs to seriously and substantially incorporate neighborhood concerns into any development plans. Not just lip service, a pat on the head, and checking 'get community input' off the to-do list.

2. Any development should strive to preserve a reasonable amount of managed green space that is accessible to the public.

3. Any development should be guided by firm, well-articulated guidelines mandating exceptionally high architectural quality, design/aesthetics, balance of uses, and good integration into existing neighborhood fabric. Especially in parcel 6 in areas adjacent to residential Petworth and Park View. If profit for the Home is the sole motivation and the highest bidder wins, we could end up with clumsy, ugly, ill-conceived projects that will potentially degrade - rather than enhance - the greater community.

Best regards,

Bill Crandel
Publisher, Petworth News
www.petworthnews.com
petworthnews.com
Please consider the following comments relating to the Draft EIS and the Master Plan for the Armed Forces Retirement Home. The pages cited are listed, in my opinion, according to the relativity to Armed Forces Retirement Home Residents and not in numerical sequence.

4-26 The AFRH-W is zoned GOV, Government and therefore is not subject to local zoning regulations unless portions of the site are sold to private parties. Implementation of the AFRH-W's Master Plan would result in a considerable change to zoning on the site if segments of the AFRH-W are sold. If the land for development were leased, it would not be subject to zoning.

Based on the statement that leased land is not subject to zoning because the AFRH-W is Government, this exemption, when applied to Home Residents, has a positive effect because Home Residents will be exempt from DC control and may keep the domicile of their choice. This will allow residents to vote for their Representatives and Senators. A domicile in a "No State Tax State" will have a positive effect on our Home Residents.

4-30 In addition, the presence of the AFRH in the City would bring the benefit of tax revenue from any resident employee, as well as local commercial entities that do business with the AFRH.

"resident employee." If the employee is a resident of DC and employed at AFRH, yes, they should pay DC taxes. But, if it means a Home Resident employee working in AFRH, that creates an issue. Present policy does not provide for Home Residents to work for a salary at AFRH. No effect on the social status of AFRH residents.

3-18 According to the District of Columbia Generalized Land Use Map, land use on the AFRH-W is characterized as "federal," meaning that the land and facilities onsite are occupied by the federal government (DC Office of Planning, 2002).

A site occupied by the federal government should be considered as a "Federal Instrumentality" and immune from State control. DC has characterized AFRH-W as "federal."

3-23 Sales and Use Taxes: The District of Columbia imposes sales and use taxes on the purchase or consumption of tangible personal property or services within the District.

Sales or use at the AFRH-W are not within the District and taxes should not be collected. This is a positive impact on the social status of Home Residents.
Individual Income Taxes: Individual income taxes are levied on all individuals who are domiciled in the District. (Black's Law Dictionary describes a domicile as the place a person states that it is where he is to live permanently and when he is absent, he will return.) AFRH-W Employees who are residents of the District would pay individual income taxes. (Of course, if they live in the District and work at AFRH-W, they should pay DC taxes.)

AFRH-W residents may be domiciled in another State. Voting rights are not removed from a resident domiciled in another state and the Income Tax laws of that domiciliary prevail. Full application of 3-24 will have a positive effect on Home Residents.

In 1851, the Federal Government purchased farmland surrounding the Cottage to form the historic core of what was called the 'Military Asylum' (HFH, 2004). General Scott used some of the $175,000.00 to pay his troops, buy supplies and offered the remainder to Congress to establish the Soldiers Home (ibid).

US Code, Title 24 is entitled "Hospitals and Asylums" and the Armed Forces Retirement Home is established under Title 24. In my opinion, being an inmate in the Asylum is not at all bad. We are definitely not under the control of the District of Columbia.

The same area was listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district in 1974. The area designated as National Historic Landmark was listed in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district on February 11, 1974, under the name "U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home" (EHT Traceries, 2004).

In 1988, The District State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) determined that the entire 272 acre AFRH-W property is eligible for listing in the National Register as a Historic District.

The rationale of my comments is to verify that when the final EIS is accepted that Home Residents of AFRH-W will keep their rights to declare a domicile of their choice and enjoy the voting rights and taxing authorities of their choosing. Residing at AFRH-W for medical or whatever reason must not mandate that residents forfeit their hard fought-for privileges and rights. It should be resolved that if Zoning and other various and sundry laws are not enforceable on AFRH-W property, why aren't AFRH-W residents entitled to the same consideration?

Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Devaney
AFRH-W 65
Sheridan 5010
202 529 3681
robert.devaney@verizon.net
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name:  KATHLEEN DONAHUE  
Address:  623 015 P. NIO, WASHINGTON, DC 20301 
Affiliation:  RESIDENT MEMBER OF UNITED NEIGHBORHOOD COALITION 
Phone:  (202) 722-0002 

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No 

Comments  

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home  
Attention: Donald Dailey  
3700 North Capitol Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20015  
donald.dailey@afnr.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005. 
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 206-6221
6 July 2005

Donald Daily
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 N. Capitol St. NW
Washington, DC 20011

Mr. Daily:

I am writing to provide my comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) regarding the proposed development at the Armed Forces Retirement Home campus at 3700 North Capitol St. NW, Washington, DC (AFRH-W). I have a number of concerns about the DEIS that I hope will be considered and addressed in the final Environmental Impact Study (EIS).

LACK OF DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES
My first concern is the lack of alternative development plans laid out in Section 2 of the DEIS. Although Alternative 1 is presented with the option of no development, it is clear that this alternative would not meet the AFRH-W’s financial needs and is not likely to be a viable option. Alternatives 2 through 4 utilize all of the conceptual development zones (both currently developed and undeveloped), and none of the alternatives considers only partial development of the six zones. Because no financial information is included in the DEIS, it is not clear why so much development is required. The final EIS should contain further development alternatives which would have less impact on the surrounding area, or a disclaimer about why less development is not financially feasible for the AFRH.

NATURAL RESOURCES
Tables 4-4, 4-5, and 4-6 highlight various issues related to storm water runoff. Unlike table 4-3, no baseline is provided to indicate how the values compare to pre-development levels. Without this information, it is impossible to get a good picture of the real impact the development will have on the watershed.

White, Section 4.1.3.1 does address the reduction in green space and wildlife habitat, one major point that is omitted is increase in human/animal contact caused by the reduction in wildlife habitat. For example, there could be an increase in road kill events caused by animals passing out of green space into developed areas. I believe that the impact on terrestrial biota would be higher than stated in the DEIS.
SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Section 4.2.1 of the DEIS states that affect of the change to the views from the Park View neighborhood would have “long-term, moderate, and adverse from the perspective of those residents who may prefer to look out on open space”. As one of those residents, I can attest that the affects of the change in my view would be “severe or highly noticeable”—in other words, major. No mitigation measures are listed in this section; however there are several which even take into account the interests of those neighbors and the AFRH who would prefer to have development in Zone 6. For example, development proposals could require the maintenance of significant green space in this area along with development, so that only some of the traditional views are disrupted.

Similarly, no mitigation measures are offered in section 4.2.2, regarding environmental justice. For example, the development could require that some portion of new housing be built for low-income residents. Financing could be provided to aid low-income homeowners in the existing neighborhoods to handle increases in their property taxes resulting from the development. Development proposals could be required to provide access to the development by existing neighbors, so that they are not excluded from enjoying benefits of additional commercial services and parkland.

Also in section 4.2.2, it is noted that transportation, air quality, and noise changes would not disproportionately affect people living in the vicinity of AFRH-W. In this area, many children play outside in the street, rather than in homes or playgrounds. These children would be disproportionately affected by these changes, because they would be in the path of the increased transportation, they would be outside in the area with reduced air quality, and the increases in noise, especially during construction, could prevent them from passing on safety information such as “Get out of the street—there’s a car coming!”

Finally, section 4.2.2 does not address the increase in temperature which would arise from the reduction in vegetation, increase in impervious surfaces such as blacktop, and additional cars/utilities. If temperatures were to increase just a few degrees in this area, utility costs would skyrocket for low-income families who must use more energy to cool their homes. In addition, increased temperatures could cause a safety hazard for people spending time outside.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The DEIS addresses the adverse affects of developments on historic viewsheds, the historic cultural landscape, and the historic district. I would like to highlight these points because it cannot be emphasized enough that once a historic place is destroyed, it cannot be replaced and the utmost caution should be used before giving up these historic resources forever.

TRANSPORTATION

Although I applaud the realistic DEIS findings that traffic infrastructure in this area would “fail” in some nearby roads, this section is woefully inadequate in addressing the affects of the proposed development on public transportation needs and infrastructure. This topic is not addressed in either section 4.4 or 4.2.3 (Community Facilities and Services). Although many residents of the new development would undoubtedly use automobiles for transportation, many would utilize public transportation. Increased use of nearby Metro stations is not addressed, nor is increased use of the Metrobus system (nor the potential need for additional bus lines to service this area). These changes could be costly and detrimental to current users of these services. Trains and buses could be overcrowded, and increased traffic could slow bus transportation for residents from all over the
area who utilize nearby routes. In addition, bicycle transportation is not addressed in the DEIS. As a bike commuter, I can attest that increased traffic on Park Place and Michigan Ave. will significantly increase my level of risk when riding my bicycle to work on those roads.

AIR QUALITY
Although air quality is addressed in terms of air pollution, the topic of air temperature is not addressed in DEIS. The reduction of green space and increase in heat-reflecting surfaces, automobiles, and utility use (such as air conditioner units), is likely to increase the air temperature in the developed area and its immediate surroundings. This can have dramatic impacts on health, utility use, and safety (especially for elderly persons) for nearby residents.

UTILITIES
Although it is noted that WASA would be involved in installing new public water lines and sewer lines, this does not address the existing workload of WASA, (including the replacement of existing lead service lines) that may be detrimentally impacted due to the additional tasks of the proposed development. City residents who are waiting for safe water lines to be installed may be forced to prolong their exposure to unsafe lead levels in their water in order for this development to be completed.

CONCLUSION
As noted in Section 4.11, the proposed development plans would have irreversible results, not only for the AFRH, but for the residents of Washington, D.C. and the United States. Serious consideration should be taken before making dramatic changes to this property. Specific actions that should be taken include:

- Consideration of development alternatives with less impact (and less development)
- Concentration on mitigation strategies for all the environmental impacts, prior to beginning development
- Frequent and open communication with AFRH stakeholders, such as AFRH-W residents, neighbors, the city of Washington, Congress, and the citizens of the United States, especially during the Request for Proposal or RFP portion of the project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and I look forward to reading the amended EIS and subsequent documentation on this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kathleen Donahue,
Parkview Neighborhood Resident
Member, United Neighborhood Coalition

Cc:
Jim Graham, Ward 1 Councilmember
Adrian Fenty, Ward 4 Councilmember
Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: David E. Douglass
Address: 3600 Park Pk. N.W.
Affiliation: Neighbor
Phone: 202-316-4425

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments: Please, please, be a good steward, keep the green space, we need the oxygen!

Please send comments to:
Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact Denise Decker (202) 208-5821
June 21, 2005

Mr. Craig Wallwork, Project Manager
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Wallwork,

These written comments are in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the AFRH-W Master Plan. As a good neighbor to the AFRH-W, I appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments out of concern for the residents of the AFRH-W, the historic property on which it stands, and the surrounding community.

First of all I would like to honor 1100 men and women who live on the AFRH-W property currently. These men and women served to safeguard our country and paid again out of their military paychecks to support and sustain the home. They continue to pay for it now in resident fees.

I would also like to honor the military personnel who contributed out of their paychecks to support and sustain this home. Although they never realized their investment by residing here, they gave for decades in the faith that it would be here for those who might need it.

I respect the need to raise additional funds to support the AFRH-W now and into the future for our men and women who have served in the US military. I hope that a reasonable solution can be found to deal with this.

The four US Presidents, who used the Anderson Cottage as their Summer White House, should also be honored, including Lincoln who composed the Emancipation Proclamation on this property and spent his last night here. George Washington Riggs, founder of Riggs bank should be remembered as well. He built the “Lincoln Cottage” available to Abraham Lincoln and is now buried in Rock Creek Church Cemetery.

The intent of the 1851 Congress should also be honored, as they established the home for veterans, as should President Millard Fillmore who signed the legislation. Indeed the legacy of the land is mighty and its history belongs to all Americans.

The Draft EIS, which I am responding to, just as it is, shows significant problems with the Master Plan. Impacts of all types are listed as long-term and adverse throughout the document, including the assessment that intersections on North Capitol Street will be inadequate to handle the car volume.

According to the EIS, the most intact area and the one having the most effect on destruction of the Historic District and historic past of the AFRH-W, is on the Western
part of the property. Petworth is 3 stories in height, proposed construction is 6-8 stories in height is out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. The EIS deems this as having, "long-term, moderate, adverse effect on Petworth and Park View. [EIS 3-38]

It also cites about Community Facilities and Services that an increased number of daytime and evening occupants has the potential to result in more calls for service. Embassies could require additional police presence should demonstrations take place; this represents a, "direct, long-term, minor impact." There is also a "direct, long-term, minor, adverse impact due to an increase in the building density...", "direct, long-term, minor, negative impact on the DCPD EMS department", "direct, long-term, negligible, adverse impact on hospital and hospital personnel in the district.", "direct, long-term, minor, adverse impact on the school system would occur", and "direct, long-term, minor, and adverse impact on the US Postal Service." [EIS 4-23]

As many other problems with the Master Plan are addressed in the EIS, I would like to close this set of concerns with this Summary of the Unavoidable Adverse Impacts:

"Unavoidable, long-term effects would include construction of new buildings within open space/meadows on the AFRH-W; removal of mature trees; changes in viewsheds for residential areas outside of the AFRH-W; permanent changes in the historic cultural landscape; changes in viewsheds to National Register listed and National Register eligible properties; and an increase in traffic and associated noise on local roads." [EIS 4-79]

Next, I would like to address problems within the EIS document itself and the assessment of the impacts on the environment of the Master Plan. As I state above, impacts are listed as long-term adverse throughout the document. However, in many instances these impacts are minimized, as with effects of the construction on the environment and affects on City services and hence low-income and minority populations.

Generally, I believe that the EIS minimizes the impact of the scope of this project. By accounting for impacts separately, the EIS creates a distorted picture of the completed projects impacts. In reality, we (residents of the AFRH-W and its neighbors) will live with the total accumulated impacts and not each piece.

I believe the number of potential of residents is underestimated. The EIS was a formula of 1000 GSF per 1.5 person. I used a formula whereby 1 housing unit is an average of 1200 to 1400 Sq Ft. It houses an average of 2.5 people. So that would mean up to 10,000 new people living on the tract. That would be in addition to the 1100 number of current residents of the AFRH.

In addition, many people who might access the AFRH-W property after the development are not accounted for in the EIS. The impacts of Medical facility patients and visitors are not accounted for. Using a formula based on 66 Sq Ft per workers and visitors per day (minus the number of workers estimated in the EIS), that would mean 20,000 additional people per day in the site. The impacts of hotel/conference center guests are also not accounted for in the EIS. According to my conservative estimation, this would mean...
approximately 750 guests per day (each guest room averaging of 400 sq ft, rendering 500 guest rooms). Shoppers in the proposed retail spaces are not accounted for at all.

The Lincoln Cottage will be opening soon to tourists creating impacts which are not accounted for in the EIS. The National Trust estimates an initial visitorship of 20,000 per year. Assuming that 5% of them visit between Memorial Day and Labor Day (97 days), that would be a total of 154 visitors per day during those months (I believe a very conservative estimate for a new National Monument in our capital).

So to calculate the possible total number of people on the current AFRH-W property at any given day, using figures pulled from the EIS and ones that have not been accounted for, the total could be as many as 50,000 people. That is the same amount of people who live in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Here is how I came to that conclusion:

- 17,000 employees [EIS]
- 10,000 residents (my calculation)
- 20,000 Medical patients and visitors
- Hotel 750 Guests per day
- 154 visitors to Lincoln cottage
- 1100 Current residents

This is a very modest estimate, as it does not include Conference Center or Retail customers, or employees of the AFRH-W. Is this environment, in all of the dimensions accounted for in the EIS, ready for the population equivalent to a whole city the size of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania to drop on the land now occupied by the AFRH-W?

Aside from these concerns stated in the EIS and the factors I list above, which the EIS neglects to include or minimizes, I have a number of concerns with The Master Plan itself as it is presented (in all of the alternatives). This Master Plan looks at every possible square foot of property that might be developed, rather than the amount of property that would need to be developed to meet the needs of the AFRH. If indeed the intent is to create revenue to sustain the AFRH-W and support its residents, which I wholeheartedly support, then the Master Plan should look at the minimum amount of development that would meet those needs. Then the rest of the land could be dedicated to the American people, as visitors to a National Monument, and left for the enjoyment and benefit of the veterans who live there.

The Master Plan, as presented in the EIS document, dishonors the soldiers who have served our country and contributed to it’s continued maintenance and service to retired service men and women. It takes away the valuable assets that were supposed to be theirs in perpetuity. It degrades the historical value of the site. It breaks rather than creates ties to the adjacent community, and it is entirely too much development for this environment to bear.

The Master Plan contradicts the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital, which provides criteria for the location of federal facilities intended to:

"Conserve and enhance the park and open space system of the National Capital Region, ensure that adequate resources are available for future generations, and
promote an appropriate balance between open spaces resources and the built environment.” And to “Preserve and enhance the image and identity of the Nation’s Capital and region through design and development respectful of the guiding principals of the L’Enfant and McMillan Plans, the enduring value of historic buildings and places, and the symbolic character of the capital’s setting.” [EIS 3-17]

I include these direct quotes from the EIS as they illustrate how development laid out in the Master Plan would destroy the enduring value of historic buildings and places on the AFRH-W property:

Specifically and destructively affected by the proposed development is the historically significant Character Area 6: “The area around the ponds is among the least altered on the AFRH-W grounds and retains significant bridges, a number of exotic and ornamental trees planted in vicinity, and its original fanciful feeling.” [EIS 3-35]:

“The lakes would be most affected by new construction in Zones 4, 5, and 6. As proposed, the new construction would completely surround the Lakes to the north and south, substantially diminishing the historic pastoral and park-like feeling and setting of the Lakes. New construction along Park Place may also result in the loss of the historic fence along the road.” [EIS 4-35]

Character Area 7: Cultivated Field would also affect the historic value of the site: “The only remaining area of agricultural cultivation on the AFRH-W, the Cultivated Field Character Area represents a significant and consistent cultural element on the site that reflects the historical function of the Military Asylum from its creation in 1851.” [EIS 3-35] “By the mid-20th century, agricultural activity on the site had been almost wholly abandoned except for the garden in the Cultivated Field Character Area. This area is currently used by residents of the AFRH-W for recreational gardening, but remains a significant link to the agricultural past of the AFRH-W.” [EIS 3-36]

“This character area would be most affected by new construction in Zone 6. The Cultivated Field... is one of the few intact areas of open land on the AFRH-W Historic District. This use has been a cultivated field since at least 1873 and illustrates an important link with the agricultural subsistence past of the AFRH-W Historic District. New construction in this zone would result in the loss of this field.” [EIS 4-36]

Proposed new construction in Zone 6, according to the Master Plan, would be between six and eight stories in height. “When Potomac (and Park View) was originally developed in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the AFRH-W was used as a public park, a function highly compatible with a residential neighborhood. Although the AFRH-W has not been accessible to the public since 1925, the introduction of new construction in Zone 6 would change this traditional relationship, separating the historic residential construction from the natural landscape of the AFRH-W. Therefore, the proposed action would have an indirect, long-term, moderate, adverse effect on the National Register-eligible Historic District.” [EIS 4-38]
Please note as well: “Petworth is potentially eligible for listing as a historic district in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A and C.” [EIS 3-39]

My final concern is that the environment of a National Monument, which will open to the public soon, is important to the historic preservation and visitor’s experience of that landmark. Richard Moe, President of the National Trust calls the site, “...perhaps the most important Lincoln site in the country because it is the only site that represents the Lincoln Presidency.” The National Trust anticipates that close to $10 million in capital improvements will be spent for the restoration and development of this National Monument. As this will be an enduring landmark, it behooves us to create a dignified environment for it, and not surround it by a thicket of townhouses or buildings too tall and massive.

This is entirely too much development and impact for this community and site. As a result of the master plan, the EIS anticipates 4,650 vehicles during peak hour [EIS 4-52], 14 tons of garbage per day [EIS 4-77], and these assessments this with the amount of residents underestimated, and many users of the site unaccounted for.

The impact of development on the site on the north, east, and southern boundaries of the property will create much less impact as they are away from the National Monument and bordered by institutional properties. This valuable historic and pastoral site cannot be recovered once it is over-developed as it is in the Master Plan. When it is gone it is unrecoverable and will just be more densely developed and populated over time.

Because of my desire to honor and see continued care in a safe environment for the retired service men and women who live at the AFRH-W now, and those who will do so in the future. Because of the need to create financial support for the AFRH-W, that does not destroy its value in the process. Because the EIS shows significant problems with the Master Plan, there are problems and consequential omissions in the EIS itself, and there are major concerns with the Master Plan alternatives as presented, I demand:

- That the Master Plan be significantly scaled back and reformulated.
- A new and more thorough EIS be created.
- The community (both residents of the AFRH-W and neighbors) be involved in planning and development.
- Within this new plan, there should be no development at all along the western edge of the property. This would leave the viewpoint from the Lincoln Cottage, would leave the historic community garden (possibly opening it to the neighbors as well), and would leave the lakes, which might be made into a public park.

These are fitting surroundings for a significant Historic District and National Monument. This use of the western edge of the site reestablishes ties between the AFRH-W and the Petworth and Park View neighborhoods, and creates an environment of rich historic context, which might be enjoyed in perpetuity by Americans and visitors.
Please be assured of my sincerity in wishing the best to the residents and staff of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, Washington, now and well into the future. Working together, I know we can find a solution to the needs of the AFRH-W without compromising its rich assets.

I look forward to meeting you at the public hearing.

Mark Ewert
401 Rock Creek Church Rd. NW
Washington, DC 20011

Cc: Timothy Fox, Chief Operating Officer, AFRH-W
The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton
Mayor Anthony A Williams
Councilmember Adrian Fenty
Ms. Anita Balleston, DC Office of Planning
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: CHARLES FELDER
Address: AFRH-W-338 - SH 6114
Affiliation: RESIDENT
Phone: (202) 828-5400

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afnh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
Zone #1, in all plans, is designated for moderate in-fill development for institutional uses compatible with AFRH-W operations - 4 to 6 stories high and 390,000 gsf, new parking for Grant Bldg. and King Hospital Complex.

Comment: As with other zones, more comprehensive alternate plans are needed in order to assess the heavily adverse environmental impact of construction on the area of zone #1 and the health hazards to the in-dwelling population.

Question: Why are the Sheridan and Scott buildings not considered 'sensitive areas' in regard to air quality, noise and the debris of construction in Zone #1?

Question: Is it necessary for King Health Center to be evacuated to the proposed new King Hospital complex in Zone #1 before development begins in Zone #3?

Question: When will construction begin on the King Hospital Complex, which will be directly adjacent to the dormitories of Independent Living, Assisted Living, COPD, dementia patients and the clinics?

Question: How long a period will the "short term" construction be that will seriously affect the health, life spans and peaceful lives of the residents?

Question: Is there any way at present to assess any mitigating measures?

Environmental Justice
Question: Why, under the EIS, are the residents of the AFRH-W not considered a distinct, unique and viable population affected by all environmental issues; or as a "local community", or as a minority population to be considered under Executive order #12898?

Land Use
Question: Since the irretrievable loss of the AFRH-W Historic District, which is eligible for listing in the National Register, adversely impacts on all present and future AFRH-W eligible veterans, can modified plans and other sources of income also be investigated through the Master plan?
Larry C. Friesel
AFRH-W (Sheridan #4204, #733
3700 N. Capitol St. NW
Washington, DC 20018-8400  
Phone# (202-316-3440)

AFRH-Washington (Master Plan) Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments (My Opinions)

YES! I would like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available!

1. Proposal #3B seems to be the best (Alternative) (In My Opinion)!
2. The (HISTORIC)! Use of this land, for more than 150 years, should be persevered, & of the utmost thought in changes or planning for this LAND! In that, There should be more plans to build (at Least) (1) more Dormitory in addition to The Scott & Sheridan buildings! There has been mention made of a (Parking) garage! I believe, this would be an outstanding addition to concentrate the parking, rather than spread the parking around in different parking areas! The location (Again, In my opinion, should be at the end of the Sheridan building across the street from the existing Security office or location, in the parking area that is now in that location! The parking garage should be at least (5) stories high & have at least (2) elevators to transport the people using the facility! #72

3. Again! Historically! The MILITARY personnel that serve & FIGHT the Wars & Conflicts are soon forgotten, after that war or Conflict is over! Of course, Fighting Men & WOMEN, are remembered & on Veterans days etc. However, benefits & Services are cut & shaved soon after that action is completed! For example, I take note of the recent actions taken by Mr. (H) Ross Perot, for the Veterans of the Viet Nam Conflict! Those Veterans (My service 1961-1961 included) have been almost ignored progressively, by Government programs, such as, Veterans Administration & other actions, from 1975 when the Conflict was concluded, to this day! Soon, the Conflicts of Afghanistan & IRAQ will conclude & what will happen from the time it's over & the days, months & years after it's over? Again, if procedures & programs are any indicator, the same thing will happen, with those Veterans! AFRH-W, should immediately adjust or change the (AGE Minimums) criteria, to accommodate some from those Conflicts &/or Actions! #73

4. I was in attendance to most of the meetings (If not all) & it is apparent that everyone has an opinion as to what & how this LAND is used! Again, the over (150) Year (HISTORIC) usage should always be emphasized to the Veterans & not offices & parks that have limited value to the RESIDENTS! #74

5. The Sherman Building! The front of the building has been renovated & restored, but the first (2) floors in the middle of the building has been ignored or left to storage & general deterioration! This building, HISTORICALLY! Has been built as a Dormitory, but is now Office space, storage, & Hobby rooms on the 3rd floor! More & better usage of this building is sorely needed! If (FUNDS) are available to do the necessary work on the front (3) floors & the relocation of the Security offices, then funds should be there for the (2) floors in the middle of the building! #75

Respectfully,
Larry C. Friesel
A better option:

The AFRH needs money, but the Washington DC campus is not operating at full capacity. In order to rectify this, the current residents of the AFRH in Gulfport should be relocated to Washington and the entire Gulfport campus should be sold for development.

The historical and environmental value of the Washington DC campus clearly makes it the asset to preserve. The historical value of the Gulfport campus is negligible, but its commercial value is great (*The Mississippi Gulf Coast region boasts some of the finest beaches, fishing, casinos, restaurants, resorts, entertainment, shopping, and championship golf courses in the southeast United States.* -- AFRH website). Liquidation of the Gulfport campus should therefore yield considerable revenue.

In the 21st century it is not fitting for our nation to continue maintenance of redundant unsustainable facilities for the segregation of veterans from Union and Confederate states.

In reverent memory of President Lincoln, the Washington DC campus should be preserved and improved for its original purpose, the care and honor of our veterans from every state, and be rededicated with the opening of the Lincoln Cottage as a monument to the preservation of the Union.

Jason Glance
Petworth Neighbor
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Michael R. George
Address: 3700 N Capitol St NW Washington DC
Affiliation: Home Member
Phone: 202 829 1949

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments
This area is important to me. The AFRH-W National Gravestone

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: TIMOTHY GRANDY
Address: 115 WEBSTER STREET, NW, WASHINGTON, DC 20011
Affiliation: RESIDENT/NEIGHBOR
Phone: 202-819-4894

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments
THE PLANNING FIRM RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS APPEARS TO BE STEPPING AWAY FROM SOUND PLANNING PRINCIPLES AND CURRENT GREEN DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES. NO MENTION OF GREEN DEVELOPMENT WAS MADE IN THE PRESENTATION.

PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED LETTER FOR MY TRAVEL CONCERNS.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afrih.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
Dear Mr. Dailey,

In attending the public hearing on June 22, it became very clear that big business is the lead in the subdividing/raping of this national treasure. This big business band-aid seems to have been created because of the federal government's failure to systematically care for the honorable men and women that have served the country. Nothing was said about the future plans for the residents of the Soldiers Home. No growth projections were given for the population. No long range planning to the growth of the home was shared or mentioned. There being only two installations like this in the country it is almost inconceivable how the bad development options presented could even be floated as trial balloons.

I have outlined some traffic concerns:

A. Rock Creek Church Road Volume
1. Two lanes of traffic that cannot be expanded
2. The District government has refused to provide any type of traffic calming measures along this road, including the use of sidewalks to access north bound busses. Pedestrian safety is key but it is not being adequately addressed. The development plans worsen this situation.
3. Access to area 6 and the neighborhoods bordering Rock Creek Church Road cannot be via Harwood Road from North Capitol Street, In assisting traffic to flow more effective through to the suburbs, the Federal Government has eliminated access to the neighborhoods via this route. This will further saturate the flow of traffic along Harwood Road. Because of this Warder street will become overburdened with North bound traffic until Rock Creek Church Road.

B. The Upshur Street Gate
1. The one-way streets currently used to calm traffic flow in the neighborhoods near the Rock Creek Church Road and Upshur Street intersections causes traffic to stack up on Upshur Street during the morning and evening rush hours result in a locking effect for residents north of Upshur street, and east of Third street desiring to go east.
C. The street patterns of the proposed new development should work in with the established city grid and planning. This includes the use of green spaces parks and vistas.

D. During the public hearing of June 22, the Washington Hospital Center’s representative made a claim that the traffic study is flawed because the hospital will only contribute to traffic loads during off-peak hours. This statement is very misleading as the office development of the property will contribute a 9 to 5 traffic component, the hospital will create traffic within these hours from patients visiting the medical center.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Timothy Q. Grandy
July 6, 2005

Mr. Donald Dailey  
Armed Forces Retirement Home  
3700 North Capitol Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Dailey,

As a homeowner and taxpayer in the District of Columbia, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Impact Statement regarding the proposed development on the grounds of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. I have read the Environmental Impact Study, I attended the public comment session at the AFRH, and I have spent considerable time and energy researching the proposal.

It is my conclusion that the EIS fails to address the impact of such large-scale development on the city and the surrounding neighborhoods in terms of traffic, air quality, storm runoff, temperature and noise. It fails to address the need for retention of green space and the initiatives by the federal and local government to expand and enhance public use parklands.

And most grievously, in my view, the EIS fails to address how the historically unique nature of this last remaining refuge in the heart of the city will be preserved.

I applaud the efforts of the AFRH along with the National Trust for Historic Preservation to restore and preserve the historic AFRH buildings and the Anderson Cottage. However, the historic value and significance of the President Lincoln and Soldiers’ Home National Monument extends far beyond its structures and boundaries to areas of the campus that are targeted for development.

It is no accident that Abraham Lincoln found both comfort and inspiration while residing here. This large tract of peaceable land with its breathtaking vistas provided an extraordinary place for the leader of our country to refresh and expand his mind at a critical point in our nation’s history. The simple fact that here is where he was moved to write the Emancipation Proclamation is, alone, sufficient reason to treat this tract with deference.

Any plan to alter the Armed Forces Retirement home property must include a provision to preserve the natural beauty and restful, restorative nature of the landscape and its views. This is, according to the Deputy General Counsel for the National Trust for Historic Preservation “integral to the Monument’s historic context and interpretation.”
The EIS also fails to address the unique role that the AFRH has played in the development and life of the Columbia Heights and Petworth communities. These local neighborhoods of historic row houses—including those in Park View, where I live—were laid out in the early part of the 20th century to take advantage of views to the open space along the western edge of the property. The very character of the area is defined by the beauty and quiet that residents and passersby enjoy each day.

Long-time residents here talk of anticipating the progress of the gardens tended by residents of the AFRH each summer, a ritual that dates back some 150 years. Sadly, it is all too easy to imagine how different the neighborhood will be if those historic gardens are replaced by high-rise buildings.

Unexplained in the development plan and the EIS are the needs for such large and dense development. Questions that naturally arise include:

- Just how much money must be raised to support the ongoing requirements of the AFRH?
- Why are there only two alternatives—no development or large-scale development with buildings up to eight stories completely surrounding the periphery of the property?
- Has there been any exploration of alternatives, such as a land swap or partial development of areas that are less historically significant?
- Has there been any consideration given to opening some of the property to public access for parks and recreation?

We all support the AFRH, honor its distinguished residents, and understand the need for the AFRH to replenish its trust fund. This plan does little to explain how the unique historic nature of the property will be preserved under any of the proposed options. Nor does it properly speak to the traditional environmental concerns associated with high-density development on a large scale. It is hard not to see how this plan will degrade the quality of life for the veterans, neighbors and residents of the city.

I urge you to send this plan back for further development and review.

Respectfully,

Lauri Hafvenstein
3550 Park Place NW
Washington, DC 20010
202-723-2407
Mr. Dailey:

I would like to submit written comments on the Armed Forces Retirement Home Environmental Impact Statement. I reside at 602 Quincy St NW, about a block and a half west of parcel 6. My comments are the following:

* I strongly oppose the proposal for retail shops on parcel 6. Retail shops will only make the streets between the developed parcel and Georgia Avenuea corridor for additional foot and automobile traffic, and therefore drug traffic, which will increase the violence level in our already-violent neighborhood. By the time that the new development is completed, the shops at the Georgia Avenue metro, only 3 blocks away, will have been completed. There is no need to add additional retail.

* Any residential or institutional/embassy development should be required to provide parking for each resident/employee.

* I am extremely disturbed that there is no plan to preserve community green space. Any community development, particularly when it is getting rid of what little green space we have in our community, should be mandated to maintain at least 10% of the space as parkland accessible to the community. It's bad enough that the children at Park View Elementary, a few blocks south, have only a concrete lot to play in; it would be a travesty if the children of the neighborhood were not provided with a real park when it would be so easy to maintain some of the lovely trees and open space.

Thank you,

Heather H. Hamilton
Vice President for Programs
Citizens for Global Solutions
418 7th St. SE
Washington, D.C. 20003
Tel: +1 202 566-3950 x107
www.globalcitizens.org

*#128*

*#136*

*#108*
July 6, 2005

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attn: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Dailey:


I. Residents of the area have received inadequate advance notice of this draft EIS and comment period to be able to respond meaningfully. Notice was given after most local community groups went into recess for the summer. The comment period was too short of local residents to obtain the EIS and educate themselves about the EIS process adequately to respond in a meaningful manner. Notice of the EIS was not widely enough publicized for many parties interested in the outcome to be aware of the EIS. For example, the Committee of 100 for the Federal City, a leading advocate of protection of the L'Enfant and McMillan plans was not aware of the draft EIS until we were told of their existence and were able to reach them by phone just prior to the July 4th holiday. Several organizations who should have been directly served with the EIS, such as the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation do not appear to have been notified. There appears have been no Spanish or French/Creole outreach to Spanish and French/Creole speaking residents in the surrounding area early enough in the process for these residents to have effective participation in the process. Adjacent census tracts have populations that are 8 to 15% Hispanic and have many Creole speaking Haitians. Nearby areas that will be affected by the loss of potential park space have even higher proportions of Spanish speaking populations.

To provide adequate opportunity for comment, the comment period on the draft EIS should be extended and additional meetings for public comment on the draft EIS should be held. To make this effective there must a multi-media outreach through television commercials, radio commercials, and multiple local papers, including newspapers targeted at local Spanish language, neighborhood and African American communities. The fact that there were so few comments to the scoping and that almost all comments from residents were from residents of the Soldier's and Airmen's Home is a sign of the ineffectiveness of the outreach effort associated with this process.

2. The EIS masks the fact that the AFRH is proposing extremely dense development of park-like open space in the middle of a neighborhood that is disproportionately low income, elderly, and African American. The density of the proposed development is so
high that is likely to have disproportionately high and adverse human and environmental effects on minority and low-income populations.

The EIS is incorrect in concluding that low-income and minority populations would not be disproportionately affected by the impacts of the development alternatives outlined under the EIS. The EIS implies that this neighborhood is an average U.S. neighborhood by comparing median income statistics for the entirety of the District of Columbia ($40,127) to the U.S. as a whole ($41,994). This is extremely misleading since the income distribution in the District of Columbia proper has a large percent of the Washington metropolitan area's minority, poor and low-income households. The median income of the Washington Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) is $80,642. As noted in the draft EIS, there are likely to be more localized impacts. These also fall disproportionately on low-income, elderly, African American populations.

The EIS incorrectly compares these local areas to the District of Columbia as a whole in determining whether they are disproportionately low income, minority populations. It is inappropriate to consider the District of Columbia as the proper unit of comparison for these neighborhoods for Environmental Justice analysis. The District of Columbia is essentially the inner city core of a large metropolitan area. As such it has a very high concentration of the metropolitan area's poor and minority population, as is demonstrated by the almost two-fold discrepancy between District of Columbia and Washington MSA median incomes. The proper unit of comparison is the Washington Metropolitan Statistical Area.

The Washington Metropolitan area is where local residents must compete for jobs, housing, and goods and services. The federal government recognizes this in adjusting its pay structure upwards for DC as one of the nation's high cost of living areas. According to the U.S. Census and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the census tracts neighboring Soldier's Home on the west have median incomes ranging from $32,000 to $44,000 compared to the Washington metropolitan area median of $80,642. This places this neighborhood in the lower 20th income percentile for the Washington area (HUD).

The EIS also incorrectly uses the District as the relevant comparison for race. Here the more appropriate comparison is with national data. Anti-discrimination laws and policy, including the Executive Order on Environmental Justice are designed to address a national legacy of racism. According to the logic of the EIS, if all African Americans in the U.S. were forced onto a reservation occupied exclusively by African Americans and a federal project affected a portion of that reservation, it would have no disproportionate impact on African Americans. This is certainly not the intent of the Executive Order. The inner city core of our large urban cities contain large areas of minority ghettos. It is inappropriate to look at comparisons of the affected neighborhood with minority population statistics for the District of Columbia simply because the District is the federal reservation and does not fall under the jurisdiction of a state. This Constitutional peculiarly should not be used to perpetrate environmentally injustice federal action on low income, minority U.S. citizens.
The census tracts neighboring Soldier's Home are 82-90% African American, compared to 26.6% percent in the Washington MSA and 12.4% nationally. The neighborhood is known as the home of Black Washington's grandparents, and the census statistics bear this out: roughly 16-18% of area residents are over 65, compared to the 9 percent in the Washington MSA and 12.4% in the U.S. population. Along with this elderly, low income, minority population comes expected life outcomes: 15-26% of individuals are below the poverty line, as compared with 7.4% in the Washington MSA and 12.4% nationally; 25-33% are disabled compared to 19% nationally; only 12-18% of residents in these census tracts have bachelor's degrees or above compared to 42.5% for the Washington MSA and 24% nationally. Despite the disadvantages they bear because of their race, age, and disproportionately low income and education, these neighbors have managed to have some of the highest owner-occupancy rates in the District of Columbia. This is a major achievement given the odds against which they have had to work to accomplish this.

All existing alternatives, except the "no-development" alternative envision very dense development on most of the Soldier's Home property. This is likely to have major adverse impacts on the health and well-being of residents in the neighborhood to the west of Soldier's Home as well as to the health of elderly residents at the Armed Forces Retirement Home:

1) These alternatives all call for an extremely large increase in traffic as indicated by the large increase in parking spaces (an underestimate since it does not account for visitor travel). There is also likely to be increased air pollution from construction and possibly from electrical generation for the large institutions planned. The Washington, D.C. metropolitan area is already out of compliance with federal EPA air quality standards. This increase in automobile traffic will worsen an already bad situation, particularly in the summer. The EIS needs to include analysis that shows the impacts of proposed development, both during construction and upon completion on local ambient air quality and on health outcomes for local area residents. Health outcomes need to be analyzed by age.

Air pollution problems are local as well as regional in scope. The immediate neighborhood seems likely to see the largest change in air quality from this increased traffic. Local air pollution is linked to increased incidence of respiratory illness. Three different recent studies being published this month in Epidemiology find a significant link between daily ground level ozone in cities and mortality rates in the next 3 days. Ozone is formed when pollutants, such as car exhaust, mix with heat and sunlight. Editors of Epidemiology have made the rather unprecedented comment that together these studies point to an "urgent need to reduce public exposure to ambient ozone by all possible means."
Communities of color across the nation are experiencing disproportionately high levels of asthma and other respiratory illness. The deteriorated local air quality seems likely also worsen these conditions in this predominantly African American neighborhood. Further analysis is needed that specifies how the health of these residents will be affected by proposed alternatives.

2) The EIS does not consider the impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadows, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surface will have on temperatures in the surrounding area. This past spring, gardens in the Petworth area bloomed roughly 2 weeks later than gardens in the DuPont Circle area. It seems unlikely that this difference is due to the small difference in elevation, and is more likely to the difference in heat generated by the dense built and paved surfaces in the DuPont Circle area and the cooling effect of open space and trees in the Petworth area — particularly at Soldier’s Home.

Increased temperatures will result in higher cooling bills, particularly burdensome for the elderly poor, or an increased frequency of dangerous summer conditions for those who cannot afford air conditioning, again particularly the elderly poor. Increased temperatures will also worsen the impact on increased exhaust by promoting local ground-level ozone formation. The EIS contains no analysis of local temperature change that will be associated with the proposed alternatives. This analysis needs to be done. It should include expected health impacts (by age) and impact on cooling costs for area residents.

3) At the current time, the mature trees on the Soldier’s Home property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.

4) The transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between Soldier’s Home and Georgia Ave. The impact on the level of increased traffic considered is unlikely to be limited to the main streets studied in the EIS. Analysis must be done on changed traffic on these side streets.

The neighborhoods to the west of the Soldier’s Home property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational services provided by streets in Petworth and Park View. This needs to be taken into account.

The District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from being hit by cars on DC streets. Bringing a large number of cars into narrow residential streets will likely increase the
mortality rate in the area to the west of Soldier’s Home, particularly because of the relatively large number of elderly and children. Analysis of traffic impacts needs to include estimates of the change in accidents and deaths.

5) Many residents in the area to the west of Soldier’s Home use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. Soldier’s Home enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The EIS has not considered how dense construction on the Soldier’s Home property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area. A rise in the water table seems likely to result from dense development on this land. A raised water table could result in serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income. Analysis must be done of the likely physical impacts of proposed alternatives on the water table in adjacent areas and the financial impacts of any changes on local residents.

6) Both residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home and neighbors who live to the west of the Home benefit, much as President Lincoln did when he lived in the Anderson cottage, from the relative calm and quiet provided by the green campus of the Home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able to walk past the property and to see its green expanses when looking out their windows or down their streets. In this way, the Home has provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its residents no matter what their income because it does not look like a poor neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty and calm will take away something of irreplaceable value in their lives. Economists have developed methods for valuing this loss of amenity, including hedonic property value studies and contingent valuation studies. Frequently this can be done using “benefits transfer” of values from existing comparable studies. Such analysis needs to be included in the EIS.

- The EIS has considered two types of alternatives: no development and dense development on virtually the entire perimeter of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. Additional alternatives need to be considered, such as development of some, but not all of the areas considered for development in currently proposed alternatives. Conservation of open space, particularly in the western half of the Soldier’s Home property or protection of that land as open space by transferring the land to park authorities would mitigate the negative impacts of development of eastern half of the property on residents around the property.

It is not at all clear that the EIS has taken the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital adequately into account. In particular, there appears to have been an inattention to the Parks and Open Element and the Preservation and Historic Features Element.
The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear that the capital area is facing increasing demand for open space and park due to increased population and tourism pressure. The Element defines open space as "any land or water surface that is not occupied by buildings, a broad definition that encompasses the vast majority of federal property" (p. 3). Under the Park and Open Space Element directs that federal agencies should:

1) Maintain and conserve federal open space as a means of shaping and enhancing urban areas (p. 7);
2) Preserve open space that is crucial to the long-term quality of life of a neighborhood or region;
3) Conserve and maintain the essential open space character of areas in the region with significant park, open space cultural or natural qualities that contribute to the setting of the National Capital Region. The Element specifically includes McMillan Reservoir to the immediate south of Area 5 as an example.
4) "Conserve portions of military reservations that add significantly to the inventory of parks, open space, and natural areas and should, to the extent practical, be used by the public for recreation...[i.e.] when security considerations permit (p. 8-9)." The Element explicitly includes U.S. Soldier's and Airmen's Home as an example of this.
5) "Maintain and conserve trees and other vegetation in the landscaped buffer areas on federal installations in a natural condition."

The Park and Open Space Element also stresses the importance of connectivity between parks and open spaces in the Capital Region. As already noted, the Element has identified both Soldier's Home and McMillan Reservoir to its immediate south as areas to be preserved as open space and parkland. Fort Totten to the northeast of Soldier's Home is an important part of the long-run open space plan for the Capital region. As land is currently configured, links could be made between these three areas through green bikeways forming a long, continuous area of open space linked to the Circle Forts chain of open space. Loss of the Soldier's Home property to development could seriously impair this open space connectivity. Alternatives must be considered that preserve this connectivity.

The Parks and Open Space Element highlights the unique role that parks created around historic sites and national monuments play in the Capital Region. The federal government is to "establish and preserve historic parks as important legacies of national, historic, architectural and landscape significance. The Anderson cottage and two acres surrounding it have been designated a National Monument because of its importance in Lincoln and other 19th-century presidencies. But as the EIS notes, the importance of the AFRH site does not stop with this. To its immediate north is the first national military cemetery, predating Arlington National Cemetery. The home itself was has been in continuous use as a final home for members of the U.S. Armed Services since the middle of the 19th century. It is the U.S. equivalent of Les Invalides in Paris. Its central landscaped core and the agricultural land (now garden) of area 6 are..."
essentially unchanged from the 19th century and provide a coherent and important historical context for the National Monument, cemetery and historically important home. The Elements also clarify the importance of protecting historic landscapes such as the Soldier's Home property from development.

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Federal Plan also commits the federal government to protecting terrain features of the region through careful design. In particular, it notes the importance of maintaining vistas of the Monumental core of L'Enfant City's core area and protecting the escarpments that provide these overlooks. As the third highest point in the District of Columbia and one of the only undeveloped ones, the AFRH property is one of the areas that falls under the federal government commitment to protect "topographic bowl features."

The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital Federal Elements complements the Parks and Open Space Element. The Preservation and Historic Features Element is not limited to preservation of historic structures and landscapes. A major concern is the "preservation and strengthening historic urban design features, such as the L'Enfant Plan." As part of this the Element commits federal agencies to "protecting the character of the region's natural features, many of which have historical or cultural significance, such as ... the ridge of the topographic bowl, agricultural land, ... and designed landscapes." All of these features are present on the Soldier's Home property and the alternatives proposed do not adequately take their protection into account. In particular plans to develop areas 5 and 6 will disturb historically agricultural land that was historically an integral part of the function of both Soldier's Home and the Anderson cottage, as well as disrupt the landscape of the topographic bowl. In particular, the Federal Plan calls for the federal government to "protect the skyline formed by the region's natural features, particularly the topographic bowl around central Washington" and to "protect and enhance the vistas and views, both natural and designed, that are an integral part of the national capital's image."

The Preservation and Historic Features Element sets policies regarding federal government stewardship of historic properties and the historic plan of Washington, D.C. Under these Elements federal agencies should:

1) protect the settings of historic properties, including views to and from sites where significant, as integral parts of the historic character of the property (p. 8);
2) protect the reservations that contain historic landscapes and features from incompatible changes or intrusion;
3) protect views ... inward from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl from inappropriate intrusions. Open space should be preserved to allow for public use and enjoyment of these views. (Examples include ... the escarpment north of Florida, Ave. NW)."

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital Federal Elements directs the federal government to look to redevelopment of surplus federal property as a means of adding to the region's inventory of parks and open space.
and notes that future acquisitions could occur by purchase, easement, donation or exchange. An alternative that has not been included in the EIS is exchange of much of the land in the western half of AFPH-W (in particular areas 5 and 6) for other federal surplus land that could be more appropriately developed. Exchanging this land for land in another location and development there could provide needed financial resources for AFPH. The western half of AFPH-W could then continue to play the important role they currently play in the District's system of federal open space by protecting historic landscapes, providing appropriate context for an important historical site and protecting views of the central core of the capital as directed by the Federal Elements. If the land were transferred to the National Park Service to enlarge the President Lincoln and Soldier's Home National Monument, this would not only preserve open space, but would help protect the historical integrity of the setting for the cottage as a place of retreat and rest, thus preventing the kind of encroachment of inappropriate new development that has so adversely affected the Manassas Battle Field and other major Civil War historic sites. It would also enhance public access to much needed open space in the District as a whole as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, it may serve to substantially mitigate adverse environmental impacts of proposed development on the eastern areas part of the Soldier's Home campus. Specific alternatives are outlined below.

The District of Columbia Parks and Recreation is currently in the middle of a comprehensive planning process. As part of this effort they are conducting a survey of park and recreation needs. Preliminary results from this survey are indicating a significant deficit of park space in the Petworth, Park View, Columbia Heights area. This is self-evident from any map of parkland in the District of Columbia. The Soldier's Home property is a uniquely large landscaped open space, one of the few remaining unprotected open space areas in the eastern part of residential Washington DC. The planning process for development of the AFPH-W property should be timed to accommodate consideration of the current comprehensive planning process of the DC Dept of Parks and Recreation.

The District of Columbia Dept. of Parks and Recreation included on the draft EIS service list. Our understanding is that they did not learn of the EIS until July 1, inadequate time to properly respond. The comment period for the EIS should be extended so that they can complete their comprehensive planning process in a way that can consider potential use of part of the Soldier's Home Property to meet District Park need.

A park that would consist of much of the western half of the Soldier's Home property would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Columbia Heights, and to planned dense residential development along Georgias Ave., Sherman Ave., as well as dense development planned for the rest of the Soldier's Home site. If connected to McMillan Reservoir, it would provide direct park access to LeDroit Park and Eckington, also areas underserved by parkland in the District. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northeast DC.
The open space already provided by Soldier’s Home is an integral design element of the adjacent Historic Register-eligible row house neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View, developed in the early 1900s. Surrounding streets to the west of the Home were designed to take advantage of vistas of the open space provided by the Home’s property. For example, the vista from Grant Circle down Illinois Ave to Area 6 is an important anchoring design element in the eastern part of Petworth. The Preservation Element of the Federal Elements direct federal agencies to “protect reciprocal views along rights-of-way and from … circles (p. 11).” Replacing the vista of this green expanse that opens out over a view of the federal core of the city with a view of an eight-story apartment building would significant harm the integrity of historic city plan in this part of the capital.

Among the alternatives, the BIS has not considered alternatives that would provide significant parkland for the neighborhood to the west of the home. As the name Park View suggests, the neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View adjacent to the western boundary of Soldier’s Home were developed in the early 1900s around the presence of the Soldier’s Home as open space.

It is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the draft EIS. Notice of the EIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local office responsible for the monumental core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway.

The draft EIS states that the proposed master plan alternatives would have long-term, major, adverse cumulative impacts on the historic resources of the Soldier’s Home property and the adjacent National Register-Eligible Historic Districts. As described above, the proposed alternatives are also inconsistent with park and open space directives of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements. No alternative, except the no development alternative, considers anything except significant built development on all 6 areas. Other alternatives should be considered that will mitigate these impacts on historic landscapes and buildings and fulfill the intended role of the Soldier’s Home property as open space or parkland under the Comprehensive Plan, including:

1) No development on the area west of a line extending north through the Soldier’s Home Property from 1st St. NW. This would buffer adjacent residential neighborhoods to the west from the noise, heat, air pollution, traffic and change in water table that is likely to result from development on the eastern half of the property. It would reduce the environmental impact to the Washington region as a whole by avoiding creating of a large area of impervious surface in a drainage area and a new heat island. It would protect almost all of the currently undisturbed historical landscape and buildings.

2) Exchange of land west of a line extending north through the Soldier’s Home Property from 1st St. NW that is not actively used for AFRH mission for surplus federal land. The
Soldier's Home property to go to the National Park Service for development as public park space as part of the President Lincoln and Soldier's Home National Monument. The land received by AFRH in exchange should be used for revenue generating purposes for the AFRH. This park would provide the environmental, social, and historic preservation mitigation described in alternative 1 above as well as meeting the park and open space and historic preservation directives of the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. The land received by AFRH in the exchange should be such as to provide comparable revenue generation for the AFRH to the most likely, legal land use allowable on the exchanged Soldier's Home property. This alternative would have the advantage of achieving AFRH-W financial goals while permanently assuring that residents of the AFRH-W would enjoy something much closer to the open space and environmental amenities they currently enjoy than would be possible under any of the considered development alternatives.

3) Sell the land to the west of a line extending north through the Soldier's Home Property from 1st St. NW that is not actively used for AFRH mission to the District of Columbia for use as city park. This would buffer adjacent residential neighborhoods to the west from the noise, heat, air pollution, traffic and change in water table that is likely to result from development on the eastern half of the property. It would protect almost all of the currently undisturbed historical landscape and buildings as well as meeting the park and open space and historic preservation directives of the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. The sale would provide revenue to the AFRH. Perhaps part of the sales arrangement could be an agreement not to challenge increased density on the eastern half of the property. Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned commits to working to find sources of private funding from Foundations and large individual donors to augment city funding for purchase of the property. This alternative would have the advantage of achieving AFRH-W financial goals while permanently assuring that residents of the AFRH-W would enjoy something much closer to the open space and environmental amenities they currently enjoy than would be possible under any of the considered development alternatives.

4) Putting no built development on historic character areas.

- None of the alternatives are described with enough specificity for residents to truly understand the impact on their neighborhood. To address this vagueness there should be significant, substantive participation of the residents in the area comparable to that required by DC planning and development process.
Residents need to be advised of how and when they can participate in the Section 106 Historic Review process with enough advanced notice (6 months) that they can organize to participate.

At p. 1-1 the EIS describes the AFRII as "a 272 acre underdeveloped, urban site". This characterization demonstrates the sensitivity shown throughout this EIS to the critical role this property plays in the landscape of the Capital and its historic, environmental and public space integrity. The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital specifically lists U.S. Soldier’s and Airemen’s Home as an important, historic area of open space that should be conserved and opened to public recreational use to the extent physically compatible with the use of other parts of the property for military purposes (p. 8 of the Park and Open Space Element of the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital). As noted above, in multiple other ways, the alternatives for development proposed in the EIS are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s Federal Element requirements among these: protection of terrain features, meeting increasing need for parks, providing connectivity of federal public open space (McMillan Reservoir and potentially Fort Totten Park), preservation of the historic urban design of the National Capital, protection of the landscape context of historic parks (President Lincoln and Soldier’s Home National Monument), protection of views inward from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl (specifically mentioning the escarpment north of Florida Ave, of which the Soldier’s Home property is a part), and protection of views from circles in the extensions of the I’Enfant Plan (Sherman Circle to Grant Circle to Area 6 in the EIS).

The AFRII’s need for revenue does not give it the legal right to destroy an important public open space in contravention of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital and other federal law. The law does not allow homeowners to build 120 story office buildings on their single-family zoned property just because they need to pay their medical bills or pay for their children’s college education, especially when such use would violate other legal requirements. The use of land must be consistent with the applicable land use plan and other legal requirements. The mere fact that Congress has approved sale of the land does not make all possible land uses legal, nor is the Act approving sale of the land itself necessarily invulnerable to legal challenge. Other alternatives to meet the AFRII’s funding requirements that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital, federal environmental and historic preservation law and Executive Order 21898 have not been considered. The Federal Elements themselves suggest alternatives that have not been considered that could help the AFRII meet their financial needs in a way consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and federal laws. This includes engaging the National Park Service and the General Services Administration in finding alternative surplus federal land that is suitable for dense development or other revenue generation that could be exchanged for the Soldier’s Home property and movement of Soldier’s Home property to the National Park Service. This alternative should be pursued.
The EIS lists as an objective of the planned development to "provide sufficient revenue to support the AFRH's goal of resident-focused care while replenishing the depleting Trust Fund, and to "Grow the Trust Fund to not only meet the needs of today's residents, but the needs of future generations as well (p.i)." The EIS does not provide an accounting of how much money is needed for this purpose, how much money is likely to be generated by each proposal and in particular the alternatives for each designated development area for each proposed alternative. There is no indication of how the funds would be managed so that the AFRH does not in a few years insist that it has to develop the remainder of its land to fulfill its mandate. The AFRH has already sold off substantial portions of its original property to fund its activities. The land currently occupied by the Washington Hospital complex was sold several years ago. Land east of N. Capital St. was sold recently to Catholic University. There is no accounting in the EIS for how this money was used and why it was not sufficient to meet the AFRH budgetary needs. In fact, this pattern of land sale for development suggests that the current land sales and proposed development are only a stop-gap measure that will not assure the AFRH financial stability into a meaningful time in the future. Given the burden that the proposed development would impose on the entire District of Columbia and in particular, neighboring communities, and given the irreplaceable loss of historic open space, the lost opportunity for development of greatly needed and highly valuable public land in the center of the District, and the irreversible disruption of the historic physical plan for the District, it seems incumbent on the AFRH to show that this action has a reasonable chance of actually accomplishing the stated financial goal. This analysis has not been included in the draft EIS. It needs to be included.

The neighborhood to the west of Soldier's Home is politically well-organized with many well functioning neighborhood civic organization and an active ANC. The neighborhood pays close attention to land use issues and has successfully challenged plans to build the Greenline of the metro above ground and the proposal for a District DMV building at the corner of Georgia and New Hampshire Aves. NW. Thus it seems very strange that none of these civic organizations were aware of the Scoping Meetings held in September of 2004 before they happened. Since that time, when we contacted the AFRH to inquire about what was happening with the site we were told that there was nothing to report. Then in late May 2005, after most of our organizations went on summer recess and many of our neighbors had made plans to be out of town, we learned that a draft EIS was being released. This timing, coupled with the short length of the comment period, has made if impossible for us to use our normal means of action through neighborhood organization meetings to respond to the draft EIS. This is not meaningful public participation. The EIS should specify a meaningful process for public participation, comparable to that required under DC planning and development law. Without this, the goal stated in the EIS to "ensure an open, participatory process with the AFRH-W residents and the community" is empty words.

Neighborhood associations to the west of Soldier's Home were not given notice of when the Section 106 process was initiated which may have prejudiced our ability to
participate in that process. Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned, United Neighborhood Coalition and other neighborhood organizations are currently inquiring into how to become participants in this process.

- Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned requests status as a consulting party to the Section 106 process.

- Use of property values and associated taxes as the sole indicators of financial impact of the proposed development on the neighboring community do not provide an adequate measure of this impact. These only capture impact on long-term wealth, and do not capture impact on cash flows. Many neighboring homeowners use basement apartments to create a stream of income that helps them pay their mortgages and meet other expenses. Others use their basements for living space without which they might be forced to seek larger, less affordable housing elsewhere. Changes in water tables may result from dense development on nearby higher ground and this may impair the use of these basements as rental property and living space. Also, many residents do not have off-street parking. Increased traffic and increased parking demand will likely result in residents paying more parking tickets. In a poor to moderate income neighborhood, $30 parking tickets are a substantial financial burden. The EIS should include analysis of these impacts.

- The indicators used to assess impact on minority and low-income populations are also inadequate. In particular, impact of proposed development on ambient temperatures that could result in higher cooling bills and higher mortality and morbidity rates should be included as an indicator. In addition to looking at changes in ambient conditions, the likely impacts of these changes on the health of these populations and on medical expenses and their ability to insure must be considered for all environmental impacts. Likely impacts include increased incidence and severity of asthma and other respiratory illness, increased incidence and severity of coronary and circulatory conditions, increased hearing loss, increased stress related illness.

- The indicators of impact on natural resources are inadequate. The current set of indicators is limited to impact on ponds on the Soldier’s Home property itself. The potential stream running through the center of the property area is hydrologically connected to other water bodies flowing into the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers. Increased run-off from the dense development proposed under the EIS will have adverse impacts on the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers. It is likely that the increased run-off will have impacts on property owners downhill from the site. The severe flooding experiences in the Dupont Circle area in the early 1990s after severe rainstorms demonstrates the environmental function that open spaces like that at the Soldier’s Home play in preventing environmental and property damage from run-off. These likely impacts need to be further quantified in the EIS.

- Indicators of impacts on the transportation system should include expected increases in auto accidents and pedestrian accidents and deaths from the increased traffic.
In addition to using changes in decibel levels as an indicator of increased noise levels that can be expected from the proposed development alternatives, the impact of these changes on hearing and other health outcomes for area residents needs to be enumerated.

Indicators of impacts on historic resources (p. 1-10) appear to be limited to the impact on structures on the AFRH-W site that will be demolished. The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear that given the historic importance of the Capital area in the nation's life, that historic preservation concerns are much broader than this. Indicators should also include disturbance and development of historic landscapes on the Soldier's Home property, the rim of the topographic bowl of the Washington basin which includes almost all of the AFRH-W site as well as visual and physical impacts on the adjacent historic neighborhoods built in the early 20th century as extensions of the L'Enfant plan.

In addition to increases in emissions over time as a indicator of changes in air quality, the EIS needs to estimate the impact of these changes on ambient air quality in both the immediate vicinity of the AFRH-W property and the Washington area as a whole. This estimate needs to include the interaction of multiple pollutants and changed ambient temperature associated with the proposed development. These estimates of impact on ambient air quality then need to be used to provide estimates of the change in health outcomes for residents living in or near the AFRH-W site as well as in the Washington Metropolitan area air shed. Changed ambient air quality will also have impacts on built structures in the area. This needs to be included as an indicator of impact. In particular, impact on historic structures and cemeteries both on the AFRH-W, in nearby neighborhoods, and in the Washington area as a whole must be assessed in the EIS.

Auto emissions contribute to nitrogen deposition in the Chesapeake Bay. Nutrient pollution is causing widespread destruction of natural habitat in the Chesapeake Bay and auto emissions have been found to be a significant contributor to this. These impacts also need to be included in the evaluation of impact of proposed development on air quality.

Development design and site landscaping on historic properties or changes that can affect historic properties or historic landscapes in the District of Columbia or that affect the historic plan of the District of Columbia or views from circles are explicitly subject to the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements and are therefore not outside the scope of the EIS. These must be given consideration. This is particularly true since the outcome of the EIS will be selection of one of the alternative development plans presented and any proposed mitigation measures and no further role for public participation by neighbors, civic organizations, or the District government is specified beyond comment on this EIS and participation in the Section 106 process.
Despite the fact that the purpose of the EIS is "creation of a master plan for the AFRH-W that will sustain the AFRH and its primary source of funding, the AFRH Trust Fund" (p. 2-1), no analysis of the expected financial consequences of each alternative is provided.

Analysis of development on zone 6 has not considered its relationship to District of Columbia Department of Planning plans for development on Georgia Avenue. All alternatives must be analyzed in relationship to development currently contemplated in District of Columbia planning for Georgia Ave. NW, in Columbia Heights, along the adjacent N. Capitol St. corridor, and neighborhoods to the east of the AFRH-W property.

The EIS fails to note in the description of the affected environment that the AFRH-W occupies a prominence along the topographic run of the Washington basin. This is a geologic feature that is designated for protection under the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital.

The draft EIS provides inadequate analysis of the ability of the pond on the property, that provide stormwater retention would be able to handle the added run-off from substantial increases in paved area on areas that drain into them.

The description of wildlife that use the home is very brief and incomplete. Area residents regularly see deer on the property as well as raccoons and possum. Further analysis is needed.

The EIS description of the project area history gives incomplete mention of the extensive use of the Anderson Cottage by President Lincoln during his Presidency and no mention of the use of the AFRH-W property as a summer residence by other U.S. presidents during the 19th Century. The history fails to explain that the reason for this use was that the property provided a serene country retreat away from the stress and heat of the then-developed area of Washington near the mall. This information should be included in the history of the site in the EIS.

A more detailed description of the location, nature and history of historic landscape features on the AFRH-W property than are provided in the draft EIS are needed for those outside the AFRH-W to be able to assess the impact of development alternatives on historic landscape features as required by the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan of the National Capital. This is particularly true if there is to be meaningful public participation, a goal stated in the EIS, since the public is allowed almost no physical access to the AFRH-W property.

Analysis of the impact of changed zoning does not take into account current planned development in the surrounding areas. The EIS looks at the AFRH-W site in
isolation from development in the surrounding community. The District of Columbia Georgia Ave revitalization strategy (Dec, 2004) calls for dense residential and commercial development on Georgia Ave. stretching from Howard University north well above the site. This area is 2-4 blocks west of much of the proposed dense housing and commercial development on the western sides of the AFRH-W site. This is already an area of developed, though blighted commercial and residential development. It seems likely given the direction of development in the area that it will be revitalized soon, significantly reducing the benefit to the surrounding area of residential and commercial development on the western part of the AFRH-W property and increasing the harm done by lost green space. In addition, dense residential and commercial development is already under construction in central Columbia Heights 8 blocks west of the AFRH-W property. This development is going to significantly increase traffic in the area and will also increase demand for open space and park. This growing demand for open space and park land in the area, which already experiences a deficit of public park, is what part of what motivates the National Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements designation of the Soldier's Home property as an area to be conserved as open space and park land. This development and land use likely reduces the benefit of housing and commercial development on AFRH-W property and increases its value as park and open space. This analysis needs to be included in the EIS.

- The traffic analysis seems to underestimate traffic increases from the addition of up to 16,678 additional employees and 7,500 residents and up to 16,678 additional parking spaces to an area that currently has a population of roughly 12,000. The analysis also only looks at impact on major roadways, not the side streets immediate to the west of the Soldier's Home property. Yet this scale of development will inevitably result in significant increase in the use of side streets as well as increased parking pressure on these streets. This is in addition to significant additional increased population planned for the Georgia Ave. Corridor a very few blocks to the west.

- The noise analysis needs to be revisited and further analysis of noise impacts, both during and after construction needs to be included in the EIS. It strains credibility to say that with the planned increase in population, construction, built hard-environment and traffic that there will be no or virtually no change in noise level on Rock Creek Church Road or adjacent streets of row homes. There is certainly a difference between the noise level on New Hampshire Avenue and Rock Creek Church Road with current traffic levels.

- Further analysis is needed of the cumulative impact of the on air emissions, ambient air quality standards and health- and welfare-based air quality standards. The EIS also needs to have modeling of the impact of the demolition, operation of the new buildings, plus the added traffic on local and regional air quality as measured by these indicators.

- Further analysis is needed of the impact of removal of trees, green space coupled with the increased auto emissions on global warming.
The EIS needs to clarify how storm water requirements will be met during construction as well as during operation or after completion of the development.

The EIS must include further analysis of the impact of all wastes, solid and hazardous from proposed development, including impacts on landfill capacity.

The parking plans and traffic patterns and noise analysis have adequately addressed the full impact of traffic and noise from visitors to planned hospital, institutional and commercial development.

The noise analysis has not adequately addressed the impact of increased emergency vehicle traffic, including helicopters and ambulances, associated with the planned hospital expansion on adjoining neighborhoods, including the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, and retreat houses in the Catholic University/Brookland area.

The EIS analysis of particulate matter and dust during construction and after completion of planned development is inadequate.

Sincerely,

Petworth and Columbia Residents Concerned.

Contact person:
Sandra Hoffman
701 Taylor St. NW
Washington, DC 20011

(202) 328-5022 (o)
hoffamn@gff.org
July 7, 2005

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attn. Donald Dailey
3700 North Capital Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Dailey:

Enclosed please find a hard, signed copy of the comments (17 pages) on the Armed Forces Retirement Home - Washington Master Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, May 2005. These comments were submitted to you yesterday (July 6, 2005) by the group Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned.

Sincerely,

[Signed]
Sandra Hoffmann

Contact person for Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned
(202) 328-5022
From: Hoffmann, Sandy
Sent: Wednesday, July 06, 2005 5:05 PM
To: donald.dalley@afrih.gov
Subject: Petworth and Columbia Heights Concerned comments on AFRH-W draft EIS

PCHR Comments on draft AF RH EIS

Dear Mr. Docker,


Thank you,

Sandra Hoffmann
July 6, 2005

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attn: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Dailey:

Below please find comments on the Armed Forces Retirement Home – Washington
Master Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, May 2005 by the group Petworth
and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned.

1. Residents of the area have received inadequate advance notice of this draft EIS
and comment period to be able to respond meaningfully. Notice was given after
most local community groups went into recess for the summer. The comment
period was too short of local residents to obtain the EIS and educate themselves
about the EIS process adequately to respond in a meaningful manner. Notice of
the EIS was not widely enough publicized for many parties interested in the
outcome to be aware of the EIS. For example, the Committee of 100 for the
Federal City, a leading advocate of protection of the L’Enfant and McMillan
plans was not aware of the draft EIS until we were told of their existence and
were able to reach them by phone just prior to the July 4th holiday. Several
organizations who should have been directly served with the EIS, such as the D.C.
Department of Parks and Recreation do not appear to have been notified. There
appears have been no Spanish or French/Creole outreach to Spanish and
French/Creole speaking residents in the surrounding area early enough in the
process for these residents to have effective participation in the process. Adjacent
census tracts have populations that are 8 to 15% Hispanic and have many Creole
speaking Haitians. Nearby areas that will be affected by the loss of potential park
space have even higher proportions of Spanish speaking populations.

To provide adequate opportunity for comment, the comment period on the draft
EIS should be extended and additional meetings for public comment on the draft
EIS should be held. To make this effective there must a multi-media outreach
through television commercials, radio commercials, and multiple local papers,
including newspapers targeted at local Spanish language, neighborhood and
African American communities. The fact that there were so few comments to the
scoping and that almost all comments from residents were from residents of the
Soldier’s and Airmen’s Home is a sign of the ineffectiveness of the outreach
effort associated with this process.

2. The EIS masks the fact that the AFRH is proposing extremely dense development of
park-like open space in the middle of a neighborhood that is disproportionately low
income, elderly, and African American. The density of the proposed development is so
high that is likely to have disproportionately high and adverse human and environmental effects on minority and low-income populations.

The EIS is incorrect in concluding that low income and minority populations would not be disproportionately affected by the impacts of the development alternatives outlined under the EIS. The EIS implies that this neighborhood is an average U.S. neighborhood by comparing median income statistics for the entirety of the District of Columbia ($40,127) to the U.S. as a whole ($41,994). This is extremely misleading since the income distribution in the District of Columbia proper has a large percent of the Washington metropolitan area's minority, poor and low income households. The median income of the Washington Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) is $80,642. As noted in the draft EIS, there are likely to be more localized impacts. These also fall disproportionately on low income, elderly, African American populations.

The EIS incorrectly compares these local areas to the District of Columbia as a whole in determining whether they are disproportionately low income, minority populations. It is inappropriate to consider the District of Columbia as the proper unit of comparison for these neighborhoods for Environmental Justice analysis. The District of Columbia is essentially the inner city core of a large metropolitan area. As such it has a very high concentration of the metropolitan area's poor and minority population, as is demonstrated by the almost two-fold discrepancy between District of Columbia and Washington MSA median income. The proper unit of comparison is the Washington Metropolitan Statistical Area.

The Washington Metropolitan area is where local residents must compete for jobs, housing, and goods and services. The federal government recognizes this in adjusting its pay structure upwards for DC as one of the nation's high cost of living areas. According to the U.S. Census and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the census tract neighboring Soldier's Home on the west have median incomes ranging from $32,00 to $44,000 compared to the Washington metropolitan area median of $80,642. This places this neighborhood in the lower 25th income percentile for the Washington area (HUD).

The EIS also incorrectly uses the District as the relevant comparison for race. Here the more appropriate comparison is with national data. Anti-discrimination laws and policy, including the Executive Order on Environmental Justice, are designed to address a national legacy of racism. According to the logic of the EIS, if all African Americans in the U.S. were forced onto a reservation occupied exclusively by African Americans and a federal project affected a portion of that reservation, it would have no disproportionate impact on African Americans. This is certainly not the intent of the Executive Order. The inner city core of most large urban cities contain large areas of minority ghettos. It is inappropriate to look at comparisons of the affected neighborhood with minority population statistics for the District of Columbia simply because the District is the federal reservation and does not fall under the jurisdiction of a state. This Constitutional peculiarity should not be used to perpetrate environmentally injustice federal action on low income, minority U.S. citizens.
The census tracts neighboring Soldier's Home are 82-90% African American, compared to 26.6% in the Washington MSA and 12.4% nationally. The neighborhood is known as the home of Black Washington's grandparents, and the census statistics bear this out – roughly 16-18% of area residents are over 65, compared to the 9% percent in the Washington MSA and 12.4% in the U.S. population. Along with this elderly, low income, minority population comes expected life outcomes: 15-26% of individuals are below the poverty line, as compared with 7.4% in the Washington MSA and 12.4% nationally; 25-33% are disabled compared to 19% nationally; only 12-18% of residents in these census tracts have bachelor's degrees or above compared to 42.5% for the Washington MSA and 24% nationally. Despite the disadvantages they bear because of their race, age, and disproportionately low income and education these neighbors have managed to have some of the highest owner-occupancy rates in the District of Columbia. This is a major achievement given the odds against which they have had to work to accomplish this.

All existing alternatives, except the "no-development" alternative envision very dense development on most of the Soldier's Home property. This is likely to have major adverse impacts on the health and well-being of residents in the neighborhood to the west of Soldier's Home as well as to the health of elderly residents at the Armed Forces Retirement Home:

1) These alternatives all call for an extremely large increase in traffic as indicated by the large increase in parking spaces (an underestimate since it does not account for visitor travel). There is also likely to be increased air pollution from construction and possibly from electrical generation for the large institutions planned. The Washington, D.C. metropolitan area is already out of compliance with federal EPA air quality standards. This increase in automobile traffic will worsen an already bad situation, particularly in the summer. The EIS needs to include analysis that shows the impacts of proposed development, both during construction and upon completion on local ambient air quality and on health outcomes for local area residents. Health outcomes need to be analyzed by age.

Air pollution problems are local as well as regional in scope. The immediate neighborhood seems likely to see the largest change in air quality from this increased traffic. Local air pollution is linked to increased incidence of respiratory illness. Three different recent studies being published this month in Epidemiology find a significant link between daily ground-level ozone in cities and mortality rates in the next 3 days. Ozone is formed when pollutants, such as car exhaust, mix with heat and sunlight. Editors of Epidemiology have made the rather unprecedented comment that together these studies point to an "urgent need to reduce public exposure to ambient ozone by all possible means."
Communities of color across the nation are experiencing disproportionately high levels of asthma and other respiratory illness. The deteriorated local air quality seems likely also worsen these conditions in this predominantly African American neighborhood. Further analysis is needed that specifies how the health of these residents will be affected by proposed alternatives.

2) The EIS does not consider the impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadow, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surface will have on temperatures in the surrounding area. This past spring, gardens in the Petworth area bloomed roughly 2 weeks later than gardens in the DuPont Circle area. It seems unlikely that this difference is due to the small difference in elevation, and is more likely to the difference in heat generated by the dense built and paved surfaces in the DuPont Circle area and the cooling effect of open space and trees in the Petworth area – particularly at Soldier's Home.

Increased temperatures will result in higher cooling bills, particularly burdensome for the elderly poor, or an increased frequency of dangerous summer conditions for those who cannot afford air conditioning, again particularly the elderly poor. Increased temperatures will also worsen the impact on increased exhaust by promoting local ground—level ozone formation. The EIS contains no analysis of local temperature change that will be associated with the proposed alternatives. This analysis needs to be done. It should include expected health impacts (by age), and impact on cooling costs for area residents.

3) At the current time, the mature trees on the Soldier's Home property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.

4) The transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between Soldier's Home and Georgia Ave. The impact on the level of increased traffic considered is unlikely to be limited to the main streets studied in the EIS. Analysis must be done on changed traffic on these side streets.

The neighborhoods to the west of the Soldier's Home property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational services provided by streets in Petworth and Park View. This needs to be taken into account.

The District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from being hit by cars on DC streets. Bringing a large number of cars into narrow residential streets will likely increase the
mortality rate in the area to the west of Soldier's Home, particularly because of the relatively large number of elderly and children. Analysis of traffic impacts needs to include estimates of the change in accidents and deaths.

5) Many residents in the area to the west of Soldier's Home use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. Soldier's Home enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The EIS has not considered how dense construction on the Soldier's Home property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area. A rise in the water table seems likely to result from dense development on this land. A raised water table could result in serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income. Analysis must be done of the likely physical impacts of proposed alternatives on the water table in adjacent areas and the financial impacts of any changes on local residents.

6) Both residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home and neighbors who live to the west of the home benefit, much as President Lincoln did when he lived in the Anderson cottage, from the relative calm and quiet provided by the green campus of the Home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able to walk past the property and to see it's green expanses when looking out their windows or down their streets. In this way, the Home has provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its residents no matter their income because it does not look like a poor neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty and calm will take away something of irreplaceable value in their lives. Economists have developed methods for valuing this loss of amenity, including hedonic property value studies and contingent valuation studies. Frequently this can be done using "benefits transfer" of values from existing comparable studies. Such analysis needs to be included in the EIS.

* The EIS has considered two types of alternatives: no development and dense development on virtually the entire perimeter of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.
Additional alternatives need to be considered, such as development of some, but not all of the areas considered for development in currently proposed alternatives. Conservation of open space, particularly in the western half of the Soldier's Home property or protection of that land as open space by transferring the land to park authorities would mitigate the negative impact of development of eastern half of the property on residents around the property.

It is not at all clear that the EIS has taken the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital adequately into account. In particular, there appears to have been an marked inattention to the Parks and Open Element and the Preservation and Historic Features Element.
The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear that the capital area is facing increasing demand for open space and park due to increased population and tourism pressure. The Element defines open space as "any land or water surface that is not occupied by buildings, a broad definition that encompasses the vast majority of federal property" (p. 3). Under the Park and Open Space Element directs that federal agencies should:

1) maintain and conserve federal open space as a means of shaping and enhancing urban areas (p. 7);
2) preserve open space that is crucial to the long-term quality of life of a neighborhood or region;
3) Conserve and maintain the essential open space character of areas in the region with significant park, open space cultural or natural qualities that contribute to the setting of the National Capital Region." The Element specifically includes McMillan Reservoir in the immediate south of Area 5 as an example.
4) "Conserve portions of military reservations that add significantly to the inventory of park, open space, and natural areas and should, to the extent practicable, be used by the public for recreation ... [i.e.,] when security considerations permit (p. 8-9)." The Element explicitly includes U.S. Soldier's and Airmen's Home as an example of this.
5) "Maintain and conserve trees and other vegetation in the landscaped buffer areas on federal installations in a natural condition."

The Park and Open Space Element also stresses the importance of connectivity between parks and open spaces in the Capital Region. As already note, the Element has identified both Soldier's Home and McMillan Reservoir to its immediate south as areas to be preserved as open space and parkland. Fort Totten to the northeast of Soldier's Home is also an important part of the long-run open space plan for the Capital region. As land is currently configured, links could be made between these three areas through green pathways forming a long, continuous area of open space linked to the Circle Forts chain of open space. Loss of the Soldier's Home property to development could seriously impair this open space connectivity. Alternatives must be considered that preserve this connectivity.

The Parks and Open Space Element highlights the unique role that parks created around historic sites play in the Capital Region. The federal government is to "establish and preserve historic parks as important legacies of national, historic, architectural and landscape significance. The Anderson cottage and two acres surrounding it have been designated a National Monument because of its importance in Lincoln and other 19th century presidencies. But as the EIS notes, the importance of the AFRH site does not stop with this. To its immediate north is the first national military-cemetery, predating Arlington National Cemetery. The home itself was has been in continuous use as a final home for members of the U.S. Armed Services since the middle of the 19th century. It is the U.S. equivalent of Les Invalides in Paris. Its central landscaped core and the agricultural land (now garden) of area 6 are
essentially unchanged from the 19th century and provide a coherent and important historical context for the National Monument, cemetery and historically important home. The Elements are very clear about the importance of protecting historic landscapes such as the Soldier’s Home property from development.

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Federal Plan also commits the federal government to protecting terrain features of the region through careful design. In particular, it notes the importance of maintaining vistas of the Monumental Core of L’Enfant City’s core area and protecting the escarpments that provide these overlooks. As the third highest point in the District of Columbia and one of the only undeveloped ones, the AFRH property is one of the areas that falls under the federal government commitment to protect “topographic bowl features.”

The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital Federal Elements complements the Parks and Open Space Element. The Preservation and Historic Features Element is not limited to preservation of historic structures and landscapes. A major concern is the “preservation and strengthening historic urban design features, such as the L’Enfant Plan.” As part of this the Element commits federal agencies to “protecting the character of the region’s natural features, many of which have historical or cultural significance, such as ... the ridge of the topographic bowl, agricultural land, ... and designed landscapes.” All of these features are present on the Soldier’s Home property and the alternatives proposed do not adequately take their protection into account. In particular plans to develop areas 5 and 6 will disturb historically agricultural land that was historically an integral part of the function of both Soldier’s Home and the Anderson cottage, as well as disrupt the landscape of the topographic bowl. In particular the Federal Plan calls for the federal government to “protect the skyline formed by the region’s natural features, particularly the topographic bowl around central Washington” and to “protect and enhance the vistas and views, both natural and designed, that are an integral part of the national capital’s image.”

The Preservation and Historic Features Federal Elements sets policies regarding federal government stewardship of historic properties and the historic plan of Washington, D.C. Under these Elements federal agencies should:

1) protect the settings of historic properties, including views to and from sites where significant, as integral parts of the historic character of the property (p. 8);
2) protect the reservations that contain historic landscapes and features from incompatible changes or incursion;
3) protect views ... inward from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl from inappropriate intrusions. Open space should be preserved to allow for public use and enjoyment of these views. (Examples include ... the escarpment north of Florida, Ave, NW).}

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital Federal Elements directs the federal government to look to redevelopment of surplus federal property as a means of adding to the region’s inventory of parks and open space
and notes that future acquisitions could occur by purchase, easement, donation or exchange. An alternative that has not been included in the EIS is exchange of much of the land in the western half of AFRH-W (in particular areas 5 and 6) for other federal surplus land that could be more appropriately developed. Exchanging this land for land in another location and development there could provide needed financial resources for AFRH. The western half of AFRH-W could then continue to play the important role they currently play in the District's system of federal open space by protecting historic landscapes, providing appropriate context for an important historical site and protecting views of the central core of the capital as directed by the Federal Elements. If the land were transferred to the National Park Service to enlarge the President Lincoln and Soldier's Home National Monument, this would not only preserve open space, but would help protect the historical integrity of the setting for the cottage as a place of retreat and rest, thus preventing the kind of encroachment of inappropriate new development that has so adversely affected the Manassas Battlefield and other major Civil War historic sites. It would also enhance public access to much needed open space in the District as a whole as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, it may serve to substantially mitigate adverse environmental impacts of proposed development on the eastern areas part of the Soldier's Home campus. Specific alternatives are outlined below.

The District of Columbia - Parks and Recreation is currently in the middle of a comprehensive planning process. As part of this effort they are conducting a survey of park and recreation needs. Preliminary results from this survey are indicating a significant deficit of park space in the Petworth, Park View, Columbia Heights area. This is self-evident from any map of parkland in the District of Columbia. The Soldier's Home property is a uniquely large landscaped open space, one of the few remaining unprotected open space areas in the eastern part of residential Washington DC. The planning process for development of the AFRH-W property should be timed to accommodate consideration of the current comprehensive planning process of the DC Dept of Parks and Recreation.

The District of Columbia Dept. of Parks and Recreation included on the draft EIS service list. Our understanding is that they did not learn of the EIS until July 1, inadequate time to properly respond. The comment period for the EIS should be extended so that they can complete their comprehensive planning process in a way that can consider potential use of part of the Soldier's Home Property to meet District Park need.

A park that would consist of much of the western half of the Soldier's Home property would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Columbia Heights, and to planned dense residential development along Georgia Ave., Sherman Ave., as well as dense development planned for the rest of the Soldier's Home site. If connected to McMillan Reservoir, it would provide direct park access to Le Droit Park and Eckington, also areas underserved by parkland in the District. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northeast DC.
The open space already provided by Soldier's Home is an integral design element of the adjacent Historic Register-eligible row house neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View, developed in the early 1900s. Surrounding streets to the west of the Home were designed to take advantage of vistas of the open space provided by the Home's property. For example, the vista from Grant Circle down Illinois Ave to Area 6 is an important anchoring design element in the eastern part of Petworth. The Preservation Element of the Federal Elements direct federal agencies to “protect reciprocal views along rights-of-way and from ... circles (p. 11).” Replacing the vista of this green expanse that opens out over a view of the federal core of the city with a view of an eight-story apartment building would significant harm the integrity of historic city plan in this part of the capital.

Among the alternatives, the EIS has not considered alternatives that would provide significant parkland for the neighborhood to the west of the home. As the name Park View suggests, the neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View adjacent to the western boundary of Soldier’s Home were developed in the early 1900s around the presence of the Soldier's Home as open space.

It is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the draft EIS. Notice of the EIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local office responsible for the monument core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway.

The draft EIS states that the proposed master plan alternatives would have long-term, major, adverse cumulative impacts on the historic resources of the Soldier's Homproperty and the adjacent National Register-Eligible Historic Districts. As described above, the proposed alternatives are also inconsistent with park and open space directives of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements. No alternative, except the no-development alternative, considers anything except significant built development on all 6 areas. Other alternatives should be considered that will mitigate those impacts on historic landscapes and buildings and fulfill the intended role of the Soldier's Home property as open space or parkland under the Comprehensive Plan, including:

1) No development on the area west of a line extending north through the Soldier's Home Property from 1st St. NW. This would buffer adjacent residential neighborhoods to the west from the noise, heat, air pollution, traffic and change in water table that is likely to result from development on the eastern half of the property. It would reduce the environmental impact to the Washington region as a whole by avoiding creating of a large area of impervious surface in a drainage area and a new heat island. It would protect almost all of the currently undisturbed historical landscape and buildings.

2) Exchange of land west of a line extending north through the Soldier's Home Property from 1st St. NW that is not actively used for ARRH mission for surplus federal land. The Soldier's Home property to go to the National Park Service for
development as public park space as part of the President Lincoln and Soldier's Home National Monument. The land received by AFRH in exchange should be used for revenue generating purposes for the AFRH. The park would provide the environmental, social, and historic preservation mitigation described in alternative 1 above as well as meeting the park and open space and historic preservation directives of the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. The land received by AFRH in the exchange should be such as to provide comparable revenue generation for the AFRH to the most likely, legal land use allowable on the exchanged Soldier's Home property. This alternative would have the advantage of achieving AFRH-W financial goals while permanently assuring that residents of the AFRH-W would enjoy something much closer to the open space and environmental amenities they currently enjoy than would be possible under any of the considered development alternatives.

3) Sell the land to the west of a line extending north through the Soldier's Home Property from 1st St. NW that is not actively used for AFRH mission to the District of Columbia for use as city park. This would buffer adjacent residential neighborhoods to the west from the noise, heat, air pollution, traffic and change in water table that is likely to result from development on the eastern half of the property. It would protect almost all of the currently undisturbed historical landscape and buildings as well as meeting the park and open space and historic preservation directives of the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. The sale would provide revenue to the AFRH. Perhaps part of the sales arrangement could be an agreement not to challenge increased density on the eastern half of the property. Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned commits to working to find sources of private funding from foundations and large individual donors to augment city funding for purchase of the property. This alternative would have the advantage of achieving AFRH-W financial goals while permanently assuring that residents of the AFRH-W would enjoy something much closer to the open space and environmental amenities they currently enjoy than would be possible under any of the considered development alternatives.

4) Putting no built development on historic character areas.
None of the alternatives are described with enough specificity for residents to truly understand the impact on their neighborhood. To address this vagueness there should be significant, substantive participation of the residents in the area comparable to that required by DC planning and development process.

Residents need to be advised of how and when they can participate in the Section 106 Historic Review process with enough advanced notice (6 months) that they can organize to participate.

At p. 1-1 the EIS describes the AFRH as "a 272 acre underdeveloped, urban site". This characterization demonstrates the insensitivity shown throughout this EIS to the critical role this property plays in the landscape of the Capital and its historic, environmental and public space integrity. The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital specifically lists U.S. Soldier's and Airmen's Home as an important, historic area of open space that should be conserved and opened to public recreational use to the extent physically compatible with the use of other parts of the property for military purposes (p. 8 of the Park and Open Space Element of the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital). As noted above, in multiple other ways, the alternatives for development proposed in the EIS are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plans Federal Element requirements among these: protection of terrain features, meeting increasing need for parks, providing connectivity of federal public open space (McMillan Reservoir and potentially Fort Totten Park), preservation of the historic urban design of the National Capital, protection of the landscape context of historic parks (President Lincoln and Soldier's Home National Monument), protection of views inward from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl (specifically mentioning the escarpment north of Florida Ave, of which the Soldier's Home property is a part), and protection of views from circles in the extensions of the L'Enfant Plan (Sherman Circle to Grant Circle to Area 6 in the EIS).

The AFRH's need for revenue does not give it the legal right to destroy an important public open space in contravention of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital and other federal law. The law does not allow homeowners to build 120 story office buildings on their single-family zoned property just because they need to pay their medical bills or pay for their children's college education, especially when such use would violate other legal requirements. The use of land must be consistent with the applicable land use plan and other legal requirements. The mere fact that Congress has approved sale of the land does not make all possible land uses legal, nor is the Act approving sale of the land itself necessarily invulnerable to legal challenge. Other alternatives to meet the AFRH's funding requirements that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital, federal environmental and historic preservation law and Executive Order 11988 have not been considered. The Federal Elements themselves suggest alternatives that have not been considered that could help the AFRH meet their financial needs in a way consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and federal laws. This includes engaging the National Park
Service and the General Services Administration in finding alternative surplus federal land that is suitable for dense development or other revenue generation that could be exchanged for the Soldier's Home property and movement of Soldier's Home property to the National Park Service. This alternative should be pursued.

- The EIS lists as an objective of the planned development to "provide sufficient revenue to support the AFRH's goal of resident-focused care while replenishing the depleting Trust Fund, and to "Grow the Trust Fund to not only meet the needs of today's residents, but the needs of future generations as well (p.i.")." The EIS does not provide an accounting of how much money is needed for this purpose, how much money is likely to be generated by each proposal and in particular the alternatives for each designated development area for each proposed alternative. There is no indication of how the funds would be managed so that the AFRH does not in a few years insist that it has to develop the remainder of its land to fulfill its mandate. The AFRH has already sold off substantial portions of its original property to fund its activities. The land currently occupied by the Washington Hospital complex was sold several years ago. Land east of N. Capital St. was sold recently to Catholic University. There is no accounting in the EIS for how this money was used and why it was not sufficient to meet the AFRH budgetary needs. In fact, this pattern of land sale for development suggests that the current land sales and proposed development are only a stop-gap measure that will not assure the AFRH financial stability into a meaningful time in the future. Given the burden that the proposed development would impose on the entire District of Columbia and in particular, neighboring communities, and given the irreplaceable loss of historic open space, the lost opportunity for development of greatly needed and highly valuable park land in the center of the District, and the irreversible disruption of the historic physical plan for the District, it seems incumbent on the AFRH to show that this action has a reasonable chance of actually accomplishing the stated financial goal. This analysis has not been included in the draft EIS. It needs to be included.

- The neighborhood to the west of Soldier's Home is politically well-organized with many well functioning neighborhood civic organization and an active ANC. The neighborhood pays close attention to land use issues and has successfully challenged plans to build the Greenline of the metro above ground and the proposal for a District DMV building at the corner of Georgia and New Hampshire Aves. NW. Thus it seems very strange that none of these civic organizations were aware of the Scoping Meetings held in September of 2004 before they happened. Since that time, when we contacted the AFRH to inquire about what was happening with the site we were told that there was nothing to report. Then in late May 2005, after most of our organizations went on summer recess and many of our neighbors had made plans to be out of town, we learned that a draft EIS was being released. This timing, coupled with the short length of the comment period, has made it impossible for us to use our normal means of action through neighborhood organization meetings to respond to the draft EIS. This is not meaningful public participation. The EIS should specify a meaningful process for public participation, comparable to that required under DC planning and development law. Without this, the goal stated in the EIS to "ensure an
open, participatory process with the AFRH-W residents and the community" is empty words.

- Neighborhood associations to the west of Soldier's Home were not given notice of when the Section 106 process was initiated which may have prejudiced our ability to participate in that process. Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned, United Neighborhood Coalition and other neighborhood organizations are currently inquiring into how to become participants in this process.

- Petworth and Columbia Heights Residents Concerned requests status as a consulting party to the Section 106 process.

- Use of property values and associated taxes as the sole indicators of financial impact of the proposed development on the neighboring community does not provide an adequate measure of this impact. These only capture impact on long-term wealth, and do not capture impact on cash flows. Many neighboring homeowners use basement apartments to create a stream of income that helps them pay their mortgages and meet other expenses. Others use their basements for living space without which they might be forced to seek larger, less affordable housing elsewhere. Changes in water tables may result from dense development on nearby higher ground and this may impair the use of these basements as rental property and living space. Also, many residents do not have off street parking. Increased traffic and increased parking demand will likely result in residents paying more parking tickets. In a poor to moderate income neighborhood, $30 parking tickets are a substantial financial burden. The EIS should include analysis of these impacts.

- The indicators used to assess impact on minority and low-income populations are also inadequate. In particular, impact of proposed development on ambient temperatures that could result in higher cooling bills and higher mortality and morbidity rates should be included as an indicator. In addition to looking at changes in ambient conditions, the likely impacts of these changes on the health of these populations and on medical expenses and their ability to insure must be considered for all environmental impacts. Likely impacts include increased incidence and severity of asthma and other respiratory illness, increased incidence and severity of coronary and circulatory conditions, increased hearing loss, increased stress related illness.

- The indicators of impact on natural resources are inadequate. The current set of indicators is limited to impact on ponds on the Soldier's Home property itself. The perennial stream running through the center of the project area is hydrologically connected to other water bodies flowing into the Anacostia and/or Potomac Rivers. Increased run-off from the dense development proposed under the EIS will have adverse impacts on the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers. It is likely that the increased run-off will have impacts on property owners downhill from the site. The severe flooding experiences in the DuPont Circle area in the early 1990s after severe rainstorms demonstrates the environmental function that open spaces like that at the
Soldier's Home play in preventing environmental and property damage from run-off. These likely impacts need to be further quantified in the EIS.

- Indicators of impacts on the transportation system should include expected increases in auto accidents and pedestrian accidents and deaths from the increased traffic.

- In addition to using changes in decibel levels as an indicator of increased noise level that can be expected from the proposed development alternatives, the impact of these changes on hearing and other health outcomes for area residents needs to be enumerated.

- Indicators of impacts on historic resources (p. 1-10) appear to be limited to the impact on structures on the AFRH-W site that will be demolished. The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear that given the historic importance of the Capital area in the nation's life, that historic preservation concerns are much broader than this. Indicators should also include disturbance and development of historic landscapes on the Soldier's Home property, the rim of the topographic bowl of the Washington basin which includes almost all of the AFRH-W site as well as visual and physical impacts on the adjacent historic neighborhoods built in the early 20th century as extensions of the L'Enfant plan.

- In addition to increases in emissions over time as an indication of changes in air quality, the EIS needs to estimate the impact of these changes on ambient air quality in both the immediate vicinity of the AFRH-W property and the Washington area as a whole. This estimate needs to include the interaction of multiple pollutants and changed ambient temperature associated with the proposed development. These estimates of impact on ambient air quality then need to be used to provide estimates of the change in health outcomes for residents living in or near the AFRH-W site as well as in the Washington Metropolitan area air shed. Changed ambient air quality will also have impacts on built structures in the area. This needs to be included as an indicator of impact. In particular, impact on historic structures and cemeteries both on the AFRH-W, in nearby neighborhoods, and in the Washington area as a whole must be assessed in the EIS.

- Auto emissions contribute to nitrogen deposition in the Chesapeake Bay. Nutrient pollution is causing widespread destruction of natural habitat in the Chesapeake Bay and auto emissions have been found to be a significant contributor to this. These impacts also need to be included in the evaluation of impact of proposed development on air quality.

- Development design and site landscaping on historic properties or changes that can affect historic properties or historic landscapes in the District of Columbia or that affect the historic plan of the District of Columbia or views from circles are explicitly subject to the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements and are therefore not outside the scope of the EIS. These must be given consideration.
This is particularly true since the outcome of the EIS will be selection of one of the alternative development plans presented and any proposed mitigation measures and no further role for public participation by neighbors, civic organizations, or the District government is specified beyond comment on this EIS and participation in the Section 106 process.

- Despite the fact that the purpose of the EIS is “creation of a master plan for the AFRH-W that will sustain the AFRH and its primary source of funding, the AFRH Trust Fund” (p. 2-1), no analysis of the expected financial consequences of each alternative is provided.

- Analysis of development on zone 6 has not considered its relationship to District of Columbia Department of Planning plans for development on Georgia Avenue. All alternatives must be analyzed in relationship to development currently contemplated in District of Columbia planning for Georgia Ave. NW, in Columbia Heights, along the adjacent N. Capitol St. corridor, and neighborhoods to the east of the AFRH-W property.

- The EIS fails to note in the description of the affected environment that the AFRH-W occupies a prominence along the topographic rim of the Washington basin. This is a geologic feature that is designated for protection under the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital.

- The draft EIS provides inadequate analysis of the ability of the pond on the property, that provide stormwater retention would be able to handle the added run-off from substantial increases in paved area on areas that drain into them.

- The description of wildlife that use the home is very brief and incomplete. Area residents regularly see deer on the property as well as raccoons and possum. Further analysis is needed.

- The EIS description of the project area history gives incomplete mention of the extensive use of the Anderson Cottage by President Lincoln during his Presidency and no mention of the use of the AFRH-W property as a summer residence by other U.S. presidents during the 19th Century. The history fails to explain that the reason for this use was that the property provided a serene country retreat away from the stress and heat of the then developed area of Washington near the mall. This information should be included in the history of the site in the EIS.

- A more detailed description of the location, nature and history of historic landscape features on the AFRH-W property than are provided in the draft EIS are needed for those outside the AFRH-W to be able to assess the impact of development alternatives on historic landscape features as required by the Federal Elements of the
also needs to have modeling of the impact of the demolition, operation of the new buildings, plus the added traffic on local and regional air quality as measured by these indicators.

- Further analysis is needed of the impact of removal of trees, green space coupled with the increased auto emissions on global warming.

- The EIS needs to clarify how storm water requirements will be met during construction as well as during operation or after completion of the development.

- The EIS must include further analysis of the impact of all wastes, solid and hazardous from proposed development, including impacts on landfill capacity.

- The parking plans and traffic patterns and noise analysis have adequately addressed the full impact of traffic and noise from visitors to planned hospital, institutional and commercial development.

- The noise analysis has not adequately addressed the impact of increased emergency vehicle traffic, including helicopters and ambulances, associated with the planned hospital expansion on adjoining neighborhoods, including the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, and retreat houses in the Catholic University/Brookland area.

- The EIS analysis of particulate matter and dust during construction and after completion of planned development is inadequate.

Sincerely,

Petworth and Columbia Residents Concerned.

[Signature]

Sandra Hoffmann
Contact person

701 Taylor St, NW
Washington, DC 20014

(202) 328-5022 (o)
hoffmann@rff.org
Dear Mr. Bailey:

Please add this comment to the Draft EIS for the AFRH development master plan.

The Armed Forces Retirement Home must select the "no action" alternative.

The only way to bring about a benefit to the home's residents, the community and the nation is to scrap the three development alternatives.

The home's residents don't want to build on the open land they enjoy for hiking and gardening.

The people who live in the neighborhoods around the home don't want the traffic congestion, ground pollution and air pollution this intense development would bring.

The people of America would oppose this rush to development before they have the chance to enjoy Lincoln's cottage and see the land as our greatest president saw it.

Too few people have known about this rush to development. By selecting the no action alternative, all parties would have more time to get involved in selecting a long-term vision that truly benefits the home, the community and the nation.

Congress would never have approved this sale if it was fully briefed on the massive scope of this development, the neighborhood opposition and the importance of Lincoln's cottage.

There are many other, less destructive ways to get the Armed Forces Retirement Home the money it needs without destroying its most precious asset.

The area around the home is already one of the most congested, crowded areas of the entire East Coast. The AFRH's 300 acres is a precious jewel of green space and open land. Once developed, the open space will be gone forever.

For all the above reasons, select the no-action alternative.

Then, let's do it right. The Armed Forces Retirement Home must consider alternatives that include open space, parkland, walking trails, gardens, perhaps a national park or historic area.

This could be a true jewel within one of the greatest cities in the world.

We look forward to working with you on the next, great plan for a great asset.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
John and Ellen Hughes
3656 Park Place N.W.
Washington D.C. 20010
202-545-3999
e-mail: jhughes53@comcast.net
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Lasterine Jackson
Address: 438 Newton PL, NW
Affiliation: 
Phone: (202) 316-1831

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments
I too like Mr. Douglass who lives 400ft away from Soldiers Home have sentimental feelings about allowing such a large development to be built. There are lots of kids in this area and the traffic along the side streets will be unbearable. I have lived in this neighborhood 40+ years and I am sure money can be raised to help the soldiers in another manner.

#15

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 8 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
As a 19 year old college student, contemplating joining the armed forces, I think that with the property that they want to develop they should use it for another retirement facility. I know that if I intact decide on joining the armed forces and one day I will intact be a senior, I would want somewhere to go when I am too tired to take care of a house or other property that I might own. This estate was created for veterans, people that have served their country. Well, I say no construction on the soldier's home.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.

For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Tim Jones
Address: 737 E 4th Ave.
Affiliation: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Phone: (202) 722-0701

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:
Return to full in-person agriculture. Use of land studies have shown that the most sustainable farms are close to urban centers. A certified USDA organic farm will reduce AFRH costs of operation and generate revenue. Green house + hydroponic gardening and generate even more revenue streams. NO fresh fruits & vegetables can be made available to Washington Hospital Complex. Fish farming and be source of fish as well.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
Dear Mr. Vallee,

Thank you for the opportunity to present my comments on the AfrH Washington Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). My comments on the DEIS are as follows:

1) I am AGAINST the development of zone 6. This zone will be the most destructive, both culturally and environmentally speaking. A call for a more thorough assessment of impact to wildlife is in order. To simply say this is an urban area so impact is minimal is absolutely false. All development options were very similar; though Option 2 is the WORST.

Option 1, do nothing, would be my choice. But since that is not financially viable, there should be an option that provides something for the community. There should be a park or public green space for people, not just 100% development for maximum profit. These plans do not take into consideration the local community, but are designed to benefit outside developers most.

2) Some important stakeholders were not on your list of individuals and organizations to whom the DEIS was provided. The District of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) was not served with the DEIS. My understanding is that they did not learn of the draft EIS until July 1.

Inadequate time to properly respond and even then only learned of the DEIS through concerned city residents. The comment period for the DEIS should be extended so that DPR can complete its own comprehensive planning process in a way that can consider potential use of part of the AfrH property to meet city park needs. In addition, it is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the DEIS. Notice of the DEIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local office responsible for Washington’s monumental core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway.

3) The DEIS needs to provide information regarding the exact amount of money that AfrH needs to raise through this development process. Dollar amounts are keep to enabling full public participation.

4) For parcels, or portions of parcels, which have historic significance or character, the development plan must spare them from development, possibly including through alternatives such as land trusts or sale of certain parcels, or portions, for use a parkland. Both options should be added as viable alternatives that allow for revenue but also conservation.

5) Retention of all of the existing mature trees in the historic character areas are particularly essential for historic-preservation purposes. All development alternatives must be crafted in such a way as to preserve the mature trees.

6) Other true alternatives to the proposed development plan must be explored. The four "alternatives" listed in the DEIS are not really different from one another, but merely slight variations on a single theme.
More effort should be made to provide true alternatives with a variety of financial and real estate options to solve the underlying concern — namely the budget of the APRH.

7) The historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence is overlooked. There should be more detail regarding Section 106 impacts including consideration of knowledgeable sources on the subject, such as Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Federal entity) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

8) The impact on traffic is vague and unexplored. It requires more details, specifics, and cost information. There is no information about the impact on the community of the number of peak-hour trips suggested in terms of cost to the city of Washington DC to address, the damage to the local infrastructure, and the overall impact on the surrounding community.

9) The DBS mentions any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but that standard does not actually appear to be consistently applied in the document. That error must be corrected. For example, alternatives 2 and 3A suggest development in Zone 6 that is not at all in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood’s architecture. The existing neighborhood is comprised entirely of rowhouse architecture. The maximum of three stories in height.

10) If land is to be developed under “GOV” zoning, then all government building standards must be applied, including the most up-to-date environmental standards. For example, the EIS should detail that any development on GOV-zoned land would have to be GSA LEED certified.

11) The draft EIS does not address honestly the fact that the APRH is proposing to develop a high density development of park-like open space in the middle of a neighborhood that is disproportionately low income, elderly, and African American. The density of the proposed development is so high that is likely to adversely affect the health and well-being (physical and mental) of these neighbors. Specifically, the Census tracts adjacent to APRH on the west have median incomes that place the neighborhood in the lowest 20th percentile for income in the Washington area. Three tracts are also 82-90% African American (compared to 12.4% nationally) with disproportionate percentages of individuals over age 65, below the poverty line, and suffering from disability.

12) The proposed development will have disproportionate negative health effects on minority populations. Specifically, air pollution problems are local as well as regional in scope. The nearby neighborhoods would experience the largest change in air quality from the increased traffic and other pollution sources associated with the proposed development. Further, local air pollution is linked to increased incidence of respiratory illness. Three different recent studies being published this month in Epidemiology find a significant link between daily ground-level ozone in cities and mortality rates in the next 3 days. Ozone is formed when pollutants, such as car exhaust mix with heat and sunlight. Editors of Epidemiology have made the rather unprecedented comment that together these studies point to an “urgent need to reduce public exposure to ambient ozone by all possible means.” To that fact must be added that communities of color across the nation are experiencing disproportionately high levels of asthma...
and other respiratory illness. The deteriorated local air quality will also worsen these health problems in this predominantly African American neighborhood. The heat-retention effect of the loss of current AFRH green space will also promote additional local ground-level ozone formation. Finally, the current mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property.

13) The EIS does not consider the heat-retention impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadow, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surface will have on temperatures in the surrounding area. The dominant green space on the current AFRH campus has a cooling effect that will be radically altered in heat-retaining buildings, parking lots, and roads are constructed where grass and trees now stand. The increased temperatures will result in higher cooling bills, particularly burdensome for the elderly poor, or an increased frequency of dangerous summer conditions for those who cannot afford air conditioning, again particularly the elderly poor. Increased temperatures will also worsen the impact of the increased automotive exhaust associated with the proposed development by promoting local ground-level ozone formation.

14) At the current time, the mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.

15) The transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between the affected AFRH property and Georgia and New Hampshire Avenues. The impact of the level of increased traffic considered is unlikely to be limited to the main streets currently studied in the EIS. More specifically, the neighborhoods to the west of the AFRH property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational services provided by streets in Petworth and Park View. In addition, the District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from automobiles on city streets. Bringing a large number of automobiles into narrow residential streets will likely increase the mortality rate in the area to the west of AFRH, particularly because of the relatively large number of elderly and children.

16) Many residents in the area to the west of AFRH use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. AFRH enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The draft EIS has not considered how dense construction on the AFRH property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area. A rise in the water table seems likely to result from dense development on this land. A raised water table could result in a serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income.

17) Both residents of the AFRH and neighbors who live to the west of the home benefit, much as President Lincoln did when the Anderson
cottage was built, from the relative calm and quiet provided by the
green campus of the Home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the
area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able
to walk past the property and to see it’s green expanses when looking out
their windows or down their streets. In this way, the APRA has
provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves
their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter
what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its
residents no matter their income because it does not look like a poor
neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty
and calm will take away something of irreplaceable value in their
lives.

18) Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the DEIS has not adequately
taken into account the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for
the National Capital adequately. In particular, there appears to have
been an marked inattention to the Parks and Open Element and the
Preservation and Historic Features Element. The Parks and Open Space
Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear
that the capital area is facing increasing demand for open space and
park due to increasing population and tourist pressure. The Element
defines open space as "any land or water surface that is not occupied
by buildings, a broad definition that encompasses the vast majority of
federal property" (p. 2). Under the Park and Open Space Element
directs that federal agencies should:

1. maintain and conserve federal open space as a means of shaping and
enabling urban areas (p. 7); 2. preserve open space that is crucial to
the long-term quality of life of a neighborhood or region; 3. conserve
and maintain the essential open space character of areas in the region
with significant park, open space cultural or natural qualities that
contribute to the setting of the National Capital Region." The Element
specifically includes McMillan Reservoir to the immediate south of Zone
5 as an example.

4. "Conserve portions of military reservations that add significantly
to the inventory of park, open space, and natural areas and should, to
the extent practicable, be used by the public for recreation" (i.e.,)
when security considerations permit (p. 8-9)." The Element explicitly
includes U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home as an example of this.
5. "Maintain and conserve lives and other vegetation in the landscaped
buffer areas of federal installations in a natural condition."

The Park and Open Space Element also stresses the importance of
connectivity between parks and open spaces in the Capital Region. As
already noted, the Element has identified both APRA and the McMillan
Reservoir to its immediate south as areas to be preserved as open space
and parkland. Port Potomac to the northeast of APRA is also an
important part of the long-term open space plan for the Capital region.
As land is currently configured, links could be made between these
three areas through green bikeways. Loss of the APRA property to
development could seriously impact this open space connectivity.

The Parks and Open Space Element highlights the unique role that parks
created around historic sites play in the Capital Region. The federal
government is to "establish and preserve historic parks as important
legacies of national, historic, architectural and landscape
significance."

The Anderson cottage and two acres surrounding it have been designated a National Monument because of its importance in Lincoln and other 19th century presidencies. But as the DEIS notes, the importance of the APRH site does not stop with this. To its immediate north is the first national military cemetery, predating Arlington National Cemetery. The APRH itself has been in continuous use as a final home for members of the U.S. Armed Forces since the middle of the 19th century. It is the U.S. equivalent of Les Invalides in Paris. Its central landscaped core and the agricultural land (now garden) at House 6 are essentially unchanged from the 19th century and provide a coherent and important historical context for the National Monument, cemetery and historically important home. The elements are very clear about the importance of protecting just such landscapes from destruction.

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Federal Plan also commits the federal government to protecting terrain features of the region through careful design. In particular, it notes the importance of maintaining vistas of the Monumental core and L'Enfant's city and protecting the escarpments that provide these outlooks. As the third highest point in the District of Columbia and one of the only undeveloped areas, the APRH property is one of the areas that falls under the federal government's commitment to protect "topographic bowl features."

The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements complements the Parks and Open Space Element. The Preservation and Historic Features Element is not limited to preservation of historic structures. A major concern is the "preservation and strengthening historic urban design features, such as the L'Enfant Plan." As part of this, the Plan commits to "protecting the character of the region's natural features, many of which have historical or cultural significance, such as the ridge of the topographic bowl, agricultural land, and designed landscapes."

All of these elements are present on the APRH property and the alternatives do not seem to adequately take these into account. In particular plans to develop Zones 5 and 6 will disturb historically agricultural land that was an integral part of the function of both APRH and the Anderson cottage, as well as disrupt the landscape of the topographic bowl. In particular, the Federal Plan calls for the federal government to "protect the skyline formed by the region's natural features, particularly the topographic bowl around central Washington" and to "protect and enhance the vistas and views, both natural and designed, that are an integral part of the national capital's image."

The Preservation and Historic Features Federal Elements set policies regarding federal government stewardship of historic properties and the historic plan of Washington, D.C. Under these elements federal agencies should:

1. protect the settings of historic properties, including views to and from sites where significant, as integral parts of the historic character of the property (p. 81); 2. protect the reservations that contain historic landscapes and features from incompatible changes or incursion; 3. protect views .. from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl from inappropriate incursions. Open human
should be preserved to allow for public use and enjoyment of these views. (Examples include the embankment north of Florida Ave, NW.)

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital Federal Element directs the federal government to look to redevelopment of surplus federal property as a means of adding to the region's inventory of parks and open space and notes that future acquisitions could occur by purchase, easement, donation or exchange. An alternative that has not been included in the EIS is exchange of land in Zones 5 and 6 for other federal surplus land that could be more appropriately developed. Exchanging this land for land in another location and development there could provide needed financial resources for AFRH.

Zones 5 and 6 could then continue to play the important role they currently play in the District's system of federal open space by protecting historic landscapes, providing appropriate context for an important historical site and protecting views of the central core of the capital as directed by the Federal Elements. If the land were transferred to the National Park Service to enlarge the Lincoln Cottage National Monument, this would not only preserve open space but would help protect the historical integrity of the setting for the cottage as a place of retreat and rest, thus preventing the kind of encroachment of inappropriate new development that has adversely affected the Manassas Battle Field and other major Civil War historic sites. It would also enhance public access to much needed open space in the District as a whole as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, it may serve to substantially mitigate adverse environmental impacts of development in the eastern Zones 2, 3, 4.

The District of Columbia's Parks and Recreation is currently in the middle of a comprehensive planning process. As part of this effort they are conducting a survey of park and recreation needs indicating a significant deficit of park space in the Petworth, Park View, Columbia Heights area.

The AFRH property is a uniquely large landscaped open space -- one of the few remaining unprotected open space areas in the eastern part of residential Washington, DC. The planning process should also be timed to accommodate consideration of the current comprehensive planning process of the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation.

The location of a park in Zone 6 in the AFRH EIS would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Colombia Heights and to planned dense residential development along Georgia Avenue, as well as dense development planned for the rest of the AFRH site. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northwest and northeast D.C.

The open space already provided by AFRH is an integral design element of the adjacent Petworth and Park View rowhouse neighborhoods, developed in the early 1980s. Surrounding streets to the west of the Home were designed to take advantage of vistas of the open space provided by the Home's property. For example, the view from Grant Circle down Illinois Ave to Zone 6 is an important anchoring design element in the eastern part of Petworth. The Preservation Element of
the federal elements direct federal agencies to "protect reciprocal views along rights-of-way and from circles (p. 11)." Replacing the vista of this green expanse that opens out over a view of the federal core of the city with a view of an eight-story apartment building would significant harm the integrity of historic city plan in this part of the capital.

Among the alternatives, the DEIS has not considered alternatives that would provide significant parkland for the neighborhood to the west of AFRH. As the name Park View suggests, the neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View adjacent to the western boundary of Soldier's Home were developed in the early 1900s around the presence of the Soldier's Home as open space.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I am confident that adequate and appropriate consideration of the comments of all affected parties will produce a better and result for AFRH, its residents, and the multitude of other city residents who will be affected by the proposed development.

In addition--the AFRH needs money, but the Washington DC campus is not operating at full capacity. In order to rectify this, the current residents of the AFRH in Gulfport should be relocated to Washington and the entire Gulfport campus should be sold for development. The historical and environmental value of the Washington DC campus clearly makes it the asset to preserve. The historical value of the Gulfport campus is negligible, but its commercial value is great ("The Mississippi Gulf Coast region boasts some of the finest beaches, fishing, casinos, resorts, entertainment, shopping, and championship golf courses in the southeast United States." -- AFRH website). Liquidation of the Gulfport campus should therefore yield considerable revenue.

In the 21st century it is not fitting for our nation to continue maintenance of redundant, unsustainable facilities for the segregation of veterans from Union and Confederate states. In reverent memory of President Lincoln, the Washington DC campus should be preserved and improved for its original purpose, the care and honor of our veterans from every state, and be re-dedicated with the opening of the Lincoln Cottage as a monument to the preservation of the Union.

Sincerely,

Christine Kennyott
6017 Illinois Ave, NW
WDC, 20011

cc: Councilmember Adrian Fenty
Councilmember Jim Graham
The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton
July 6, 2005

Mr. Donald Dailey
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011


Dear Mr. Dailey:

Thank you for the opportunity to present our comments on the Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington (AFRH-W) Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). We are deeply concerned about the potential adverse effect of the proposed master plan upon the neighborhood in which we live - Petworth - its potential adverse effect upon other surrounding neighborhoods such as Park View - as well as what seems to be its certain adverse effect upon the AFRH-W itself. Without thorough study, consideration of all of the potential effects caused by the proposed master plan, without carefully considered advice and counsel from both AFRH-W and local neighborhood residents, and without a full examination and presentation of all of the information that is available, we feel that the master plan, as proposed, has the potential to forever compromise the integrity of these National Register-eligible historic resources. After our examination of the DEIS, we have a few specific concerns that we would like to have addressed by the AFRH-W in some sort of direct interaction with the local community as well as, most importantly, addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS). Our topics of concern are as follows:

1. First and foremost, there is a dearth of information in the DEIS concerning the proposed master plan. We would like to see a much fuller description and explanation. The master plan proposed by the AFRH-W is only presented in the DEIS in the vaguest of terms. Maps of the site showing outlined borders of potential development zones, simple square footage estimates, and projected simple financials do not provide the information necessary in order to adequately determine the effect of the proposed master plan upon the historic fabric of the AFRH-W, upon the historic fabric of surrounding neighborhoods, upon surrounding roadways, and upon the local environment. The AFRH-W issued a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS on August 17, 2004. Realistically, planning for this proposed development must have started well before that date. Even using the most-conservatively estimated start-date, however, planning for the proposed development started nearly a year ago. It is simply not credible that, a year into the planning process, the master plan consists only of the information presented to the public in the DEIS. More information has to be available, and should be presented to the public. The DEIS (and by extension, the Final EIS) is useless without inclusion of the full proposed master plan; it seems impossible to make the determinations of effect presented in the DEIS with the bare-bones information about the proposed master plan that has been provided.

2. The Area of Potential Effect (APE), as presented in the DEIS, appears to be too small to adequately determine the effect of the proposed master plan upon the National Register-listed and -eligible sites in its vicinity. In addition, the methodology used to determine the boundaries of the APE is neither described nor justified in the text of the DEIS. The boundaries of the APE should be expanded to include the entirety of the National Register-eligible neighborhoods surrounding the AFRH-W, and the methodology used to determine the boundaries of the APE should be described and justified in the text of the Final EIS. The boundaries of the APE currently include the National Register-listed and National Historic Landmark D.S. Soldiers and Airmen's Home, the entire National Register-eligible AFRH-W, and the entire National Register-eligible Park View neighborhood. The APE, however, excludes the majority of the National Register-eligible Petworth neighborhood. It does not seem that an adequate determination of effect for the entire National Register-eligible Petworth neighborhood could have been possible if only a small portion of that neighborhood is included within the boundaries of the APE. The boundaries of the APE should be expanded to include all of Petworth, and a new determination of effect should be prepared to reflect the expanded APE.
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Michael J. Longwell
Address: 3700 N Capitol St NW, Washington, DC 20011
Affiliation: AFRH-W resident
Phone: (202) 882-0616

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

The one solution to solving the AFRH financial problems was not addressed. This solution would raise the $50/month deduction from active duty military (enlisted and warrants) to $150. ($150 is already authorized but not implemented). This solution would generate an additional $4 million per fiscal year exceeding by $3 million in any of the proposed plans. This solution (a very viable and realistic one) would generate more revenue without leasing or selling of any land. This solution would be paid for by the very service members who one day may be living here. (It makes a lot of common sense). This is a realistic solution (not a political one).

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afrh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decke (202) 205-5821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Elizabeth Martin
Address: 4001 Illinois Ave, NW
Affiliation: Resident
Phone: 202-782-0345

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments
See attached letter

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 8 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
July 6, 2005

Donald Dailey (donald.dailey@afrh.gov)
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20011

Re: Response to Draft EIS for AFRH—Washington Plan

Dear Mr. Dailey,

Thank you for the opportunity to present my comments on the AFRH Washington Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). My comments on the DEIS are as follows:

Other true alternatives to the proposed development plan must be explored. The four "alternatives" listed in the DEIS are not really different from one another, but merely slight variations on a single theme. More effort should be made to provide true alternatives with a variety of financial and real estate options to solve the underlying concern—namely the budget of the AFRH.

The DEIS mentions any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but that standard does not actually appear to be consistently applied in the document. That error must be corrected. For example, alternatives 2 and 3A suggest development in Zone 6 that is not at all in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood's architecture. The existing neighborhood is comprised entirely of row house architecture, with a maximum of three stories in height.

The historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence is also overlooked. There should be more detail regarding Section 106 impacts including consideration of knowledgeable sources on the subject, such as Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (federal entity) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. For parcels, or portions of parcels, which have historic significance or character, the development plan must spare them from development, possibly including through alternatives such as land trusts or sale of certain parcels, or portions, for use as parkland. Both options should be added as viable alternatives that allow for revenue but also conservation.

At the current time, the mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality. Further, retention of all of the existing mature trees in the historic character areas are particularly essential for historic-preservation purposes. All development alternatives should be crafted in such a way as to preserve the mature trees.

The EIS does not consider the heat-retention impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadow, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surface will have on temperatures in the
and the McMillan Reservoir to its immediate south as areas to be preserved as open space and parkland. Fort Totten to the northeast of AFRH is also an important part of the long-run open space plan for the Capital region. As land is currently configured, links could be made between these three areas through green bikeways. Loss of the AFRH property to development could seriously impair this open space connectivity.

The District of Columbia Parks and Recreation is currently in the middle of a comprehensive planning process. As part of this effort they are conducting a survey of park and recreation needs indicating a significant deficit of park space in the Petworth, Park View, Columbia Heights area. The AFRH property is a uniquely large landscaped open space—one of the few remaining unprotected open space areas in the eastern part of residential Washington, D.C. The planning process should also be timed to accommodate consideration of the current comprehensive planning process of the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation.

Among the alternatives, the DEIS has not considered alternatives that would provide significant parkland for the neighborhood to the west of AFRH. As the name Park View suggests, the neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View adjacent to the western boundary of Soldier’s Home were developed in the early 1900s around the presence of the Soldier’s Home as open space.

Finally, some important stakeholders were not on your list of individuals and organizations to whom the DEIS was provided. The District of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) was not served with the DEIS. My understanding is that they did not learn of the draft DEIS until July 1—an inadequate time to properly respond—and even then only learned of the DEIS through concerned city residents. The comment period for the DEIS should be extended so that DPR can complete its own comprehensive planning process in a way that can consider potential use of part of the AFRH property to meet city park needs. In addition, it is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the DEIS. Notice of the DEIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local office responsible for Washington’s monumental core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I am confident that adequate and appropriate consideration of the comments of all affected parties will produce a better end result for AFRH, its residents, and the multitude of other city residents who will be affected by the proposed development.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Maclin

cc: Councilman Adrian Fenty
    The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name:  Jacqueline Marlow
Address:  730 Quebec Pl. N.W.
Affiliation:  U.A.C.
Phone:  (202) 726-4225

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
[ ] Yes  [ ] No

Comments:
There should be a balance between the need and the community. The presentation of the proposed building should not contrast what is already established in the neighborhood. This is to say it should not look like downtown D.C. Chinatown but that it should blend into the style and fashion of the established neighborhood.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Christopher McCauley
Address: AFRH-800
Affiliation: 
Phone: 202-426-5157

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☒ Yes ☐ No

Comments

Any thoughts as to the increase in crime to come with the influx of thousands of people working & living on the grounds & what will be done to ensure your safety?

why so many housing units here to become just another small part of the veteran complex & why in DC?

what will be the traffic patterns on the home grounds & who will control it, how will the increase in traffic on the grounds impact the traffic in the area? & how & who will be responsible for the upkeep & roadways on the home grounds?

A 150 year plan to turn the tide the military veterans squeezed into a year across what you need to be their beautiful and peaceful home. What a shame.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dalley
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dalley@afh.gov

For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: PATRICIA MCCARTER
Address: 638 DTS Pl NW
Affiliation: _________________________________
Phone: 202 822 8524

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☑ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

I am against #6, put in near north Capitol Dr. Thank you,

[Signature]

Please send comments to:
Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Daley
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.daley@afh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5521
Mr. Wallwork,

I am writing to comment on the draft SIS for the AFRH development proposals. I live with my family in the 600 block of Princeton Place Northwest, about half a block west of the area that now contains the friendship garden. I am sympathetic to the need to generate funds for maintenance and operation of the AFRH but, as a neighbor and a parent, I have concerns about the development proposed. Therefore I request that the development contain a large green space buffer zone between the edge of the property and any housing, commercial, or embassy buildings.

I enjoy views of the AFRH grounds every day. Since the neighborhood has no other parks (other than the small Parkview baseball field at Princeton and Warder), the view is precious. However, the large iron gate separating the AFRH from the neighborhood has always been a source of frustration; we can see the beautiful grounds, but only through bars. My mother used to tell stories of family picnics at the Old Soldiers Home in the 1940s. While I realize that the park grounds will not be wholly opened to the public, I believe the development creates a positive opportunity for permitting the local community to better enjoy the campus. By creating open space accessible to the public between Park Place Northwest and the development, down past the duck pond, the project could accomplish its financial goals while buffering the noise and traffic dangers and adding sorely needed, accessible greenspace.

Also, unlike some of my neighbors, I request that if any housing is created, the AFRH require that at least 15% of the units be affordable to low- to moderate-income families. The rapid gentrification of Parkview and Petworth have priced out many potential buyers and renters who grew up in the area and would like homes of their own. I request that preference for these units be given to longterm DC residents.

In sum, setting development back from the property line, taking a buffer zone park open to all, and requiring a fair number of affordable housing units would make the development of the AFRH a net positive for the surrounding community.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marion Hollehen McFadden
619 Princeton Place NW
Washington, DC 20010
Donald Dailey  
**Armed Forces Retirement Home**  
3700 North Capitol Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20011

**Re: Comments on Draft EIS for AFRH-Washington Master Plan**

Dear Mr. Dailey,

Thank you for the opportunity to present comments on the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH)-Washington Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). As an initial matter, the United Neighborhood Coalition requests status as a consulting party to the historic-preservation (Section 106) process associated with the AFRH-Washington Master Plan and EIS.

Specific to the DEIS, the United Neighborhood Coalition's comments are below (please note that all references to numbered "zones" use the system established in "Figure 2-1: Proposed Development Zones of the DEIS"):

**Comment 1:**

Of paramount importance, other true alternatives to the proposed development plan have not been properly explored. The four "alternatives" listed in the DEIS are not really different from one another, but merely slight variations on a single theme. Additional, true alternatives are needed with a variety of financial and real estate options. As a means of mitigating the impact on historic properties and environmental and social impacts on the immediate neighborhood and larger metropolitan area, and adjacent disproportionately low income, minority, elderly communities the following alternatives should be considered:

A) No development on the area west of a line extending north through the AFRH property from First Street, NW. This would buffer adjacent residential neighborhoods to the west from the noise, heat, air pollution, traffic and change in water table that is likely to result from development on the eastern half of the property. It would protect almost all of the currently undisturbed historical landscape and buildings, thereby mitigating the majority of the potential impact on them.

B) Exchange for surplus federal land of land west of a line extending north through the AFRH property from First Street, NW that is not currently actively used for AFRH's mission. The AFRH property described above could then go to the National Park Service for development as public park
space as part of the Lincoln Cottage Soldier's Home National Monument.
The land received by AFRH in exchange should be used for revenue
generating purposes for the AFRH. The park would provide the
environmental, social, and historic preservation mitigation described in
alternative "A" above, as well as meeting the park and open space and
historic preservation directives of the Federal Elements of the
Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital (see below). The surplus
land received by AFRH should be such as to provide comparable revenue
generation for the AFRH to the most likely, legal land use allowable on
the exchanged AFRH property.

C) Sell the land to the west of a line extending north through the AFRH
property from First Street, NW that is not currently actively used for
AFRH's mission to the District of Columbia for use as city park. This
would buffer adjacent residential neighborhoods to the west from the
noise, heat, air pollution, traffic and change in water table that is likely to
result from development on the eastern half of the property. It would
protect almost all of the currently undisturbed historical landscape and
buildings as well as meeting the park and open space and historic
preservation directives of the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan
for the National Capital. The sale would provide some revenue to the
AFRH. Civic groups in the Petworth and Park View area are committed
to working to find sources of private funding to augment city funding for
purchase of the property.

D) Because the AFRH-Washington campus is not operating at full capacity,
the current residents of the AFRH facilities in Gulfport could be relocated
to Washington and the entire Gulfport campus could be sold for
development. The historical and environmental value of the Washington
DC campus clearly makes it the asset to preserve. The historical value of
the Gulfport campus is negligible, but its commercial value is great ("[t]he
Mississippi Gulf Coast region boasts some of the finest beaches, fishing,
casinos, restaurants, resorts, entertainment, shopping, and championship
golf courses in the southeast United States." -- AFRH web site).
Liquidation of the Gulfport campus could therefore yield considerable
revenue that would meet AFRH's revenue-generation goals. This option
must be considered seriously, and not rejected out-of-hand without full
analysis, because long-term preservation of the historic and environmental
assets associated with the AFRH-Washington campus outweigh short- to
medium-term inconvenience associated with the proposed relocation of
AFRH-Gulfport residents.

Comment 2:

Also of extreme importance, the DEIS has not properly taken into account the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. In particular, there
appears to have been an marked inattention to the Parks and Open Element and the Preservation and Historic Features Element. The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear that the capital area is facing increasing demand for open space and park due to increase population and tourism pressure. The Element defines open space as “any land or water surface that is not occupied by buildings, a broad definition that encompasses the vast majority of federal property” (p. 3). The Parks and Open Space Element directs that federal agencies should:

1. maintain and conserve federal open space as a means of shaping and enhancing urban areas (p. 7);

2. preserve open space that is crucial to the long-term quality of life of a neighborhood or region;

3. “Conserve and maintain the essential open space character of areas in the region with significant park, open space cultural or natural qualities that contribute to the setting of the National Capital Region.” The Element specifically includes McMillan Reservoir in the immediate south of Zone 5 as an example.

4. “Conserve portions of military reservations that add significantly to the inventory of park, open space, and natural areas and should, to the extent practicable, be used by the public for recreation ... (i.e.) when security considerations permit (p. 8-9).” The Element explicitly includes U.S. Soldier’s and Airmen’s Home as an example of this.

5. “Maintain and conserve trees and other vegetation in the landscaped buffer areas on federal installations in a natural condition.”

The Parks and Open Space Element also stresses the importance of connectivity between parks and open spaces in the Capital Region. As already noted, the Element has identified both AFRH and the McMillan Reservoir to its immediate south as areas to be preserved as open space and park land. Fort Totten to the northeast of AFRH is also an important part of the long-run open space plan for the Capital region. As land is currently configured, links could be made between these three areas through green bikeways. Loss of the AFRH property to development could seriously impair this open space connectivity.

The Parks and Open Space Element highlights the unique role that parks created around historic sites play in the Capital Region. The federal government is to “establish and preserve historic parks as important legacies of national, historic, architectural and landscape significance.” The Anderson cottage and two acres surrounding it have been designated a National Monument because of its importance in Lincoln’s and other 19th century presidencies. But as the DEIS notes, the importance of the AFRH site does not stop with this. To its immediate north is the first national military cemetery, predating Arlington National Cemetery. The AFRH itself has been in continuous use as a final
home for members of the U.S. Armed Services since the middle of the 19th century. It is the U.S. equivalent of Les Invalides in Paris. Its central landscaped core and the agricultural land (now garden) of Zone 6 are essentially unchanged from the 19th century and provide a coherent and important historical context for the National Monument, cemetery and historically important home. The Elements are very clear about the importance of protecting just such landscapes from destruction.

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Federal Plan also commits the federal government to protecting terrain features of the region through careful design. In particular, it notes the importance of maintaining vistas of the Monumental core of L’Enfant’s city and protecting the escarpments that provide these overlooks. As the third highest point in the District of Columbia and one of the only undeveloped ones, the AFRH property is one of the areas that falls under the federal government commitment to protect “topographic bowl features.”

The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the “Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements” complements the Parks and Open Space Element. The Preservation and Historic Features Element is not limited to preservation of historic structures. A major concern is the “preservation and strengthening of historic urban design features, such as the L’Enfant Plan.” As part of this, the Element commits to “protecting the character of the region’s natural features, many of which have historical or cultural significance, such as ... the ridge of the topographic bowl, agricultural land, ... and designed landscapes.” All of these elements are present on the AFRH property and the alternatives do not adequately take these into account. In particular, plans to develop Zones 5 and 6 will disturb historically agricultural land that was an integral part of the function of both AFRH and the Anderson cottage, as well as disrupt the landscape of the topographic bowl. Also of importance, the Federal Plan calls for the federal government to “protect the skyline formed by the region’s natural features, particularly the topographic bowl around central Washington” and to “protect and enhance the vistas and views, both natural and designed, that are an integral part of the national capital’s image.”

The Preservation and Historic Features Federal Elements set policies regarding federal government stewardship of historic properties and the historic plan of Washington, D.C. Under these Elements, federal agencies should:

1. protect the settings of historic properties, including views to and from sites where significant, as integral parts of the historic character of the property (p. 8);

2. protect the reservations that contain historic landscapes and features from incompatible changes or incursion (emphasis added);

3. protect views ... inward from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl from inappropriate intrusions. Open space should be
preserved to allow for public use and enjoyment of these views. (Examples include the escarpment north of Florida Avenue, NW.) (emphasis added).

The Parks and Open Space Element of the “Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements” directs the federal government to look to redevelopment of surplus federal property as a means of adding to the region’s inventory of parks and open space and notes that future acquisitions could occur by purchase, eminent domain, donation or exchange. As noted above, an alternative that has not been included in the EIS is exchange of land in Zones 5 and 6 for other federal surplus land that could be more appropriately developed. Exchanging this land for land in another location and development there could provide needed financial resources for AFRH. Zones 5 and 6 could then continue to play the important role they currently play in the District’s system of federal open space by protecting historic landscapes, providing appropriate context for an important historical site and protecting views of the central core of the capital as directed by the Federal Elements. If the land were transferred to the National Park Service to enlarge the Lincoln Cottage National Monument, this would not only preserve open space but would help protect the historical integrity of the setting for the cottage as a place of retreat and rest, thus preventing the kind of encroachment of inappropriate new development that has adversely affected the Manassas Battle Field and other major Civil War historic sites. It would also enhance public access to much needed open space in the District as a whole as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, it may serve to substantially mitigate adverse environmental impacts of development on the eastern Zones 2, 3, and 4.

In addition, the open space already provided by AFRH is an integral design element of the adjacent Petworth and Park View rowhouse neighborhoods, developed in the early 1900’s. Surrounding streets to the west of the Home were designed to take advantage of vistas of the open space provided by the Home’s property. For example, the vista from Grant Circle down Illinois Avenue to Zone 6 is an important anchoring design element in the eastern part of Petworth. The Preservation Element of the Federal Elements directs federal agencies to “protect reciprocal views along rights-of-way and from . . . circles (p. 11).” Replacing the vista of this green expanse that opens out over a view of the federal core of the city with a view of an eight story apartment building would significant harm the integrity of historic city plan in this part of the capital.

Comment 3:

The District of Columbia Parks and Recreation is currently in the middle of a comprehensive planning process. As part of this effort they are conducting a survey of park and recreation needs indicating a significant deficit of park space in the Petworth, Park View, and Columbia Heights area. The AFRH property is a uniquely large landscaped open space -- one of the few remaining unprotected open space areas in the eastern part of residential Washington DC. The planning process for development of AFRH property should be timed to accommodate consideration of the current comprehensive planning process of the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation (see also Comment 4 below).
The location of a park in Zone 6 of the AFRH property would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Colombia Heights and to planned dense residential development along Georgia Avenue, as well as dense development planned for the rest of the AFRH site. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northwest and northeast D.C.

Among the alternatives, the DEIS has not considered alternatives that would provide significant parkland for the neighborhood to the west of AFRH (additional alternatives that would do so are proposed in the first comment of this submission). As the name Park View suggests, the neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View adjacent to the western boundary of AFRH were developed in the early 1900s around the presence of the "Soldiers' Home" as open space.

Comment 4:

Some important stakeholders were not on your list of individuals and organizations to whom the DEIS was provided. This procedural flaw has resulted in an adequate consultation process regarding the DEIS. For example, the District of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) was not served with the DEIS. Our understanding is that DPR did not learn of the DEIS until July 1, i.e., two working days before the deadline for comments on the DEIS — inadequate time to properly respond — and even then DPR only learned of the DEIS through concerned city residents. The comment period for the DEIS should be extended so that DPR can adequately consider potential use of part of the AFRH property to meet city park needs. In addition, it is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the DEIS. Notice of the DEIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local office responsible for Washington’s monumental core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway.

Comment 5:

As a matter of law, we must question the accuracy of the DEIS’s characterization that AFRH parcels leased for development (instead of being sold) would remain subject to "GOV" zoning, rather than be subject to the District of Columbia’s municipal commercial/residential zoning. We maintain that the uses proposed in the Master Plan documents are not inherently governmental in nature and, therefore, that D.C.’s municipal commercial/residential zoning authority would apply regardless of whether the land is leased or sold.

Comment 6:

The DEIS does not address forthrightly the fact that the AFRH is proposing very dense development on park-like open space in the middle of a neighborhood that is disproportionately low income, elderly, and African American. The density of the proposed development is so high that is likely to adversely the health and well-being
(physical and material) of these neighbors. Specifically, the Census tracts adjacent to AFRH on the west have median incomes that place the neighborhood in the lowest 20th percentile for income in the Washington area. These tracts are also 82-90% African American (compared to 12.4% nationally), with disproportionate percentages of individuals over age 65, below the poverty line, and suffering from disability.

Comment 7:

The proposed development will have disproportionate negative health effects on minority populations. Specifically, air pollution problems are local as well as regional in scope. The nearby neighborhoods would experience the largest change in air quality from the increased traffic and other pollution sources associated with the proposed development. Further, local air pollution is linked to increased incidence of respiratory illness. Three different recent studies being published this month in Epidemiology find a significant link between daily ground-level ozone in cities and mortality rates in the next 3 days. Ozone is formed when pollutants, such as car exhaust mix with heat and sunlight. Editors of Epidemiology have made the rather unprecedented comment that together these studies point to an “urgent need to reduce public exposure to ambient ozone by all possible means.” To that fact must be added that communities of color across the nation are experiencing disproportionately high levels of asthma and other respiratory illness. The deteriorated local air quality from the proposed AFRH development would worsen such health problems in this predominantly African American neighborhood. The heat-retention effect of the loss of current AFRH green space would also promote additional local ground-level ozone formation. Finally, the current mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property; those mature trees must be retained to minimize negative health impacts from development.

Comment 8:

The EIS does not consider the heat-retention impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadow, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surface will have on temperatures in the surrounding area. The dominant green space on the current AFRH campus has a cooling effect that will be radically altered if heat-retaining buildings, parking lots, and roads are constructed where grass and trees now stand. The increased temperatures will result in higher cooling bills, particularly burdensome for the elderly poor, or an increased frequency of dangerous summer conditions for those who cannot afford air conditioning, again particularly the elderly poor. Increased temperatures will also worsen the impact of the increased automotive exhaust associated with the proposed development by promoting local ground-level ozone formation. The EIS must consider the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.

Comment 9:

The impact on traffic is vague and unexplored. It requires more details, specifics, and cost information. There is no information about the impact on the community of the
number of peak-hour trips suggested in terms of cost to the city of Washington DC to address, the damage to the local infrastructure, and the overall impact on the surrounding community.

In particular, the transportation-impact portion of the DEIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between the affected AFRH property and Georgia and New Hampshire Avenues. The impact of the level of increased traffic considered is unlikely to be limited to the main streets currently studied in the DEIS. Here is one example of an unaddressed impact: the neighborhoods to the west of the AFRH property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The DEIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational opportunities provided by streets in Petworth and Park View. In addition, the District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from automobiles on city streets. Bringing a larger number of automobiles into narrow residential streets will likely increase the mortality rate in the area to the west of AFRH, particularly because of the relatively large number of elderly and children.

Comment 10:

Many residents in the area to the west of AFRH use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. AFRH enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The DEIS has not considered how dense construction on the AFRH property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area. A rise in the water table seems likely to result from dense development on this land. A raised water table could result in a serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income.

Comment 11:

Both residents of the AFRH and neighbors who live to the west of the Home benefit, much as President Lincoln did when the Anderson cottage was built, from the relative calm and quiet provided by the green campus of the Home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able to walk past the property and to see its green expanses when looking out their windows or down their streets. In this way, the AFRH has provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its residents regardless of their income – because the proximity of natural beauty means that it does not look like a poor neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty and calm will take away something of irreplaceable value in residents' lives.

Comment 12:

The DEIS needs to provide information regarding the exact amount of money that AFRH needs to raise through this development process. Specificity and transparency with regard to dollar amounts (including the calculations used to arrive at those amounts) are
key to enabling fail and meaningful public participation in an assessment of viable alternatives.

Comment 13:

For any parcels ("zones"), or portions of parcels, which have historic significance or character, the development plan must spare the historic portions from development, possibly including through alternatives such as land trusts or exchange or sale of certain parcels, or portions, for use as parkland, as outlined above. Preservation-enabling options must be added as alternatives in ways that allow for both revenue generation and conservation.

Comment 14:

Retention of all of the existing mature trees in the historic character areas is particularly essential for historic-preservation purposes, among other essential goals (see also above). All development alternatives must be crafted in such a way as to preserve the mature trees.

Comment 15:

The historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence is overlooked. There should be more detail regarding Section 106 impacts including consideration of knowledgeable sources on the subject, such as Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (federal entity) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Comment 16:

The DEIS mentions any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but that standard does not actually appear to be consistently applied in the document. That error must be corrected. For example, alternatives 2 and 3A suggest development in Zone 6 that is not at all in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood’s architecture. The existing neighborhood is comprised entirely of rowhouse architecture, with a maximum of three stories in height.

Comment 17:

Assuming arguendo that AFRH parcels are developed under “GOV” zoning, then all U.S. government building standards must be applied, including the most up-to-date environmental standards. The EIS must detail the standards to be applied, e.g., that any development on GOV-zoned land would have to be GSA LEED certified.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I am confident that adequate and appropriate consideration of the comments of all affected parties will produce a better end result for AFRH, its residents, and the multitude of other residents of Washington, D.C., who will be affected by the proposed development.
Sincerely,

Andrew J. McGilvray  
President, United Neighborhood Coalition

cc: Councilmember Adrian Fenty  
Councilmember Jim Graham  
The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name:     Amy McLaughlin
Address:  18 V St NW WDC 20011
Affiliation:  
Phone:    202-545-0089

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments

Please rework your plan to consider a park, running/biking path, green spaces that would be accessible to neighbors. I would be willing to pay an annual fee to have access to this land as far as our others would. This could be a potential source of revenue.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capital Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afnh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 265-5821
Dear Mr. Delley,

Thank you for the opportunity to present my comments on the APRH Washington Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

My comments on the DEIS are as follows:

1. Some important stakeholders were not on your list of individuals and organizations to whom the DEIS was provided. The District of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) was not served with the DEIS. My understanding is that they did not learn of the draft EIS until July 1.

   Inadequate time to properly respond and even then only learned of the DEIS through concerned city residents. The comment period for the DEIS should be extended so that DPR can complete its own comprehensive planning process in a way that can consider potential use of part of the APRH property to meet city park needs. In addition, it is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the DEIS. Notice of the DEIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local office responsible for Washington’s monumental core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway.

2. The DEIS needs to provide information regarding the exact amount of money that APRH needs to raise through this development process. Dollar amounts are kept so as to enable full public participation.

3. For parcels, or portions of parcels, which have historic significance or character, the development plan must start from development, possibly including through alternatives such as land trusts or sale of certain parcels, or portions, for use a parkland. Both options should be added as viable alternatives that allow for revenue but also conservation.

4. Retention of all of the existing mature trees in the historic character areas are particularly essential for historic-preservation purposes. All development alternatives must be crafted in such a way as to preserve the mature trees.

5. Other true alternatives to the proposed development plan must be explored. The four "alternatives" listed in the DEIS are not really different from one another, but merely slight variations on a single theme. More effort should be made to provide true, alternatives with a variety of financial and real estate options to solve the underlying concern, namely the budget of the APRH.

6. The historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence is overlooked. There should be more detail regarding Section 106 impacts including consideration of knowledgeable sources on the subject, such as Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (federal entity) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

7. The impact on traffic is vague and unexplored. It requires more details, specifics, and cost information. There is no information about the impact on the community of the number of peak-hour trips suggested in terms of cost to the city of Washington DC to address, the
8) The DEIS mentions any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but that standard does not actually appear to be consistently applied in the document. That error must be corrected. For example, alternatives 2 and 3A suggest development in Zone 6 that is not at all in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood's architecture. The existing neighborhood is comprised entirely of rowhouse architecture, with a maximum of three stories in height.

9) If land is to be developed under "GOV" zoning, then all government building standards must be applied, including the most up-to-date environmental standards. For example, the EIS should detail that any development on GOV-zoned land would have to be GSA LEED certified.

10) The draft EIS does not address honestly the fact that the AFRH is proposing extremely dense development of park-like open space in the middle of a neighborhood that is disproportionately low income, elderly, and African American. The density of the proposed development is so high that is likely to adversely the health and well being (physical and mental) of these neighbors. Specifically, the Census tracts adjacent to AFRH on the west have median incomes that place the neighborhood in the lowest 20th percentile for income in Washington. These tracts are also 22-30% African American (compared to 12-17% nationally), with disproportionate percentages of individuals older age 65, below the poverty line, and suffering from disability.

11) The proposed development will have disproportionate negative health effects on minority populations. Specifically, air pollution problems are local as well as regional in scope. The nearby neighborhoods would experience the largest change in air quality from the increased traffic and other pollution sources associated with the proposed development. Further, local air pollution is linked to increased incidence of respiratory illness. Three different recent studies being published this month in Epidemiology find a significant link between daily ground-level ozone in cities and mortality rates in the next 3 days. Ozone is formed when pollutants, such as car exhaust mix with heat and sunlight. Editors of Epidemiology have made the rather unprecedented comment that together these studies point to an "urgent need to reduce public exposure to ambient ozone by all possible means." To that fact must be added that communities of color across the nation are experiencing disproportionately high levels of asthma and other respiratory illness. The deteriorated local air quality will also worsen these health problems in this predominantly African American neighborhood. The heat-retention effect of the loss of current AFRH green space will also promote additional local ground-level ozone formation. Finally, the current mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property.

12) The EIS does not consider the heat-retention impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadow, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surface will have on temperatures in the
The dominant green space on the current AFRH campus has a cooling effect that will be radically altered if heat-retaining buildings, parking lots, and roads are constructed where grass and trees now stand. The increased temperatures will result in higher cooling bills, particularly burdensome for the elderly poor, or an increased frequency of dangerous summer conditions for those who cannot afford air conditioning, again particularly the elderly poor. Increased temperatures will also worsen the impact of the increased automotive exhaust associated with the proposed development by promoting local ground-level ozone formation.

At the current time, the mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.

The transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between the affected AFRH property and Georgia and New Hampshire Avenues. The impact of the level of increased traffic considered is unlikely to be limited to the main streets currently studied in the EIS. More specifically, the neighborhoods to the west of the AFRH property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational services provided by streets in Petworth and Park View. In addition, the District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from automobiles on city streets. Bringing a large number of automobiles into narrow residential streets will likely increase the mortality rate in the area to the west of AFRH, particularly because of the relatively large number of elderly and children.

Many residents in the area to the west of AFRH use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. AFRH enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The draft EIS has not considered how dense construction on the AFRH property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area. A rise in the water table seems likely to result from dense development on this land. A raised water table could result in a serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income.

Both residents of the AFRH and neighbors who live to the west of the home benefit, much as President Lincoln did when the Anderson cottage was built, from the relative calm and quiet provided by the green campus of the home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able to walk past the property and to see its green spaces when looking out their windows or down their streets. In this way, the AFRH has provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its residents no matter what their income was.
neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty and calm will take away something of irreplacable value in their lives.

17) Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the DEIS has not adequately taken into account the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital adequately. In particular, there appears to have been an marked inattention to the Parks and Open Space Element and the Preservation and Historic Features Element. The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear that the capital area is facing increasing demand for open space and park due to increase population and tourism pressure. The element defines open space as "any land or water surface that is not occupied by buildings, a broad definition that encompasses the vast majority of federal property" (p. 3).

1. Under the Park and Open Space Element, directs that federal agencies should:

1. maintain and conserve federal open space as a means of shaping and enhancing urban areas (p. 7);

2. preserve open space that is essential to the long-term quality of life of a neighborhood or region;

3. Conserve and maintain the essential open space character of areas in the region with significant park, open space cultural or natural qualities that contribute to the setting of the National Capital Region.

The element specifically includes McMillan Reservoir to the immediate south of Zone 5 as an example.

4. "Conserve portions of military reservations that add significantly to the inventory of park, open space, and natural areas and should, to the extent practicable, be used by the public for recreation (i.e., when security considerations permit (p. 5-9)." The Element explicitly includes U.S. Soldier's and Airmen's Home as an example of this.

5. "Maintain and conserve trees and other vegetation in the landscaped buffer areas on federal installations in a natural condition."

The Park and Open Space Element also stresses the importance of connectivity between parks and open spaces in the Capital Region. As already noted, the Element has identified both AFRH and the McMillan Reservoir to its immediate south as areas to be preserved as open space and parkland. Fort Totten to the northeast of AFRH is also an important part of the long-run open space plan for the Capital Region. As land is currently configured, links could be made between these three areas through green bikeways. Loss of the AFRH property to development could seriously impair this open space connectivity.

The Parks and Open Space Element highlights the unique role that parks created around historic sites play in the Capital Region. The federal government is to "establish and preserve historic parks as important
logies of national, historic, architectural and landscape significance.

The Anderson Cottage and two acres surrounding it have been designated a National Monument because of its importance in Lincoln and other 19th century presidencies. But as the DCPES notes, the importance of the AFRN site does not stop with this. To its immediate north is the first national military cemetery, predicting Arlington National Cemetery. The AFRN itself has been in continuous use as a final home for members of the U.S. Armed Services since the middle of the 19th century. It is the U.S. equivalent of Les Invalides in Paris. Its central landscaped core and the agricultural land it now gardened in Zone 6 are essentially unchanged from the 19th century and provide a coherent and important historical context for the National Monument, cemetery and historically important home. The elements are very clear about the importance of protecting just such landscapes from destruction.

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Federal Plan also commits the federal government to protecting terrain features of the region through careful design. In particular, it notes the importance of maintaining vistas of the Monumental area of L'Enfant's city and protecting the enclaves or enclaves that provide these overlooks. As the third highest point in the District of Columbia and one of the only undeveloped ones, the AFRN property is one of the areas that fall under the federal government commitment to protect "topographic bowl features."

The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements complements the Parks and Open Space Element. The Preservation and Historic Features Element is not limited to preservation of historic structures. A major concern is the "preservation and strengthening historic urban design features, such as the L'Enfant Plan." As part of this the Element commits to "protecting the character of the region's natural features, many of which have historical or cultural significance, such as the ridge of the topographic bowl, agricultural land, and designed landscapes. All of these elements are present on the AFRN property and the alternatives do not seem to adequately take these into account. In particular plans to develop Zones 5 and 6 will disturb historically agricultural land that was an integral part of the function of both AFRN and the Anderson Cottage, as well as disrupt the landscape of the topographic bowl. In particular, the Federal Plan calls for the federal government to "protect the skyline formed by the region's natural features, particularly the topographic bowl around central Washington" and to "protect and enhance the vistas and views, both natural and designed, that are an integral part of the national capital's image."

The Preservation and Historic Features Federal Elements set policies regarding federal government stewardship of historic properties and the historic plan of Washington, D.C. Under these Elements federal agencies should:
1. Protect the settings of historic properties, including views to and from sites where significant as integral parts of the historic character of the property (p. 88);

2. Protect the reservations that contain historic landscapes and features from incompatible changes or encroachment;

3. Protect views inward from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl from inappropriate intrusions. Open space should be preserved to allow for public use and enjoyment of these views. Examples include the encampment north of Florida Ave. NW.

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements directs the federal government to look for redevelopment of surplus federal property as a means of adding to the region's inventory of parks and open space and notes that future acquisitions could occur by purchase, easement, donation or exchange. An alternative that has not been included in the EIS is exchange of land in Zones 5 and 6 for other federal surplus land that could be more appropriately developed. Exchanging this land for land in another location and development there could provide needed financial resources for AFRH. Zones 5 and 6 could then continue to play the important role they currently play in the District's system of federal open space by protecting historic landscapes, providing appropriate context for an important historical site and protecting views of the central core of the capital as directed by the Federal Elements. If the land were transferred to the National Park Service to enclose the Lincoln Cottage National Monument, this would not only preserve open space but would help protect the historical integrity of the setting for the cottage as a place of retreat and rest, thus preventing the kind of encroachment of inappropriate new development that has adversely affected the Manassas Battle Field and other major Civil War historic sites. It would also enhance public access to much needed open space in the District as a whole as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, it may serve to substantially mitigate adverse environmental impacts of development in the eastern Zones 7, 8, and 4.

The District of Columbia Parkland-Rec Parkland-Rec is currently in the middle of a comprehensive planning process. As part of this effort they are conducting a survey of park and recreation land indicating a significant deficit of park space in the Petworth, Park View, Columbia Heights Area. The AFRH property is a uniquely large landscaped open space -- one of the few remaining unprotected open space areas in the eastern part of residential Washington, DC. The planning process should also be timed to accommodate consideration of the current comprehensive planning process of the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation.

The location of a park in Zone 6 in the AFRH EIS would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Columbia Heights and to planned dense residential development along Georgia Avenue, as well as dense development planned for the rest of the AFRH site. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northwest and northeast D.C.
The open space already provided by AFRH is an integral design element of the adjacent Petworth and Park View rowhouse neighborhoods, developed in the early 1900s. Surrounding streets to the west of the Home were designed to take advantage of vistas of the open space provided by the Home’s property. For example, the vista from Grant Circle down Illinois Avenue Zone 6 is an important anchoring design element in the eastern part of Petworth. The Preservation element of the Federal Elements direct federal agencies to “protect residential views along rights-of-way and from 2 circles up.” Replacing the vista of this green expanse that opens out over a view of the federal core of the city with a view of an eight-story apartment building would significantly harm the integrity of historic city plan in this part of the capital.

Among the alternatives, the DEIS has not considered alternatives that would provide significant parkland for the neighborhood to the west of AFRH. As the name Park View suggests, the neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View adjacent to the western boundary of Soldier’s Home were developed in the early 1900s around the presence of the Soldier’s Home as open space.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns. I am confident that adequate and appropriate consideration of the comments of all affected parties will produce a better end result for AFRH, its residents, and the multitude of other city residents who will be affected by the proposed development.

Sincerely,

David Pansegrue
1110 Fairmont St. NW
Washington, DC 20009

CC: Councilman Jim Graham
July 6, 2005

Donald Dailey (donald.dailey@af.r.gwu)

Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Dailey:

I am writing to take advantage of the brief period allowed for comments on the Armed Forces Retirement Home Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I fully support the need to sustain the Armed Forces Retirement Home, but feel that the document presents over-development as the only option to achieve this goal. A combination of other profit-bearing initiatives with more modest development would mobilize the financing required by the Home without jeopardizing the integrity of the land that surrounds it. I am particularly concerned that the financing alternatives eliminated from the detailed study (section 2.2, p. 2-15) were not given full consideration and I am requesting that they be revisited. In addition, I would also like to encourage the Armed Forces Retirement Home to examine other options that may yet to have been considered. Among those mentioned at the June 22 meeting were: requesting U.S. Congress to create a line item and support for recurrent funding; examining opportunities to exchange land with the DC government; environmental easements; establishing a land trust, etc. For another member of the community would welcome the opportunity to help explore these or other options with you.

In addition, I would like to highlight that per the findings from the draft EIS, the development will not contribute to or achieve the stated objectives.

- One of the draft EIS objectives indicates that the Master Plan will "preserve and improve the essential components of the AFRH-W for residents and the community." However, most EIS findings indicate minimal negative impact on diverse aspects of the environment, indicating few or any areas where the options contribute positively. In general, it appears the draft EIS falls short in showing improvement and preservation of the historical value, the environment, and the city's absorptive capacity.

- While the AFRH may be preserving some of the historic buildings, the plan appears to ignore the overall historic integrity as it does not reflect or consider the value of preserving the surroundings to these historic buildings. As stated at the June 22 meeting, development will permanently change the historic value unique to the AFRH. In addition, the proposal appears to be inconsistent with existing architecture and therefore not preserving the historic quality of the community. For example, while the draft claims that options will be consistent with neighboring architecture, the plans propose buildings (6-8 stories). This is NOT consistent with the existing architecture.

- Environment: It does not appear that the draft EIS sufficiently considered either green development approaches or the cumulative effect of the AFRH development and the already approved nearby development on the community and broader environment. It also appears that traffic and air quality impact were underestimated.

- Absorptive capacity of DC infrastructure. It is of huge concern that the DC police department is already operating with limited resources. I am concerned that the capacity of the DC infrastructure to absorb increased demands has not been adequately considered. Similarly, the lack of a nearby metro station will result in an already taxed transportation system being to further overburdened.
According to the draft EIS, the Master Plan will "Grow the Trust Fund to not only meet the needs of today’s residents, but the needs of future generations as well." It does not appear that the EIS has adequately addressed quality of life needs of the current residents nor the long term requirements of the AFRH to meet the future (and likely growing) needs of veterans. (Again, I refer to the thoughtful comments of our veterans and concerned community on this matter). This should be the real goal of any proposal and I would encourage their current and future needs to be elevated to the highest priority.

Although, the Master Plan indicates it will "Attract development, at fair market value, that is compatible with the mission of the AFRH", I am concerned that fair market value does not take into account the need for low income housing or the need to maintain the wonderful diversity of the community. The environmental justice findings indicate that low income and minority populations would not be disproportionately affected by impacts of the alternatives. However, there appear to be no benefits to these groups in terms of housing options. Furthermore, I would like clarification as to how residential housing, retail, and office buildings are "compatible with the mission of the AFRH."

Lastly, contrary to the stated objective of ensuring "an open, participatory process with the AFRH-W residents and the community", I do not feel that the community was given the sufficient time or information needed to actively participate in this process and question the earnestness of the AFRH’s intent to engage the community in this process. Few of us knew of the June 22 meeting and even fewer of any prior steps. I refer to the many written and voiced comments supporting this concern. I would like the AFRH to extend and open this process and would also like to ensure that from here out, the AFRH be more transparent and take more active steps to ensure stakeholder participation. I would also like to ensure that a community representative participate in all meetings and that minutes and updates be shared monthly.

In addition to and support of the above mentioned concerns, I would like the AFRH Master Plan and EIS drafters to:

- improve transparency: ensuring community representation and monthly updates
- consider and address additional options: non development, more conservative development options and combinations of several development and nondevelopment options
- provide three dimensional mapping of proposal
- conduct a rigorous and unbiased parking and traffic study that considers nearby approved development
- share the financial report of AFRH that shows how much revenue is required and how much will be generated with these and other options
- share the projected capacity needs of AFRH (in terms of space and growing numbers of veterans ensuring that quality of life is NOT compromised)
- describe the EIS process in terms of participation and transparency and conduct a survey of stakeholders to measure their perspective of the process thus far.
- detail how the options will be consistent with surroundings

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft EIS. I look forward to your consideration of and responses to my concerns and comments.

Sincerely,

Leslie Palykewich
312 Shepherd Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Cc: Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton
    Linda W. Cropp, Council Chair, Council of the District of Columbia
    Jack Evans, Chair Pro Tempore
    Jim Graham, Ward One
    Adrian Fenty, Ward Four
    Vincent Orange, Ward Five
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name:    Marcell Parker
Address:  413 Quincy St. NW
Affiliation:    Resident
Phone:   (202) 726-1677

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments

As do many of my neighbors, I find it hard to accept that all alternatives which went run the very nature of the Soldier's Home as a retirement community and take away one of DC's few remaining open spaces. At all been explored.

I also am convinced that no matter which of these development projects is selected, noise and traffic will impact the surrounding neighborhoods profoundly.

I urge the planning committee to consider the negative impact all of these development scenarios will have on both the Soldier's Home residents and our neighborhoods.

Please send comments to:
Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afm.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
Subject: EIS AFRH-W

To: Donald Bailey
AFRH-W

The suggested plan to destroy
The Home is ridiculous. The proposed
purpose of the plan is to raise
money to pump up the AFRH fund.
This is neither desirable or necessary.
There would be no shortage of
funds if non-disabled Veterans were
no longer accepted as residents. There
would be no shortage of funds if a
reasonable user fee were assessed each
Resident.

The draft EIS was prepared
by a idiot who sees no social
impact. Removing security and
causing a thousand elderly persons
to live in a high crime area
is an extreme social impact.

The entire AFRH-W area is
on the grounds of the former
Soldiers Home, a True National Treasure.
Recruited Movement To Desert.

This. Treasure to save a few

lives. To see a few dollars is disgusting.

The COO has been authorized

by Congress to adjust the

users for time to time. He has

never made any attempt to do

this or require residents to make

a maximum effort to pay their

own way. His purpose is to

destroy the home.

Proposed plans 3, 3 and 4 call for

institutional development in the area

around the Sheridan building.

This opens a whole can of worms.

Institutional can be anything from

a prison to a leper asylum.

Twice in the last two years,

Mr. Cox has unsuccessfully attempted

to keep hundreds of homeless veterans

on to rent property. I have no doubt

what he had in mind for

residential use.

In summary, the only sane

option is alternative #1. This will

preserve a National Monument}

#29
And continue to deter security...

To MacGill's and Jon's favor,

The worry of someone else to pay...
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Janisha Richardson
Address: P.O.Box 75144 Washington, DC 20013
Affiliation: Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner 1A03
Phone: (202) 241-1707

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments

I am a resident of Columbia Heights on Princeton Pl, NW. I ask that the EIS look into having a public park instead of selling the land to developers.

I also ask that the community have a strong voice in the development of the land.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afirh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-6821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Allison Shelley
Address: 
Affiliation: GABESH PW, 20012
Phone: 202-489-3162

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available? 
☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

Please reconsider forever changing the historic green nature of this valuable piece of property—one of the very few green spaces left in our city, as well as a historically significant landmark. Surely there are more environmentally responsible ways to raise the needed funds.

Judging by the comments made at the public hearing, it seems that neighbors and home residents have not been consulted about any of these plans before they were created.

Let's take some time here.

It seems reasonable to use the resources available—governments, subsidies, etc.—for the preservation of open green space, before launching into massive, irreversible development that does not enhance the community in needed parks, etc., but surely promises to worsen traffic and parking issues in the neighborhood.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afnh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-6821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: JOSEPHINE V MOLESK
Address: AFRH-W 403
Affiliation: RESIDENT OF AFRH-W
Phone: 202-722-1803

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available? [X] Yes  [ ] No

Comments

1. Security?

2. Safety?

3. Serenity?

FOR SUCH A "VAST" UNDERTAKING- ARE THESE TRULY A PART OF THE "MASTER PLAN". I HOPE SO.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Darley
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.darley@afh.gov

For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
Donald Dailey  
Armed Forces Retirement Home  
3700 North Capitol Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20011

Re: Response to Draft EIS for AFRH-Washington Plan

Dear Mr. Dailey,

Thank you for the opportunity to present my comments on the AFRH Washington Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). I am aware that I am utilizing a form letter, but this letter captures my concerns regarding the proposed plan for the AFRH. I do not support the development of Zone 6 and the high-density development proposed for the other zones. My comments on the DEIS are as follows:

1) Some important stakeholders were not on your list of individuals and organizations to whom the DEIS was provided. The District of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) was not served with the DEIS. My understanding is that they did not learn of the draft EIS until July 1—insufficient time to properly respond—and even then only learned of the DEIS through concerned city residents. The comment period for the DEIS should be extended so that DPR can complete its own comprehensive planning process in a way that can consider potential use of part of the AFRH property to meet city park needs. In addition, it is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the DEIS. Notice of the DEIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local offices responsible for Washington's monumental core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway.

2) The DEIS needs to provide information regarding the exact amount of money that AFRH needs to raise through this development process. Dollar amounts are key to enabling full public participation.

3) For parcels or portions of parcels, which have historic significance or character, the development plan must spare them from development, possibly including through alternatives such as land trusts or sale of certain parcels, or portions, for use as parkland. Both options should be added as viable alternatives that allow for revenue but also conservation.

4) Retention of all of the existing mature trees in the historic character areas are particularly essential for historic-preservation purposes. All development alternatives must be crafted in such a way as to preserve the mature trees.

5) Other true alternatives to the proposed development plan must be explored. The four "alternatives" listed in the DEIS are not really different from one another, but merely slight variations on a single theme. More effort should be made to provide true alternatives with a variety of financial and real estate options to solve the underlying concern—namely the budget.
6) The historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence is overlooked. There should be more detail regarding Section 106 impacts, including consideration of knowledgeable sources on the subject, such as Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (federal entity) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

7) The impact on traffic is vague and unexploited. It requires more details, specifies, and cost information. There is no information about the impact on the community of the number of peak-hour trips suggested in terms of cost to the city of Washington DC to address, the damage to the local infrastructure, and the overall impact on the surrounding community.

8) The DEIS mentions any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but that standard does not actually appear to be consistently applied in the document. That error must be corrected. For example, alternatives 2 and 3A suggest development in Zone 6 that is not at all in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood's architecture. The existing neighborhood is comprised entirely of rowhouse architecture, with a maximum of three stories in height.

9) If land is to be developed under “GOV” zoning, then all government building standards must be applied, including the most up-to-date environmental standards. For example, the EIS should detail that any development on GOV-zoned land would have to be GSA LEED certified.

10) The draft EIS does not address honestly the fact that the AFRH is proposing extremely dense development of park-like open space in the middle of a neighborhood that is disproportionately low income, elderly, and African American. The density of the proposed development is so high that it is likely to adversely affect the health and well-being (physical and material) of these neighbors. Specifically, the Census tracts adjacent to AFRH on the west have median incomes that place the neighborhood in the lowest 20th percentile for income in the Washington area. These tracts are also 82-90% African American (compared to 12.4% nationally), with disproportionate percentages of individuals over age 65, below the poverty line, and suffering from disability.

11) The proposed development will have disproportionate negative health effects on minority populations. Specifically, air pollution problems are local as well as regional in scope. The nearby neighborhoods would experience the largest change in air quality from the increased traffic and other pollution sources associated with the proposed development. Further, local air pollution is linked to increased incidence of respiratory illness. Three different recent studies being published this month in Epidemiology find a significant link between daily ground-level ozone in cities and mortality rates in the next 3 days. Ozone is formed when pollutants, such as car exhaust melt with heat and sunlight. Editors of Epidemiology have made the rather unprecedented comment that together these studies point to an "urgent need to reduce public exposure to ambient ozone by all possible means." To that fact must be added that communities of color across the nation are experiencing disproportionately high levels of asthma and other respiratory illness. The deteriorating local air quality will also worsen these health problems in this predominantly African American neighborhood. The heat-retention effect of the loss of
current AFRH green space will also promote additional local ground-level ozone formation. Finally, the current mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property.

12) The EIS does not consider the heat-retention impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadow, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surface will have on temperatures in the surrounding area. The dominant green space on the current AFRH campus has a cooling effect that will be radically altered in heat-retaining buildings, parking lots, and roads are constructed where grass and trees now stand. The increased temperatures will result in higher cooling bills, particularly burdensome for the elderly poor, or an increased frequency of dangerous summer conditions for those who cannot afford air conditioning, again particularly the elderly poor. Increased temperatures will also worsen the impact of the increased automotive exhaust associated with the proposed development by promoting local ground-level ozone formation.

13) At the current time, the mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.

14) The transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between the affected AFRH property and Georgia and New Hampshire Avenues. The impact of the level of increased traffic considered is unlikely to be limited to the main streets currently studied in the EIS. More specifically, the neighborhoods to the west of the AFRH property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational services provided by streets in Petworth and Park View. In addition, the District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from automobiles on city streets. Bringing a large number of automobiles into narrow residential streets will likely increase the mortality rate in the area to the west of AFRH, particularly because of the relatively large number of elderly and children.

15) Many residents in the area to the west of AFRH use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. AFRH enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The draft EIS has not considered how dense construction on the AFRH property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area. A rise in the water table seems likely to result from dense development on this land. A raised water table could result in serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income.

16) Both residents of the AFRH and neighbors who live to the west of the Home benefit, much as President Lincoln did when the Anderson cottage was built, from the relative calm and quiet provided by the green campus of the Home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able to walk past the property and to see it's
green expanses when looking out their windows or down their streets. In this way, the AFRH has provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its residents no matter their income because it does not look like a poor neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty and calm will take away something of irrereplaceable value in their lives.

17). Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the DEIS has not adequately taken into account the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital adequately. In particular, there appears to have been marked inattention to the Parks and Open Element and the Preservation and Historic Features Element. The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear that the capital area is facing increasing demand for open space and park due to increases in population and tourism pressure. The Element defines open space as “any land or water surface that is not occupied by buildings, a broad definition that encompasses the vast majority of federal property” (p. 3). Under the Park and Open Space Element directs that federal agencies should:

1. maintain and conserve federal open space as a means of shaping and enhancing urban areas (p. 7);  
2. preserve open space that is crucial to the long-term quality of life of a neighborhood or region;  
3. Conserve and maintain the essential open space character of areas in the region with significant parks, open space cultural or natural qualities that contribute to the setting of the National Capital Region.” The Element specifically includes McMillan Reservoir to the immediate south of Zone 5 as an example.
4. “Conserve portions of military reservations that add significantly to the inventory of park, open space, and natural areas and should, to the extent practicable, be used by the public for recreation when security considerations permit (p. 4, 9).” The Element explicitly includes U.S. Soldier’s and Airmen’s Home as an example of this.
5. “Maintain and conserve trees and other vegetation in the landscaped buffer areas on federal installations in a natural condition.”

The Park and Open Space Element also stresses the importance of connectivity between parks and open spaces in the Capital Region. As already noted, the Element has identified both AFRH and the McMillan Reservoir to its immediate south as areas to be preserved as open space and parkland. Fort Totten to the northeast of AFRH is also an important part of the long-run open space plan for the Capital region. As land currently configured, links could be made between these three areas through green bikeways. Loss of the AFRH property to development could seriously impair this open space connectivity.

The Parks and Open Space Element highlights the unique role that parks created around historic sites play in the Capital Region. The federal government is to “establish and preserve historic parks as important legacies of national, historic, architectural and landscape significance.” The Anderson cottage and two acres surrounding it have been designated a National Monument because of its importance in Lincoln and other 19th century presidencies. But as the DEIS notes,
the importance of the AFRH site does not stop with this. To its immediate north is the first national military cemetery, pre-dating Arlington National Cemetery. The AFRH itself has been in continuous use as a final home for members of the U.S. Armed Services since the middle of the 19th century. It is the U.S. equivalent of Les Invalides in Paris. Its central landscaped core and the agricultural land (now garden) of Zone 6 are essentially unchanged from the 19th century and provide a coherent and important historical context for the National Monument, cemetery and historically important home. The Elements are very clear about the importance of protecting just such landscapes from destruction.

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Federal Plan also commits the federal government to protecting terrain features of the region through careful design. In particular, it notes the importance of maintaining vistas of the Monumental core of L'Enfant's city and protecting the escarpments that provide these overlooks. As the third highest point in the District of Columbia and one of the only undeveloped ones, the AFRH property is one of the areas that falls under the federal government commitment to protect "topographic bowl features."

The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements complements the Parks and Open Space Element. The Preservation and Historic Features Element is not limited to preservation of historic structures. A major concern is the "preservation and strengthening historic urban design features, such as the L'Enfant Plan." As part of this the Element commits to "protecting the character of the region's natural features, many of which have historical or cultural significance, such as ... the ridge of the topographic bowl, agricultural land, ... and designed landscapes." All of these elements are present on the AFRH property and the alternatives do not seem to adequately take these into account. In particular plans to develop Zones 5 and 6 will disturb historically agricultural land that was an integral part of the function of both AFRH and the Anderson cottage, as well as disrupt the landscape of the topographic bowl. In particular, the Federal Plan calls for the federal government to "protect the skyline formed by the region's natural features, particularly the topographic bowl around central Washington" and to "protect and enhance the views and vistas, both natural and designed, that are an integral part of the national capital's image."

The Preservation and Historic Features Federal Elements set policies regarding federal government stewardship of historic properties and the historic plan of Washington, D.C. Under these Elements federal agencies should:

1. protect the settings of historic properties, including views to and from sites where significant, as integral parts of the historic character of the property (p. 8);
2. protect the reservations that contain historic landscapes and features from incompatible changes or incursion;
3. protect views...inward from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl from inappropriate intrusions. Open space should be preserved to allow for public use and enjoyment of these views. (Examples include ...the escarpment north of Florida, Ave. NW).

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal
Elements directs the federal government to look to redevelopment of surplus federal property as a means of adding to the region's inventory of parks and open space and notes that future acquisitions could occur by purchase, easement, donation or exchange. An alternative that has not been included in the DEIS is exchange of land in Zones 5 and 6 for federal surplus land that could be more appropriately developed. Exchanging this land for land in another location and development there could provide needed financial resources for AFRH. Zones 5 and 6 could then continue to play the important role they currently play in the District's system of federal open space by protecting historic landscapes, providing appropriate context for an important historical site and protecting views of the central core of the capital as directed by the Federal Elements. If the land were transferred to the National Park Service to enlarge the Lincoln Cottage National Monument, this would not only preserve open space but would help protect the historical integrity of the setting for the cottage as a place of retreat and rest, thus preventing the kind of encroachment of inappropriate new development that has so adversely affected the Manassas Battle Field and other major Civil War historic sites. It would also enhance public access to much needed open space in the District as a whole as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, it may serve to substantially mitigate adverse environmental impacts of development on the eastern Zones 2, 3, and 4.

The District of Columbia Parks and Recreation is currently in the middle of a comprehensive planning process. As part of this effort they are conducting a survey of park and recreation needs indicating a significant deficit of park space in the Petworth, Park View, Columbia Heights area. The AFRH property is a uniquely large landscaped open space—one of the few remaining unprotected open space areas in the eastern part of residential Washington D.C. The planning process should also be timed to accommodate consideration of the current comprehensive planning process of the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation.

The location of a park in Zone 6 in the AFRH EIS would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Columbia Heights and to planned dense residential development along Georgia Avenue, as well as dense development planned for the rest of the AFRH site. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northwest and northeast D.C.

The open space already provided by AFRH is an integral design element of the adjacent Petworth and Park View rowhouse neighborhoods, developed in the early 1900s. Surrounding streets to the west of the Home were designed to take advantage of vistas of the open space provided by the Home's property. For example, the vista from Grant Circle down Illinois Ave to Zone 6 is an important anchoring design element in the eastern part of Petworth. The Preservation Element of the Federal Elements directs federal agencies to "protect reciprocal views along rights-of-way and from ... circles (p. 11)." Replacing the vista of this green expanse that opens out over a view of the federal core of the city with a view of an eight story apartment building would significant harm the integrity of historic city plan in this part of the capital.

Among the alternatives, the DEIS has not considered alternatives that would provide significant parkland for the neighborhood to the west of AFRH. As the name Park View suggests, the neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View adjacent to the western boundary of Soldier's Home
were developed in the early 1900s around the presence of the Soldier's Home as open space.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I am confident that adequate and appropriate consideration of the comments of all affected parties will produce a better end result for AFH, its residents, and the multitude of other city residents who will be affected by the proposed development.

Finally, please add me to any list of announcements or meetings concerning the proposed development at AFH. My e-mail address is mivasmith@hotmail.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mitzie Smith
731 Rock Creek Church Road, NW
Washington, DC 20010

cc: Councilman Adrian Fenty
    Councilman Jim Graham
    The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Melissa Saysy
Address: 5801 81st St
Affiliation: 
Phone: 340-622-7014

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments

I am absolutely AGAINST any development of ZONE 6. Developing this zone will be the most destructive, both culturally and environmentally speaking. All options presented were very similar. Although OPTION 2 is the worst, Option 1, do nothing, would be my choice. But since that is not financially viable, there should be an option that provides something for the community. There should be a park or public green space for people, not just 100% development for maximum profit. These plans do not take into consideration the local community, but are designed to benefit outside developers most.

I would also call for a more thorough assessment of impact to wildlife. To simply say →

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 5 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
This is an urban area so impact is minimal is absolutely false. As a Smithsonian research biologist who has studied urban ecosystems, I am sure impact to such an area is not minimal and will be trying to pursue a study which will prove it. If development of ZONE 6 proceeds, this area should be off limits. Preserving this area will be some protection for wildlife that will be affected by the development.

I hope you will take the time to consider more options. This is an opportunity that will never come again, not just to make money, but to increase opportunities for community interaction with the residents, cultural experiences, while keeping key areas intact. Please look beyond the dollars and not monocultural. Sincerely, [Name]
July 6, 2005

Sent Via Electronic Mail

Donald Dailey (donald.daily@afhr.gov)
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Re: Response to Draft EIS for AFRH-Washington Plan

Dear Mr. Dailey,

Please accept the following as my written comments on the AFRH Washington Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). They will likely mirror comments raised by other individuals and entities, but they also include other comments that may well be mine alone.

First, some important stakeholders were not on your list of individuals and organizations to whom the DEIS was provided. The District of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) was not served with the DEIS and did not learn of it until July 1, less than one week ago. In addition, it is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the DEIS. Notice of the DEIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local office responsible for Washington’s monumental core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway. Finally, residents of Wards 1 and 4 of the District of Columbia were not adequately informed. In addition to being important stakeholders, those individuals have a wealth of knowledge crucial to effectively addressing the myriad issues raised in the DEIS.

To remedy these deficiencies, the comment period for the DEIS should be extended so that these important stakeholders can properly comment on the DEIS.

Second, the DEIS needs to provide information regarding the exact amount of money that AFRH needs to raise through this development process. Dollar amounts are key to enabling full public participation. Otherwise, the public is left without ability to weigh in on cost-benefit calculations crucial to evaluating the environmental impact of the proposed development. Without this information commenting on the DEIS is an empty exercise, to the extent the Home plans to cite financial reasons for rejecting certain
development alternatives.

Third, for parcels, or portions of parcels, which have historic significance or character, the development plan must spare them from development, possibly including through alternatives such as land trusts or sale of certain parcels or portions thereof for use as parkland. Both options should be added as viable alternatives that allow for revenue but also conservation. This is particularly true for parcels 1, 5 and 6, each of which front onto residential neighborhoods in Petworth and Park View.

Fourth, the DEIS did not make clear that any development would include retention of all mature trees. Keeping these trees is important, particularly in the historic character areas. All development alternatives must be crafted in such a way as to preserve the mature trees.

Fifth, other alternatives to the proposed development plan must be explored. The four “alternatives” listed in the DEIS are not really different from one another, but merely slight variations on a single theme: massive development. The DEIS needs to be reworked to include medium-range development alternatives. For example, none of the alternatives includes parkland, despite the fact much of the land has incredible historical significance and sits next to residential neighborhoods.

Sixth, the DEIS overlooks the historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence. There should be more detail in the DEIS including consideration of knowledgeable sources on the subject, such as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (federal entity) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Seventh, the impact on traffic is vague and incomplete. It requires more details, specifics, and cost information. There is no information about the impact on the community of the number of peak-hour trips suggested in terms of cost to the city of Washington DC to address, the damage to the local infrastructure, and the overall impact on the surrounding community.

Moreover – and of particular concern to those neighbors left out of the communications loop in Wards 1 and 4 – the transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between the affected AFRH property and Georgia and New Hampshire Avenues, NW. Based on some of the proposed development plans, the impact of the increased traffic will not be confined to the main streets currently studied in the EIS. The neighborhoods to the west of the AFRH property have a large number of children. Because of the lack of park area and because side streets are currently relatively calm, children use the streets for recreation. The EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on loss of recreational services provided by streets in Petworth and Park View.

In addition, the District of Columbia government has recognized that there is a serious problem with pedestrian deaths from automobiles on city streets. Bringing a large number of automobiles into narrow residential streets will likely increase the mortality
rate in the area to the west of AFRH, particularly because of the relatively large number of elderly and children.

_Eighth_, the DEIS mentions the desirability of any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but then it proceeds to effectively ignore any development alternatives that would do just that. That error must be corrected. For example, alternatives 2 and 3A suggest development in Zone 6 that is not at all in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood’s architecture. The existing neighborhood is comprised entirely of rowhouse architecture, with a maximum of three stories in height.

_Ninth_, the DEIS does not consider the heat-retention impact that the proposed dramatic replacement of green meadows, lawn and trees with buildings and paved surfaces will have on temperatures in the surrounding area. The dominant green space on the current AFRH campus has a cooling effect that will be radically altered if heat-retaining buildings, parking lots, and roads are constructed where grass and trees now stand. The increased temperatures will result in higher cooling bills, particularly burdensome for the elderly poor, or an increased frequency of dangerous summer conditions for those who cannot afford air conditioning, again particularly the elderly poor. Increased temperatures will also worsen the impact of the increased automotive exhaust associated with the proposed development by promoting local ground-level ozone formation. It will also have a deleterious effect on those neighbors with respiratory conditions.

_Tenth_, similarly, the mature trees on the AFRH property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.

_Eleventh_, many residents in the area to the west of AFRH use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. AFRH enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The draft EIS has not considered how dense construction on the AFRH property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area, or simply what will be the effect to drainage systems, natural or man made. A raised water table could result in a serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income.

_Twelfth_, both residents of the AFRH and neighbors who live to the west of the Home benefit, much as President Lincoln did when he lived in the Anderson cottage, from the relative calm and quiet provided by the green campus of the Home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able to walk past the property and to see it's green expanses when looking out their windows or down their streets. In this way, the AFRH has provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its residents no matter their income because it does not look like a poor neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty and calm will take away something of
Thirteenth, finally, and perhaps most importantly, the DEIS has not adequately taken into account the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. In particular, there appears to have been a marked inattention to the Parks and Open Element and the Preservation and Historic Features Element. The drafters of the DEIS should review those documents and reissue a DEIS that properly addresses the myriad concerns raised therein. For example, an alternative that has not been included in the EIS is exchange of land in Zones 5 and 6 for other federal surplus land that could be more appropriately developed, with those revenues going to AFRH. Zones 1, 5 and 6 could then continue to play the important role they currently play in the District’s system of federal open space by protecting historic landscapes, providing appropriate context for an important historical site and protecting views of the central core of the capital as directed by the Federal Elements. If the land were transferred to the National Park Service to enlarge the Lincoln Cottage National Monument, this would not only preserve open space but would help protect the historical integrity of the setting for the cottage as a place of retreat and rest, thus preventing the kind of encroachment of inappropriate new development that has adversely affected the Manassas Battle Field and other major Civil War historic sites. It would also enhance public access to much needed open space in the District as a whole as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, it may serve to substantially mitigate adverse environmental impacts of development on the eastern Zones 2, 3, and 4.

The location of a park in Zone 6 in the AFRH EIS would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Columbia Heights and to planned dense residential development along Georgia Avenue, as well as dense development planned for the rest of the AFRH site. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northwest and northeast D.C.

The open space already provided by AFRH is an integral design element of the adjacent Petworth and Park View rowhouse neighborhoods, developed in the early 1900s. Surrounding streets to the west of the Home were designed to take advantage of vistas of the open space provided by the Home’s property. For example, the vista from Grant Circle down Illinois Ave to Zone 6 is an important anchoring design element in the eastern part of Petworth. The Preservation Element of the Federal Elements directs federal agencies to “protect reciprocal views along rights-of-way and from . . . circles” (p. 11).” Replacing the vista of this green expanse that opens out over a view of the federal core of the city with a view of an eight story apartment building would significantly harm the integrity of historic city plan in this part of the capital.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I am confident that adequate and appropriate consideration of the comments of all affected parties will produce a better and more complete result for AFRH, its residents, and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Sincerely yours,
/s/
Arlus J. Stephens
Please accept my remarks as comments on the draft EIS statement.

As a current active duty service member I wholeheartedly support the mission of the AFRH. Additionally, as a Petworth resident I support the AFRH as a valuable local and historical asset.

That being said, I find the proposals contained within the draft EIS to be far too potentially damaging to the environment of NW Washington DC. I believe that the sheer amount of concrete and asphalt alone will disrupt the local ecosystem. The current green space acts as a natural buffer to the heat retention and decreased drainage of the concrete that exists outside the home.

The effect of increased traffic is not sufficiently explored in the EIS. More detail and study, including of potential mass transit hubs, needs to be included in the final EIS.

I would encourage the AFRH to consider slowing down the pace of proposed development. Once an area is sold and developed, it's gone forever. While I have no problem, per se, with development at AFRH, I would like to see a more thought out process that includes community involvement at all phases.

Sincerely,

Matthew Sullivan
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: ____________________________
Address: __________________________
Affiliation: Edward L. Sitter
7000 N Capital St. NW Apt 306
Washington, DC 20011
Phone: 202-524-0296

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?  
[ ] Yes  [ ] No

Comments

AFRH Master Plan/AFRH-W 83 Tide 2005

After attending the Public Meeting in Scott Theater and after having reviewed the 1 - 4 alternatives and site development of AFRH-W (Proposed), I have the following comments:

1. Please preserve the Great Building and have developer include it for their plans.

2. Include opportunities for the elderly so that they can be employed on part time/full time basis by the developers/contractor and future work opportunities after development is completed.

3. Provide through parklike setting, particularly for educational/medical/educational recreational opportunities to residents.  To ensure quality of life in the area.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capital Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afnh.gov

Respectfully,

Edward L. Sitter

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Deck (202) 205-8821
Mr. Dailey,

Please use this response amending what I sent earlier today. The only difference is omitting the reference to the Sierra Club since this group has not had the chance to review this statement.

Thanks for the chance to participate.

Lisa Swanson <melatar@yahoo.com> wrote:
Date: Wed, 6 Jul 2005 14:12:08 -0700 (PDT)
From: Lisa Swanson <melatar@yahoo.com>
Subject: Armed Forces Retirement Home - Washington draft EIS
To: donald.dailey@afnh.gov

Donald Dailey (donald.dailey@afnh.gov)

Armed Forces Retirement Home

3700 North Capitol Street, NW

Washington, DC 20311

Armed Forces Retirement Home - Washington

Response to Draft Environmental Impact Statement

I live a block from the AFRH-W side where I benefit from the climate conditions and quiet of the tree court and meadow and see views of the site many times a day.

Range of options:

While the draft EIS appears to consider a range of options for the effects of developing spaces on the AFRH-W, the potential development options proposed to generate revenue does not include the potential of opening this middle-city green space to the public without further extensive development.

The current AFRH-W website proudly promotes "a city within a city" with amenities that the Petworth, Park View and other adjacent neighborhoods have been lacking for years: an auditorium for films and live entertainment, a golf course and driving range, stocked fish ponds, community garden space, a bar and restaurant or space for a large catered event, a bowling alley, craft studios, magnificent and modest buildings of historical interest, and superb vistas within a landscape relatively untouched for almost two centuries.

With sound management and promotion, by opening access gates to the public, all of these amenities could provide additional commercial and recreational resources for the surrounding residential neighborhoods, apart from the larger-scale development planned at Georgia Avenue/New Hampshire Avenue, with none of the short- or long-term adverse effects.
The EIS does not consider the cumulative effects of slated development at Georgia Avenue/New Hampshire Avenue or the potential development of the Macmillan Sand Filtration site.

Transit:

The EIS notes the relatively poor public transit options nearby. Though the entrances to the site are barely within walking distance of Metrorail stations, they are underserved by buses, with one route running along the northwest gate, two along the south, and none along the eastern perimeter. Thus the development options evaluated rely on acres of parking; Plan 2, the most extensive, considers building 17 thousand parking spaces. Yet there is no inclusion in any options for bikeways and pedestrian walkways to or within the existing perimeter.

The Washington Post of 22 June included an article proposing extensive new development (though in a completely different type of site at a Metrorail station, and outside the Beltway) designed to discourage the use of cars: "Mini-City Plan Discourages Use of Cars," Metro, June 22. This would introduce a radical rethinking of development within the metropolitan area, but not necessarily one for the health of the city.

Other statements have addressed the changing but overwhelmingly residential characteristics of the immediate neighborhood. For the purposes of any development within the District of Columbia, the environmental impact considerations must include not only the perimeter neighborhoods, but also the Anacostia and Potomac rivers and the Chesapeake Bay.

Though sensible growth in areas with existing roads, schools and other services is preferable to creating sprawl, we do not need to sacrifice increasingly precious green space, usable by all for recreation and other purposes, to development for unsubstantiated need for income.

Until the financial situation is explained the "needs" of this entity are justified, further development that compromises the economic and physical health of the neighboring community cannot proceed.
Please accept my remarks as comments on the draft EIS statement.

As a current acting duty service member, I wholeheartedly support the mission of the AFRH. Additionally, as a Petworth resident, I support the AFRH as a valuable local and historical asset.

That being said, I find the proposals contained within the draft EIS to be far too potentially damaging to the environment of NW Washington DC. I believe that the sheer amount of concrete and asphalt alone will disrupt the local ecosystem. The current green space acts as a natural buffer to the heat retention and decreased drainage of the concrete that exists outside the home.

The effect of increased traffic is not sufficiently explored in the EIS. More detail and study, including of potential mass transit hubs, needs to be included in the final EIS.

I would encourage the AFRH to consider slowing down the pace of proposed development. Once an area is sold and developed, it’s gone forever. While I have no problem, per se, with development at AFRH, I would like to see a more thought-out process that includes community involvement at all phases.

Sincerely,

Matthew Sullivan
Dear Mrs. Darling:

As I look over your environmental impact statement, this plan could be prosperous for AFRH. Also, it could become a financial drain on the budget if I can also see the AFRH-W in the future will lack admissions to the home, forcing the home to close.

My question: If this should happen, would the “U. S. Old Soldiers Home,” become a National Historic Preservation Museum you about a stone wall with all residents that have lived here from 1841 to present, have their names engraved?

Our grandchildren and great grandchildren would have a great time.

Thank you,

Elton & Sylvia Dr
Scott Narrative 4205
Dear Mr. Dudley,

4 July 95

Allow me to introduce myself. I am Joseph F. Taylor, Ret/USAF. I have lived here a few APRH-W, off and on for more than 1251 years. For the most part I have enjoyed my stay immensely. I personally feel that too much medical care is available here on campus. I favor a dispensary level facility and I say that because of our near proximity to medical units in the area.

I will likewise fall in step with those who criticize current fee payments. For [1200 -?] years we paid nothing. I cannot believe that "user fees" help the survival of this facility hardly at all. Especially, since some are allowed to live here for little or nothing.

Recommendations: Sell off the Le Guard Medical Facility. Drop the (60) year old age limit. Level fees so that all Residents pay the same. Reduce medical staff. Cut the current staff level even more. Many residents would rent space for storage and we have lots of empty space. Thank you for reading my ramblings.

Joseph Taylor,

Resident
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: EDWARD L. TIFFANY
Address: 4510 SECOND STREET N.E.
Affiliation: WASHINGTON D.C. 20011-4947
Phone: 202-529-4111

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afrh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Becker (202) 205-5821
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft EIS for the proposed development of the Soldiers Home property. I am a resident of the Park View neighborhood to the west of the Soldiers Home, in an area that would be impacted most directly by development of zone 6. Though community-wide impacts from the other proposed zones would also affect me.

The draft EIS covers a number of items that are important to me as a resident of the neighborhood adjacent to the Soldiers Home, such as development’s impact on traffic, community services, and the local economy. Unfortunately, the draft EIS did not account for some items, and I hope that this will be resolved in the publishing of the final EIS.

In many of the alternatives (2, 3A, 4), the EIS proposes to use zone 6 for residential development with some retail space as well. In Alternative 2, the EIS refers to areas “compatible with the residential development west of Rock Creek Church Road.” It should be noted that compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods would require open streets. Gated neighborhoods would not be compatible with the existing openness and community atmosphere of the surrounding Park View and Petworth neighborhoods. Moreover, current residents should have access to any new retail developments.

Alternative 3B also holds potential in its suggestion for the development of an embassy in zone 6. This could be a positive addition to the neighborhood, offering the neighborhood prestige and potential commercial customers of local shops. However, p. 4-22 recognizes a need for increased police presence only in the event of demonstrations. The FEIS should recognize that foreign missions would require a greater constant police presence both at the site and in the surrounding neighborhood.

Park View residents enjoy a view of the trees and green areas of the Soldiers Home. The draft EIS recognizes the loss of this viewshed on p. 4-19, unfortunately no mitigation measures are mentioned for this loss. The FEIS should include the option of mitigating at least some of this loss of the historic “park view” of the neighborhood.

Nor does the draft EIS afford any opportunities for greater public access to green areas. On p. 3-17, the draft EIS identifies the need for more public parks and green spaces as part of the land use plan of The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. Later, on p. 4-23, the draft EIS concludes that Master Plan Alternatives would “conserve open space on the site,” but it does not include any opportunity for public access to this open space. On p. 4-38, the draft EIS acknowledges that the use of the Soldier Home as public parkland is compatible with the traditional residential neighborhoods surrounding it. I would feel more comfortable supporting any of the Master Plan Alternatives if some public access was given to the existing green areas within the Soldiers Home property, thereby making the Master Plan Alternatives consisted with the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

It is my hope that these issues will be addressed in full in the final EIS. Thank you for consideration of my views.

Michael Tubman
MEMO

To: Donald Dailey (Donald.dailley@afrih.gov)
    Armed Forces Retirement Home

Cc: Councilman Jim Graham
    Councilman A. Peaty
    Andrew McGillvray, President, U.N.C.
    The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton

From: Drew Tuchin
      3644 Park Pl. NW
      Washington, DC 20010
      (202) 258-2692

Res: Response to DEIS of 'Old Soldier's Home' AFRH-Washington Plan
    Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

(Note: I would like to receive a copy of the final EIS when available.)

Comments:

Dear Mr. Dailey,

Thank you for the opportunity to present my comments to the AFRH Washington Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As a neighbor on Park Place living directly across the street from the 'Old Soldier's Home', I am highly appreciative your effort is seeking public comment. It is a positive sign to you, especially compared with other military and federal government land activities in DC and nation-wide. My comments are as follows:

1) The EIS does not mention, suggest, or provide financial information as to how sale of land and development thereof is really a solution to the economic challenges of the AFRH Master Plan. The first solution of non-sale should explore other revenue generation schemes, including but not limited to: reduction in costs, better budgeting, increasing contributions from enlisted men, fund-raising, and rental of existing resources. Without a sense of the economic need, there is no way to determine if the suggestions truly would be successful or not. Options other than just sale must be explored, as sale is a short term gain, not a long term sustainable solution.

2) The four alternatives listed are not really different from one another. More effort should be made to provide true alternatives with a variety of financial and real estate options to solve the underlying concern - namely the budget of the AFRH.
3) There is no mention of the potential of establishing a land trust or sale of property as a park. Both options should be added as viable alternatives that allow for revenue but also conservation.

4) The historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence is overlooked. There should be more detail regarding Section 106 impacts and from consideration of knowledgeable sources on the subject, such as Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (federal entity) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

5) The impact on traffic is vague and unexplored. It requires more details, specific, and cost information. There is no information about the impact on the community of the number of peak hour trips suggested in terms of cost to the city of Washington DC to address, the damage to the local infrastructure, and the impact that has on the surrounding community.

6) The increase in as many as 50,000 people on this space does not consider reasonable physical space for parking, attractive building, and quality of life for work or living. We expect federal standards of parking of 1:5 ratio and other federal requirements be established for mitigation.

7) There is no mention of any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but it appears to be inconsistently applied to the document. That error should be amended. Examples are that alternatives 2 & 3A suggest developments in Section 6 that are not in keeping with the community at all. There are no multi-story buildings any in the neighborhoods. There is not enough parking for such construction and the local streets cannot accommodate such traffic. These alternatives need to be identified as not keeping with the neighborhood. They should be removed altogether as also not in keeping with the stated goals of the master plan and the impact goals.

8) Any development should be in compliance with environmental standards. The EIS should detail that any chosen would have GSA LEED certified buildings and a reasonable percentage (10%) classified as green building standards.

Sincerely,
Drew Tutchin
Hello, and thank you for taking the time to review my comments.

Personally, I am against development of any of the property of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (especially zone 6 along Park Place), with the exception of renovation / expansion of existing buildings. I believe redevelopment along Georgia Ave is essential to the quality of life in this area of DC, and any competing development risks over-development. Please understand that I am all for helping to find alternatives so our soldiers can be adequately cared for, and given the resources our country owes them.

Below, here are my comments relating to the CIS directly:

- The May 2005 draft contains many contradictions:
  - Section 1-9 says Minority / Low Income populations potentially could be disproportionately affected vs. section 2-17 Low Income and minority populations would not be disproportionately affected.
  - There may not be sufficient infrastructure to support the additional facilities (1-11) vs. "no direct impacts to water resources" (2-16) and other statements listed throughout (see vii, viii).
  - Traffic considerations do not include increases from the Lincoln Cottage, or the hotel planned for the site, not to mention that it is far enough away from the Metro station that most people aren’t going to walk, but drive. Additionally, it does not include an assessment of how traffic will be impacted from the new projects already slated for Georgia Avenue, Columbia Heights, and Petworth.
  - Many sections are too general/boiled to have any real meaning. When you look at the ‘Retail’ sections, they don’t offer any more insight than the summary sections do.
  - Under the "no action" plan, it says there will be an adverse economic impact to the AFRH-W because of insufficient funding (2-18) ? this statement is intellectually dishonest. A "no-action" option would have a neutral effect (no effect) on the current financial situation.
  - Other alternatives to generating revenue for the Old Soldiers Home need to be discussed. Our Federal Government has the responsibility to make sure our soldiers are adequately funded in their retirement. Giving up their gardens and green space or their prescription drugs should not even be an issue. Granted, this proposal is the easiest out for the financial woes of the AFRH, but it’s a band-aid.

- Almost all of the Impact Summary shows a negative effect to the existing community:
  - More traffic on roads the draft says are already congested (vii).
  - Alt 3A/3B and 4 site access would fail (2-20) $ North capital St would fail o Removal of mature trees (2-16) o Adverse effects on aquatic life (2-16) o Adverse effects to topography (2-16) o Increase noise level (viii) o Degraded air-quality (viii)1(1-11)(2-20) o Decreased green space o Increase in city and federal services (2-17) o Direct, long-term adverse impact on archeological / historical significance (2-19) o Says current Lincoln cottage views would be adversely affected, yet the city and federal government have spent allot of money to preserve this historic sight.
  - Only short term interests of developers and profiteers are served by this plan, but the long term interests of Washington DC, residents of Petworth, and residents of the Old Soldiers Home are not represented.
Every option, except the "no action" option, is huge in scale, even 3B, which shouldn't even be on the table since the State Department has clearly stated they have no interest in putting Embassies and such at the sight.

The Master Plan for our neighborhood includes a lot of development along Georgia Avenue, which I support. Well, we have a lot of work to do on Georgia Avenue, so let's get that rolling before we consider competing opportunities. We risk over-development and suffocating the neighborhood charm if we act too quickly.

How do the Soldiers feel about this? Every soldier I have talked to either doesn't know about it, or is against it. I am told by long time residents in the neighborhood that the reason public access was closed off at the Old Soldiers Home was because they wanted it to be peaceful and quite for the soldiers, now we're talking about creating a city within a city? The increase from the Lincoln Cottage is certainly going to make it busier around there, but not to the point that creating this huge development will.

I am against any development of the property at all, except renovation/expansion of existing buildings. If it could be opened as public green-space that would be great, but I really believe we should leave it as it is in its historical context, and for the soldiers as originally intended by George Riggs.

Thank you,

Cliff Valenti
202.336.7764
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Brian Yoo
Address: 4215 37th St NW, DC, 20016
Affiliation: 
Phone: 202-965-4708

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments

- Thus far, efforts to engage the community in this process have been inadequate.
- I read the paper and listen to the radio and walk the streets near the AFRH, but I have heard nothing about this proposal until a few weeks ago-despite the fact that Fed Reg notice appeared in August 2004.
- Little effort made to explain alternatives or criteria to evaluate them. Presentation contains no detailed description of actual issues--blockade and too little info--much less than the presentation.
- Stormwater impact should be controlled. No net impact.
- Public parks or green space must be a part of this plan if AFRH expansion takes place. Walking through the property (E-W) should be incorporated.
- Parking should be incorporated into part of the final design--on both East and West side of AFRH.

Please send comments to:
Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afrh.gov

Substantial efforts (e.g. a site-specific lapsi) should be made to ensure that DC residents benefit from job opportunities associated with construction and development.

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.

For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: DAVID VINTON
Address: 1925 15th St. NE, Washington, DC, 20310
Affiliation:正文
Phone: 703 277 3822 - USAA Wood Companies

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Comments

VERY INFORMATIVE

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afirh.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
Dear Mr. Bailey,

Thank you for the opportunity to present my comments on the AFRH Washington Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). My comments on the DEIS are as follows:

1) Some important stakeholders were not on your list of individuals and organizations to whom the DEIS was provided. The District of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) was not served with the DEIS. My understanding is that they did not learn of the draft EIS until July 1.

Inadequate time to properly respond and even then only learned of the DEIS through concerned city residents. The comment period for the DEIS should be extended so that DPR can complete its own comprehensive planning process in a way that can consider potential use of part of the AFRH property to meet city park needs. In addition, it is not clear that National Park Service offices with responsibility for the Capital Region actually received notice of the DEIS. Notice of the DEIS was sent to a regional office in Philadelphia, but was not sent to local office responsible for Washington's monumental core or to the superintendent of Rock Creek Parkway.

2) The DEIS needs to provide information regarding the exact amount of money that AFRH needs to raise through this development process.

3) For parcels, or portions of parcels, which have historic significance or character, the development plan must spare them from development, possibly including through alternatives such as land trusts or sale of certain parcels, or portions, for use a parkland. Both options should be added as viable alternatives that allow for revenue but also conservation.

4) Retention of all of the existing mature trees in the historic character areas are particularly essential for historic-preservation purposes. All development alternatives must be crafted in such a way as to preserve the mature trees.

5) Other true alternatives to the proposed development plan must be explored. The four "alternatives" listed in the DEIS are not really different from one another, but merely slight variations on a single theme. More effort should be made to provide true alternatives with a variety of financial and real estate options to solve the underlying concern — namely the budget of the AFRH.

6) The historical importance of the property and maintaining its coherence is overlooked. There should be more detail regarding Section 106 impacts including consideration of knowledgeable sources on the subject, such as Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (federal entity) and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

7) The impact on traffic is vague and unexplored. It requires more details, specifics, and cost information. There is no information about the impact on the community of the number of peak-hour trips suggested in terms of cost to the city of Washington DC to address, the damage to the local infrastructure, and the overall impact on the surrounding community.
8) The DEIS mentions any project being in keeping with the neighborhood, but that standard does not actually appear to be consistently applied in the document. That error must be corrected. For example, alternatives 2 and 3a suggest development in Zone 6 that is not at all in keeping with the adjacent neighborhood's architecture. The existing neighborhood is comprised entirely of rowhouse architecture, with a maximum of three stories in height.

9) It land is to be developed under "GOV" zoning, then all government building standards must be applied, including the most up-to-date environmental standards. For example, the EIS should detail that any development on GOV-zoned land would have to be GSA LEED certified.

10) At the current time, the mature trees on the APRH property contribute positively to air quality and cooling, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the property. The EIS has not considered the specific impact of loss of trees on the property on area temperature and air quality.

11) The transportation impact study of the EIS has not considered the impact of increased traffic on side streets between the affected APRH property and Georgia and New Hampshire Avenues. The impact of the level of increased traffic considered is unlikely to be limited to the main streets currently studied in the EIS.

12) Many residents in the area to the west of APRH use their basements for living space or rent them out to gain much needed income. APRH enjoys the physical advantages of being the third highest point in the District of Columbia. The draft EIS has not considered how dense construction on the APRH property will change the water table and how this might affect basements in the adjacent, lower lying area. A rise in the water table seems likely to result from dense development on this land. A raised water table could result in a serious damage to the use of basements and a substantial loss in income.

13) Both residents of the APRH and neighbors who live to the west of the home benefit from the relative calm and quiet provided by the green campus of the Home. The EIS notes that the noise level in the area is that usually found in parks. Area residents enjoy being able to walk past the property and to see its green expanses when looking out their windows or down their streets. In this way, the APRH has provided area residents with a real source of wealth that improves their quality of life in ways that they could not purchase no matter what their income was. This neighborhood does not seem poor to its residents no matter their income because it does not look like a poor neighborhood. The increased traffic, noise, and loss of green beauty and calm will take away something of irreplaceable value in their lives.

14) Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the DEIS has not adequately taken into account the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital adequately. In particular, there appears to have been an marked inattention to the Parks and Open Element and the Preservation and Historic Features Element. The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital makes clear that the capital area is facing increasing demand for open space and park due to increase population and tourist pressure. The Element
defines open space as "any land or water surface that is not occupied by buildings, a broad definition that encompasses the vast majority of federal property" (p. 1). Under the Park and Open Space Element, federal agencies should:

1. maintain and conserve federal open space as a means of shaping and enhancing urban areas (p. 7); 2. preserve open space that is crucial to the long-term quality of life of a neighborhood or region; 3. conserve and maintain the essential open space character of areas in the region with significant park, open space cultural or natural qualities that contribute to the setting of the National Capital Region.

The element specifically includes McMillan Reservoir to the immediate south of Zone 5 as an example.

4. conserve portions of military reservations that add significantly to the inventory of park, open space, and natural areas and should, to the extent practicable, be used by the public for recreation (i.e., when security considerations permit (p. 8)). The element explicitly includes U.S. Soldier's and Airmen's Home as an example of this.

5. maintain and conserve trees and other vegetation in the landscaped buffer areas on federal installations in a natural condition.

The Park and Open Space Element also addresses the importance of connectivity between parks and open spaces in the Capital Region. As already noted, the element has identified both AFRH and the McMillan Reservoir to its immediate south as areas to be preserved as open space and parkland. Fort Totten to the northeast of AFRH is also an important part of the long-run open space plan for the Capital region. As land is currently configured, links could be made between these three areas through green bikeways. Loss of the AFRH property to development could seriously impair this open space connectivity.

The Parks and Open Space Element highlights the unique role that parks created around historic sites play in the Capital Region. The federal government is to establish and preserve historic parks as important legacies of national, historic, architectural and landscape significance. The Anderson cottage and the area surrounding it have been designated a National Monument because of its importance in Lincoln and other 19th century presidencies. But as the DEIS notes, the importance of the AFRH site does not stop with this. To its immediate north is the first national military cemetery, predating Arlington National Cemetery. The AFRH itself has been in continuous use as a final home for members of the U.S. Armed Forces since the middle of the 19th century. It is the U.S. equivalent of Les Invalides in Paris. Its central landscaped core and the agricultural land (now garden of Zone 6) are essentially unchanged from the 19th century and provide a coherent and important historical context for the National Monument, cemetery and historically important home. The Elements are clear about the importance of protecting just such landscapes from destruction.

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Federal Plan also commits the federal government to protecting terrain features of the region through careful design. In particular, it notes the importance of maintaining
vistas of the Monumental core of L'Enfant's city and protecting the escarpments that provide these overlooks. As the third highest point in the District of Columbia and one of the only undeveloped ones, the AFRH property is one of the areas that falls under the federal government's commitment to protect "topographic bowl features."

The Preservation and Historic Features Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements comprises the Parks and Open Space Element. The Preservation and Historic Features Element is not limited to preservation of historic structures. A major concern is the "preservation and strengthening historic urban design features, such as the L'Enfant Plan." As part of this the Element commits to "protecting the character of the region's natural features, many of which have historical or cultural significance, such as...the ridges of the topographic bowl, agricultural land...and designed landscapes." All of these elements are present on the AFRH property and the alternatives do not seem to adequately take these into account. In particular plans to develop Zones 5 and 6 will disturb historically agricultural land that was an integral part of the function of both AFRH and the Anderson cottage, as well as disrupt the landscape of the topographic bowl. In particular, the Federal Plan calls for the Federal government to "protect the skyline formed by the region's natural features, particularly the topographic bowl around central Washington" and to "protect and enhance the vistas and views...both natural and...designed, that are an integral part of the National capital's image."

The Preservation and Historic Features Federal Elements set policies regarding federal government stewardship of historic properties and the historic plan of Washington, D.C. Under Linear Elements federal agencies should:

1. protect the settings of historic properties, including views to and from sites where significant, as integral parts of the historic character of the property (p. 8); 2. protect the reservations that contain historic landscapes and features from incompatible changes or incursion; 3. protect views...inward from vantage points along the rim of the topographic bowl from inappropriate intrusion. Open space should be preserved to allow for public use and enjoyment of these views. (Examples include the escarpment north of Florida Ave. NW...)

The Parks and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements directs the federal government to look to re-development of surplus federal property as a means of adding to the region's inventory of parks and open space and making that future acquisitions could occur by purchase, donation, development or exchange. An alternative that has not been included in the NPS is exchange of land in zones 5 and 6 for other federal surplus land that could be more appropriately developed. Exchanging this land for land in another location and development, there could provide needed financial resources for AFRH.

Zones 5 and 6 could then continue to play the important role they currently play in the District's system of federal open space by protecting historic landscapes, providing appropriate context for an
important historical site and protecting views of the central core of the capital as directed by the Federal Elements. If the land were transferred to the National Park Service to enlarge the Lincoln Cottage National Monument, this would not only preserve open space but would help protect the historical integrity of the setting for the cottage as a place of retreat and rest, thus preventing the kind of encroachment of inappropriate new development that has so adversely affected the Manassas Battle Field and other major Civil War historic sites. It would also enhance public access to much needed open space in the District as a whole as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, it may serve to substantially mitigate adverse environmental impacts of development on the eastern Zones 2, 3, and 4.

The District of Columbia Parks and Recreation is currently in the middle of a comprehensive planning process. As part of this effort they are conducting a survey of park and recreation needs indicating a significant deficit of park space in the Petworth, Park View, Columbia Heights area.

The AFRH property is a uniquely large landscaped open space -- one of the few remaining unprotected open space areas in the eastern part of residential Washington D.C. The planning process should also be timed to accommodate consideration of the current comprehensive planning process of the D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation.

The location of a park in Zone 6 in the AFRH EIS would be easily accessible to dense development in neighboring Columbia Heights and to planned dense residential development along Georgia Avenue, as well as dense development planned for the rest of the AFRH site. In addition, because of proximity to the Georgia/Petworth Metro stop, it would provide much needed parkland for other parts of northwest and northeast D.C.

The open space already provided by AFRH is an integral design element of the adjacent Petworth and Park View rowhouse neighborhoods, developed in the early 1900s. Surrounding streets to the west of the Home were designed to take advantage of vistas of the open space provided by the Home’s property. For example, the vista from Grant Circle down Illinois Ave to Zone 6 is an important anchoring design element in the eastern part of Petworth. The Preservation Element of the Federal Elements direct federal agencies to “protect reciprocal views along rights-of-way and from 9 circle[s]” (p. 11). Replacing the vista of this green expanse that opens out over a view of the federal core of the city with a view of an eight story apartment building would significant harm the integrity of historic city plan in this part of the capital.

Among the alternatives, the DBIS has not considered alternatives that would provide significant parkland for the neighborhood to the west of AFRH. As the name Park View suggests, the neighborhoods of Petworth and Park View adjacent to the western boundary of Soldier’s Home were developed in the early 1900s around the presence of the Soldier’s Home as open space.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I am confident that adequate and appropriate consideration of the comments of all affected parties will produce a better and result for AFRH.
residents, and the multitude of other city residents who will be affected by the proposed development.

Sincerely,

Abby Wahl
4126 Fifth St, NW
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Debra F. Walsh
Address: 393 Rock Creek Church Rd
Affiliation: Home Owner
Phone: 202-783-7362

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:

I received a flyer two days ago. This was kept out of the plan. We are not designed for the old of the elderly community. This is not about the men in this home needing money.

Please send comments to:

Armed Forces Retirement Home
Attention: Donald Dailey
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
donald.dailey@afrih.gov

All comments must be postmarked by 6 July 2005.
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact: Denise Decker (202) 205-5821
AFRH-Washington Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment Form

Name: Suzanne Welsby, Dir of New Project Development
Address: 5101 16th St NW
Affiliation: Transitional Housing Corporation
Phone: 202-291-5535

Would you like to receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for this action when it becomes available?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:
The EIS did not adequately address the housing demands and needs pressure on the District today. Affordable housing is in great demand and need, not because housing, hotels or high rise condo.
Please consider the enclosed housing in the Watson Capital 2004 by the Urban Land Institute and Fannie Mae Foundation. Where residential leases are considered at least 20% should be affordable for sale or for rent housing for low and moderate income families.

Please set Transitional Housing Corporation

6 July 2005
For questions on the Draft EIS, please contact Rose Decker (202) 291-5821
Dear Mr. Bailey,

I know I have until July 6th, so here are my two cents. I'm a resident of Yetworth and am a bit concerned that the Soldier's Home development decisions are being made too fast, and with only one public hearing. For what it's worth, here's a recent article in the NY Times that makes the case to proceed slowly, and with care, because 100 year-old trees won't shade our family picnics if they're paved over in a quick effort to make a profit.

Thanks for the opportunity.

Virginia Williams
Executive Producer/President
New View Films, LLC
4108 4th Street NW
Washington, DC 20011
O: (202) 723-7703
E: (202) 297-1777
www.newviewfilms.tv

IN THE REGION/Long Island: Forgoing Profits to Save Natural Beauty

By VALENTIN COSTELAS
Published: April 10, 2005, Sunday

The 15-acre Siena Spirituality Center at Villa Maria in Water Mill is surrounded by signs of Long Island's development boom: race and trucks stream along Montauk Highway just outside the iron entrance gates, and junko McMansions and their Landscapers' whining lawnmowers intrude from across the waters of Mill Creek, which borders 1,200 feet of the property.

The 612-member sisters of the Order of St. Dominic own the center but can no longer afford to maintain the 21,000-square-foot, 23-bedroom, Neoclassical mansion, built in 1910, four other buildings, and the scenic grounds.

The order is seeking a buyer who will agree to preserve the property so that its beauty is not lost forever, as has happened at some estates and is threatened at others.

Only two sisters now live on the estate, once run as a school for young women and later as a retirement home for aging nuns. Today, the center is a non-denominational retreat used by a variety of organizations.

For reasons that go to the heart of their religious beliefs, the remaining sisters say, the order wants to add a restriction to the deed prohibiting subdivision of the property far into the future.

"The destruction of the natural world is the destruction of the human soul," Sister Margaret Galliardi said in a sunlit room overlooking the rear grounds and Mill Creek. "The land is part of the mission; it's
important to us that the way we sell the land communicates what we believe.''

One buyer, whom the sisters would not identify, has offered $25 million for the estate and would keep its religious zoning, but brokers say the property would be worth at least $10 million more to a developer without the restriction. 'Real estate is the name of the game out here,' said Robert Byten, a listing agent with Prudential Douglas Elliman. 'It's the currency.'

Many owners have chosen to amass as much of that currency as they can. The ultrarich living on Long Island today take up less space than they did in the early 1900's, when robber barons built mansions on hundreds of acres along the Island's shores. Many celebrated Gold Coast and East End mansions have long since fallen into disrepair or been torn down altogether, their surrounding estates divided up into smaller parcels, each with a million-dollar home. Real estate sales show that the trend continues.

'People who want the seclusion of a larger estate are not looking at the 20- to 30-acre parcels as being economically viable when they can live on a palatial estate of 3 acres,' said Paul Bloom, a partner at the law firm of Harris, Bloom & Archer.

Mr. Bloom represents owners of estates in Sands Point, Kings Point and Lloyd Harbor who are planning to subdivide their properties. He would not identify the exact locations, but said they range from 16 to 34 acres.

Last November, a bidding war erupted over the 13-acre Land's End estate in Sands Point, built in 1900 and most recently owned by Virginia Payson, the widow of the industrialist Charles Shipman Payson.

Bert Brodsky bought the estate for $17.5 million, said Susan Klein, an agent at Accent on Real Estate, GMNC, who brokered the sale.

The estate sits on a peninsula with two private beaches and borders a 25-acre bird sanctuary. 'It's the most breathtaking property you've ever seen,' Mr. Brodsky said in a telephone interview. He said he had hoped to restore the mansion and subdivide the land to build four additional 8,000-square-foot homes, one for each of his adult children.

But he forgot to check with the family first. 'Unfortunately, my wife doesn't want to live in the mansion,' Mr. Brodsky said. 'And the kids don't want to live on the same block.'

A second plan was to join with a partner and build condominiums on the site, but Mr. Brodsky said the Sands Point Village Board of Trustees preferred the lower density plan. 'I don't want to fight with anyone,' he said of the village, where he has lived for 37 years. He has gone back to the plan to build four more homes at the site and then to sell them and the mansion, but he has not yet submitted plans, he said.

As housing prices reach ever skyward, 'It becomes harder and harder to convince people to forget the enormous profit that can be made in selling these properties,' said Lloyd Zuckerberg, president of the
Nassau Land Trust, a land conservation organization that he founded in 2001.

The 145-acre Kirby Hill estate in Muttontown and the 155-acre Gordon Phipps estate in Old Westbury are both slated for subdivision, Mr. Zuckerberg said.

But as woodland spaces and green landscapes disappear at a rapid pace, conservation efforts arise from unlikely sources.

Mr. Zuckerberg, for example, is also a real estate investor and developer, and he said he tries to incorporate principles of land conservation into his projects on Long Island.

Making use of a federal tax deduction for landowners who give up development rights on land that borders a public road or a preserve or has other conservation value, Mr. Zuckerberg and a partner are planning to subdivide an estate in Nassau County, he said, but have given up 75 percent of the development right to the land. That means they will build far fewer homes on the land than the zoning allows.

"I think what we're creating on this land is going to be worth far more over time than if we chopped it up into 30 pieces cookie-cutter style," Mr. Zuckerberg said. "Not wanting to name the property until he has town approvals. "This land will look in 100 years the way it looks today."

Nassau and Suffolk Counties have acquired some old estates over the years, either as gifts from wealthy landholding families or by buying the properties outright.

One of the largest county owned preserves in Nassau is the 216-acre Sands Point Preserve, given to the federal government in the 1940's by the Congdon family and acquired in 1971 by Nassau County. The county spends about $1 million each year to maintain the preserve and its historic buildings, according to Michael Xie, a deputy county executive for Nassau County parks.

Suffolk County owns eight traditional estates, including the 43-acre Vanderbilt estate in Centerport, given to the county by the family in 1997. The mansion is open to the public, and a planetarium built in 1970 holds sky shows and telescope viewings.

Both counties work with foundations and other organizations to find uses and caretakers for the estates.

"Restoration is an expensive thing, and it's almost a never ending thing," said Ronald Foley, the Suffolk County parks commissioner. "You can get them to a state of repair where the restoration is complete, but they still need maintenance."

In Southampton, the Sisters of St. Dominic have spent millions. Sister Margaret said, renovating the mansion over the last 70 years, looking out the floor-to-ceiling windows in the sitting room, she remarked on the beauty of the grounds.
'When you look at this land, people think, 'O.K., what can we do with it?' she said. 'Why not leave it?'
July 1, 2003

Donald Delaney
Armored Forces Retirement Home
3700 North Capitol Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Dear Mr. Delaney,

We are writing to take advantage of the brief period allowed for comments on the Armed Forces Retirement Home Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). While we fully support the need to maintain the Armed Forces Retirement Home, we feel that the process has thus far lacked the opportunity for community participation.

According to the draft EIS, one objective of the AFPH Master Plan is to "establish an open, participatory process with the AFPH-W residents and the community." To date, we do not feel that the community has been given the sufficient time or information needed to actively participate in this process. Few of us know of the June 13 meeting and even fewer of any prior steps. We would like this AFPH to extend and open this process and would also like to ensure that from here on, the AFPH be more transparent and take more active steps to ensure stakeholder participation. We would also like to ensure that a community representative participate in all meetings and that minutes and updates be shared monthly.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments at this point of the process. We look forward to your consideration of and positive response to our concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

Co.: Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton
        Linda W. Cropp, Council Chair, Council of the District of Columbia
        Jack Evans, Chair Pro Tempore
        Jim Graham, Ward One
        Adrian R. Fenty, Ward Four
        Vincent Gray, Ward Five
To Whom It May Concern:

We, the undersigned residents and homeowners of the Columbia Heights and Petworth neighborhoods of Washington, D.C., wish to register our strong concerns with the Environmental Impact Statement addressing the proposed development of the grounds of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

We believe there are significant deficiencies in the report, and that insufficient consideration has been given to the possible impacts of large-scale development on the city and especially, on the neighboring communities.

Specifically:

- The EIS neglects the fact that the AFRH is proposing extremely dense development of park-like open space in the middle of a neighborhood that is disproportionately low income, elderly and African American (reference U.S. Census).
- The EIS understates the impact of large-scale development on traffic in the surrounding areas, including parking, increased traffic on major arteries, and increased traffic on narrow side streets now used by high concentrations of children and the elderly.
- Insufficient consideration is given to the impact of the local and regional environment, including air quality, ambient temperature and the loss of mature trees and vegetation.
- Likewise, the EIS fails to adequately address the issues of water run off, including impacts on the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers, and affects on local properties and adjacent water table.

The EIS has considered only two alternatives, no development, or dense development on virtually the entire perimeter of the AFRH. It is not at all clear that the EIS has taken into account the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. In particular there appears to have been a marked inattention to the requirements addressing Park and Open Space and Preservation and Historic Features.

The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital directs the government to look to redevelopment of surplus federal property as a means of adding to the region's Inventory of parks and open space. In particular the AFRH and Mobilian Reservoir to its immediate south are identified as areas to be preserved as open space and parkland. The EIS fails to address any addition to or preservation of public use land.
Nor does the EIS adequately address preservation of the unique historical role of the AFRH property. For instance:

- Plans to develop areas 5 and 6 of this property will disrupt historically agricultural land that has been an integral part of the AFRH for a century and a half.
- Highrise development along the periphery of the property will destroy streets and from the highest topography in the District.

We are disturbed that the EIS appears to have been developed with little or no consideration for the requirements of local and federal guidelines for such development, and without the participation and consent of neighboring communities.

In fact, it is not clear that the National Park Service actually received the EIS in time for meaningful comment. The District of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation was not served with the EIS, and did not learn of the project until July 1, 2009 — just before the deadline for comment. Meanwhile, the Columbia Heights and Petworth communities immediately to the west, both with large and very active neighborhood organizations, were not informed until late in the process.

We fully support the goals of the AFRH and, in particular, take pride in hosting the men and women residents as our neighbors. We believe, however, that the residents of the District deserve better planning and a more thorough process for developing this unique green space in the heart of the Capital.

Please send this hastily and ill-conceived report back to the drawing board. We believe there are other alternatives — and better solutions — for the AFRH and for our communities. We stand ready to work with AFRH to develop workable ideas for the benefit of all.

Respectfully,

[Signatures]
June 28, 2005

Timothy Cox
Armed Forces Retirement Home
3700 N Capital St NW
Washington, DC 20011-8400

Dear Timothy,

I would like to take this time to introduce ServiceTRAC. Like your organization, we
pride ourselves in providing quality services and satisfaction management to the
Senior Living Industry.

ServiceTRAC is a full-service research and marketing firm. For over 15 years,
ServiceTRAC has been helping the senior living industry improve resident, family
member, and employee satisfaction and raise occupancy rates through marketing
audits, satisfaction research, mystery shopping, and sales training. ServiceTRAC
provides customer-focused solutions that provide our clients valuable information and
actionable strategies to help sales professionals and managers achieve more
success with their operations and marketing programs.

Quality First seems to be the "buzz word" of choice within our industry. ServiceTRAC
has taken it one step forward and integrated Quality First into our Satisfaction Survey
process. ServiceTRAC has generated the ALFA Senior Living Satisfaction database,
which is now the benchmark against which all U.S. Senior Living communities are
measured. Our Industry benchmarks and pioneering Value Report will give you the
key to improving customer satisfaction. ServiceTRAC’s Satisfaction survey offers the
following:

* **COMPARISON TO NATIONAL INDUSTRY DATABASE:** ServiceTRAC has
  partnered with the Senior Industry Associations and key leaders to build the
  industry’s largest and most reliable database. We increase the value of your
  results by placing them into context. The reports index your company’s
  score averages to the industry database averages.

* **ANONYMITY & OBJECTIVITY:** ServiceTRAC offers your resident, family
  members and employees the peace of mind of anonymity and the ability to
  answer honestly to an objective third party. All research shows that the
  promise of anonymity and the involvement of an objective third party elicit
  more honest responses while eliminating positive response bias.

* **RELIABLE QUESTIONNAIRE:** During the design of our standardized
  questionnaire instrument, ServiceTRAC reviewed over 15,000 surveys! We
  then tested the instrument by conducting numerous focus groups with
  Resident/Employee, family members and employees. We are in the unique
  position to continually improve this survey instrument through ongoing
  research and customer feedback!

* **ACTIONABLE REPORTS:** ServiceTRAC takes an overwhelming amount of
  qualitative and quantitative data and delivers it to you in an easily understood
  and actionable format. The reports are accessible online 24x7.

* **QUALITATIVE FOCUS:** ServiceTRAC gets to the heart of
  Resident/Employee satisfaction by coding your Resident/Employee’s actual
  comments into specific categories. This allows you to review the sentiments
  of your customers in a manageable manner. The verbatim section of the
report truly brings the survey results to life by relaying certain illustrative comments, word for word.

- **TURNKEY PROGRAM**: ServiceTRAC will handle the entire program from beginning to end. This means no management, data processing, report formulation or complicated data analysis by you. This leaves you time to do what you do best - take great care of your Residents and Employees.

- **THE CREATION OF YOUR OWN DATABASE**: ServiceTRAC will track your company's scores over time. Each time we conduct your ValueSat Resident/Employee Expectations-Based program, we will track and report trends along with changes since the last time you surveyed your Resident/Employees.

I would welcome the opportunity to schedule a telephone conference with you, Bill Nowell (ServiceTRAC President and CEO), and myself to learn more about your organization, and discuss how ServiceTRAC can assist you. I look forward to the opportunity to answer any additional questions you may have. Thank you for your time and I look forward to speaking with you soon. Feel free to visit our website at www.servicetrac.com.

Sincerely,

Michael S. Miller  
Chief Operating Officer  
ServiceTRAC, LLC  
800.951.8808  
mike.miller@servicetrac.com  
www.servicetrac.com  

P.S. ServiceTrac is conducting a Sales Training Boot Camp in Scottsdale, AZ on September 21-25, 2006. To obtain more information, feel free to contact me to receive a copy of the brochure.
June 29, 2005

NOTE TO: Donald Daily
FROM: Linda V. Taylor
Executive Assistant to the President

Attached are the written comments from Washington Hospital Center for the Draft E18.

If you need additional information or have any questions, I can be reached at (202) 877-6102.

Thank you.
I appreciated the opportunity to attend the AFRH-Washington Master Plan Scoping Meeting held on September 9th and submit the following in order to document my comments at the meeting:

1. **MedStar/WHC fully supports the concept of development of the property being proposed in the plan. As the owner and operator of the medical complex on land immediately to the south across Irving Street, we believe that appropriate development compatible with AFRH and neighboring uses is important for the efficient use of land to benefit the community and City as a whole.**

2. **This City has limited large tracts of land for development. When large parcels become available for use, a variety of possibilities should be considered that maximize the benefits to the community, both financially and substantively. Because of the character of the land use south of Irving, medical, educational, research and other related institutional uses should be considered.**

3. **The major street arteries adjacent to the site, such as North Capitol Street and Irving Streets and Michigan Avenue provide excellent access to the site. A relatively high density could be accommodated so long as residential areas to the northwest are protected. The characteristics of the site, with large open spaces, lend itself to appropriate urban development appropriate so as to counteract urban sprawl. Metro's Red Line is sufficiently close to the site that shuttle bus service benefiting all in the immediate community would reduce traffic.**

4. **The clinical and research components of MedStar/WHC's plan have a unique compatibility with the mission of the home and could assist in providing or coordinating development for this important site. In addition, the site would allow the expansion and renovation of WHC facilities, which can become a model for the delivery of medical services.**

5. **MedStar/WHC has the capacity and will pursue the opportunity to develop the entire property in an integrated and intelligent manner, respectful of the community and AFRH residents and guided by the leadership of AFRH.**

6. **The traffic impact identified in Alternative 2 overstates the projections Washington Hospital Center developed by a factor of 2.**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
- We believe the Environmental Impact Analysis of ALT 2 overestimated total peak hour trip generation by a factor of 2+ forecast 21,268 trips vs. 8,983 trips.

- The principal reasons for the overestimation were:
  
  o Use of junior/community college ratio for the area designated as medical education. This overstates the need by 6 times.

  o Does not account for replacement of existing trips (WHC move to AFRH takes traffic away from WHC campus).

  o Does not account for full impact of internal capture and transit – 2 Metro stops and 5 bus routes directly serving adjacent land use.

  o Does not recognize shift change hours for medical facilities vs. office users that mirror rush hour, i.e., clinical facility staff arrive before a.m. peak hour and leave before p.m. peak hour.

- Parking demand for ALT 2 was overestimated by a factor of 2. Note that NIH with a daytime population of 17,000 only provides 8,000 spaces on its 300 acre campus

- Suggest that prior to assigning final traffic impact, a more refined analysis be undertaken to more accurately predict future growth parameters – note also that the full development program is spread over a 15-20 year time frame. This allows for adjustments to be made in roadway configuration, mass transit utilization, internal traffic management, and development staging.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Theodore F. Mariani, F.A.I.A., P.E.  CSD/Mariani

FROM: Michael P. Hurley  Louis J. Sade, P.E., P.T.O.E

DATE: June 21, 2005

SUBJECT: Analysis of Armed Forces Retirement Home Draft EIS

BACKGROUND

The US Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) is considering the reuse of under-utilized portions of its campus in Northwest Washington, D.C. AFRH disposed of 49 acres on the east side of North Capital Street within the last year. Now, AFRH has identified an additional 112 acres that are located on the west side of North Capital Street that it wishes to dispose of. An environmental impact statement has been drafted that examines potential development scenarios for the 112 acres plus the land that is retained by AFRH. The Draft EIS analyzed the impact of three alternatives on surrounding roadways. Alternative 2 had the densest development of those proposed. This memorandum provides an evaluation of the trip generation assumptions for Alternative 2 contained in the Draft EIS. It is the opinion of Gorove/Slade Associates, Inc. (G/SA) that the Draft EIS transportation forecast greatly over-estimated the potential trip generation rates of the proposed development under Alternative 2.

G/SA analyzed a development proposal that was prepared by MedStar, which is interested in developing the 112 acres at AFRH. MedStar's proposal is similar to the development analyzed by the Draft EIS under Alternative 2, however, it proposes less development for a number of land uses. MedStar's development proposal contained 490,000 SF less for medical educational land uses, 100,000 SF less for retail land uses, 25,000 SF less for residential land uses, and 4,518 fewer parking spaces than Alternative 2 in the Draft EIS. In some instances G/SA used data similar to MedStar's development proposal to analyze assumptions made by the Draft EIS. The impact of the increased development proposed under Alternative 2 and the rationale for using data similar to MedStar's development proposal are discussed below.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

G/SA analyzed three trip generation assumptions contained in the Draft EIS using the expected development intensity proposed under Alternative 2.

ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition Coding. The Draft EIS calculated anticipated trips with the ITE Trip
Generation, 7th Edition equation for Junior/Community College based on 1,000 Square Feet Gross Floor Area. G/FSA analyzed the impact of choosing this equation by calculating the anticipated trip generation rate of the educational facilities with the ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equation for University/College based on the anticipated number of students, faculty and staff that are expected to use the facilities. Table 1 illustrates that there is a significant difference in anticipated trip generation rates produced by the different ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equations. The Draft EIS anticipated 12,568 trips during the AM and PM peak hour, while only 2,366 trips for the AM and PM peak hour were forecasted with the Trip Generation, 7th Edition equation for University/College based on the anticipated number of students, faculty and staff; both numbers were reduced by the 12.5% to account for the internal capture and transit reduction rates anticipated by the Draft EIS.

Replacement of Existing Trips: G/FSA analysis of the proposed development suggests that a percentage of existing trips to the Washington Hospital Center will likely travel to the proposed development. It appears that the Draft EIS did not account for this possibility when it calculated anticipated trips under Alternative 2. Table 2 illustrates the impact of this assumption on anticipated trip generation rates for the proposed hospital facilities. Assuming that 30% of existing trips generated by the Washington Hospital Center would travel to the proposed development, which is the approximate amount of existing medical facilities that will be replaced by the proposed development, reduced the total AM and PM peak hour trips by approximately 1,100 trips. Additional reductions are likely to occur as adjacent facilities are replaced by new facilities within the proposed development.

Internal Capture and Transit Reduction Rates: G/FSA calculated the impact of the mixed used nature of the proposed development and its proximity to two Metro Stations and 12 Metro bus routes, five of which directly serve existing adjacent land uses, would produce a higher internal capture and transit reduction rate than forecasted by the Draft EIS. Table 3 illustrates, increasing the reduction rate by 7.5%, to a total of 20%, would reduce total trips generated under Alternative 2 by an 3,217 trips during the AM and PM peak hour.

Impact: G/FSA analysis of the Draft EIS suggests that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the trip generation rates anticipated by the Draft EIS under Alternative 2 overestimated the impact of the proposed development at AFRH. G/FSA analysis of the Draft EIS suggests that a total of approximately 32,000 fewer trips could be generated under Alternative 2 using the different assumptions outlined above. As Figure 1 illustrates, 21,768 total AM and PM peak hour trips were anticipated by the Draft EIS under Alternative 2 and 10,531 under Alternative 3A. Using the revised assumptions outlined in this draft memorandum, G/FSA forecasted only 8,983 total AM and PM peak hour trips under Alternative 2. This represents nearly 58% fewer trips forecasted by the Draft EIS under Alternative 2 and 15% fewer trips than Alternative 3A. Additional reductions would likely occur under development conditions proposed by MedStar.

This suggests that the impact of Alternative 2 on the levels of service of surrounding intersections would
more closely approximate the impact anticipated by the Draft EIS under Alternative 3A, which contains 2.9 million fewer square feet of proposed development than Alternative 2.

**Figure 1: Peak Hour Trip Generation**

These findings suggest that additional detailed analysis should be conducted before concluding, as the Draft EIS did, that the development expected under Alternative 2 will have a direct, long-term, adverse impact on the surrounding intersections, especially because, as the Draft EIS states, "it is not uncommon for intersections in highly developed/urbanized areas like DC to experience poor levels of service during peak hours (4-5AM)." A more rigorous analysis of the anticipated trips generated by the proposed development under Alternative 2 would provide more accurate trip generation rates and a clearer understanding of the impact on surrounding intersections. Such an analysis would likely demonstrate additional reductions in trip generation rates and improved levels of service at surrounding intersections.

**ITE TRIP GENERATION, 7TH EDITION CODING**

The Draft EIS for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) used the ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition to forecast trip generation rates for the proposed development. Each alternative analyzed by the Draft EIS, as well as the MedStar proposal, dedicated land for medical educational facilities. Even if it were assumed
that a totally new medical center was fully developed, which is not likely, the population for medical educational land uses would not exceed 2,500, which includes students, faculty and staff.

To forecast trip generation rates for the proposed medical educational facilities at AFRH the Draft EIS used the ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equation for Junior/Community College based on 1,000 Square Feet Gross Floor Area. G/SA suspects that this code was used because the square footage of the educational land use was known by those drafting the EIS but not the number of students, faculty and staff. This may have also been the reason why the equation for Junior/Community College was used and not University/College. The ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition has trip generation rates for Junior/Community College based on 1,000 Square Feet Gross Floor Area but not for University/College. Regardless of the reasons, G/SA believes a more accurate forecast of trip generation rates is produced using the ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equation for University/College land use based on the anticipated number of students, faculty and staff for the proposed facilities. The ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition defines University/College land use as land that, "includes four-year universities or colleges that may or may not offer graduate programs," while it defines Junior/Community College land use that, "includes two-year junior, community, or technical colleges." G/SA analysis of the Georgetown University Medical Center suggests that it most closely approximates ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition definition for University/College.

Table 1 illustrates the significant decrease in trips anticipated by the different ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equations. The trip generation rates listed in Table 1 were reduced to account for the anticipated internal capture and transit reduction rates predicted by the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS anticipated that the proposed educational facilities would generate 12,568 total peak hour trips under Alternative 2.

Calculating the trip generation rates for the proposed medical educational facilities with the ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equation using the actual number of anticipated students, faculty and staff reduced the number of trips generated under Alternative 2 by 56%. The decrease produced by the different ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equations within the same land use code suggests that the Draft EIS significantly overestimated the trip generation numbers anticipated under Alternative 2. Significant, additional reductions in trip generation rates are realized using the University/College ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equation. Trip generation rates were forecasted to decrease an additional 64% using the University/College ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equation while assuming the same number of students, faculty and staff. Using the University/College ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equation based on the number of students and faculty/staff decreased the number of total trips generated by medical educational facilities by 10,590, a reduction of 84%. This reduces the total anticipated AM and PM peak hour trips generated for the proposed development under Alternative 2 by more than 50%. Table 1 and Figure 2 detail the significant differences in trip generation rates forecasted by different ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition equations.
Table 1: Trip Generation - Education Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Daily Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior/Community College</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/Community College</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING TRIPS

The Draft EIS forecasted anticipated trips for the proposed land uses under each alternative. It does not appear that the Draft EIS trip generation forecasted were adjusted to account for the number of existing trips to adjacent land uses that will travel to the proposed development. Specifically, approximately 50% of existing clinical facilities located south of the proposed development, across Irving Street NW, which is one of four access roads for the proposed development site, will be replaced by new facilities north of Irving Street under each development scenario analyzed in the Draft EIS. This suggests that approximately 50% of existing trips generated by the Washington Hospital Center and National Rehabilitation Hospital during the AM and PM peak period will travel to the proposed facilities using the same intersections. Adjusting anticipated trip generation rates to account for existing trips reduces the total anticipated trips generated under Alternative 2 by medical land uses during the AM and PM peak hours to 1,304 from 2,609. Table 2 illustrates the impact of removing existing trips from the trip generation rates anticipated by the Draft EIS under Alternative 2.

Table 2: Trip Generation - Hospital Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Daily Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1,600,000 SF</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>1,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1,600,000 SF</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>537</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Removed 50% of existing trips

Accounting for existing trips to adjacent land uses will further improve the level of service of adjacent roadways and intersections. This is especially true of intersection 6 on Irving Street NW, which serves as the current and future entrance to the medical facilities on both sides of the road, because it reduces the number of autos entering and exiting the existing facility and proposed facility. A more detailed analysis of existing and proposed land uses would likely determine that additional existing trips were included in the anticipated trip generation rates detailed in the Draft EIS.

INTERNAL CAPTURE AND TRANSIT REDUCTION RATES
more than 8,000 parking spaces for employees and visitors, which results in a parking ratio of 0.46.

Consideration should be given to supplying parking at a lower ratio to encourage ride sharing and transit use. The model for this approach to demand management can be found in the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital Region parking guidelines issued by the National Capital Planning Commission for Federal Agencies. While this development will not be a federal agency campus, it will have similar characteristics from a transportation standpoint and thus, these NCPC guidelines are a good starting point for a demand management program. Reducing the parking ratio could be expected to further reduce the total trips generated during the AM and PM peak hour.

IMPACT

G/SA analysis suggests that the impact of Alternative 2 on the levels of service of surrounding intersections would more closely approximate the impact anticipated by the Draft EIS under Alternative 3A. The trip generation rates of Alternative 4A anticipated that only two intersections during the PM peak, North Capitol Street/Harewood Road and Irving Street/11th Street NW/Site Access, would operate at level of service below what DDOT considers adequate. The Draft EIS forecasted that trips generated under Alternative 2 would cause three intersections to fail during the AM and PM Peak hour.

According to the Draft EIS, Alternative 4A generated 5,093 AM peak hour trips and 5,436 PM peak hour trips. G/SA analysis forecasted only 4,516 trips during the PM peak under Alternative 2. These findings suggest that the level of service of surrounding intersections under Alternative 2 would be significantly improved. G/SA conducted a rough analysis of one intersection, North Capitol Street/Harewood Road, to determine the impact of different trip generation assumptions under Alternative 2. G/SA analysis indicates that the total delay anticipated by the Draft EIS under Alternative 2, 357 seconds, could decrease by approximately 150 seconds. In both scenarios the delay at these intersections is below what the District considers adequate, but, as the EIS states, "It is not uncommon for intersections in highly developed/urbanized areas like D.C. to experience poor levels of service during peak hours (4-54)."*

These findings suggest that the Draft EIS greatly overestimated the trip generation rates anticipated under Alternative 2. A more rigorous analysis of Alternative 2 would provide a clearer understanding of the impact of the proposed development and establish appropriate mitigation measures. Based on the findings outlined above, G/SA believes additional detailed study of the Draft EIS is merited.
Figure 2: Trip Generation by Land Use

Note: The Draft EIS under Alternative 2 assumed two separate development sites for Junior/Community College and Shopping Center.