The meeting convened at 6:40 pm.

David Julyan opened the meeting with an introductory statement that outlined the parties co-sponsoring the process (ANC2A, DC Office of Planning, and GW University) and the process that had been followed over the summer. The full statement is posted on the planning process website: (www.neighborhood.gwu.edu).

The purpose of this meeting was the presentation of GW’s conceptual framework for the development of Square 54 and their conceptual framework for the future development of the Foggy Bottom campus, and capturing initial reactions and comments from the participants. In addition, the Issues Exhibit was explained. The Issues Exhibit, which records any issue that any participant felt was relevant to the project will remain open for four (4) weeks for additional issues from participants and comments from the cosponsors.

It was highlighted that this was the last meeting of the current process. The GW development teams had spent the summer listening and interacting with the community and would now present GW’s frameworks. The frameworks are not final products and are not ready for submission to the District government; they are the current step in a continuing process.

Next steps in the process would include preparing these frameworks and submitting them to the District’s regulatory process. The cosponsors may consider other steps, but only submitting to the regulatory process was known for sure.

The agenda for the meeting was reviewed. The agenda is posted at the website. After brief statements from the cosponsors, and general overviews of the two frameworks, the focus for the meeting was to provide residents with a direct presentation of the frameworks and to capture comments and reactions. Three “stations” were established in different areas of the room. One station addressed the Square 54 framework, one station addressed the Foggy Bottom campus framework, and the final station addressed the Issues Exhibit.

Each cosponsor made brief statements. Lou Katz, GW’s Executive Vice President, reviewed their plan for future campus development, the need for a Neighborhood-GW Advisory Committee, GW’s compliance, monitoring and enforcement of the current campus plan, and GW’s specific commitments with respect to campus development issues. Mr. Katz’s presentation is posted on the website.
Vince Micone, Chair ANC2A, spoke of the community’s willingness to engage in an open and transparent process, but reminded all participants that there were many steps left to take and no agreement on either 1) what the final plans should include or 2) any process other than the District’s normal procedures.

Travis Parker, DC Office of Planning, spoke regarding OP’s commitment to a transparent and inclusive process and to the regulatory process that would follow the current, voluntary effort. Ellen McCarthy, Director of the Office of Planning joined the meeting and participated in the stations.

Matt Bell, EEK architects, presented an overview of the framework for the Foggy Bottom campus and neighborhoods. Rafael Pelli, of Cesar Pelli architects, presented an overview of the framework for Square 54.

After those presentations, participants moved to the “stations” for approximately 1 hour. Comments, questions, and reactions from participants at the framework stations were recorded and are presented as an addendum to this Report.

David Julyan reconvened the full meeting, reviewed next steps, thanked all participants, and adjourned the meeting at 8:30.
Community Meeting #5: Presentation & Discussion of Proposed Concept Framework

September 20, 2005
The Westin Grand Hotel (2350 M Street, NW)
6:30-8:30 p.m.

Community Participation in Interactive Stations

Station 1: GW’s Foggy Bottom Campus Proposed Concept Plan

Flip Chart Notes:

- Retain the park at the cancer center site (39A)
- Height at the cancer center near residential side should be appropriate
- At the southern side of the cancer center sculpt the building so that there is a line of site to Washington circle from the current apartment building behind it.
- The proposed heights at square 54 and the cancer center are not appropriate
- Look at adding space on top of Ross Hall
- The oxygen supply at the hospital is an eyesore
- Plans should be representative of the actual building
- Increase of residential permit parking (parking near commercial sites)
- The proposed height for square 54 is out of context with the neighborhood
- General concern in the district overall about GW “gobbling-up” real estate and using it for commercial purposes
- Will the university maintain ownership of the old hospital site?
- Spreading out parking is preferable for environmental reasons
- What are the numbers like for the plan to demolish the University Parking Garage and building new underground parking?
- What is the phasing of the projects (specifically: the science center and square 54)?
- What will happen to restaurants in the new building development on 2100 Pennsylvania Ave.?
- What will happen to the fraternities on G between 20th and 21st Streets?
- Is there an opportunity to involve students in the new development (parking, engineering)?
- How about an ID system for student cars?
- Does the university own all of the proposed development area at 22nd and G Streets?
- There is no reason why non-profits should not “have a little oil well” to make some money
- The FAR and underground development should be maximized
- What proposed development sites have been scratched and why?
- To what extent will this model change?
- No late-night activities at 24th and H street development
• Really concentrate the development with very large buildings in the middle of campus
• Housing at square 54 will be another Columbia plaza. Student housing will face student housing. Instead, place the residential uses on 54 and anywhere where prospective student apartments do not face dorms.
• When adding retail on I Street please be careful not to have any uses that are too loud late at night.

Station 2: Square 54 Proposed Concept Plan

Flip Chart Notes:
• What types of tenants are attracted to this property?
• What type of traffic (foot or car) will come from the grocery store?
• Grocery carts travel. What types of barriers to prevent this?
• What are the retail spaces sized to house?
• Any Denny’s or Bob’s Big Boy planned?
• How do we know you won’t use the retail space for Target, Home Depot, etc?
• Where will the entrance to the grocery store be?
• Please focus the projection of lights on buildings down onto the street instead of skyward
• What types of materials will be used to construct the buildings?
• Is there a design that cuts down on the HVAC noise?
• What will be built underground?
• Will this be a PUD?
• Consider automated parking in garages
• How many parking spaces will there be underground?
• Suppose you cut the building to 90 feet, is it still lucrative?
• Of the 30 feet of sidewalk how much is private and how much is public space?
• Concern that there is landscaping planned on public not private space
• What impact would loading/parking have on existing parking spaces on 22\textsuperscript{nd} Street?
• Is the interior space open to the public?
• Where does the building property line end on I street?
• Is Pennsylvania Ave. and 22\textsuperscript{nd} Street exclusively office space?
• What types of retail are being considered?
• Will building be connected by a skywalk on the upper floors?
• Which of the buildings will have green space on the roof? For what use?
• What characteristics will the buildings have?
• Where are we with affordable housing? Will there be any? What price? How Many?
• (In response to a comment made by Ed Murn regarding affordable housing and discouraging students from residing in the apartments…) Have you looked into human rights laws?
• Will you landscape the 30 foot sidewalk?
• Concerned that the facade will be one big block
• Would like the design to indicate that there is a historic neighborhood close by
• Will there be more meetings once there is a hearing on the actual design?
• Where is the underground entrance planned for the grocery store?
• Will there be any bridges between buildings?
• Why is there an opening into the interior from the street?
• What type of office tenants are being considered?
• Will there be any type of connection between tenant and the university (i.e. medical offices?)
• How long is Boston Properties’ involved in the project?