

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Aaron King <aagking@udel.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 24, 2013 12:08 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place. D.C. is already a very walkable city, but we need to consistently be striving for even greater livability standards for our residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron King
304 E St NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sarah DiJulio <sarahdijulio@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 17, 2013 3:47 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah DiJulio
209 6th St SE
Washington, DC 20003

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2013 3:23 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; McDuffie Kenyan; Anita Bonds
Subject: McMillan testimony to "surplussing " meeeting

Daniel Goldon Wolkoff
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com

Shiv Newaldous, and Jeff Miler, Deputy Mayors Office for Economic Development , this is my testimony to the "surplussing public comment meeting for McMillan Park. Please include it in the package the mayor sends to the city council.

I am still seeking information from Shiv on the contractor that is paid , I think, \$250,000 a year to cut the grass at McMillan. Please supply the information you had said you would provide, thanks

Our own Office of Planning, **Historic Preservation Office**, staffer **Kim Williams** wrote this **great nomination for Mcmillan Park** to The National Register of Historic Places (<http://www.nps.gov/nr/feature/places/13000022.htm>). One can quickly understand from the description of the park, a memorial to Senator McMillan, The Sand Filtration Plant, and it's history, that McMillan is a resource of NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE. Any city in the country would gather the resources to restore and preserve it and return this wonderful park to public enjoyment. This is just plain **common sense**. I have been disappointed that the City Council has not educated the people in DC or even itself very well, while determining the future of this incredible site,, just awesome as originally designed and landscaped by the founder of American landscape architecture, rederick Law Olmsted Jr. Tragically, the DC government's chosen developer's plan will demolish most of the historic structures, over crowd and super urbanize the site with poorly coordinated and uninspiring, 50 buildings and streets. The ten planning and design firms in VMP (Vision McMillan Partners) are predictably failing as the re-working of any great design is always a mistake, substantially diminishing the original intent and elegance. It's presumptuous, even ridiculous, over-building the work of Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. with condos, medical offices and a grocery store, can have some graciousness.

The design team's response to community demands for more "park" has resulted in a supposed "50%" park space, really a big lawn, VMP grudgingly carved out of their site plan but it has nothing to do with the historic engineering treasure and shows how little understanding these current architects possess. Our Historic Preservation Review Board criticized their disconnected, discordant, and inappropriate designs throughout HPRB hearings. Parks are not created by percentages of land remaining unpaved, they are cultural, historic, or reflect the natural geography, streams, valleys, hills, etc.. Like in the privileged upper NW section of DC, parks are community gardens, stream valleys and glens and Civil War Fortifications, while we, in central DC, are confronted by the city government with an unhealthy deficit of natural areas, mature trees and real parks. We don't want destructive compromises that are not comparable to McMillan, when specifically hiking and biking trails, woods, and water features are desperately missing. Senator McMillan planned an "emerald necklace" of parks, and green-space over 100 years ago and we have every right to see all of these recreational areas fulfilled, and our families enjoy the benefits.

McMillan, a spectacular, historic "great place" is a perfect arts/performance/cultural Glen Echo type community campus and just one element in the System of Parks needed from NOMA to Woodridge, and Michigan Park.

McMillan belongs to the people, not the mayor or city council. Gray was elected by campaign fraud, flat out electoral fraud, and Mayor Gray confronts us with wresting our own resources back from arrogant, classless, dc officials abusing their power. A very small number of DC politicians are guilty of blocking public access and fencing it off, in utter contempt of the residents for 27 years. There is nothing in this record of miserable, arrogant disservice that recommends any DC official to run this development. RIGHT NOW as I write this, Mayor Gray, under federal prosecutor's investigation, is declaring "McMillan is no longer needed for any public use" as required by law, as part of his process to "surplus" this billion dollar 25 acre park, and literally give away the land, and a \$319 million taxpayer subsidy to the VMP, ten developers, architects, planning companies, all set to feed on this PIG trough for years to come, at our expense. The barbed wire fence, and cancelling site tours organized by neighborhood ANC shows the mayor and his economic planning deputy's, **hypocrisy**, as if every kid, teenager, family, parent with babies, senior citizen, wouldn't be enjoying McMillan Park every day, views, breezes, strolling, jogging, picnicking, urban farming. arts, music, movies, festivals, classes, our place to exercise, and "build community".

This is not an either or proposition, full services like the City Market can cleverly occupy the existing huge, 20 acres of **under-surface**, 15 foot high galleries, in adaptive re-use as the entire surface park is restored, planted green, and active for all, residents and visitors alike. This is not a delusion, and could have been helping to build our community for 27 years !! It is specifically the **THEFT** of multi-millions, in recreational value to the community, lost for 27 years, that should be added to the crimes of the corrupt DC officials who brought you this failed "re-development" scheme. All along, we have demanded an open process of education, analysis, and proper public discussion of all options for McMillan and a system of parks, for dc voters to decide, it's called **SELF DETERMINATION** Mr. Mayor.

We must demand our representatives on the city council, who openly profess, not even knowing very much about McMillan, to reject the "surplussing" of our park land. This "re-development" has had so many versions, and agencies, and at present ten failing design partners as to be such an overworked flop. And frighteningly, it is even the work of corrupt dc officials imprisoned, indicted, convicted, and awaiting sentencing, for bribery, fraud, theft, and this plan is being run by

a mayor under federal investigation for massive electoral fraud. WAMU reporter Patrick Madden and Julie Patel are right now in the middle of an expose of the "symbiotic" relationship between the DC government and the developers, a relationship distorting, our cities brilliant L'Enfant and McMillan Senate Parks Committee urban plan. A very tiny number of DC "elected" and appointed officials who are hell bent on removing wholesale our mature tree canopy, filling up every last sq ft with curb to curb, mega-urbanization, right as devastating flooding of this very section of DC is destroying our homes. Endless massive construction is a delusion, and the most damaging thing there is to the environment, as if the resources of the planet are endless and there is no imperative to restore, re-use, and adapt existing structures, to conserve our planet. Mayor Gray has produced a "Sustainable DC" plan aiming for DC to be the "greenest city" in the country by 2032. But continuing right up to 2032, exploiting every remaining open space, denuding the city of the most valuable tree cover, paving over endless more land, and overloading a failing antiquated infrastructure is not the path to this farcical goal. Their priority, to keep the construction trade piping along at full speed is unethical, not the way to the "green city" when these same construction industries should be renovating, restoring, and helping dc residents, especially seniors, improve their deteriorating houses. They need to be training the young and underemployed for good careers, not lining up to a pig festival of consumption, and pride in how many cranes mark the skyline, a view soon to be blocked by even more irresponsible zoning. This is the time, right now, right here in the center of our city, to put this wasteful, over-consumption under sensible control, and make this incredible opportunity for a healthier quality of life HAPPEN at McMillan, it is 27 years late.

email reply from Councilmember

Mary Cheh to Daniel Wolkoff's McMillan HPRB testimony below

Dear Mr Wolkoff

Thanks so much for sending me your testimony. I found your vision for the Park to be inspirational. I confess I have not been focused on this and regret that. Have all of the plans proceeded so far that this is a lost cause....

I am having my staff brief me on this next week.

Again, thanks for sending this to me.

Mary Cheh

On Mar 6, 2013, at 7:13 AM, "Daniel Wolkoff" <amgla...@yahoo.com> wrote:

The hearing to raze-demolition of parts of McMillan concurs with the approval of the HPRB nomination to the National Registry of Historic Places,, which protects the site and it's context. HPRB is responsible for **preservation** as it's mission and responsibility is stated in, the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Act. It is obvious that many DC residents would support the preservation , and restoration of the 25 acre Olmsted Park at McMillan Sand Filtration Plant had there ever been this option presented by the government to the community and given any proper consideration. No vote of any kind has ever been taken by the people of the district , not even a proper evaluation of the park and

re-incorporating the reservoir and park ,

"A Great Place" worthy, healthy, great for DC. My testimony below hopefully opens up a discussion, not a fait-acompli of massive over-development plopped onto the historic site. This on top of the flooded houses of Bloomingdale, turns McMillan into a storm water retention pond, with shops and condos and literally re-shapes our whole city, destructive of the l'Enfant and Senator McMillan plan for a gracious park ringed city.

please read the testimony below, scroll down. Thanks, Steve, Daniel Wolkoff

Save McMillan Park Daniel Goldon Wolkoff for HPRB July 2012

McMillan Park, designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., is a gem in the Emerald Necklace of parks planned by Sen. McMillan's Senate Parks Commission in 1906. Parks that the DC govt. does not think this section of the city deserves.

It is difficult to understand, why we are confronted with wrestling our own resources back from a government and development community, obsessed with huge new construction, which needlessly destroys our parkland. The simple recognition of the limits of resources, nature, energy and available land, need to be recognized and adhered to, for a healthy living environment. This tunnel vision would not have allowed NY Central Park or Rock Creek Park to exist unless excessively built over.

We need to emulate Manhattan's Central Park, one of the world's "Great Places". Over 500 acres, declining in the 1970s, where a conservancy joined with the City of New York for a 26-year public-private partnership to restore, manage, and enhance the magnificent park. It is hard to accept the District fencing off McMillan, our Olmsted park, wasting this "Great Place" and over \$17 million for over a quarter of a century. Then spending over \$250,000 annually to mow a lawn, no one could ever sit on, picnic on, stroll on or in any way benefit from! How could they leave this precious , large tract of parkland to waste, instead of simply planting trees which by now would have already grown into a tall lush forest with all its critical benefits to the environment, the storm water retention, the air, and the health of the community.

In any city including the preferred upper NW section of DC, with proper planning, the millions of dollars would have supported a McMillan Park Conservancy, and funded the restoration of the park and all its activities for our city, years ago. The complete waste of McMillan Park demonstrates the neglect and contempt the DC government has for DC's eastern section, under-served for generations, with one fifth the park space as the NW section, always given preferences. The Vision McMillan Partners development which destroys most of the historic landmark continues this unacceptable imbalance. I encourage the HPRB to reject the city's development plans.

The McMillan Site is protected under the Landmark and Historic District Act of 1978, DC Law 2-144, the entire site and its context "PROTECTED!" VMP itself commissioned the Historic Preservation Report by EHT Traceries, Inc. which states "this level of development, is inconsistent with historic preservation of the site," AND THAT IS SELF EVIDENT!

We need all of this park space, our land, even more we need an expanded park system, for critical community activities and recreation. We need the vision of Sen. McMillan to restore and complete "The Emerald Necklace" of green space, woods, and trails for the health of our central city. For a higher quality of life, like the upper income areas of DC have enjoyed, since Olmsted designed Rock Creek Park in 1890.

Our wasteful city govt., sucking every dollar it can out of the tax paying residents, and pleading about increasing its revenue from McMillan. But the richest government in the world can increase its tax revenue as the parkside property values rise and the concessions, performances, art classes and a huge City Market generate tax revenue and fees in McMillan Park.

Revenue and benefits to our city will also come from the new residents, who do not buy condos on our parkland, but who buy and rent in alternative locations and renovate derelict properties, thus returning them to the tax rolls. Medical offices can be built across the street at Washington Hospital Center, where they belong. While patients from all the hospitals, especially Children's National Medical Center, and their families, get some fresh

air, take a nice walk, and help their recovery in a "Healing Garden" at McMillan. City residents and our visitors need parks, destinations, and "Great Places." The real McMillan (Senator from Michigan) had that vision over 100 years ago. Nothing about this miserable failure, by the DC govt., recommends them to develop, pave over, and sell out our park. McMillan should never have been lopped off in the first place. When the federal government offered it to DC for free if they maintained it as green space. The best option is to now revert to federal control where National Park Service and McMillan Park Conservancy can restore and provide recreation along the Glen Echo Model.

I support the park restoration and more sustainable community design like CUA Professor Miriam Gusevich and the CUA Collage City grad students, a design which sunlights the underground creek creating a sand beach, offers us urban agriculture and forestry, and brilliantly creates a world-class City Market, in adaptive reuse of the huge existing under-surface masonry galleries. Even the "so dangerous" manhole covers can be converted to skylights for a natural light source as you buy your fresh local farmed ingredients for dinner in the City Market below.

The restoration of McMillan is an incredible opportunity, the crass vision-less DC govt. is destroying. The reservoir in New York's Central Park serves thousands of joggers everyday, people meet and walk, for good exercise and camaraderie. It is a center, a social gathering, meanwhile our reservoir is fenced off and our park wasted since the 1980's. Even as First Lady Michelle Obama promotes exercise, urban gardening, and good nutrition, we need our jogging paths, our reservoir, and our urban farming system in the city center at McMillan. This is really a last chance, as all remaining available land is being over-developed in an anti-environmental onslaught by the DC government and the big developers they serve, at our expense.

We need space where youth and under-employed can train in masonry (that's how it will be affordable to restore the park), carpentry, plumbing, landscaping, forestry and so much more.

The restoration of McMillan will be a wellspring for the whole city, training programs can spin off into urban conservation corps, to help seniors fix-up and insulate their houses, etc., etc. We need sustainable energy demonstrations, and we can preserve functioning sand filtration cells to exhibit the legacy of McMillan. And even more so, it is critical we preserve all of McMillan, as a back-up emergency clean water system. Just as the fence went up in World War II to protect McMillan, this, in a world of terrorism and sabotage, how irresponsible to demolish this critical clean water infrastructure.

The shining example, Glen Echo Park in Montgomery County, benefits all ages with a myriad of art, education, dance, theater, and festivals 365 days a year and preserved the charming 1930s amusement park and 1890s Chattaqua. Why did Montgomery County and the Maryland Park System join with the National Park Service and a Park Consortium, and do the most spectacular historic renovation? They considered a mixed use development at Glen Echo too, but they had the foresight and they value the population, the areas young people, and provided such wonderful services and recreation and preserved the history. It is very sad how mindless the DC govt. is. and no surprise we suffer crime and disrespect in return from our urban youth. They are killing each other and lives are destroyed, as DC launches another and another and another development for the rich. At McMillan, the community is ready to support our "Glen Echo", as a place to **develop** DC youth in health, character, and respect, "COMMUNITY BUILDING." Every city official campaigns on supporting our young people, and all continue to fail them, and our homes and neighborhood security suffers the result.

We need this "Great Place" to help our youth and underemployed to succeed. We can teach masonry, carpentry, electrical, landscaping, forestry, urban agriculture and gardening, pottery and theater, all useful trades for becoming a responsible, productive adult.

McMillan is a protected landmark. The entire site is protected by our law – all of it - not to be demolished, paved, sectioned off with 50 buildings and strips of green space. We need to restore our Olmsted Park. It is your responsibility as the HPRB to preserve the historic character of our city and McMillan is ready for such beneficial adaptive reuse. The report from the developers, that McMillan is too deteriorated for reclaiming is ludicrous and they would have built over Manhattan's Central Park too. I encourage the HPRB to reject the city's development plans. Stop wasting a fortune in treasure, preserve historic McMillan

Park, for so many excellent reasons,for its value to the environment, to our city, to our young people.

July 2012 Daniel Wolkoff 202-232-8391 email: amgla...@yahoo.com

[Click here to Reply](#)

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Aimee Custis <aimee@smartergrowth.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 2:19 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aimee Custis
1727 Massachusetts Ave NW #402
Apt 402
Washington, DC 20036

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Cheryl O'Neill <everett3619@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2013 6:01 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cheryl O'Neill
3619 Everett Street NW
Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Christina Sobiloff <christina.sobiloff@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 01, 2013 2:47 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christina Sobiloff
3708 Albemarle St NW
Washington, DC 07626

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Victoria Leonard <VLeonard@maliuna.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2013 4:06 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: surplussing of McMillan Reservoir

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I hope it is not too late to submit comments for the record on the surplussing of McMillan. I am a resident of Bloomingdale. I live at 2218 Flagler Place, NW, about 3 blocks from McMillan. I support the surplussing. Because the property is unzoned, the only way to move forward is to surplus it. The land has been sitting in its derelict state for more than 30 years, and I appreciate and support the Government of the District of Columbia moving forward.

I was at the public hearing on the surplussing at All Nations Baptist Church. The room was filled with individuals who were openly against surplussing—holding signs, wearing sashes, and cackling. Their disruptive behavior made it too uncomfortable for me to go up to the microphone and share my viewpoint: I support the surplussing of McMillan.

Sincerely,
Victoria A. Leonard

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Iris Gestram <gestramiris@naop.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com; Iris Gestram
Subject: McMillan Park - HPRB hearing

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

The National Association for Olmsted Parks is writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, **we urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

Second, **we urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Iris Gestram

Iris Gestram
Executive Director
National Association for Olmsted Parks
1111 16th Street NW, Suite 310
Washington, DC 20036
202-223-9113 (p)
202-223-9112 (f)

[Learn more! Register now!](#)

**Frederick Law Olmsted Jr.:
Inspirations for the 21st Century**

October 10-11, 2013, Washington, DC
www.olmsted.org/symposia

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Elyor Vali <elyor_t@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2013 12:24 AM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Keep the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Elyor Vali
70 R St NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Paul Cerruti <paulcerruti@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 21, 2013 8:37 AM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park - Our Central Park !

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

To those who question whether McMillan Park was ever a park or not - and, more specifically, whether it included the sand filtration plant or not... I have done some research.

McMillan Park, including the sand filtration plant, was a park serving the surrounding communities from its inception.

Any attempt to re-write the history - as is being done by the VMP development lobby and its agents - is simply a shallow attempt at misleading the public.

The facts speak for themselves - I have summarized below a few highlights with sources:

1) **McMillan Park** comprised the entirety of the ground level surface area of the Sand Filtration Plant (both east and west of 1st Street) and the grounds surrounding the reservoir (west of 1st Street) The exact boundaries can be seen on Google Maps by clicking on the link below:

https://maps.google.com/maps?q=mcmillan+park+dc&ie=UTF-8&ei=ykrCUZ7SD9bG4AOnjYFg&ved=0CAgQ_AUoAg

To be clear:

- Southern boundary was Bryant Street (west of 1st Street) and Channing Street (east of 1st Street)
- Eastern boundary was North Capitol Street
- Northern boundary was Michigan Ave/Hobart Place
- Western boundary was 5th Street NW

Sample Sources:

=>The Sunday Star, April 15, 1906; "McMillan Park - Name for Filtration Plant Grounds Approved: It was announced at the War Department yesterday that Secretary Taft had approved the name "McMillan Park" as the official designation of the public grounds embracing the Washington city filtration beds and plant, the adjacent reservoir and all approaches thereto belonging to the United States."

=>The Evening Star, June 6, 1907; "The Public Stable Site:The reservoir and filtration bed reservation has been formally styled "McMillan Park" in honor of the late senator from Michigan, to whom is today due the highest credit for the work of developing the capital."

=>Washington Times, November 9, 1912; "Board of Trade Will Re-Elect Its Present Officers - Campaign for Park Improvements in Capital Supported From Michigan: ...The monument referred to (McMillan Memorial

Fountain) is now being erected on the grounds of the filtration plant, McMillan Park, near the head of North Capitol Street."

2) **McMillan Park** included the "**Bloomingdale Playgrounds**" - which included the contemporary understanding of playground as in **children's playground** (swings, slides, etc, etc) AND sports venues (**tennis courts, baseball/soccer/football fields**).

Sample Sources:

=>Washington Times, February 28, 1919; "City Playgrounds Reopen Tomorrow: ...Bloomingdale, First and Bryant streets northwest;..."

=>Washington Times, August 5, 1919; "What's Doing; Where; When: Dance Fiesta - McMillan Park, Bloomingdale playground, children, 7:30 p. m."

=>Washington Times, August 9, 1920: "Playgrounds Help Make 10,000 Happy - D.C. Recreation Centers in 29 Locations Prove Mecca for Children: ...Bloomingdale playground is the shadiest (as in lots of shade from the sun). It has six tennis courts and will accommodate 3,000 children."

3) **McMillan Park's "Bloomingdale Playgrounds"** contained sports venues including **tennis** (six tennis courts), **track & field, baseball/soccer/football fields** with use by diverse age groups and organized teams/leagues.

Sample Sources:

=>Baseball=>Washington Herald, August 7, 1921; "Playground Baseball Season Opens - The midsummer season of the Junior Baseball League for boys 16 years of age and under of the various playgrounds under the Municipal Playground Department opened Wednesday.... Western Division League: Tuesday, August 9 - Mackin vs. Bloomingdale at Bloomingdale"

=>Football=>WashingtonTimes, November 6, 1921; "Liberty Wants Games - The Liberty A.C. (Athletic Club) will take on the Mohawk Reserves today at 1:30pm on the Bloomingdale playgrounds..."

=>Soccer=>Washington Herald, November 2, 1916; "Surprises Sprung In Playground Leagues: One of the best games to date in the playground soccer ball leagues was played on the New York avenue grounds yesterday between Twining and Seaton schools elevens.... On the Bloomingdale Playgrounds the Brookland School eleven defeated the Gage School, 5 to 1."

=>Tennis=>Washington Times, May 19, 1916; "Ten Teams Play For Times' Tennis Trophy - Program For Today in Tennis Tourney - Today's Contests: Bloomingdale playground - Eckington vs. Brightwood"

=>Track & Field=>Washington Herald, June 14, 1922; "Grade Schoolboys Conclude Meets - Wallach and Brookland Win Final Preliminary Track Contests: The last two playground division track and field meets for elementary school students under the supervision of the municipal playgrounds were held yesterday. Wallach School won the Virginia avenue division meet with eighty-one points, while Brookland romped away with the Bloomingdale meet with sixty-five points."

4) **McMillan Park** included a **Park Staff** who organized **children's activities** and **events**.

Sample Sources:

=>Washington Times, August 5, 1919; "What's Doing; Where; When: Dance Fiesta - McMillan Park, Bloomingdale playground, children, 7:30 p. m."

=>Washington Herald, March 16, 1921; "Playground Work Proves "Poplar" - Speaking of popular clothing apparel, the most "poplar" piece of clothing which has been put on display in the District in many seasons was hung up for inspection in the office of Mrs. Susie Root Rhodes, supervisor of municipal playgrounds, Saturday. The article is a piece of neck wear made of poplar tree catkins pasted on a piece of silk, shaped like a neckpiece. It was made by a **class** of the **Bloomingdale playground** under the direction of Director Elizabeth Mahon..."

=>Washington Herald, April 18, 1921; "Kind to Animals - Miss Elisabeth Mahon, director of the Bloomingdale Playgrounds, reports that the boys and girls under her care are striving to make this week a successful "kind to animals week".

5) **McMillan Park** had a yearly summer **Concert Series**.

Sample Sources:

=>Washington Times, May 29, 1919; "Summer Concerts For D.C. Arranged - A detailed list of the evening concerts to be given this summer by the Engineers' Band, the Sixty-third infantry Band and the Cavalry Band was made public today... June 13, McMillan Park; June 26, McMillan Park; July 18, McMillan Park; July 25, McMillan Park; August 6, McMillan Park; August 29, McMillan Park; September...".

=>Washington Herald, June 5, 1921; "Park Concerts Program - Washington music lovers who enjoy hearing band concerts are fortunate this year. Col. Sherrill, of the office of public buildings and grounds, war department, has announced the summer schedule of 84 outdoor concerts in the parks and circles of the District. The list follows: ...McMillan Park, June 7, July 7, Aug 8, Sept 6

6) **McMillan Park** had multi-purpose **pavilions**.

Sample Sources:

=>Washington Herald, July 11, 1917; "Dancing Pavilions For Playgrounds - Five Washington Centers to Have Improvements in Near Future - Mrs. Susie Root Rhodes, superintendent of playgrounds, has announced that dancing pavilions will be erected this week on five of the Washington Playgrounds, New York avenue, Bloomingdale, Virginia avenue, Georgetown and Howard. These pavilions will be for kindergarten work, Red Cross work and dancing."

=>Washington Times, August 5, 1919; "What's Doing; Where; When: Dance Fiesta - McMillan Park, Bloomingdale playground, children, 7:30 p. m."

All of the above exists today in NY's Central Park...

-McMillan Park's McMillan Memorial Fountain (Three Grace's Fountain) in its original form and setting is just as beautiful and unique as Central Park's Bethesda Fountain (Angel of the Water's Fountain)!

-McMillan Park's Olmsted Walk is just as beautiful as Central Park's many Olmsted walking paths!

-McMillan Park can and should once again have "Playgrounds" as exists today in Central Park!

-McMillan Park can and should once again host sports for all ages - baseball, football, soccer, tennis, running, walking, cycling as exists today in Central Park!

-McMillan Park can and should once again host children's activities and summer camps as exists today in Central Park!

-McMillan Park can and should once again host a Summer Concert Series as exists today in Central Park!

McMillan Park is our Central Park + the High Line + the Low Line + So much more ! It should be restored - **in its entirety** - to serve the surrounding communities and all DC residents with development of the existing historic structures - both above ground and below ground - for public use.

NO to Surplus ! **NO** to the VMP plan !

Save Historic McMillan Park !

Best regards,
Paul

Paul J. Cerruti

26 T Street NW

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Phenomw <Phenomw@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, June 21, 2013 7:26 AM
To: gwensouth@aol.com; devi@bengfort.com
Cc: dianne_brns@yahoo.com; ccleptak@aol.com; b-ashton-thomas@verizon.net; rbrannum@robertbrannum.com; Mdwa1105@aol.com; Crain, Deborah (OP); r_l_edison@yahoo.com; Pinkney, Sylvia (ANC 5E04); tonymorman@peoplepc.com; scott@scott-roberts.net; david.scott92@gmail.com; krmcduffie@gmail.com; ronnieedwards5c11@gmail.com; mrgeovani@aol.com; james.fournier@gmail.com; edgewooddc@comcast.net; LADinDC@aol.com; alc@envisionmcmillan.com; tclark@dccouncil.us; satkinson@dccouncil.us; cherylw@crosslink.net; Quinn, Teri Janine (ANC 5E06); laxmi25555@yahoo.com; mcmsalon@gmail.com; athakkar@eya.com; abr2594238@aol.com; info@jtpowell.com; nulliparaacnestis@gmail.com; tlehner@gmail.com; markmueller100@hotmail.com; Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Follow up to June 20 MAG meeting
Importance: High

Good morning, MAG and others,

It was great to see many of you again and to meet new faces that have arrived since I had been able to regularly attend our meetings.

As a follow up to our discussion of the proposed grocery store location, I am recommending that the original request on behalf of Stronghold residents be restored. Since "somebody left the gate open" so to speak, let me go on record and remind the group about the original store location recommendation and why.

If retail is planned, locate it away from the residences along North Capitol St., NE. It is a residential area with homes at a maximum height of 33 ft. and these homes are already impacted by high traffic flow and negative environmental effects of current noise and air pollution from traffic.

Locate store as originally planned along Michigan Ave., NW which has no residential homes immediately North of the site and is along the business/commercial property route near the hospital complex.

The current drawing proposes a 75 ft grocery store (including apartments above the store) be centrally located on the site's N. Capitol St., NW area immediately across from 33 ft residential homes on N. Capitol, NE. This is a height in excess of 40 ft above the skyline of the homes immediately across from the location! Another issue is that such a store location could also mean higher traffic volume and water and sanitation challenges of having a grocer so close to homes.

However, the current drawing proposes 33 ft residential homes along Michigan Ave., NW. I recommend moving these proposed homes to the N. Cap location as originally planned and moving the store back to MI Ave. The extra medical building proposed in the current drawing could be moved to the current hospital property or other area, thus again satisfying the need for more area for the grocery store. Thanks!

Respectfully submitted,

Doris J. Newton

Sent from my Sprint phone.

--

^

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Chessick Peter <pchessick@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 10:47 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Cc: Peter Chessick
Subject: McMillan Surplus Comment

Dear Mr. Newaldass:

I am writing to you today to provide my thoughts on the proposed surplus of the McMillan site. I grew up in the DC suburbs, am a 17-year resident of the District, and am a ten-year resident of Bloomingdale. I strongly oppose the determination to surplus the McMillan site. I have several reasons for this opinion.

First, I understand that the determination requires that the site not have a public use. Given that two of the cells are about to be retrofitted for use in collecting stormwater, the site quite clearly has a public use, and a very important one. But beyond that use, there are many ways that the site could have a public use, and it is disingenuous for the DC government to let it fall into disrepair and then seek to make a determination that it has no public use. The site is a unique one that could serve a multitude of public purposes, even more so given the two levels it has – above and below ground. Among others, those purposes include parkland (which is sorely lacking in this part of the city) and storm water diversion. Many seem to think that slow sand filtration is an outdated technology. Not so. In fact, the city of Los Angeles is turning back to this inexpensive and efficient means of filtering water instead of using the more supposedly high-tech methods. With some creative thinking, the DC government could come up with more efficient uses of this gem of a property.

Second, supporters of development like to talk about balance: “we need a balanced approach,” “the site should have a mix of uses.” I disagree. Not every site in the city should have balance, should support a mix of uses. Take the Mall, for instance. Why should the Mall have balance? And Rock Creek Park. Do they need more retail? Should National Place or the Old Post Office Pavilion have balance as well? Should we stick a little tiny park in them? Some apartments? Of course not. It is the city that should have balance, and not every square foot of the city. With all of the construction that the city has seen over the last ten years, the need for public parks is greater than ever, and growing. And Bloomingdale is an area of the city with very few public parks. Further, there are many areas all around Bloomingdale that are rapidly being developed: Brookland, NoMa, Georgia Ave. to name a few – these are successfully developing neighborhoods with retail, residential, and office space. We need to make McMillan into a public park to balance out that development.

Third, there is an argument that the city needs more affordable housing, and more housing in general. I agree. But there are vacant lots all over the city, and other brownfield sites, where we can put more housing. In the Bloomingdale neighborhood, just look at the corner of Florida and North Capital, where a lot has stood vacant for well over a decade.

Fourth, I don’t hear people talk much about traffic. Adding hundreds of residences will increase the traffic problem all around Bloomingdale, a neighborhood already saddled with several major arteries: North Capital, Michigan, Rhode Island, and New York Ave. already bring an immense amount of traffic through Bloomingdale. I have yet to see any realistic plan for dealing with the increase in traffic that the proposed development will bring. I think this is because there really is no way to deal successfully with the increase. I understand that the developer proposed building a Metro station, which is absurd.

Fifth, I cannot understand how the city could possibly consider making surplus and selling a property that is on the National Park Service's National Register of Historic Places. There may be no law against it, but it says a lot about a city that it chooses to sell such a gem to private development that will essentially destroy its character. When I first heard that, I just couldn't believe that the city would consider such a move. A property on that list by definition serves an important public purpose.

Finally, I would finish by asking what legacy the city wants to leave to its future residents 20, 50, or 100 years from now at the McMillan site. Does it want to leave yet another mixed-use development – just like in NoMa, Columbia Heights, the old Convention Center, even the Kentlands in Maryland – that retains a mere veil of its original character? Or does it want to leave a unique piece of history that can be enjoyed by all, an oasis in the middle of the city that provides a much-needed natural respite for its residents? McMillan could be a wonderful investment in the long-term quality of life of the city and its fortunate residents.

Because we can do so much better than to surplus and sell this incredible gem, I am strongly opposed to the proposal. Thank you for including my letter in the record for consideration.

-Peter Chessick

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: MIRIAM GUSEVICH <miriamg123@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 8:01 PM
To: Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Kenyan McDuffie; Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); David Grosso; Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP)
Subject: testimony: NO SURPLUS FOR McMillan Park

Dear Mr. Mayor, Distinguished members of the Council, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Miller, Mr. Newaldass and Ms. Tregoning

McMillan Park is a National Landmark and it is public property. I urge you to vote NO to the plans to declare McMillan Park a surplus property, to change course and adopt a more creative solution for both the design and the economic development.

A. NO SURPLUS because it remains a vital site for the public good.

1. It is designated a National and a District of Columbia Historic Landmark because of its demonstrated architectural, civic and landscape values. The District of Columbia has a responsibility to be a good steward of our common land and to safeguard our heritage for the future.

2. It is still crucial to the water infrastructure of the District of Columbia, as proven by DC Water's current use of the site to store storm water and alleviate the flooding in the Bloomingdale neighborhood.
It is premature to assume that more of the site will not be needed for flood control.

3. The city can achieve economic development without designating the site a surplus. It can remain in the public domain and become a business incubator **for lease** to start-ups and small entrepreneurs.

B. A creative plan for McMillan Park is wise business. It will promote economic opportunity for the 21st century.

4. McMillan offers ready-made loft spaces ready to be put to work with minimum investment. The historic vaults can be used as business incubators to create new businesses and therefore, real jobs with a future. These could include restaurants, cafes, bars, IT, bakeries, art galleries, breweries, wineries, creameries, crafts, small design and digital manufacturing.

5. McMillan could become a beehive of economic enterprise to complement the governmental and institutional jobs dominant in the Washington, DC area.

It would be a vital urban environment for work and play.

It would be a unique destination to promote tourism.

Ultimately, a creative plan will be cost effective. It will increase tax revenues and local property and would give the residents more wealth in their increased equity. It will be more sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.

Jane Jacobs stressed the importance of a mix of older buildings to promote enterprise of all kinds, since new construction is prohibitive for start-ups. Let's take advantage of this unique site to build a better future.

To see our more creative, alternative vision, go to www.McMillanPark.com

See today's article on the Washington Post.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/group-has-alternative-vision-for-disputed-mcmillan-redevelopment-site/2013/06/18/df939894-d776-11e2-9df4-895344c13c30_story.html

Sincerely

Miriam Gusevich

3601 Connecticut Avenue, NW, apt. 820
Washington, DC 20008
202-253-8035.

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Darrell Duane <d@duane.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Make McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site into an Open Park!



Review Board:

I am writing for three reasons regarding the McMillan Park

First, I would like to see this land also used for Community Gardens or otherwise for sustainable agriculture, as opposed to building more commercial or residential structures on it.

Second as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

Third, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Darrell Duane

3110 13th St NW

Washington, DC 20010-2408

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Camille Loya <wiselatina64@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 11:57 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings.

After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, while I also believe the city should pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I urge that more be agreed to in order to ensure that those who live in the neighborhoods can continue to afford to do so and that those from other parts of the city can have a realistic opportunity to relocate to Ward 5 to add to the diversity and potential vitality of the region.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Camille Loya
1412 Shepherd Street NW
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 5:54 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); friends-of-mcmillan-park@googlegroups.com; hugh@youngbloodcapitalgroup.com; Kirby Vining
Cc: Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL)
Subject: McMillan

Mr. Newaldous, please supply me with the transcript of my verbal testimony from the June 6th public comment meeting on "surplus property" for McMillan. I understand it will be included in the "package" going to city council. Thanks for supplying this to me. The lack of any recording, any video, any public address system and the difficult acoustics of the room, concern me. I know the speakers had their backs to you, were not facing you or the other DC employees writing notes, so how accurate is the transcrption?

I have one more question I hope you can help with. It is my understanding that an expenditure of \$250,000 per year is spent at the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant, to mow the lawn. I would like this corroborated, and please tell me who contracts this , which DC office, and who is responsible? It seems like I might have this figure incorrect.? That would come to almost \$5000 a week. Could we be expecting the taxpayers to spend almost \$5000 a week on the lawn mowing at McMillan? Please clarify this expense for me, and how long it has been going on. thanks so much, Daniel Goldon Wolkoff

Daniel Goldon Wolkoff
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 5:43 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM)
Cc: ATD EOM MIS
Subject: Fw: Testimony on "surplussing" McMillan

Shiv, please include all my testimony below, including the additional paragraphs at the end in package of public comments for "surplus property legislation" McMillan to the City Council
Thanks so much, Daniel Goldon Wolkoff

Daniel Goldon Wolkoff
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com

--- On **Thu, 6/20/13, Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com>** wrote:

From: Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com>
Subject: Testimony on "surplussing" McMillan
To: "Jeff (EOM)Miller" <jeff.miller@dc.gov>, shiv.newaldous@dc.gov
Cc: mch eh@dccouncil.us, "KenyanMcDuffie" <kmcduffie@dccouncil.us>, "Phil" <pmendelson@dccouncil.us>, "Jim Graham" <Jim@grahamwone.com>, "friends-of-mcmillan-park@googlegroups.com" <friends-of-mcmillan-park@googlegroups.com>, mbarry@dccouncil.us, "Muriel Bowser" <mbowser@dccouncil.us>, dcatania@dccouncil.us, jevans@dccouncil.us, "David Grosso" <dgrosso@dccouncil.us>, "yvette alexander" yalexander@dccouncil.us

Shiv, please include all of the following text and the additional testimony below to the package of public comments on "surplus property" legislation of the DC City Council

Daniel Goldon Wolkoff
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com
SAVING MCMILLAN PARK - TESTIMONY TO DMPED
DANIEL GOLDON WOLKOFF

McMillan Park, designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., is a gem in the Emerald Necklace of parks planned by Sen. McMillan's Senate Parks Commission in 1906. Parks that the DC govt. does not think this section of the city deserves.

It is difficult to understand, why we are confronted with wresting our own resources back from a government and development community, obsessed with huge new construction, which needlessly destroys our parkland. The simple laws of conservation of the limits of resources, nature, energy and available land, need to be recognized and adhered to, for a healthy living environment. This tunnel vision would not have allowed NY Central Park or Rock Creek Park to exist unless excessively built over.

We need to emulate Manhattan's Central Park, one of the world's "Great Places". Over 500 acres, declining in the 1970s, where a conservancy joined with the City of New York for a 26-year public-private

partnership to restore, manage, and enhance the magnificent park. It is hard to accept the District fencing off McMillan, our Olmsted park, wasting this "Great Place" and over \$17 million for over a quarter of a century. Then spending over \$250,000 annually to mow a lawn, no one could ever sit on, picnic on, stroll on or in any way benefit from! How could they leave this precious, large tract of parkland to waste, instead of simply planting trees which by now would have already grown into a tall lush forest with all its critical benefits to the environment, the storm water retention, the air, and the health of the community.

In any city including the preferred upper NW section of DC, with proper planning, the millions of dollars would have supported a McMillan Park Conservancy, and funded the restoration of the park and all its activities for our city, years ago. The complete waste of McMillan Park demonstrates the neglect and racist discrimination the DC government commits against DC's eastern section, under-served for generations, with one fifth the park space as the NW section, always given preferences. The Vision McMillan Partners development which destroys most of the historic landmark continues this unacceptable imbalance. I encourage the City Council to reject the Mayors "surplussing" plans. Elected by campaign fraud, he has no right to rob the public of our parks.

The McMillan Site is protected under the Landmark and Historic District Act of 1978, DC Law 2-144, the entire site and its context "PROTECTED!" VMP itself commissioned the Historic Preservation Report by EHT Traceries, Inc. which states "this level of development, is inconsistent with historic preservation of the site," AND THAT IS SELF EVIDENT!

We need all of this park space, our land, even more we need an expanded park system, for critical community activities and recreation. We need the vision of Sen. McMillan to restore and complete "The Emerald Necklace" of green space, woods, and trails for the health of our central city. For a higher quality of life, like the upper income areas of DC have enjoyed, since Olmsted designed Rock Creek Park in 1890.

Our wasteful city govt., sucking every dollar it can out of the tax paying residents, and pleading about increasing its revenue from McMillan. But the richest government in the world can increase its tax revenue as the parkside property values rise and the concessions, performances, art classes and a huge City Market generate tax revenue and fees in McMillan Park.

Revenue and benefits to our city will also come from the new residents, who do not buy condos on our parkland, but who buy and rent in alternative locations and renovate derelict properties, thus returning them to the tax rolls. Medical offices can be built across the street at Washington Hospital Center, where they belong. While patients from all the hospitals, especially Children's National Medical Center, and their families, get some fresh air, take a nice walk, and help their recovery in a "Healing Garden" at McMillan. City residents and our visitors need parks, destinations, and "Great Places." The real McMillan (Senator from Michigan) had that vision over 100 years ago. Nothing about this miserable failure, by the DC govt., recommends them to develop, pave over, and sell out our park. McMillan should never have been lopped off in the first place. When the federal government offered it to DC for free if they maintained it as green space. The best option is to now revert to federal control where National Park Service and McMillan Park Conservancy can restore and provide recreation along the Glen Echo Model.

I support the park restoration and sustainable community design by CUA Professor Miriam Gusevich, a design which sunlights the underground creek creating a sand beach, offers us urban agriculture and forestry, and brilliantly creates a world-class City Market, in adaptive reuse of the huge existing under-surface masonry galleries. Even the "so dangerous" manhole covers can be converted to skylights for a natural light source as you buy your fresh local farmed ingredients for dinner in the City Market below.

The restoration of McMillan is an incredible opportunity, the vision-less DC govt. is destroying. The reservoir in New York's Central Park serves thousands of joggers everyday, people meet and walk, for good exercise and camaraderie. It is a center, a social gathering, meanwhile our reservoir is fenced off and our park wasted since the 1980's. Even as First Lady Michelle Obama promotes exercise, urban gardening, and good nutrition, we need our jogging paths, our reservoir, and our urban farming system in the city center at McMillan. This is really a last chance, as all remaining available land is being over-developed in an anti-environmental onslaught by the DC government and the big developers they serve, at our expense.

We need space where youth and under-employed can train in masonry (that's how it will be affordable to restore the park), carpentry, plumbing, landscaping, forestry and so much more. The restoration of McMillan will be a wellspring for the whole city, training programs can spin off into urban conservation corps, to help seniors fix-up and insulate their houses, etc., etc. We need sustainable energy demonstrations, and we can preserve functioning sand filtration cells to exhibit the legacy of McMillan. And even more so, it is critical we preserve all of McMillan, as a back-up emergency clean water system. Just as the fence went up in World War II to protect McMillan, this, in a world of terrorism and sabotage, how irresponsible to demolish this critical clean water infrastructure.

The shining example, Glen Echo Park in Montgomery County, benefits all ages with a myriad of art, education, dance, theater, and festivals 365 days a year and preserved the charming 1930s amusement park and 1890s Chattaqua. Why did Montgomery County and the Maryland Park System join with the National Park Service and a Park Consortium, and do the most spectacular historic renovation? They considered a mixed use development at Glen Echo too, but they had the foresight and they value the population, the areas young people, and provided such wonderful services and recreation and preserved the history. It is very sad how mindless the DC govt. is. and no surprise we suffer crime and disrespect in return from our urban youth. They are killing each other and lives are destroyed, as DC launches another and another and another development for the rich. At McMillan, the community is ready to support our "Glen Echo", as a place to **develop** DC youth in health, character, and respect, "COMMUNITY BUILDING." Every city official campaigns on supporting our young people, and all continue to fail them, and our homes and neighborhood security suffers the result.

We need this "Great Place" to help our youth and underemployed to succeed. We can teach masonry, carpentry, electrical, landscaping, forestry, urban agriculture and gardening, pottery and theater, all useful trades for becoming a responsible, productive adult.

McMillan is a protected landmark. The entire site is protected by our law – all of it - not to be demolished, paved, sectioned off with 50 buildings and strips of green space. We need to restore our Olmsted Park. It is the responsibility of HPRB to preserve the historic character of our city and McMillan is ready for such beneficial adaptive reuse. The report from the developers, that McMillan is too deteriorated for reclaiming is ludicrous and they would have built over Manhattan's Central Park too. I demand the City Council act in the best interest of the public, not a private group of Developers and wealthy new residents. You must reject the Mayor's plan to "Surplus" our park, McMillan. He was elected by campaign fraud, he is under federal investigation and has refused the prosecutors invitation to be interviewed three times. You must not do this disservice to our community, and abide such dishonesty. This development was brought to us by the mayor and his campaign fraud, Harry Thomas Jr, in federal prison, Kwame Brown, convicted of bank and IRS fraud, and Michale Brown pleading guilty to taking bribes. I demand more from my elected representatives!! Stop wasting a fortune in treasure, preserve historic McMillan Park, for so many excellent reasons, for its value to the environment, to our city, to our young people. **Reject the "surplussing" of McMillan**

June 6, 2013

Please include my additional testimony.

I have some points I would like to share on this meeting, June 6th public comments on "surplussing" McMillan. The Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Dev., Jeff Miller, is uniquely positioned to help solve the problem we are confronted with on McMillan, flooding, and area development and especially my concept parks. A park system of trails, wooded areas, like I enjoyed so much when I lived in Mt. Pleasant/Adam Morgan for 20 years. I'm now a homeowner in Brookland and haven't walked up a city trail since I left.

June 6, 2013 Basement of All Nations Baptist Church

This meeting on "surplus property" was really extraordinary. I think it might have been 150 people united in their commitment against the dividing up and "surplussing" of McMillan Park to the team of McMillan Partners. The selected team which is 10 top design, planning and architecture firms, who have so devoid of design talent, as to constantly add more "professionals" to salvage this misguided "Master Plan." The community wants a fair deal of parks for their families. I think of how busy the parks are on Capitol Hill and how great the wooded trails are in NW.

What kind of racial and class discrimination has decades of DC government perpetrated against this area? The fencing off of McMillan? The flooding just makes it much worse. The input from this meeting is clear: don't want the super-urbanization of a special place that is already a park. The city govt. responsible for the park, kept this park fenced off with barbed wire since 1987 and now claims there is no public use. A self-serving lie, is not open or honest govt. You do not have our consent!! This is bringing hypocrisy to a new level even for this city. We are going to demand that the fence be removed, or other access created, all hazards removed, the manhole covers be secured, and tours restart immediately.

I can tell you the farce this govt. calls community input, and engaging the people in the process must be

rejected.

We have sensible alternatives and the city holds SHAM meetings like this and refuses to open proper discussion of the potential of this whole park system. A park system designed over 100 years ago.

The public comment meeting is required by the "Surplus Property Law", but imagine how infuriating it was that there was no public address system, no audio or video recording for the City Council, no webcast or any way to include the electorate to hear the 60 or 70 people testifying. I believe that this alone would violate the wording of the law, certainly it's intent.

The fraudulent process aside, this is a problem that the Mayors Office of Economic Development is uniquely positioned to solve, especially your role in real estate. The VMP needs to place it's "talented" landscape designers across Michigan Ave, where all the hospital center parking lots are impermeable and contribute millions of gallons of storm water runoff to the flooding problem in Bloomingdale. The entire hospital complex must be re-engineered to capture the storm water and reduce that runoff as these new medical offices are built at the hospital grounds? Like wise other area re-engineering to permeable surfaces, recharging curbs, alley green spaces and of course massive tree planting. The other places to have the VMP work is the Old Safeway Plaza (where a grocery would atleast be on the metro) at the Rhode Island Ave. Metro and also a large lot that has been sitting in Brookland for years at 13th St. NE and Rhode Island Ave. These are needed developments, and McMillan and the Emerald Necklace of Parks be renewed, with a DC Parks Renewal Taskforce.

The public needs and will use McMillan again, that was the almost totally unanimous message of an exciting evening for DC. I have followed this issue since 2006 and never experienced a level of passion and commitment like this at All Nations Baptist Church.

What a great coincidence that on the same night, former Council-at-large Michael Brown was cornered by an FBI sting and said he will plead guilty to accepting bribes on tonights 11 o'clock news. I had just testified about the criminal acts of Kwame Brown and Harry Thomas Jr. a few hours ealier. All three integral to the McMillan process. My newest humourous remark is that when HTJ is released from the Federal Prison Camp, he will not be able to vote during his 3 years of probation, but he can run for city council again!

The Mayor and your office , Mr. Miller have rammed this project down our throats from the beginning with Harry Thomas Jr., who arranged a \$55,000 payment from EYA to smooth the way for their Chancellors Row development. We have to be skeptical about the relationship between EYAa and Harry Thomas Jr.

The "surplus property" legislation requires the Mayor to find there is no longer public use for this land. WHAT A MISERABLE FIXED DEAL!! The land is fenced off, and the much needed park space blocked from public use, and this Mayor is going to declare "no longer needed by the public". Even the mayors own ANC tours of the Sand Filtration Plant were blocked by your office. We hav ehad enouogh of your manipulation! This is disgusting my friend, and demonstres exactly the distorted and corrupt relationship between our fraudulently elected and criminal officials and the developers. The Mayor Will lie, and the people are bossed around and ABUSED, you will do his bidding, I hope your future employers see this corruption and you and the city council-members suffer an appropriate reward. Your perpetrating a BIG MISTAKE, contrived, forced, and WRONG! Your builders will have massive problems, geologically, hydrologically, and politically! The pathetic reputation this city government has among the people of this county, and the entire world, is justified, and you and the cioty council are proving it at McMillan.

Daniel Goldon Wolkoff
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com

| | --

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Frederick <woodcut55@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Cc: kstanley9@aol.com; kileybednar@gmail.com; davidbrittonquick@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park Surplus?

Dear Mayor & Council Memebers:

I wanted to copy you this testimony written last summer about McMillan Park from Mr. Daniel Wolkoff, I believe in this vision and I want our government to embrace it too and give us back our park. Please don't waste our green spaces for more buildings that don't serve us all.

Thank you,

Frederick Nunley
3934 10th St. NE
Ward 5
woodcut55@aol.com

McMillan Park, designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., is a gem in the Emerald Necklace of parks planned by Sen. McMillan's Senate Parks Commission in 1906. Parks that the DC govt. does not think this section of the city deserves.

It is difficult to understand, why we are confronted with wrestling our own resources back from a government and development community, obsessed with huge new construction, which needlessly destroys our parkland. The simple laws of conservation of the limits of resources, nature, energy and available land, need to be recognized and adhered to, for a healthy living environment. This tunnel vision would not have allowed NY Central Park or Rock Creek Park to exist unless excessively built over.

We need to emulate Manhatta's Central Park, one of the world's "Great Places". Over 500 acres, declining in the 1970s, where a conservancy joined with the City of New York for a 26-year public-private partnership to restore, manage, and enhance the magnificent park. It is hard to accept the District fencing off McMillan, our Olmsted park, wasting this "Great Place" and over \$17 million for over a quarter of a century. Then spending over \$250,000 annually to mow a lawn, no one could ever sit on, picnic on, stroll on or in any way benefit from! How could they leave this precious, large tract of parkland to waste, instead of simply planting trees which by now would have already grown into a tall lush forest with all its critical benefits to the environment, the storm water retention, the air, and the health of the community.

In any city including the preferred upper NW section of DC, with proper planning, the millions of dollars would have supported a McMillan Park Conservancy, and funded the restoration of the park and all its activities for our city, years ago. The complete waste of McMillan Park demonstrates the neglect and contempt the DC government has for DC's eastern section, under-served for generations, with one fifth the park space as the NW section, always given preferences. The Vision McMillan Partners development which destroys most of the historic landmark continues this unacceptable imbalance. I encourage the HPRB to reject the city's development plans.

The McMillan Site is protected under the Landmark and Historic District Act of 1978, DC Law 2-144, the entire site and its context "Protected!" VMP itself commissioned the Historic Preservation Report by EHT Traceries, Inc. which states "this level of development, is inconsistent with historic preservation of the site," and that is Self Evident!

We need all of this park space, our land, even more we need an expanded park system, for critical community activities and recreation. We need the vision of Sen. McMillan to restore and complete "The Emerald Necklace" of green space, woods, and trails for the health of our central city. For a higher quality of life, like the upper income areas of DC have

enjoyed, since Olmsted designed Rock Creek Park in 1890.

Our wasteful city govt., sucking every dollar it can out of the tax paying residents, and pleading about increasing its revenue from McMillan. But the richest government in the world can increase its tax revenue as the parkside property values rise and the concessions, performances, art classes and a huge City Market generate tax revenue and fees in McMillan Park.

Revenue and benefits to our city will also come from the new residents, who do not buy condos on our parkland, but who buy and rent in alternative locations and renovate derelict properties, thus returning them to the tax rolls. Medical offices can be built across the street at Washington Hospital Center, where they belong. While patients from all the hospitals, especially Children's National Medical Center, and their families, get some fresh air, take a nice walk, and help their recovery in a "Healing Garden" at McMillan. City residents and our visitors need parks, destinations, and "Great Places." The real McMillan (Senator from Michigan) had that vision over 100 years ago. Nothing about this miserable failure, by the DC govt., recommends them to develop, pave over, and sell out our park. McMillan should never have been lopped off in the first place. When the federal government offered it to DC for free if they maintained it as green space. The best option is to now revert to federal control where National Park Service and McMillan Park Conservancy can restore and provide recreation along the Glen Echo Model.

I support the park restoration and sustainable community design by CUA Professor Miriam Gusevich, a design which sunlights the underground creek creating a sand beach, offers us urban agriculture and forestry, and brilliantly creates a world-class City Market, in adaptive reuse of the huge existing under-surface masonry galleries. Even the "so dangerous" manhole covers can be converted to skylights for a natural light source as you buy your fresh local farmed ingredients for dinner in the City Market below.

The restoration of McMillan is an incredible opportunity, the vision-less DC govt. is destroying. The reservoir in New York's Central Park serves thousands of joggers everyday, people meet and walk, for good exercise and camaraderie. It is a center, a social gathering, meanwhile our reservoir is fenced off and our park wasted since the 1980's. Even as First Lady Michelle Obama promotes exercise, urban gardening, and good nutrition, we need our jogging paths, our reservoir, and our urban farming system in the city center at McMillan. This is really a last chance, as all remaining available land is being over-developed in an anti-environmental onslaught by the DC government and the big developers they serve, at our expense.

We need space where youth and under-employed can train in masonry (that's how it will be affordable to restore the park), carpentry, plumbing, landscaping, forestry and so much more.

The restoration of McMillan will be a wellspring for the whole city, training programs can spin off into urban conservation corps, to help seniors fix-up and insulate their houses, etc., etc. We need sustainable energy demonstrations, and we can preserve functioning sand filtration cells to exhibit the legacy of McMillan. And even more so, it is critical we preserve all of McMillan, as a back-up emergency clean water system. Just as the fence went up in World War II to protect McMillan, this, in a world of terrorism and sabotage, how irresponsible to demolish this critical clean water infrastructure.

The shining example, Glen Echo Park in Montgomery County, benefits all ages with a myriad of art, education, dance, theater, and festivals 365 days a year and preserved the charming 1930s amusement park and 1890s Chattaqua. Why did Montgomery County and the Maryland Park System join with the National Park Service and a Park Consortium, and do the most spectacular historic renovation? They considered a mixed use development at Glen Echo too, but they had the foresight and they value the population, the areas young people, and provided such wonderful services and recreation and preserved the history. It is very sad how mindless the DC govt. is. and no surprise we suffer crime and disrespect in return from our urban youth. They are killing each other and lives are destroyed, as DC launches another and another and another development for the rich. At McMillan, the community is ready to support our "Glen Echo", as a place to develop DC youth in health, character, and respect, "Community Building." Every city official campaigns on supporting our young people, and all continue to fail them, and our homes and neighborhood security suffers the result.

We need this "Great Place" to help our youth and underemployed to succeed. We can teach masonry, carpentry, electrical, landscaping, forestry, urban agriculture and gardening, pottery and theater, all useful trades for becoming a responsible, productive adult.

McMillan is a protected landmark. The entire site is protected by our law -- all of it - not to be demolished, paved, sectioned off with 50 buildings and strips of green space. We need to restore our Olmsted Park. It is your responsibility as the HPRB to preserve the historic character of our city and McMillan is ready for such beneficial adaptive reuse. The report from the developers, that McMillan is too deteriorated for reclaiming is ludicrous and they would have built over Manhattan's Central Park too. I encourage the HPRB to reject the city's development plans. Stop wasting a fortune in

treasure, preserve historic McMillan Park, for so many excellent reasons,for its value to the environment, to our city, to our young people.

Daniel Wolkoff

amglassart@yahoo.com

July 2012

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Alicia Hunt Gersen <aliciahunt@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 8:23 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Cc: Anne Corbett; Mandel, Jon (Council); Mark Mueller
Subject: McMillan Surplus - Opposition - 2200 Block of Flagler Place NW

Dear Mr. Newaldass--

I oppose DC's surplus of the McMillan Sand Filtration Site **as premature** because the city does not have a fully developed plan to address the flooding in Bloomingdale. DC Water's First Street Tunnel plan will have severe community impacts on residents of the 2200 Block of Flagler Place NW that have not been resolved. Until DC Water fully and sufficiently resolves resident concerns and obtains permits for the First Street Tunnel, the city does not have an adequate plan in place to address the flooding.

At this time, the McMillan site retains a "necessary use by the District" and is "required for public purposes" because the property remains an option to mitigate flooding in Bloomingdale. Section 5.2.3 of the Final Report of the Mayor's Task Force on the Prevention of Flooding in Bloomingdale and LeDroit Park identified a solution to store the excess water at the McMillan Sand Filtration site, by building a pumping station on Bryant. According to the Task Force Report, this solution would achieve flooding relief for Bloomingdale. Additionally, it would be more than \$100 million cheaper and would achieve flooding relief about 2 years sooner than the First Street Tunnel project. And most importantly, it would have minimal community impact because the pumping station could potentially be built on or near DC Water's own property on Bryant Street. Table 5-13 in the Mayor's Task Force report says the McMillan storage and Flagler Pumping Station would reduce sewer backups, reduce impacts of surface flooding, protect downstream properties and have a "high" benefit. It was, without good explanation, deemed not "practical."

Until DC Water and the city fully address the very serious concerns of the residents on the 2200 Block of Flagler Place NW, the McMillan storage and Flagler Pumping Station option must remain on the table.

I write with some regret because I would like to see McMillan developed and put to good use. I have no issue with VMP or its plans, and I look forward to continuing to work productively with them on the design. But that is not the point right now. The point is that McMillan remains required for public purposes until the city figures out a flooding mitigation plan that does not throw some residents under the bus in the name of economic development. (I note that DC Water continues to work with Flagler residents. But we do not yet have all the information, we're not sure what DC Water is committed to, we need plans in writing, and we need to know specifically, in writing, how all of our concerns will be addressed).

The city and DC Water are simply operating with far too little transparency and process in Bloomingdale right now. There is a paternalistic attitude, a lack of notice, and a lack of timely and adequate information. Even if there is no corruption, the process feels corrupted. The time to remedy this is now.

Regards,
Alicia Hunt
2208 Flagler Place NW
[703-585-9217](tel:703-585-9217)

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Daniel Wolkoff <amglassart@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 3:17 AM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Testimony to HPRB McMillan

- **To:** steve.callcott@dc.gov, historic.preservation@dc.gov
- **Cc:** pmendelson@dccouncil.us, kmcduffie@dccouncil.us, dcatania@dccouncil.us, vorange@dccouncil.us, dgrosso@dccouncil.us, abonds@dccouncil.us, jgraham@dccouncil.us, jevans@dccouncil.us, mcheh@dccouncil.us, mbowser@dccouncil.us, twells@dccouncil.us, yalexander@dccouncil.us, mbarry@dccouncil.us, vincent.gray@dc.gov, victor.hoskins@dc.gov, jeff.miller@dc.gov, shiv.newaldass@dc.gov, harriet.tregoning@dc.gov, friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

This meeting was an insult to the city. In a church basement, with no proper recording or transcription of the passionate testimony against this corrupt system of taking from the public and giving to the corporations. There was no microphone, no public address system, no video or audio recording, and no web cast. You obviously do not want to share the shame of what your doing with the rest of the city. The city council should be ashamed of itself. This is a CHARADE, not a process with any legitimacy. Democracy is where the governed GIVE informed consent to be governed..SHAME ON YOU!

Second, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

The buildings as rendered by VMP would be hideous anywhere. They are offensive and ugly, especially in McMillan PARK. Likewise the entombment of our historic structures, like some bizarre architectural oddities,

displayed out of context is just WRONG. Designers all over the world do much better, as is the Cottage City Gusevich Plan.

This violates the Historic Preservation Act, which is your job to administer. MISERABLE FAILURE!!!

The Park, the historic context , all there for a glorious park restoration, and cohesive, complimentary, urban adaptive re-use. Must we aim this low with the VMP plan,, You and the City Council must reject the VMP PLAN if we have any integrity and any courage. We the people of DC, your employers, want to see a gracious future for this Olmstead PARK for our families and children!

Thank you,

Daniel Goldon Wolkoff

amglassart@yahoo.com
Adams Morgan Stained Glass
1231 Randolph Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202-232-8391
www.adamsmorganstainedglass.com

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Michael Farrell <jpmof38@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 12:23 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I've had a chance to hear the developers present their plan at an ANC meeting, and last Sunday I also spoke to some of the "Friends of McMillan Park" at the Bloomingdale Farmer's Market. I found their plan to be unrealistic, a disingenuous cover for doing nothing. The McMillan sand filtration site is not a good location for a major park- there aren't enough people living nearby. It's dead flat, and it's questionable whether the roofs of the underground reservoirs could support large trees. The little development in the "friends" plan couldn't support the lavish facilities that they are proposing.

I thought the developer proposal was thoughtful and imaginative, with the right balance of development and well-designed park space. I look forward to using the new park and pool, and to walking the streets of this new neighborhood.

I can't speak to the financial arrangements - perhaps the developer is really getting too sweet a deal. Given the corruption that has afflicted Ward 5 I don't trust that the city got the best possible deal. That said, the development plan is a good one. I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site site.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Farrell
73 S Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kirby Vining <nulliparaacnestis@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 10:12 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Cc: Miller, Jeff (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); krmcduffie@gmail.com McDuffie; vorange@dccouncil.us; Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; ATD EOM3
Subject: June 6, 2013 DMPED hearing on the surplussing of the McMillan Site -Kirby Vining
Attachments: dmped_6june_testimony_1jun13.docx

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

Thank you for hosting the June 6 McMillan Surplus Community Meeting at All Nations Church. We counted about 150 persons who turned out for that event on a rainy Thursday evening. In my experience, getting 150 persons out for any political purpose is huge. Advertising of the event was poor. Most of the persons you saw in the room were there because many of us who advocate NOT surplussing the land put flyers out throughout the community advising people about the meeting. Why didn't the city do this? Several persons who testified do not have e-mail or computers at all, so a paper flyer is the only way they knew about the meeting. These people must be included in the political process.

I submitted a copy of my written and spoken testimony to your staff on the evening of the hearing, and include a copy of that testimony below for your reference.

I noted that about 45 persons gave testimony at the hearing, 3 persons advocating the surplussing of the McMillan property, and 42 advocating NOT surplussing the property. I was in the latter group, most of whom noted the importance of that site in our past and for our future as a resource for park and other uses more important than those provided by the current Vision McMillan Partners proposal which is the only proposal currently being entertained by the city. We hope to see this all reflected in your memo to the Mayor concerning the proposed surplussing of the property, so that community input is given proper place in this.

Many of us who attended the hearing still have many questions about the Mayor's justification for considering to surplus the property. DC law notes that the Mayor may do so if he deems that a given property is no longer required for public purposes. You heard many speak of the fact that since the city acquired the property in 1987, the city has not attempted to put it to public use. You also heard many state that the property was a park until it was fenced off at the beginning of WWII, and that since 1986 the justification for that fence (to protect our drinking water supply, previously purified beneath the property) has ended, and advocated taking the fence down and using it as a park. The city has not done this, not even tried, not even considered this, and yet the Mayor is indicating that the property is "no longer required for public purposes." Further, DC Water has just begun preparing two of the 20 water filtration cells on the site for use as storm water diversion cells in part of a plan to stop the catastrophic flooding in Bloomingdale, yet the Mayor still says that the property is "no longer required for public purposes." Is that not a very important public purpose?

We are also concerned that the city has entered into a special arrangement with Vision McMillan Partners such that if the land is surplussed VMP would automatically be offered the property with no bidding and no competition for the design of a development at the site. Many of us believe that this is definitely unethical and may be illegal. There was no RFP for the vertical development of the site. Why? While the Mayor may select a developer rather than go through the RFP process, we would like to know why he is considering doing so in this case, precluding any other competing designs for the site. There is one fully-fledged plan for an alternate development scheme which would include city and

community needs. But even the author of that plan would like to see the vertical development put out for RFP and open bidding, with a clear set of terms of what the city and the community want in a development. That has never been done.

The current proposal by VMP is not well liked by the community, as attested by the survey of 1,000 homes in the neighborhood several of us undertook last year, which points out several strong, specific desires for the site from the community which are not satisfied by the VMP plan, a current petition campaign several of us are doing which already has over 4,000 signatures asking the Mayor to please open the development of McMillan up to open competition so that we can get a plan we like, and several strong letters from the Stronghold Civic Association and the Bloomingdale Civic Association citing particular aspects of the currently proposed plan which their respective neighborhoods are very unhappy with.

We hope that the summary you prepare for the Mayor of the testimony given at the June 6 hearing will reflect the items above which were brought out by many of the 42 persons who gave testimony AGAINST surplussing the property for inclusion in the Mayor's decision about whether or not to do so.

Thank you.

Civic Association

Kirby Vining
Friends of McMillan Park, Stronghold

202 213 2690

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: cherylw <cherylw@crosslink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 9:50 PM
To: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP)
Subject: Please reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass;

I am writing as a follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting. I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cheryl Wagner
3103 Hawthorne Dr NE
Washington DC 20017-1040
(202) 387-2361 Home

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Anne Geggie <annegeggie@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 8:50 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity. It is important that we continue to recognize the need for affordable housing as development moves across the city. The most dynamic DC I can imagine includes families of all income levels living in neighborhoods together.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anne Geggie
531 Ingraham Street NE
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Tula Connell <connell.tula@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 8:39 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Please Do Not Surplus McMillan

Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I would like to request that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Also, regarding the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

--

Tula Connell, Ph.D.
connell.tula@gmail.com

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Tula Connell <connell.tula@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 8:36 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I would like to note the following:

First, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

--

Tula Connell, Ph.D.
connell.tula@gmail.com

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Victor Perry <brstp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Victor Perry
1400 20th St NW
612
Washington, DC 20036

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Pregel, Viktor <VPregel@PattonBoggs.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 10:07 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: RE: McMillan

Good morning Shiv:

I just wanted to follow up to see if you've had a chance to put together the promotional/informational materials about McMillan that we talked about last week.

From: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM) [mailto:shiv.newaldass@dc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 10:53 AM
To: Pregel, Viktor
Subject: McMillan

Hi Viktor,

I hope all is well. Corey indicated that you were interested in talking more about McMillan. Please feel free to give me a ring or shoot an email at your convenience.

By the way, my roommate college, Vinoda Basnayake is at PB as well. Congrats on the new gig.

Keep well,

Shiv

Shiv Newaldass | Project Manager
Government of the District of Columbia
Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development
1350 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 317 | Washington, DC 20004
| W 202.674.2336 | F 202.727.6703 | Shiv.Newaldass@dc.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and contains information which may be confidential, legally privileged, proprietary in nature, or otherwise protected by law from disclosure. If you received this message in error, you are hereby notified that reading, sharing, copying, or distributing this message, or its contents, is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please telephone or reply to me immediately and delete all copies of the message.

moveDC is a citywide initiative to develop a bold, new vision for the District's transportation future and increase transportation choices for all.

Visit www.wemovedc.org for more information.

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail message contains confidential, privileged information intended solely for the addressee. Please do not read, copy, or disseminate it unless you are the addressee. If you have received it in error, please call us (collect) at (202) 457-6000 and ask to speak with the message sender. Also, we would appreciate your forwarding the message back to us and deleting it from your system. Thank you. This e-mail

and all other electronic (including voice) communications from the sender's firm are for informational purposes only. No such communication is intended by the sender to constitute either an electronic record or an electronic signature, or to constitute any agreement by the sender to conduct a transaction by electronic means. Any such intention or agreement is hereby expressly disclaimed unless otherwise specifically indicated. To learn more about our firm, please visit our website at <http://www.pattonboggs.com>.

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Pregel, Viktor <VPregel@PattonBoggs.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 10:07 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: RE: McMillan

Good morning Shiv:

I just wanted to follow up to see if you've had a chance to put together the promotional/informational materials about McMillan that we talked about last week.

From: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM) [mailto:shiv.newaldass@dc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 10:53 AM
To: Pregel, Viktor
Subject: McMillan

Hi Viktor,

I hope all is well. Corey indicated that you were interested in talking more about McMillan. Please feel free to give me a ring or shoot an email at your convenience.

By the way, my roommate college, Vinoda Basnayake is at PB as well. Congrats on the new gig.

Keep well,

Shiv

Shiv Newaldass | Project Manager
Government of the District of Columbia
Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development
1350 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 317 | Washington, DC 20004
| W 202.674.2336 | F 202.727.6703 | Shiv.Newaldass@dc.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and contains information which may be confidential, legally privileged, proprietary in nature, or otherwise protected by law from disclosure. If you received this message in error, you are hereby notified that reading, sharing, copying, or distributing this message, or its contents, is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please telephone or reply to me immediately and delete all copies of the message.

moveDC is a citywide initiative to develop a bold, new vision for the District's transportation future and increase transportation choices for all.

Visit www.wemovedc.org for more information.

DISCLAIMER: This e-mail message contains confidential, privileged information intended solely for the addressee. Please do not read, copy, or disseminate it unless you are the addressee. If you have received it in error, please call us (collect) at (202) 457-6000 and ask to speak with the message sender. Also, we would appreciate your forwarding the message back to us and deleting it from your system. Thank you. This e-mail

and all other electronic (including voice) communications from the sender's firm are for informational purposes only. No such communication is intended by the sender to constitute either an electronic record or an electronic signature, or to constitute any agreement by the sender to conduct a transaction by electronic means. Any such intention or agreement is hereby expressly disclaimed unless otherwise specifically indicated. To learn more about our firm, please visit our website at <http://www.pattonboggs.com>.

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Matt Jarvis <matjarvis00@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 9:23 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matt Jarvis
44 V St
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Matt Jarvis <matjarvis00@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 9:23 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matt Jarvis
44 V St
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Eric S <eschultzdc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:23 PM
To: McDuffie, Kenyan (Council); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Cc: Mandel, Jon (Council); Smith-Steiner, Debbie (ANC 5E01); Davis, Christy (ANC 5E02); Clark, Tim (ANC 5E03); Pinkney, Sylvia (ANC 5E04); Robinson-Paul, Joyce (ANC 5E05); Quinn, Teri Janine (ANC 5E06); Foster, Wanda B. (ANC 5E07); Mueller, Mark (ANC 5E08); Barnes, Dianne (ANC 5E09); Blanks, Angela (ANC 5E10)
Subject: Re: McMillian Park

Dear Councilmember McDuffie –

Thank you for your suggestion to attend the surplus hearing concerning McMillian Park. I was surprised that you did not attend. It was simply amazing. The room was packed with people and there was standing room only. The people were overwhelmingly united in the fact that they DO NOT LIKE the city's plans to build 12 story buildings on McMillian park. Only two people supported the development and people lined up to speak out against the city's plans until the time ran out and they were cut off.

There was so much excitement, energy and commitment to change in the room it was tremendous. The overwhelming take away from the meeting was that people do not want tall buildings built on the park. In fact, they want the park opened. One of the lines that was repeated that night was, "Mr. Mayor, tear down this fence!" The people are speaking and they want the historical aspects of the park preserved and they want a park, not more development.

Ward 5 is lacking in parks. Take a look at a map of the parks in the city and you will clearly see that Ward 5 has less parkland than the rest of this city. This is your opportunity; this is the city's opportunity to do something special. McMillan could be a truly wonderful place, a world class park, please don't destroy it with office buildings and condos. Sincerely,

Eric Schultz

58 Rhode Island Ave NW

Washington, DC 20001

On Mon, Jun 3, 2013 at 10:44 PM, McDuffie, Kenyan (Council) <kmcduffie@dccouncil.us> wrote:
Eric,

Thank you for emailing me regarding McMillan. I will take your concerns under advisement. Also, should your schedule permit, I would encourage you to attend the McMillan surplus public meeting on June 6 at 6:30 pm at All Nations Baptist Church, 2001 North Capitol Street NE (North Capitol & Rhode Island).

Best,

Kenyan

On Jun 1, 2013, at 9:46 PM, "Eric S" <eschultzdc@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Council Member McDuffie - I am writing to you because I do not like the existing plans for McMillian park. The development is too big for that space. The residential neighborhood does not need 12 story office buildings replacing a park. Washington, DC needs more park spaces. DC just spent 50 million so that residents of NoMa could have some park space. McMillian is a special place and is a real treasure that should not be destroyed and turned into more office buildings and condos.

>

> This park should not be declared surplus when so many people need parkland. the residents of Eckington are fighting over a small plot of land that some people want to use as a dog park. Developed properly, McMillian could be a world class tourist destination that would also benefit the residents of the community. Please ask the mayor to cancel the surplus meeting. McMillian is not surplus, it is desperately needed by the citizens of DC, not just ward 5 but the entire city. Last weekend, I took my out of town friends to Meridian Hill park. It was great, crowded, but great. This is ward 5's opportunity to have a real park. Please don't let this development take place. Thanks, Eric

>

> Eric Schultz

> 58 Rhode Island Ave NW

> Washington, DC 2000202-903-6595

>

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Anna Cero <cer.anna@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:47 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

Second, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Anna Cero

1101 New Hampshire Ave NW Apt 721, Washington DC 20037

--

Anna Cero | Associate AIA, LEED AP BD+C

[e]: cer.anna@gmail.com

[p]: (215).803.3325

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: cherylw <cherylw@crosslink.net>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:40 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Written Testimony to the Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB) for the hearing scheduled for June 27, 2013

Written Testimony to the Historic Preservation Review Board
(HPRB) for the hearing scheduled for June 27, 2013

RE: Urging the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners' proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the following comments on the McMillan Park Reservoir-Revised Master Plan and Building Design Guidelines. I understand the need for responsible planning and land use. However, I feel it is also important to respect the values inherited from the L'Enfant Plan (1791-92) and the McMillan Commission (1901-02). I am urging consideration of options for reuse of the site while preserving its historical context and blending into the surrounding neighborhood. Nearly 3,000 local residents have endorsed preserving at least 50% of the site as parkland and this should also be respected.

There is an inherent tension on the McMillan site: on the one hand, a gridded landscape and industrial facility and on the other hand an evocative almost surreal landscape and structure that reminds people of Stonehenge. I hope that both aspects of the history and industrial facility can be celebrated.

Careful consideration of building massing and footprint can be used to great benefit to retain and celebrate the unique spatial and historic qualities of the McMillan site.

Although the park was enlarged in the current design, there does not appear to be any concomitant trimming of the buildings. The result is that the building footprints are pushed out to the edges of the site and some building heights have been increased (cf. pp. 32-33 February 24, 2012 Master Plan submission with p. 11 March 20, 2013 Master Plan submission). The buildings on the northern segment are still too high and should be shortened, particularly when considered in context of the topography of the entire site. Judicious reduction of the buildings should be considered to bring the site's open space/building ratio back into a complimentary relationship.

In quoting from relevant sections of the Comprehensive Plan,

MC-2.6 McMillan Sand Filtration Site

. . . The McMillan site has been the subject of community forums for nearly 20 years. . . . Whatever the outcome, several basic objectives should be pursued in the re-use of the McMillan Sand Filtration site.

Policy MC-2.6.1: Open Space on McMillan Reservoir Sand Filtration Site Require that reuse plans for the McMillan Reservoir Sand Filtration site dedicate a substantial contiguous portion of the site for recreation and open space. The

open space should provide for both active and passive recreational uses, and should adhere to high standards of landscape design, accessibility, and security. Consistent with the 1901 McMillan Plan, connectivity to nearby open spaces such as the Armed Forces Retirement Home, should be achieved through site design.

Policy MC-2.6.2: Historic Preservation at McMillan Reservoir Restore key above-ground elements of the site in a manner that is compatible with the original plan, and explore the adaptive reuse of some of the underground “cells” as part of the historic record of the site. The cultural significance of this site, and its importance to the history of the District of Columbia must be recognized as it is reused.

I am hoping you will take into consideration the many special aspects of the McMillan site and not allow a pedestrian design of dense buildings to dominate this historic place.

Thank you.

Cheryl Wagner
3103 Hawthorne Dr NE
Washington DC 20017-1040
(202) 387-2361

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jennifer Pilla <jennifer.pilla@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 7:04 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Jennifer Marsoni
23 S Street NW**

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: David Schwartzman <dschwartzman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 6:32 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: My McMillan Park Testimony

Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board,

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I strongly urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.** Second, **I likewise strongly urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines. The McMillan Park Reservoir should be maintained as an historic site. The only future changes on this site must be entirely consistent with ecological and recreational principles, perserving the historic sand filtration structures. Then it will be consistent with the vision developed by the participants in Sustainable DC (I was a member of the Green Economy Working Group, with links to Energy and Climate).

Thank you,

David Schwartzman (Professor Emeritus, Howard University)

1634 Montague St NW

Washington DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Andrea Rosen <aerie@rcn.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 6:12 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Re: McMillan Park

Dear Preservationist,

I request that you overlook the fact that I am sending you a form letter, as I am communicating from travels overseas via my phone's "keyboard," which makes original composition arduous.

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

**Sincerely,
Andrea Rosen
3266 Worthington Street, NW., 20015
[Ward 4](#)**

Sent on the fly from my fone.

Sent on the fly from my fone.

On Jun 18, 2013, at 12:09 AM, Andrea Rosen <aerie@rcn.com> wrote:

Dear Preservationists,

Sent on the fly from my fone.

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Andrea Rosen <aerie@rcn.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 6:10 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: McMillan Park

Dear Preservationists,

Sent on the fly from my fone.

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ron Robinson <ronnymr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 5:47 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Reject Surplus and Disposal Proposal for McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board: I am writing for two reasons. First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site. Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).**

The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,
Ronny Robinson
119 V. Street NW

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Francis Gassert <fgassert@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:57 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Surplussing of McMillan Park

Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board,

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus. The sand filtration site, even as is, is of clear value to our community, neighborhood, and city as a rare green space and flood mitigation site.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Kind regards,

Francis Gassert
74 V St NW 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: John T. Salatti <john.salatti@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:57 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Kenyan McDuffie; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Cc: Youngblood, Hugh (ANC 5C03)
Subject: Testimony regarding the District's effort to Surplus McMillan Park
Attachments: Testimony Regarding Why the District of Columbia Should Not Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site.pdf

Mr. Mayor and members of the Council,

I attach to this e-mail my testimony from the June 6th community meeting concerning the District's effort to surplus the the District-owned portion of the McMillan Park. The reasons I offer strictly concerning the issue of surplussing and problems I found with the process. To my written submission, I note these lapses in how the District handled this meeting.

Specifically, I am troubled that the District decided it was necessary and took the trouble to take police officers away from patrolling our neighborhoods to have them at the meeting, but it was either unable or unwilling to put equipment in the room that would have improved the meeting.

First, the meeting was not videorecorded for future review by the Council or the community. Having a video of what was said in the public record would have been the correct action. Having multiple scribes taking notes of what people said was something, but that method leaves you and the public at the interpretative whim of the people who are taking notes. And however good the notes may be, they cannot convey the sentiment and gravitas that came through, especially from the elderly neighbors who came forward slowly but determinedly using their canes and speaking in firm yet emotional cadences. In this day and age of simple and miniaturized technology, such a recording should have been an unquestioned part of the evening.

Second, DMPED did not have a sound system that would have greatly improved attendees' ability to hear the people who spoke, not the least of whom was DMPED's Mr. Newaldass. Anyone with any kind of hearing deficit (and the room held many seniors) was having some trouble hearing the people speaking. Given the District's resources and the fact that public meetings are being held all the time, not having a sound system in place was a real lapse in the planning for this meeting.

Beyond those technical considerations and the other legal and technical points I raise in my attached testimony, I also want to say that I oppose this surplus effort because we can do better. I've had the pleasure and privilege of working with a number of you and can say that Washington, DC the creativity and the talent to do great things and we can

definitively do better than what we are looking at right now. The city of Pierre L'Enfant and James McMillan can do better; I dare say that those two men are not looking kindly on this effort to surplus McMillan. In the midst of the most enviable economic boom of any city in the country, Washington should be leading the way on creative innovation of publicly owned land. New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Seattle, etc. all should wish they were doing what we could be do here at McMillan.

Very sincerely yours,

John T. Salatti
(202) 986-2592

"Together, Building a Better Bloomingdale"

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Alex Shtogren <alex.shtogren@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:53 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Cc: kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL)
Subject: McMillan Surplus Hearing Testimony for Submission
Attachments: June 6 Submitted Testimony.pdf

Mr. Newaldass,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit the attached remarks. I believe the McMillan site is a tremendous asset and should be retained by the city for use as park and open space. I do not support declaring it surplus property.

Best regards,

Alex Shtogren

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Anna Nehring <annanehring@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:49 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

I lived in the Bloomingdale neighborhood near McMillan Park for 2 years, and have since moved to another location in DC. Bloomingdale and the surrounding area still remains my favorite part of the city because of the beautiful views and incredible history of McMillan Park.

Thank you,

Anna Nehring
3900 16th St NW #239
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: VN Campbell <vnoahcampbell@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:48 PM
To: Calcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP; Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); Nicole Campbell
Subject: Stronghold Resident Supporting Surplus of McMillan Site

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons: first, I very much want to convey the opinion of myself and my family that we greatly disagree with the manner by which the "friends of McMillan" have falsely claimed that those who live near the McMillan site are opposed to the VMP plan. We live one block away from the site and very much support the VMP plan and planned surplussing of the property (as do many of our neighbors). I urge the City Council to ACCEPT Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the the site so that development can move forward immediately.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to ACCEPT the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are APPROPRIATE for the historic site and are consistent with the needs of a rapidly growing city, as well as the needs of families such as mine who desire access to amenities that citizens on other areas take for granted, including a park and a grocery store, both of which are currently too far away to easily access. I find that proposed building designs are compatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site.

Thank you,

VN Campbell, 25 Franklin St NE

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ralph Garboushian <ralphgarboushian@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:48 PM
To: ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Support the Surplus of McMillan for the Good of the City and the Environment

Mr. Mayor, Members of the DC City Council, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the HPRB:

I am writing to urge you to ACCEPT the proposal to surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, and I urge the HPRB to ACCEPT the proposal from Vision McMillan Partners for the proposed building designs on the McMillan site.

It is unfortunate that the vocal minority opposing the redevelopment of this abandoned industrial site are wrapping themselves in the cloak of environmentalism. In an urban context, environmentalism is much more nuanced than trees, grass or 'parks'. Urban environmentalism is about land use and energy consumption. It is the unwise and profligate use of these two resources that has put our region at the point that we find ourselves today: an urban core that, despite recent growth and vibrancy, remains well below its peak population surrounded by a seemingly endless sea of sprawl that has destroyed tens of thousands of acres of prime agricultural land and wildlife habitat, impaired water quality in the Chesapeake Bay and fostered an automobile dependence that fouls our air and clogs our streets. (And makes too many of our children obese and requires too many households to assume deep debt as a prerequisite for accessing jobs and participating in our economy.)

The proper antidote to this situation is to use our remaining urban land as efficiently as possible in a manner that maximizes the use of previous infrastructure investments and places homes in close proximity to jobs and stores. In the context of urban environmentalism and urban planning, transforming the McMillan Sand Filtration site, an abandoned industrial site that is close to the city center, into a walkable, mixed-use development following traditional urban patterns is precisely what the District ought to be doing.

On the 'park' issue that the vocal minority of opponents appears to hang their hat on: in an urban setting, parks are for people. To a large extent, the success of an urban park is determined by the number of people that use it and its accessibility more than by its size. (I would argue that tiny Dupont Circle is a much more successful urban park than large but mostly empty and forlorn Fort Totten.) At present, there simply aren't significant numbers of people sufficiently close to the sand filtration site to create a successful park. In addition, the site is surrounded by a traffic sewer on two sides. As currently designed, Michigan Avenue and North Capitol Street are designed to move suburbanites in their cars through the neighborhood as quickly as possible, a design that discourages all but the most intrepid pedestrian or bicyclist from trying to access the site. The best strategy for success of the proposed new parkland in the southern end of the site will be to add as many residents, and daytime workers, as is possible and to improve pedestrian and bicycle access to the site from adjacent neighborhoods.

I once again urge you to ACCEPT the proposal to surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, and I urge the HPRB to ACCEPT the proposal from Vision McMillan Partners for the proposed building designs on the McMillan site.

Thank you.

Ralph Garboushian
1726 Potomac Avenue SE
Washington DC 20003

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jane Huntington <bjhuntington@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:34 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park
Attachments: June 17 2013 mayor +.doc

Mr. Mayor, members of the Council, Mr. Newaldass, Mr. Callcott, and members of the Historic Preservation Review Board, I am attaching my testimony, in response to the June 6 Surplus meeting and for the June 27th HPRB meeting, about the future of McMillan Park.

If you have any questions or comments, I can be reached at my information, below.

Cordially,

Jane F. Huntington
1920 Shepherd Street, NE
Washington, DC 20018
202.526.2601

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Robert Robinson <robrobin@me.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); Councilmember Vincent Orange; Councilmember David Grosso; Councilmember Anita Bonds; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com; Councilmember Jim Graham
Subject: My Opposition to the Mayor's Plan to Surplus and Dispose of the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

June 17, 2013, 4:20 p.m.

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

The Truxton Circle, Bloomingdale, Eckington and Stronghold neighborhoods and the gateway to the Capitol at North Capitol Street, Florida Avenue and New York Avenue have been the victim of one civic embarrassment after another, notably:

1. the Gateway vista from North Capitol Street and Florida Avenue south to the US Capitol blasted, first, by low-rise urban decay and, second, by high-rise, Shanghai-style commercial metastasis.
2. New York Avenue's paean to brutalist architecture: the Homeland Security fortress.
3. The Florida-New York Avenue Traffic Noose; and,
4. The unsustainable growth of polluting commercial and commuter traffic engulfing these communities from Irving Street, Michigan Avenue, North Capitol Street, Rhode Island Avenue, Florida and New York Avenue.

Now comes the proposal to remove most of the green space and cram a maximum-security development on the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, originally planned as a park by the celebrated Frederick Law Olmsted.

Enough is enough: elegant North Capitol vista of the US Capitol does not deserve further visual mutilation and the gracious Ward 5 neighborhoods that frame it are under incessant attack from traffic, blight and pollution.

Thank you,

/ s /

Robert Robinson

1631 Newton Street, NW

Washington, DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Christie Wren <christiewren@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:17 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus. As many members of the local community tried to make clear on June 6th, this land is not surplus. It is public land that can and should be put back into use as public land. The officials at the community meeting set out this idea as a zero-sum game of either we develop the land or it sits completely useless to the community. This is not the only option. Please do not declare this land surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

I am sure that you have seen this same language in many emails today. Please know that the community is sincere in its desire to see a good, public use of this space. One that is in line with the historic character of McMillan Park. This is a unique space in DC. Please do us the courtesy of recognizing that and working to preserve it for current and future generations.

Thank you,

Christie Wren
1108 Monroe St NW

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Tod Preston <todpreston1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:02 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park -- no surplus

June 17, 2013

Mr. Mayor, City Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am resident of the District of Columbia (Ward 5) and am writing for two reasons:

First, I strongly urge you not to declare McMillan Park surplus. I attended the June 6th surplus meeting in Bloomingdale, which only strengthened my opposition to this action.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Tod Preston
120 V St, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Tod Preston <todpreston1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:01 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

June 17, 2013

Mr. Mayor, City Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am resident of the District of Columbia (Ward 5) and am writing for two reasons:

First, I strongly urge you not to declare McMillan Park surplus. I attended the June 6th surplus meeting in Bloomingdale, which only strengthened my opposition to this action.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Tod Preston
120 V St, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Philip Blair & Mary Pat Rowan <Blair-Rowan@starpower.net>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 3:59 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM)
Subject: Historic McMillan Park

Office of the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development,

Dear Sirs,

I oppose any building on the historic McMillan site up for consideration by HPRB. This site does not qualify in any way to be considered surplus. This historic park is a thing of beauty that must be preserved for this and future generations. The plans proposed by the city at this time would destroy this historic resource and rob the citizens of this city of a potentially magnificent park on this site open to the public. Adaptive reuse of the underground and above ground historic structures has yet to be fully explored. The full site devoted to parkland with adapted reuse of the underground and above ground historic structures is not only possible it is economically beneficial to the neighborhood and the city.

The master plan and details presented at this time by the city destroy an historic landmark. It is the responsibility of the Mayor and the City Council to prevent this from happening.

Devoted to saving McMillan as a city park since 1999,

Mary Pat Rowan

Mary Pat Rowan
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
1518 Kearney Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
blair-rowan@starpower.net
202-526-8821

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Scott Lowell Aker, AIA <aker.architect@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 3:57 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Save McMillian Park Petition

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

Second, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Scott L. Aker, AIA

2929 Connecticut Ave. NW Apt. 405,

Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Keith Stanley <KStanley9@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 3:29 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com> >
Cc: Frederick
Subject: McMillan Park Surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Keith Stanley
3934 10th Street NE
Washington,DC 20017-1828**

Sent from my iPad

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jessica Hopson <hopson07@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:56 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Jessica Hopson
74 V Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: sherrill <sberger4@ix.netcom.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:55 PM
To: abonds@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); dgrosso@dccouncil.us; ATD OP HP; Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); vorange@dccouncil.us; Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com; Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Callcott, Steve (OP)
Subject: - My Opposition to McMillan Prk Development

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Sherrill Berger
1631 Newton Street, NW
Washington, DC 20010**

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Frederick <woodcut55@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:51 PM
To: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com; kstanley9@aol.com; kileybednar@gmail.com
Subject: Mcmillan site 2501 1st street NW

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:
I am writing for two reasons:

First, after attending the meeting on June 6th I request that you not declare McMillan Park a surplus property. Numerous reasons for saving the park space were discussed and presented and I believe declaring the park a surplus property is premature.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board Meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan park and water filtration site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The currently proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank You,

Frederick Nunley
3934 10th St. NE
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Katelijn van den Berg <katelijnvandenberg@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:37 PM
To: Callicott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com; Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL)
Subject: No to surplus and comments for HPRB meeting for Mc Millan Park Sand Filtration Site

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

The analysis of why the Mayor has determined that the property is no longer required for a public purpose is missing, there are many critical functions which the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site continues to fulfill and should further fulfill in the future and the developers plan stands in contravention with the DC Comprehensive Plan. The land should be kept as a public park with its historic identity intact for the neighborhood, Ward 5, and the District with the development on the site based on adaptive re-use and preservation of above ground and under ground historic structures.

Second, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Katelijn van den Berg
69 V street, NW
Washington, DC

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Lisa Holley <holley13@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:11 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Lisa Holley and Brian Lounsbury
1216 Taylor Street NE
Washington DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: joanna.de.berry@rcn.com
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:08 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

Second, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Jo de Berry

1731 FIRST Street, NW, Apt#2

Washington DC, 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Samuel Shipley <samuel.shipley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:56 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: friends-of-mcmillan-park@googlegroups.com
Subject: McMillan Park
Attachments: Shipley McMillan Testimony.pdf

Mr. Mayor, members of the Council, Mr. Newaldass, and members of the Historic Preservation Review Board, I would like to submit my testimony - for both the June 6 Surplus meeting and the June 27th HPRB meeting - about the future of McMillan Park.

The testimony is attached. If you have any questions or comments, I can be reached at my information, below.

Best,

Sam Shipley
Stronghold Resident
26 Bryant Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
202 330 1205
samuel.shipley@gmail.com

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Lauren Deromedi <lderomedi@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:53 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Lauren Deromedi
165 U ST, NW

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Candace Mitchell <cemdds@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:32 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Reservoir Project
Attachments: image.png
Importance: High

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

I have lived in the LeDroit Bloomingdale area for almost 26 years. I have raised my child here and I work in the neighborhood at Howard University. I am also a fourth generation Washingtonian and I have watched the many changes in this city - some excellent and some which are poor choices for the city and its citizens. I grew up near Rock Creek Park and miss the green space I was surrounded by as a child. As it is, with the new housing and other projects in this area we are becoming more and more congested. We do not need to mar the natural beauty of the McMillan Reservoir by erecting medical buildings but should consider enhancing the natural beauty of what is there. We already have a large hospital and medical office complex across the street - we do not need more of the same. Don't allow the plan for McMillan to be a poor choice.

Thank you,

Candace E. Mitchell, DDS, MBA
121 S Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: gwensouth@aol.com
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:26 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; igrham@dccouncil.us; Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); ATD EOM MIS
Cc: Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Testimony to HPRB on VMP Plan for McMillan Park
Attachments: McMillan Park Ideas.docx

To: Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

Second, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Furthermore, McMillan is a unique space that requires unique and *creative ideas*. The current concept presented by VMP and past developers, is merely a humdrum, cookie-cutter template of a mixed-used design. There is no creativity, only a plan that will destroy the site. I would ask all of you to reflect on the *legacy* that you leave behind in your treatment of McMillan. There are many creative design ideas that could be implemented on the site, including one of low-density, park and contiguous open. McMillan is an opportunity for great and creative design.

Also, please see the attachment of contiguous open green space ideas that would be suitable for McMillan.

Thank you,

Gwen Southerland

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Todd Crosby <tcrosby@usaid-yaajeende.org>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:19 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgross@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; jgraham@dcouncil.us; jevan@dccouncil.us; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: No surplus of McMillan

Dear Members of the DC City Council,

I am writing to express my concern that surplusizing McMillan in this context of non-transparency around McMillan sends the wrong message to citizens of Washington. Because the selection of VMG has not been conducted in a transparent, public manner (via an RFP and bids) it would be a disservice to the city as well as damaging to the Council's reputation to surplus the land without providing clarity to the community on details surrounding the transaction. To do so would give the appearance of possible impropriety on behalf of council members who have received funds from EYA, Trammel Crow or other VMG partners.

The VMG design has potential, but it is far from adequate from an aesthetic, architectural perspective to occupy this last great open space in mid-city. This is clearly NOT world class design. What is called for here, is a public/private/foundation partnership that allows the site to be divided up and developed by several interests: VMG perhaps, but also the community in conjunction with foundations and other partners.

I hope that you'll resist surplusizing this property until a good plan is in place and the HPRB has approved it.

Sincerely,
Todd V. Crosby
20 W street NW
Washington DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Corinne M. Land <corinne.m.land@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:19 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Historic Preservation Review

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

Second, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Corinne Land
1620 Fuller St. NW #205
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kevin Caldwell <kevin.caldwell1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:14 PM
To: Callicott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP)
Subject: I DO NOT stand with Friends of McMillan

Please know there are voices out there who do not stand with "Friends of McMillan." I for one would prefer more options for the development, but am not opposed to development if done right with proper considerations for transportation and flooding.

I am sick of FoM's strong-arm tactics and misrepresentation that they speak for all of Bloomingdale and surrounding communities. They are a very vocal minority. Their petition is not entirely accurate—I am counted as one of the names, though when I signed two years ago, I was not asked to sign in opposition of development or surplussing, it was to see more options for the development.

FoM is rhetorically and ethically questionable.

Kevin Caldwell
Ward 5
ANC 5E08

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Thomas Metcalf <thmetcalf@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:12 PM
To: ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP)
Subject: Surplus McMillan for the good of the city

Mr. Mayor, Members of the DC City Council, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the HPRB:

I am writing to urge you to ACCEPT the proposal to surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site, and I urge the HPRB to ACCEPT the proposal from Vision McMillan Partners for the proposed building designs on the McMillan site.

Environmentalism in an urban context is often counterintuitive. A century or more of profligate waste of two of our most precious natural resources, land and energy, has brought us to crisis points with global warming and wildlife habitat destruction. The proper corrective measures are to make as efficient possible use of our remaining land and energy. In the context of urban planning, transforming an abandoned industrial site that is close to the city center--the McMillan Sand Filtration site--into a walkable, mixed-use development following traditional urban patterns is precisely what the District ought to be doing.

On parkland in particular: first, an honest inspection of maps from the early 20th century shows that the proposed development area, bounded by Michigan Avenue, Channing Street, 1st St NW, and North Capitol Street, was NEVER a public park; it was an active industrial area. The park was the area immediately around the reservoir, and the area west of 1st ST NW and north of Bryant St NW. Second, in an urban setting, parks are for people. The success of a park is not determined by its size but by the number of people that use it. People love parks, but research has shown that once a park is more than a three minute walk away, the distance to travel starts to outweigh the desire to use a park. At present, there simply aren't significant numbers of people sufficiently close to the sand filtration site to create a successful park; the best strategy for success of the proposed new parkland in the southern end of the site will be to add as many residents, and daytime workers, as is possible.

Thank you,

Tom Metcalf
3809 17th ST NE
Washington, DC 20018

thmetcalf@mac.com

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Larry Martin <lmartindc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:00 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP)
Subject: HPRB McMillan Reservoir Site Review

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing to support a smart-growth, green space and green infrastructure alternative for the McMillan Reservoir site plan. (HPA#13-318). This site has provided little public amenity since its closure in 1986, and the status quo should not be considered a viable alternative any longer. This sizable parcel of land can and should serve multiple purposes for development, modeling green infrastructure to manage stormwater flows, and to provide historic continuity with the Park's original intent. Various agencies have at different times asserted various best use for the land, and the HPRB should use these arguments prudently to exercise its discretion in developing the parcel for its highest purpose. Presently, some 25% of the land has been proposed to be used as park-space. This will result in some dimensions of the historic parkland being lost, and should be considered the very minimum set aside for this use. Recreational areas, particularly playing fields are in high demand in DC - and this use of the site should be seriously considered for up to half of the parcel. Its hard to site new playing fields in DC, but our youth population is growing. This use is also consistent with green infrastructure for management of storm water run-off to reduce the need for expensive engineered alternatives. DC Water's plan to the use part of the site to relieve flooding in Bloomingdale is a logical, low cost strategy that should be permanently incorporated into the site. It will in some measure protect and preserve a couple of the historic underground structures.

I'd argue that the most important dimension of the new site proposal should be to reintegrate this part of DC back into DC. "Smart growth" neighborhoods that will provide convenient walkability to surrounding land-uses including the hospital complex and Howard University should be understood to provide both affordable housing to folks employed locally as well as to students. Accommodations for people visiting at the hospital would be valuable. All of this integrated into the neighborhoods with improved local retail and parkspace will make McMillan once again a destination for District residents.

Larry Martin, Ward 4

--

May 2013 - The Senate Energy Committee, by a bi-partisan voice vote, approved the [Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act \(S. 761\)](#). H.R.1616, companion legislation for S761 awaits action by the House Committee. The bills will spur the use of energy efficiency technologies in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors, using a variety of low-cost tools to reduce barriers for private sector energy users and drive adoption of off-the-shelf efficiency technologies. The bills also contains a private commercial building financing provision that will provide modest funding to states to create and operate innovative financing programs for efficiency upgrades to private sector commercial buildings. The Alliance to Save Energy, the Bipartisan Policy Center, Business Roundtable, the National Association of Manufacturers and the US Chamber of Commerce's Institute for 21st Century Energy have put their support behind the legislation.

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Laurence Chang <yocahuna@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:53 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Save McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

Second, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Larry Chang
3800 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Apt 507, Washington DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Reginald Esteban <esteban757@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:44 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Reginald Esteban
635 Ingraham Street NW
DC, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Richard Nunno <ricknunno@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:38 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park planning

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the [June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting](#), **I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.**

Second, **I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318).** The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines. Please keep me apprised of your thought process on this critical issue for the city's future.

Thank you,

Richard Nunno
3539 13th St. NW Washington DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Cathy Ginther <cathy.ginther@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:23 PM
To: Callcott, Steve (OP); ATD OP HP
Cc: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Hoskins, Victor (EOM); Miller, Jeff (EOM); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Tregoning, Harriet (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, as follow-up to the June 6th McMillan Park Surplus Meeting, I urge the City Council to reject Mayor Gray's proposal to surplus and dispose of the McMillan Park Sand Filtration Site.

Second, I urge the Historic Preservation Review Board to reject the Vision McMillan Partners proposed building designs for McMillan Park Reservoir (HPA #13-318). The height, scale, and designs of the proposed buildings are inappropriate for the historic McMillan Park site and are inconsistent with the overall open space character, sense of place, aesthetics, and historic vistas of this distinctive national landmark Olmsted park. The proposed building designs are also incompatible with the existing historic buildings and with the above- and below-ground historic structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined given that the Historic Preservation Review Board has yet to approve the proposed master plan and design guidelines.

Thank you,

Cathy Ginther
1441 Rhode Island Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20005

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: nancie coan <nanco4000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 11:54 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Nancie S. Coan
4000 Cathedral Ave. NW,
Washington, DC 20016

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sarah Dione <xoseraxo@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 11:49 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: don't declare McMillan Park surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
Sarah Coleman
Washington, D.C.
20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: James Drane <jfdrane@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 11:40 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Cc: James Drane
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
James Drane
1524 Monroe St NW DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Anna Adamczyk <aadamczyk@adaone.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 11:28 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Anna Adamczyk
3923 Illinois Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Melissa Kramer <melissagk@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 11:20 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Melissa Kramer
1433 W ST NW
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Mary Kenel <mekenel@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 11:14 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Site for Historic Preservation Review Board

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
Mary Kenel
mekenel@aol.com
901 Perry Place NE
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Laura Milner Shipley <laura.milner@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:52 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); McMillan Park
Subject: McMillan park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Laura Milner Shipley
26 Bryant street ne
Washington DC, 20002**

Sent from my iPad

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Abbasi, Ayesha (EOM)
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:33 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: RE: McMillan Park Surplus

“McMillan Park” is really the portion of the site that is now that area on the Reservoir side, right? We’ll have to clarify with Council before we go forward with the surplus legislation anyways, but I’d rather do that in person before we are moving forward with the surplus legislation. We’ll also have to make sure that McDuffie very clearly understands this so that he can explain to his colleagues as well. I know he supports the redevelopment of the site, but I think his ability to explain it to his colleagues will go far with Council being able to weed through the misinformation.

In addition, does HPRB understand what the difference is between the Reservoir side and the Sand Filtration side?

From: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:24 AM
To: Abbasi, Ayesha (EOM)
Subject: FW: McMillan Park Surplus

I’ve gotten like 30 of these in the last day. I expect it to increase as we get closer to the 21st. My concern is that these folks are being misled by the Friends of McMillan Park. We aren’t surplussing the McMillan Park or anything else on the McMillan Reservoir grounds, where the McMillan use to be. Can we create a message to the Council and HPRB that clarifies this? Thanks.

Shiv

Shiv Newaldass | Project Manager
Government of the District of Columbia
Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development
1350 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 317 | Washington, DC 20004
| W 202.674.2336 | F 202.727.6703 | Shiv.Newaldass@dc.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and contains information which may be confidential, legally privileged, proprietary in nature, or otherwise protected by law from disclosure. If you received this message in error, you are hereby notified that reading, sharing, copying, or distributing this message, or its contents, is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please telephone or reply to me immediately and delete all copies of the message.

OneCityYouth.DC.gov is your new, one-stop source for summer activities for District youth.
Head to the site today for programs & services for young people across the District!

From: Carla Merritt [<mailto:cmerritt@lpdco.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:22 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.co
Subject: McMillan Park Surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Regards,

Carla M. Merritt

President

LeDroit Park Development Company, LLC

2027 M.L. King Jr., Avenue S.E.,

Washington, DC 20020

202-577-4007

<http://www.lpdco.com>

A CBE Certified Company

@MerrittCarla on twitter



-Depending on the content herein, this communication may be considered an advertisement or solicitation.
-This is not intended to solicit property currently listed by another broker.

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kate <fox.kate@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:22 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com> >
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

In my own words, razing this site (which is what this development would essentially do) is truly a loss for DC. An innovative plan that brings this park into the 21st century would be a great boon to an area of DC with no major park, and an asset to the city. Let us look to New York for ideas; this could be Washington, DC's High Line, an innovative and cutting edge green space that has had wide teaching social and economic benefits for Manhattan. Or look at the new plan for Governor's Island. Other cities are taking not, so why shouldn't we? Let DC be a forerunner in the movement to green cities; let us be a model for livable cities that seamlessly blend innovation with tradition.

Thank you,

**Kate Fox
37 R St NW
Washington, DC 20001**

Sent from my mobile

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Carla Merritt <cmerritt@lpdco.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:22 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.co
Subject: McMillan Park Surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Regards,

Carla M. Merritt

President

LeDroit Park Development Company, LLC

2027 M.L. King Jr., Avenue S.E.,

Washington, DC 20020

202-577-4007

<http://www.lpdco.com>

A CBE Certified Company

@MerrittCarla on twitter



-Depending on the content herein, this communication may be considered an advertisement or solicitation.

-This is not intended to solicit property currently listed by another broker.



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Schultz, Eric E <Eric.E.Schultz@uscis.dhs.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:18 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); mcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus. Ward 5 does not have enough park space as it is. The residents of NoMa just received 50 million from the city so that they could have a small park. Residents in Eckington are fighting over a small plot of land that some people would like to use as a dog park. Building on McMillan will increase traffic and increase water runoff in Bloomingdale. More people are moving into ward 5 all the time. The people need this park, it's not surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Eric Schultz
58 Rhode Island Ave NW
Washington, DC 20001**

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: anathemasit.com@gmail.com on behalf of Nathan Castellanos
<nathanrcast@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:58 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); mcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Nathan Castellanos
135 Florida Ave, NW
Washington DC, 20001**

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jo Bond <jo14@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: McMillan

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Jo Constance Bond
1712 Second St NW**

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Patrick Hudak <patrickhudak@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:52 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); CM Kenyan McDuffie; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Subject: Do Not Surplus McMillan & VMP Plan is Inconsistent with Historic Preservation

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Patrick Hudak
120 V Street NW**

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Richard Senerchia <richardsenerchia@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:41 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: saving McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Richard Senerchia
1351 Otis St. NE
Washington DC

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Susan Eubank <susaneubank@cherryantiques.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:36 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); abonds@dccouncil.us; Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com; Larry Bowers
Subject: Save McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Susan Eubank & Larry Bowers
711 E Capitol St, SE
Washington, DC 20003**

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Natalya Scimeca <natalya_scimeca@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:36 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan site

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, I understand that the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. I also understand that the proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

I firmly believe that the McMillan Park site should be developed for the benefit of the city as a whole, with a particular eye toward the neighborhood in which it is located. However, the democracy deficit suffered by the current plan, which has been pushed forward by the city government without endorsement by the neighboring community, is unacceptable. Because of the tactics it has chosen to employ, the city must now go back to the drawing board to develop a plan that will inspire and encourage buy-in from all interested parties.

Thank you,

Natalya Scimeca
53 W Street, NW

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sarah Gray <sadie.gray@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:29 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Sarah Gray
4711 9th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Janine Harris <janineharris@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:21 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Janine Harris
3200 16th St. NW Apt. 619
Washington DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ben Laws <laws.ben@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:20 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Ben Laws
1718 Hobart St NW

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ashley Lancaster <allancaster@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 9:01 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park RE: Historic Preservation Review Board hearing

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Ashley Lancaster
28 Bryant Street NE**

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sergey Guryakov <sguryako@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 8:53 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Regarding proposed McMillan Park project.

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Sergey Guryakov
33 Florida Ave NW

<http://www.stereoj.am>
[@stereojam](http://tumblr.stereoj.am)

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Rachel Ward <rachelmward@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 8:34 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Rachel Ward
621 11th Street NE

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Joyce Gordon-Shapkaliska <joygordon@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 8:08 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I was unable to attend the meeting on June 6th and regret that I was not able to add my voice to the many that object to McMillan Park being declared a surplus.

In light of the upcoming meeting on June 27th with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Joyce Gordon-Shapkaliska
1812 1st St. NW Unit 1
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: David Hoexter <djhoexter@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 7:38 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale, and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you for your consideration,

David J. Hoexter
125 11th Street, Southeast
Washington, DC 20003

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: EllaKBert@aol.com
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 6:21 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Please Do Not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**EK Bert
152 W Street NW, DC 20001**

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: kita mitrapaap <kitamit@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 4:41 AM
To: Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Do Not Surplus McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Katherine Young
16 Franklin St. NE
Washington, DC
20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Heather Phipps <heathbleau@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 3:24 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Dear Mr. Mayor, DC Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
Heather Phipps
15th Street NE, WDC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Claire Surrey <claires118@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 2:23 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Claire Surrey
120 5th St NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ben Willman <benwillman@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 1:16 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park - Please do not declare it surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Ben Willman
1638 5th St. NW
Washington DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: SG <bikerindc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:28 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Surplussing of McMillan

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Why do residents in NW DC enjoy the peace and beauty of Rock Creek Park, while we in the eastern and central parts of town are deemed unworthy of such amenities? If the City cannot maintain a park because it is "too expensive," can I respectfully request that we deed the property over to the National Park Service, so that they can preserve this historic landmark, which was, from its original design, intended to be a place of respite and relaxation for the general public. Erecting a bunch of ugly office buildings and condos will totally destroy the spirit of this beautiful and unique slice of DC's history.

Thank you,

Scott E Graham
2030 1st Street, NW
Washington DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Laura Friedenbach <lfriedenbach@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:13 AM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Laura Friedenbach
1441 Rhode Island Ave NW, Apt M09
Washington, DC 20005

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kevin Hein <kevin.hein@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 11:39 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Please do not declare McMillan Park surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I urge you not declare McMillan Park surplus. I strongly oppose VMPs current plans for development of McMillan. McMillan has so much potential to be a unique amenity for the city. It shouldn't be haphazardly developed in a cookie cutter suburban style fashion. Selection of a developer should be open and transparent. Alternative concepts for the site should be fully explored.

Also, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,
Kevin Hein
57 U Street NW
Washington, DC 20001-1010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Caroline Mousset <caroline2310@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 11:14 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

**Thank you,
Caroline Mousset
1426 S Street, NW**

Sent from my iPhone

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Abby Lindsay <abbylindsaynh@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 10:45 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass, and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus. I was at the meeting and saw the overwhelming number of community members that were against the Vision McMillan plan.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

**Abby Lindsay
785 Fairmont St NW
Washington, DC 20001**

--

Abby Lindsay

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Aaron M. Ucko <amu@alum.mit.edu>
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 10:42 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Please preserve McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Aaron M. Ucko
2817 Woodley Road, NW
Washington, DC 20008
(202) 669-7495

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Matt Higgins <yohiggins@earthlink.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 10:39 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

Matt Higgins
1441 Rhode Island Ave NW #101

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sim Smiley <sim.smiley@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 10:27 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park Surplus

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons:

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board.

Thank you,

--

Ms. Sim Smiley
4469 Sedgwick St. NW
Washington, DC 20016
(202) 812-8466

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Colleen Dailey <colleen.dailey@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 10:12 PM
To: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Catania, David A. (COUNCIL); vorange@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; Graham, Jim (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Wells, Thomas (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); Barry, Marion (COUNCIL); Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); ATD OP HP; Callcott, Steve (OP); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Do NOT declare McMillan Park surplus!

Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mr. Newaldass and Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board:

I am writing for two reasons.

First, with regard to the June 6th surplus meeting, I am asking that you not declare McMillan Park surplus.

Second, with regard to the Historic Preservation Review Board meeting, the height, scale and designs for the proposed buildings on the historic McMillan site are inconsistent with the overall distinctive Olmsted open space character, aesthetics and historic vistas. The proposed building designs are incompatible with the present historic buildings and above ground structures on the site. The building design iterations are also premature and unrefined until the historic master plan design and guidelines are finalized by the Historic Preservation Review Board. Please do not rush this process and do not ignore the community opposition to the proposed plan.

Thank you,

Colleen Dailey
904 Jackson St. NE
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Laura Good <good.laura@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 15, 2013 12:00 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); McMillan Park; Barry, Marion (COUNCIL)
Subject: Student letters and illustrations on behalf of McMillan Park
Attachments: McMillan Park Letters.pdf; McMillan Park Illustrations.pdf

Dear Mayor Gray & Council Members,

I again urge you not to declare McMillan Park surplus and convert such beautiful green space into concrete. My third grade students at Excel Academy wrote letters on behalf of the park. Perhaps a child's perspective will shed a different light on this very important matter. A sampling of their letters and illustrations is attached. I will mail the remainder of the letters to your office. Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Laura Good

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: David Taube <pinnacle20009@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 15, 2013 3:58 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Taube
2136 12th pl nw
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Anthony James <anthonydjames@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 9:18 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anthony James
1703 Kenyon St NW
Washington, DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: M. Michel <tikreyol@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 1:13 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I do not support the McMilan plan. Too many construction/development in the area already like the Brookland new apartments by Buzzuto Group. These developments will force low income out of the area as it has been happening already.

Thank you for your consideration.

M. Michel
1238 Evarts St. NE
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Tony Lucadamo <tonylucadamo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 9:34 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tony Lucadamo
535 Florida Ave NW
Apt 2
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sharon Cochran <Sharon.cochran@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 9:28 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sharon Cochran
1327 Emerald st NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: LA Seidensticker <onefemme@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 8:39 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

LA Seidensticker
3000 7th St NE No. 211
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Leslie Dembinski <leslie@dwellingbydesign.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 8:29 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leslie Dembinski
Ward 3 Vision
4115 Emery Place, NW

Leslie Dembinski
Emery Place, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Donald Winkler <winklerdr@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 4:13 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Donald Winkler
3137 Aberfoyle PI NW
Washington, DC, DC 20015

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Dan Miller <danmillerlists@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 9:57 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Miller
1477 3rd St. SW
Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Steven Boyd <sb@vt.edu>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 5:13 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steven Boyd
9 W St NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Bryan Martin Firvida <bryandc@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 4:41 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

Good Afternoon Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development,

As a resident of Northeast District of Columbia and Ward 5, I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious redevelopment plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see this now fenced off and closed site opened up to public access with the District's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that District pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan, especially as we are redeveloping public property. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the District move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bryan Martin Firvida
510 Regent Place NE
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Shilpi Paul <shilpishilpi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 3:08 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Shilpi Paul
1709 4th Street NW
Apt. 2
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Mike Samuelson <michaelasamuelson@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 1:50 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mike Samuelson
628 Kenyon Street NW
Washington, DC 20035

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: John Siko <johnasiko@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 1:01 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Siko
3408 20th St. NE
Washington, DC 20018

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jeffrey Oser <jeff.oser@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 12:33 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey Oser
14 S Street, NE, #205
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: James Powell <Jtpowell@cbmove.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:52 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Powell
52 Channing Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Rahul Mereand-Sinha <rahul@mereand-sinha.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:42 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rahul Mereand-Sinha
1615 Q Street NW
Apartment 102
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kevin Caldwell <kevincaldwell0@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:37 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I would like to see bigger park space and am still concerned about traffic congestion.

I also encourage you to question the accuracy of Mr. Youngblood's signatures. He has been asking people to sign petitions for years, not specifically opposing the development

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin Caldwell
77 U Street NW
#1
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Matthew Dickens <mldickens@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matthew Dickens
1654 Euclid St NW
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: David Ricksecker <david_ricksecker@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:25 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Ricksecker
2904 Upton St. NW
Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jesse Rauch <jesse.rauch@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:07 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jesse Rauch
744 13th Street SE
Washington, DC 20003

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Michael Aiello <thechorp@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:06 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Aiello
221 R St NE Apt B
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Foley santamaria <foleysantamaria@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 11:04 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Foley santamaria
913 8th st ne
washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Rebecca Mills <vena.cava@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 10:57 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I attended the surplus hearing on June 6 and didn't stand up and testify because supporters of the "Friends of McMillan" group, which is opposed to Vision McMillan's plan, were oppressively claiming to be there representing "the community" and making it difficult to get a word in edgewise.

So, I am writing instead to express my support for the plan. As someone who lives on North Capitol Street one-half block south of the site, I believe it's the best chance we have of turning the land into useable space. In an article that was just posted today on Greater Greater Washington, Malcolm Kenton sums up the reasons very well:
<http://greatergreaterwashington.org/post/19128/redeveloping-mcmillan-is-the-only-way-to-save-it/>

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Mills
2407 North Capitol Street NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: John Hagood <j-hagood@nga.gov>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 10:46 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

Count on me to support your declaring the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant surplus property. A tiny few of my neighbors, the naysayers, apparently would prefer to keep a desolate waste land undeveloped.

I am tired of seeing our streets and avenues serve as traffic sewers for suburbanite car commuters. Density and good options for moving about (walking, cycling, bikeshare, and public transportation) are bound to improve the quality of life in the nation's capital for everyone.

Thank you for your work on evaluating this issue. Wonderful that something is being done.

John Hagood
71 P St NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Alex Posorske <aposorske@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 10:35 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alex Posorske
1417 West Virginia Ave NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Gino Duda <ginoduda@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 10:05 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gino Duda
2312 First St Nw
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Cristina Antelo <cantelo@podesta.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 10:04 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cristina Antelo
2312 First St NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ray Perez <raymondanthony7@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 7:57 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I understand the need to preserve green space, but also know that the development of this space is expensive and needs developer support. I also do not believe that solely a park would be safe and used for productive purposes by all. I also do not think that the site should sit idle either and wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ray Perez
3099 Hawthorne Dr. NE
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Robin Arnett <robin.arnett@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 11:20 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Cc: Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Testimony on McMillan Park

Hello,

I am a resident of the 500 block of Kenyon Street NW and would like to express my opinion regarding the development of McMillan Park. I am opposed to McMillan park being declared a surplus. This area desperately needs more public and green space, and it would be a disservice to the community to develop this precious historic landmark. Furthermore, public transportation does not serve this area adequately and traffic will become even worse with this development. The area simply cannot handle it. Finally, the public is not adequately informed on these matters, and there should be more input from the community before something like this is advanced.

Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration.

Regards,

Robin Arnett

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Chris Wagner <cwagner33@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 9:06 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris Wagner
Oakdale Place NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kirby Vining <viningghotiacnestis@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 8:55 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my opposition for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" to stop the currently proposed development plan which will destroy 80-90% of the historic resources of this site in the words of the HPRB and take away forever this historic integrated park.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kirby Vining
16 Franklin St. NE
Washington, DC, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jeffrey Oser <jeff.oser@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 3:31 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey Oser
14 S Street, NE, #205
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Barrie Daneker <bdaneker@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 2:21 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barrie Daneker
26 Bryant St NW #2
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Thomas Boeke <tomboeke@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 1:23 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas Boeke
2331 1st St NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Claire Carlin <Claireecarlin@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 12:34 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Claire Carlin
910 Girard street NE
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: mike iacovone <mikedax@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 12:33 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

mike iacovone
18 W st NW
washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Patrick McDonough <p_mc_donough@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 8:46 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patrick McDonough
1391 Pennsylvania Ave SE #265
Washington, DC 20003

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: cecily kohler <cecilyk@juno.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 12:11 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: McMillan Park Tesimony

Dear DC Council members,

Last week I attended the meeting about McMillan Park. As an environmentalist (director of the Capitol Hill Energy Co-op), my initial attitude regarding governmental plans to destroy the historic nature of the area by yet another example of high-density concrete construction was negative. However, after listening to the eloquent and informative testimony of perhaps 60 residents that evening I am more convinced than ever that your “ideas” about what should be done with the park are completely off the mark. Indeed, I am also not sure that you even care how Washington residents, your constituents, feel about this issue. Not one city official of any importance or in any decision-making capacity attended the meeting. The testimonies were not recorded so that you could hear verbatim what we had to say. Most of us came away with the feeling that this meeting was a sham.

I do NOT support your intention to surplus the property for the following reasons:

- 1) The property called McMillan Park is presently serving public use as a mitigator of flooding and traffic congestion.
- 2) McMillan Park is a unique site on two historic registries. We should take advantage of this resource to enhance the value of our city and attract out-of-town visitors and residents alike. A creative restoration plan for the silos and tunnels could satisfy the residents’ wish for green space as well as provide additional revenue for the city.
- 3) Mayor Grey allegedly intends to make Washington the most livable and sustainable city in the US. The transformation of one of the last available green spaces in the city into another Crystal City is not in harmony with sustainability or a livable city. It is also purported to be a goal of this administration to increase the tree canopy of the city. If this is so, why would you propose to cover 25 acres of green space with concrete?
- 3) 4) The residents of DC do not want to have their park turned into a housing and retail development. They want a park, bike trails, swimming pool, picnic area, etc. They want the area to be opened up and structured for their relaxation and enjoyment. Ward 5 is already underserved with park area.
- 5) 5) If the city allows the current flooding situation to continue the property values of the afflicted homes will drop, leading to a corresponding drop in city property tax revenue. A Crystal City-like development on the McMillan Park site would also decrease property values. There is not sufficient intra-structure to support the proposed development plan.

If you as our Council members truly want to enhance the beauty, sustainability and livability of our city please listen to your constituents. We are tired of traffic snarls, flooding, congestion. We do not want high-rises to block out the sun. We want a bright and cheerful city. We need places to relax and revive our spirits.

Sincerely,
Cecily Kohler

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Roberta Gutman <roberta.gutman@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 8:45 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: FW: A case to preserve the McMillan Reservoir property for public use as a park open to all

Mr. Newaldass—This is what I sent to all Council members and tried to send o you at the same time; for whatever reason, it wouldn't go along with the others last night. I do hope you carefully consider my words and concerns as given below. Thank you.—Roberta Gutman

From: Roberta Gutman [mailto:roberta.gutman@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2013 9:00 PM
To: 'kmcduffie@dccouncil.us'; 'mbowser@dccouncil.us'; 'twells@dccouncil.us'; 'mbarry@dccouncil.us'; 'jgraham@dccouncil.us'; 'jevans@dccouncil.us'; 'mchah@dccouncil.us'; 'abonds@dccouncil.us'; 'yalexander@dccouncil.us'; 'vorange@dccouncil.us'
Subject: A case to preserve the McMillan Reservoir property for public use as a park open to all

Dear D.C. Council Members:

On Friday evening June 7, I attended a public meeting more out of curiosity than anything else and at the urging of a friend who is interested in the disposition of the McMillan Reservoir property. Although I am a resident of Ward 6, my late husband was a professor at Catholic University, so I am acquainted with, and curious about, the property. For the 24 years I've lived in D.C. the property has been fenced off from the public, and I've often wondered why. When I recently learned that the property may be developed for residential and commercial use, I was inclined to think that it may be a good site for such development.

After hearing the testimonials of several people at Friday night's meeting, I came away completely convinced of the opposite: that the property must be converted to, or preserved for, public use. For one thing, I'm aware of the huge amount of building and other development that has been occurring in D.C. in recent years. I've been delighted with the River Walk development, the creation of bike lanes (I'm a frequent user), the development along M Street SE, and the many other (mostly) improvements long-overdue in our city. I've observed with amazement the huge craters at NJ Ave and I St SE and at Bladensburg Road and NY Avenue; surely there will be much housing created at these locations. The Costco and related development near the Arboretum will improve commerce and residential prospects, and a huge development of townhouses can be seen from the Arboretum grounds. There is plenty of residential and other property being created in D.C. I hope I can assume that the Council will ensure that much of this development will benefit low- and middle-income residents.

Almost everybody testifying at Friday's meeting spoke of the great need for park and recreation facilities in the area. Children now must play in alleys, sidewalks, and streets. I was especially touched by two long-time elderly residents, one named Wanda (I didn't get her last name) and the other a Ms. Sutherland, who gave moving testimonials of the beauty of the property, of the gorgeous sunsets and views of the Capitol and monuments downtown, and of how at one time the property was accessible to and used for recreation. **So why not NOW make this into a park accessible by not just local residents, but residents from all over the city and metropolitan region, as well as visitors from elsewhere in the U.S. and from abroad. It could be a spectacular showcase for the city's wonders, affording beautiful views, fresh air, cycling and walking paths, playgrounds, and picnic facilities.**

Some of the testimonials referred to the property's original use as a nonchemical, sand-only water-purifying facility, and others spoke of its value in absorbing storm water runoff (I write this as it's pouring outside). These are clearly

two reasons, among other significant environmental needs, to preserve the property. I was also totally unaware of, but amazed by, the underground tunnels on the property, which could surely be put to appropriate public use.

And, of course, there's the issue of pay-to-play D.C. politics, which is making a mockery of our democratic system of governance. When my late husband and I moved here 24 years ago, D.C. was a bastion of drug dealing and money squandering, its downtown decaying and its schools a public shame. We've come a long way, and I no longer have to take jibes about living in a decaying city that happened to be the nation's capital. Let's keep the progress going—and let's be sure our city is one that all of us, of all ages and income levels, can be proud of, work for, be educated and work in, feel safe in, and otherwise enjoy. **Let's take another major step forward by creating a McMillan Prospect Park or McMillan Pinnacle Park—let's have a city-wide park-naming contest!—that will add so much to the quality of everybody's life in D.C., and not just more money to line the pockets of already-wealthy developers and complicit politicians.**—Roberta Gutman, proud D.C. and Ward 6 resident

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Benjamin Friedman <bbfriedman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2013 9:08 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Benjamin Friedman
819 Taylor St. NE
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Nathaniel Tipton <ntipton@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2013 1:50 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nathaniel Tipton
1919 North Capitol St NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Otis McClees <otisray32@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 09, 2013 10:27 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Cc: info@mcmillanpark.com
Subject: McMillan Park

To whom it may concern,

As this debate has gone on for some time. I cannot see a reason why the McMillan Park cannot be turned into a mixed used area (without mass development). The site @ <http://www.mcmillanpark.com/> appears to accommodate all the necessary items our community needs. Yes their site is not a money maker as some offerings we have seen. But the offering from the group would work out perfectly for the growing number of families that are currently living and will soon be living in our area. I thank you for your time. Have a blessed day.

--

Otis Ray
"Knowledge is Power"

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: VN Campbell <vnoahcampbell@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 07, 2013 10:27 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Cc: Nicole Campbell; McDuffie, Kenyan (Council)
Subject: McMillan Surplus Meeting

Shiv,

First, great job in handling the unruly crowd at last night's meeting... I can imagine that it was a bit challenging. I wanted to write in to express my thoughts for the record that myself and many of my neighbors on Franklin Street in Stronghold support development of the McMillan site. Of course, I can't speak for them, but for our house I can certainly say that we would like to see the property surplussed so as to pave the way for creation of a space that will improve access to amenities that are now difficult to access, such as a grocery store, restaurants and yes, even a park.

Thanks for your hard work on this, good luck in getting the ball across the goal line.

Best,

VN Campbell
25 Franklin St NE

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kirby Vining <nulliparaacnestis@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 11:15 PM
To: kmcduffie@dccouncil.us McDuffie
Cc: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); ATD EOM DMPED
Subject: Testimony of Kirby Vining for the DMPED McMillan Land Surplussing Hearing, 6 June 2013.
Attachments: dmped_6june_testimony_1jun13.docx

Attached please find a copy of the testimony I presented to the DMPED 6 June 2013 McMillan Site Land Surplussing Hearing.

As I mentioned in previous letters and in this testimony, I am disturbed that the hearing was not postponed until the community could see the various issues raised in DC Code 10-801, spelling out the Mayor's intentions and rationale for proposing the surplussing of this property.

Further, I was disturbed to note that there was no recording of this hearing, which is now part of the official record. I will request a copy of the transcripts from the hearing as soon as they are available.

Mr. Newaldass promised that the FOIAed "Exclusive Rights Agreement" which DMPED signed with VMP would be presented to me before this hearing. It was not.

Noting that there was no recording tonight, I counted about 42 persons who testified against surplussing the McMillan Site, and about 3 who testified for it. These numbers are consistent with the preferences we found in the surrounding neighborhoods during our survey last summer: 86% of those surveyed want at least 50% of that site to remain contiguous public park.

Some find these numbers incredulous -- I myself was surprised -- but each new major community survey or petition brings the same numbers up.

Thank you, -Kirby Vining

attachment: hearing testimony copy:

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kathleen Rooney <krooney80@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 9:05 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathleen Rooney
11 Hamilton St NE
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jocelyn Hospital <jocelyn.hospital@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 3:51 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jocelyn Hospital
Oakdale Place NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Mary Kenel <mekenel@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 3:37 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan Park

Although I am most likely not able to attend tonight's meeting to personally demonstrate my support for the McMillan Park, I wish to go on record in support of this Olmstead Park. and the preservation of his toric structures and green space I also wish to go on record opposing McMillan Park being declared surplus.

There is already a hugh amount of development, both residential and retail, in this section of the City. We need spaces where green areas are maintained and where we can actually see the sky. In addition, I wish to point out that there have been no upgrades to the local transportation system although the influx of new residents and businesses is placing an additional burden on roads that are already major commuter routes between DC and Maryland, loaded with buses, trucks and personal vehicles. There seems to have been little if any thought given to infrastructure such as water and sewer management - the plans proposed by DC Water do not address the needs of our local community - at least not fast enough to help this situation.

We need park space - what we have is little enough - do not sell us out by destroying this parcel in the name of the god of greed!

Mary Elizabeth Kenel
mekenel@aol.com
901 Perry Place NE DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: ems30@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 2:58 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: McMillan park

Please be aware that I oppose McMillan park being declared surplus and therefore subject to sell to developers who will build yet another nondescript development.

Sent from my iPhone

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Natalya Scimeca <natalya_scimeca@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: McMillan surplusage

Dear all,

I am writing to express my concern and dismay with regard to the decision to designate the McMillan site as surplusage. I am a LeDroit Park/Bloomingdale resident who moved to within 3 blocks of the McMillan site with the expectation that it will once again live up to its historical, aesthetic, and civic potential. I fear that the plan currently being espoused by the city will fail us on each of these grounds. Moreover, I am very concerned about the way in the current development process has played out. The site should be developed, but thoughtfully and with the full participation of the neighboring community -- those who have the most to gain or lose from the development. I sincerely hope that you will consider calling off the meeting scheduled to take place this evening (June 6) and to reinvigorating a fully participatory, credible process for developing the site.

Kind regards,
Natalya Scimeca

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Erin FRBKS <czarinanatasha@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 11:02 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: where to send testimony for the surplus hearing

Good Morning Mr. Newaldass:

Where may people send their written testimony regarding the McMillan Surplus hearing so that it is on the public record?

Thanks so much!

Erin

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Thomas Boeke <tomboeke@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 10:56 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Support for McMillan Vision Partners Plan

Mr. Newaldass,

I live in the neighborhood of the McMillan Sand Filtration Site (1.5 blocks) and walk my dog by the site every day. I have reviewed the proposed plans put forward by VMP and am in favor of the site plan as proposed. It looks like they have done a thorough job of assessing the community's needs and wishes, and implementing a plan that addresses all these various aspects in a very appealing design. I am hopeful that the city and developer can **finally** move forward with the plans for this site, as I believe it will be a huge benefit for the neighborhood and the city. I won't be able to attend the meeting tonight, but I wanted to make my wishes known.

Thank You.

Tom Boeke
2331 1st St NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kate Ogorzaly <catherine.ogorzaly@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 10:04 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL)
Cc: friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Save McMillan Park!

Dear Mayor Gray, Ms. Newaldass, and Council Members,

I strongly urge you to reconsider the upcoming development project at McMillan Park. As a neighborhood resident, I would much rather see the site be preserved and maintained for public enjoyment. This is an incredible opportunity to give back to the community around North Capitol Street and create an asset to be treasured by all.

1. **I am opposed to McMillan being declared surplus.**
2. Public lands should remain in the public portfolio and not be sold.
3. The McMillan Park is a treasure on the National Register of Historic Places.
4. There is a deficit of park land in this part of the city.
5. With 10 million sq ft of development coming to areas around the park, why must this park be sold for further development?
6. Not enough has been done to inform the public of the city's plans. Simply passing information to ANC's and relying on them to spread the word is not acceptable, particularly for a private development receiving financial subsidization from taxpayers and resulting in the destruction of a historic site.

Please consider what having a public park could mean to long-time and new residents of the neighborhood. These are the things that make people want to LIVE here and not just work here.

Sincerely,
Catherine Ogorzaly

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Lew Baker <baker5000@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 10:02 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM); Gray, Vincent (EOM); Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL);
kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL);
friendsofmcmillanpark@gmail.com
Subject: Opposing View

Hello,

I am the owner at 21 Bryant St NW. In brief I am in support of exploring greener options for the MacMillan site like the one proposed by Catholic U. It has taken this long, we might as well take some time and do it right.

Thanks,

Lew Baker

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sean Murphy <swm@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 9:49 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sean Murphy
4000 Cathedral Ave NW
Washington, DC 20016

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Laura Rydland <kylie.rydland@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 9:17 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ASK THAT THE CITY PURSUE MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AS PART OF THIS MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Laura Rydland
317 1/2 Constitution Ave NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Richard Naylor <Ranaylor@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 8:32 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Naylor
28 Bryant St Ne
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Thomas Metcalf <thmetcalf@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 6:55 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I am writing to support the proposal to deem the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious mixed use development plan. At present, the site is an unused patch of grass that is green in color only. The truly green outcome for this site is to develop the site following the patterns of traditional urbanism, incorporating housing, retail, commercial, and park uses into the site. Such development in the context of an urbanized city makes and supports the most efficient uses of land and energy, the two resources whose scarcity creates today's most pressing environmental problems.

Bordered on the north by the hospitals, the west by the reservoir, and the east by a very thin strip of housing, the site, if converted completely to parkland, would be perpetually vacant. There simply isn't sufficient population close enough to make full use of a park. If planted to resemble wilderness, at best the site would become ecologically useless edge habitat. The site needs more people for any proposal to be successful.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas Metcalf
3809 17th ST NE
Washington, DC 20018

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: David Call <davecall27@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 5:38 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Call
52 Channing ST NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Erik Weber <erik.vebah@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 11:37 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

As DC thrives and our population grows, we are in greater and greater need of affordable housing and high-quality parks. Though Washington, DC the Nation's Capital has the National Mall for visitors, Washington DC the city lacks a grand park for its residents. The vibrant, but nearly over crowded nature of the cities smaller parks like Meridian Hill, Rose Park, Lincoln Park and others show how much residents of all backgrounds and incomes thrive on availability of good park land.

However, it's also important to insure residents of all incomes have good access to this park space. Affordable housing interspersed throughout neighborhoods is a great way to accomplish this.

The McMillan Sand Filtration Plant plan offers a fantastic opportunity to increase both affordable housing and viable, high quality park land.

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Erik Weber
1427 Chapin St NW
Washington, DC 20037

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Toni Codinas-Fort <a.codinas@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 10:49 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Toni Codinas-Fort
2010 1st Street NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ted Kill <tedkill@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 10:45 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

The Current Plans for McMillan are totally inadequate. Please do not declare the area "surplus" to turn it over to the EYA team. Their plans do not enjoy support from the community.

No development at McMillan should take place until an adequate transportation plan is in place that includes construction of the east-west street car route at Michigan Ave.

Ted Kill
134 Randolph Place NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Myles Smith <mylesgsmith@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:00 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

Totally in favor of new walkable neighborhoods in DC. Especially if affordable apartments are built above the retail options.

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Myles Smith
Kansas Ave NW
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Steve Strauss <straussnyc@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:32 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible, transit-accessible, mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve Strauss
3001 Veazey Terrace NW, #1332
Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Amy Benson <amychristinebenson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:26 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Amy Benson
2325 42nd Street, NW
#415
Washington, DC 20007

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Francy Stilwell <francy.stilwell@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 9:36 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

Think Big, Think Central Park, Prospect Park, Olmstead Landscaping, and please, please, we need more affordable housing. We really need it.

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings.

Thank you !

Francy Stilwell
1729 Harvard St NWw
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Rebecca Kalmus <rkalmus@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 9:03 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Kalmus
1200 14th St NW
Washington, DC 20005

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Paula Cohen <pmcdcdc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 8:22 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paula Cohen
2001 19th st. nw #12
washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ryan Keefe <Rkavfc@aim.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 7:04 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ryan Keefe
3405 Garrison St NW
Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jesse B Rauch <jesse.rauch@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 7:01 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jesse B Rauch
744 13th Street SE
Washington, DC 20003

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Abbasi, Ayesha (EOM)
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 5:13 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: RE: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

In the short term, keep each one and don't worry. We will be submitting everything to Council when we move forward with surplus. We will print and submit each email you receive to the Council, good and bad, CMs cc'd and CMs not cc'd.

The upside to this is that people always cc the world when they do not like something. As a result, Council understands that they get cc'd on everything anyone opposes. However, they all care about knowing the full picture. If you get any questions from Council about the opposition letters, you will say that dmped is collecting ALL comments on the proposed surplus and everybody's comments will be submitted to Council as part of the surplus analysis. Then they know they have to wait until you submit the surplus package to Council and that package will contain the universe of comments on the surplus.

Hope this helps.

-----Original Message-----

From: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 3:36 PM
To: Abbasi, Ayesha (EOM)
Subject: FW: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

We have like 55 of these, but they're all being sent just to me, while the 2 opposition letters that I have are addressed to every councilmember and the Mayor as well. What should I do?

Shiv Newaldass | Project Manager
Government of the District of Columbia
Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development
1350 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 317 | Washington, DC 20004
| W 202.674.2336 | F 202.727.6703 | Shiv.Newaldass@dc.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and contains information which may be confidential, legally privileged, proprietary in nature, or otherwise protected by law from disclosure. If you received this message in error, you are hereby notified that reading, sharing, copying, or distributing this message, or its contents, is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please telephone or reply to me immediately and delete all copies of the message.

moveDC is a citywide initiative to develop a bold, new vision for the District's transportation future and increase transportation choices for all.

Visit www.wemovedc.org for more information.

-----Original Message-----

From: Sally Hobbaugh [mailto:Sally.hobbaugh@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 3:10 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sally Hobough
213 Ascot Place NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jaime Fearer <jaime.fearer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 5:02 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jaime Fearer
1218 Oates Street NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: John Nowicki <aramis@starpower.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 4:45 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Nowicki
1531 Park Rd, NW #4
Washington, DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Anne Berlin <anniepoohster@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 4:34 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anne Berlin
2221 40th pl nw unit 4
washington, DC 20007

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Andrew Sackett <andrew.sackett@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 4:11 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Andrew Sackett
3020 Dent Place NW #20W
Washington, DC 20007

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Lance Eubanks <lance.eubanks@zgf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 4:09 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lance Eubanks
1340-B Corcoran St NW
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: matthew steil <matthew.steil@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 4:02 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

matthew steil
4127 4th St. NW
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sally Hobaugh <Sally.hobaugh@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 3:10 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sally Hobaugh
213 Ascot Place NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Dan Malouff <signup@malouff.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 3:05 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I support developing the McMillan Sand Filtration site into a dense new neighborhood of housing, retail and more.

I live in the city instead of the suburbs because I like urban places. That's the District's main competitive advantage over suburban areas.

Please move forward with plans to surplus the sand filtration site, so it can be developed into the city's next great mixed use place.

Thank you.

Dan Malouff
1629 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Rebecca Mills <vena.cava@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 3:02 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I live on North Capitol Street, one-half block south of the southeast corner of the McMillan Sand Filtration Site.

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Mills
2407 North Capitol Street NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ralph Garboushian <ralphgarboushian@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 2:55 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ralph Garboushian
1726 Potomac Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20003

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kyle Strand <kyle.strand@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 2:14 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kyle Strand
39th st
Washington, DC 20016

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Anthony James <anthonydjames@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 1:32 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anthony James
Kenyon St NW
Washington, DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Karen Benner <krb@rcn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:48 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Benner
3701 Connecticut Ave NW #715
715
Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Chris Jamieson <Jamieson@alum.wpi.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:42 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris Jamieson
819 Capitol Sq Pl SW
Washington, DC 20024

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Rebecca Ennen <rebecca.ennen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:40 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rebecca Ennen
2044 Pierce Mill Road NW
V House
Washington, DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Aaron Overman <aoverman@usa.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:40 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron Overman
Resident of Park View and enthusiastic supporter of anything better than a completely closed and unusable property.

Aaron Overman
621 Columbia Rd NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Noni lewis <nonilewis@rocketmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:37 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Noni lewis
819 Taylor St. NE
Washington, DC 20017

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Beth Zgoda <bzgoda@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:25 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" municipal land. I strongly support the introduction of affordable housing, parkland, and mixed-use development on this land.

This would be a great location for affordable (and mixed-income) housing. My former primary care physician is located in the hospital center. I always thought it was how odd it was that the complex is so isolated. By creating additional affordable housing adjacent to the medical center, you can ensure that residents have access to adequate medical care. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I strongly support improving upon the natural beauty of this area. I frequently ride my bicycle along the streets adjacent to the reservoir. I sometimes even go out of my way to do so because it offers some natural beauty in the midst of a concrete jungle.

I support mixed-use development for the land for several reasons. First, I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration. Second, mixed-use development (if planned appropriately) will enable the new residents to live here without needing to use a car very often, which will reduce the traffic impacts of the development.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Beth Zgoda
1629 Columbia Rd. NW # 332
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Dori Klar <doriklar@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:23 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dori Klar
3906 17th Place NE
Washington, DC 20018

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Dori Klar <doriklar@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:24 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dori Klar
3906 17th Place NE
Washington, DC 20018

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Payton Chung <lists@westnorth.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:17 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I strongly support all steps necessary for the redevelopment of the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant, including but not limited to deeming the property "surplus" land. Redevelopment of this site will add new housing, public parks, commerce, and tax revenue to a city that desperately needs all of those.

I have been a Sierra Club member for almost 20 years, and joined the Club because it was one of the first large environmental organizations that recognized the destructiveness of suburban sprawl. I am disappointed that some people within the local Club chapter have co-opted the group's name to further their narrow agenda.

As a resident of another fast-growing D.C. neighborhood, I recognize that a growing city benefits all District residents. I strongly resent that neighbors of this site continue to use the public involvement process -- intended to improve development -- to instead hold up much-needed development, thereby depriving all of D.C. the benefits that this development will bring.

Payton Chung
560 N St SW N415
Washington, DC 20024

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sarah Lamm <sarahlamm89@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:16 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah Lamm
3201 Idaho Ave
Washington, DC 20016

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Kayla Anthony <kg@umd.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:13 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kayla Anthony
1822 Kenyon St NW
Washington, DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ann Cook <cook45@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:03 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ann Cook
4610 49th Street NW
Washington, DC 20016

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Cliff Majersik <cliff@majersik.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:01 PM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cliff Majersik
2802 27th St. NW
Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: John Mataya <johnmataya@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Mataya
40 Q St NE
Apt B
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Steve Wardell <steve.b.wardell@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:38 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve Wardell
2231 Hall PI NW
Washington, DC 20007

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Gavin Baker <gavin@gavinbaker.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:35 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gavin Baker
2440 16th St NW, #119
Apt. 119
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Julie Coons <coonsjulie@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Julie Coons
3820 Albemarle St., NW
Washington, DC 20016

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Brenda Sandberg <brenda.sandberg@montgomeryparks.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:21 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brenda Sandberg
629 8th Street NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Nick Casey <nicholas.l.casey@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:20 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nick Casey
43 Tuckerman St. NW
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Mary Pendergast <MaryKPendergast@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:09 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Pendergast
4328 Yuma St
Washington, DC 20016

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Janak Mayer <janak.mayer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:04 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janak Mayer
1744 U St NW, Apt C
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jacob Mason <mason.jacob@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:53 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jacob Mason
4705 9th St NW
Washington, DC 20011

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Bryan Stockton <bryan.stockton@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:51 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bryan Stockton
3409 29th St. NW #4
Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Geoffrey Hatchard <hatchard@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:43 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Geoffrey Hatchard
1218 Oates Street NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jason Broehm <jason.broehm@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:41 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Finally, I am a Sierra Club member but strongly disagree with their misguided all-park, no development position. I believe it's important to develop this site sensibly while protecting the historic character of this unique site.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jason Broehm
3542 10th Street NW
Washington, DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Tony Lucadamo <tonylucadamo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:40 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tony Lucadamo
535 Florida Ave NW #2
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Tony Lucadamo <tonylucadamo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:40 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tony Lucadamo
535 Florida Ave NW #2
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Christy Kwan <christykwan@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:36 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christy Kwan
235 Tennessee Ave NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sam Feldman <srfeld@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:34 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sam Feldman
3750 Oliver St NW
Washington, DC 20015

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Josh Young <adustus@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:30 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Josh Young
19 Michigan Ave NE DC 20002
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Josh Young <adustus@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:29 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Josh Young
19 Michigan Ave NE DC 20002
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: lilly shoup <lilly.shoup@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:26 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

lilly shoup
1521 Marion St. NW
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jeff Blackwood <blackwoodjeff@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:22 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeff Blackwood
642 I street NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Curtis Barger <cbpb@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:20 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Curtis Barger
2801 Adams Mill Rd
#402
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jeffrey Little <jeffreydavidlittle@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:13 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

As a neighbor a few blocks down North Capitol Street, I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey Little
106 V St. NE
Washington, DC 20002

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Raymond Nuesch <renuesch@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:09 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Raymond Nuesch
2000 16th Street NW
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Jared Lang <jaredmlang@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:09 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jared Lang
3426 16th Street NW, Apt 602
Washington, DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Hope Richardson <hopecrichardson@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:07 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hope Richardson
3823 Van Ness St. NW
Washington, DC 20016

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ryan Donahue <Donahuerm@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:07 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ryan Donahue
Franklin st ne
Washington, DC 20018

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Andrew Marcus <andrew@amarcus.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:06 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Andrew Marcus
6907 6th Street NW
Washington, DC 20012

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Louise Brodnitz <ldbdc@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:06 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Louise Dunford Brodnitz
Ward 2 Resident

Louise Brodnitz
1525 29th Street NW
Washington, DC 20007

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Michael Samuelson <michaelasamuelson@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:05 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Samuelson
1425 Chapin Street Apt 1
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Ronald Eichner <Ron@NewLegacyPartners.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:05 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ronald Eichner
3914 Legation Street, NW
Washington, DC 20015

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Melissa Chow <mpchow@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:05 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Melissa Chow
425 L Street NW
913
Washington, DC 20001

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Sarah Gutschow <gutschow@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:03 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah Gutschow
1375 Fairmont St., NW
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Alan Budde <alanbudde@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:02 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alan Budde
3338 17th St NW
Washington, DC 20010

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Brian Levy <levybd@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:04 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brian Levy
1321 FLORIDA AVE NW
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Marc Tomik <marc.tomik@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:03 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marc Tomik
3003 Van Ness Street
Apt W910
Washington, DC 20008

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Chris Blauwkamp <cblauwkamp@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:02 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chris Blauwkamp
1232 Euclid St NW #1
Washington, DC 20009

Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)

From: Maya Contreras <missmaya@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 10:02 AM
To: Newaldass, Shiv (EOM)
Subject: Surplus the McMillan Sand Filtration Site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Newaldass,

I wish to express my support for deeming the McMillan Sand Filtration Plant "surplus" in order to move forward with the ambitious plans to create a six acre large park, restore the unique historic resources of the site, and create new housing, retail and medical office buildings. After decades of isolation, I am eager to see the site opened up to public access with the city's largest new park and thoughtful restoration of distinctive historic buildings and landscapes. I recognize that that these public benefits would not be possible without the redevelopment program that helps pay for the cost of the restoration.

While overall I believe the plans for the site offer a tremendous amount of public benefits, I ask that that city pursue more affordable housing as a part of this mixed use development plan. Redevelopment of our public lands offer an opportunity to create many new public benefits. While some affordable housing is included in the proposed plans, I ask that more affordable housing be included to ensure we are making the most of this important opportunity.

I ask the city to move forward with its plans to surplus the sand filtration site so we can enjoy the benefits of a new park and compatible mixed use development of this unique place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Maya Contreras
Ridge St NW
Washington, DC 20001