

Meeting on 06/01/07

Attendees:

Anne Sullivan, ANC 3E05 Chair of ANC 3E Special Committee on Janney/Library PPP
Amy McVey, Chairperson, ANC 3E
Lucy Eldridge, ANC 3E04
Talia Primor, ANC 3E02
Frances Anderson, St. Ann's Parish Council
Nancy MacWood, Chairperson, ANC 3C
Cathy Wiss, Chairperson, ANC 3F
Sue Hemberger, Community Member
Daniel Carozza, Community Member, St. Ann's Parishioner
Armond Spikell, Roadside Development LLC
Susan Linsky, Roadside Development LLC
Cheryl Browning, President, Tenleytown Neighbors Association
Tom Hier, President, Ward 3 Vision
Jane Waldmann, Coalition to Stop Tenleytown Overdevelopment
Susan Banta, Chief of Staff for CM Cheh
Marvin Tievsky, President, Friendship-Tenleytown Citizens Association
Kristen Barden, Executive Office of the Mayor
Sherry Ettleson, Janney School Improvement Team

The meeting began with a discussion of what Armond Spikell presented as a draft summary of the finances. (Please note: A copy of this draft summary of finances will be made available upon request to interested parties but cannot be incorporated in this set of minutes. Please send an e-mail to acsullivan@starpower.net with a fax number if interested.)

We were joined by Sherry Ettleson who stated that she was sent by Scott Cartland, Principal of Janney School.

The height of the proposed building was discussed and Armond stated that he thought it would be 65 feet -- about 5 feet shorter than CityLine. Because the building would be on a hillside, the question of where the height would be measured from came up. Armond said that there was a technical rule and that his recollection from the CityLine project was that the relevant point was on Albemarle St. about half-way up the hill.

As requested, Roadside presented the committee with a DRAFT of Armond's summary of the project finances. Roadside projected a residual land value of \$9.8 million and a potential PILOT bond of \$6.95 million based on a project involving 125 residential condominiums with a gross square footage of 1,035 and a net square footage of 880 each. These condos could be constructed for \$300/SF and sold for \$590/SF. (NB: Gross square footage is used when computing construction costs, and net square footage is used in computing the sales price.) No affordable units were included in the calculations, though it was pointed out that they would probably be required, either under the city's

inclusionary zoning legislation or as requirement for a PUD. A request was made that future drafts assume a minimum of 10% affordable housing. 63 residential parking spaces were included in the specs. There was some discussion of whether or not more spaces would need to be made available to residents.

The draft financial summary apportioned 20% for profits and 15% for residual land value. Armond indicated that the residual land value would be locked in as a purchase price contingent on permission to build based on these specs.

Sue Hemberger questioned the bond calculations, asking whether they took into account the homestead deduction (they didn't, but not everyone would be able to claim it), questioning whether the city or underwriters would be willing to securitize the entire tax stream, and stating that whatever the bond amount was, only about $\frac{3}{4}$ of it would actually be available for construction, judging from Oyster's experience and various TIFs. Susan Banta replied that there might not literally be bonds, but that this was a measure of the net present value of the incremental tax revenue and that if bonds were issued, it would be at a good rate because they would be based on the city's rate rather than a private developer's. She acknowledged that the city's general revenue bond obligations might preclude securitizing the entire tax stream associated with the project, although Armond opined that because this project was on public land (where no tax revenue had been anticipated), all of the property taxes from the condos could be devoted to the school and the library.

When asked, Armond said he did not know what percentage of the land involved belonged to Janney land and what percentage to the library. Amy McVey asked Armond to explain how the revenue generated by Roadside's purchase of the land would be split between the library and school projects. For example: suppose there was 10M generated, would there be some formula by which it was decided that 3M would go to the library and 7M to Janney? What is the guarantee that the money will be used the way he is proposing instead of going into DCPL and DCPS funds to be spent as they see fit. Armond said there is no guarantee and that a decision as to how the money will be spent is made at a very high political level. Amy then asked if Roadside would be building the library and the addition to the school. Armond said they would certainly be willing to do so, but that Roadside had never built a library or a school, so the city might prefer another contractor. Roadside was primarily interested in doing the residential component.

Anne inquired about construction costs for the public facilities, which were not included in the draft financials. Armond explained that was because these financials were designed only to compute the revenue that private development might contribute to the project. Tom was surprised at DCPL's budget for the library – it's about \$800/SF which seems quite high.

Cathy Wiss asked if the library would be situated below ground in the back. This is a concern because during the community meetings for the design of the new library (three years ago), citizens were very vocal about wanting lots of windows in any new library structure.

Anne asked if we could be provided with elevation drawings. Armond said that they usually make Styrofoam models followed by wood models of a project. He said that would be done during the PUD process and not now.

Armond was asked how he would protect parking when it would be very easy for guests of a resident to take a parking space designated for library patrons of Janney staff. Tom Hier said he had just come from a conference discussing this issue and that there was new technology available to handle such issues in mixed-use buildings/garages.

Traffic concerns were touched upon. Armond said they would like an easement from St. Ann's and to combine driveways for the Church and the new project to minimize traffic conflicts. They will use the public alley between St. Ann's and the old convent behind the church for access to a loading area. There is great concern for the safety of the children from both Janney and St. Ann's who use the driveway several times a day. There has been no determination how loading for all of the buildings will be arranged. Armond said that he would be working on a circulation plan regarding how traffic would enter and exit the project site. Frances Anderson pointed out that St. Ann's driveway would soon be gated and that the curb cut on Wisconsin was used for exit only, which was limited to right turns.

The question arose as to whether "swing space" (relocation of students to a different site) for Janney students would be required during construction. While Armond didn't think it would be necessary, it would be a possibility depending on what the school system decides. Dan Carozza asked whether Roadside had looked into asbestos abatement issues at the school and suggested they might necessitate relocation of the students for part of the construction period. When a concern about the noise of construction was voiced, Sherry Ettleson remarked that if the school had an upgraded electrical system, the air conditioners could be used and the windows could be closed to shut out some of the noise.

When asked if the location of the Metro near this site would impact in any way how the project would have to be constructed, Armond discussed how various techniques are used to determine if blasting is necessary. Site surveyors bore holes in the property to look for rocks, underground streams, etc. Only then would limitations or special circumstances be known. Cathy Wiss said that DCPL had already done its boring at the library site and saw no problems but, then again, it didn't plan to build underground on that parcel. Frances asked if Roadside would provide a Collateral Damage Bond to protect neighboring properties. She specifically mentioned the old stained glass windows in the church.

The meeting ended with a review of the questions submitted and a summary of the answers.

