

Q&A

1. Peter Lewis 06:40 PM

Public good is not limited to facilitating "affordable housing." Alternatively, it includes sufficient room and facilities for training DC youth who have limited choices on how they succeed. Also, redevelopment versus renovation is a fundamental discussion that affects the future of the subject Chevy Chase site. If the developer is, again, a company not owned by a DC resident and with headquarters offices outside of DC, this is a no-go.

2. Marie and Bill Hoffman 06:42 PM

What is the precise definition of public use/ need?

3. Robin Diener 06:45 PM

But without an approved plan, how can we decide how much land and exactly what portion should be surplussed? The process seems backwards.

4. Carol Grigsby 06:47 PM

I'd like to hear the panelists some examples of any past public/private development in the city that may have been handled in the same way (using surplus and disposition). Thanks

5. Michele Wolin 06:48 PM

In the survey done by OP, and a past survey by the ANC, the community was clear that they valued the playground, ball courts, and open green space at the property. Even OP acknowledged this in the SAP. It sounds like this land will be sold off. A developer will have no interest (no profit motive) in keeping that land unbuilt for public use and recreation. How will we be able to preserve the open space, playground, and outdoor recreation facilities if this land is sold off?

You would like to answer this question live.

6. Mary Jacobs 06:48 PM

Some buildings on

Connecticut Avenue have been declared public nuisances by the Metropolitan Police Department because of crime. Will the library and community center be separate buildings from the residences or in what other way will be library and community be safe for residents to visit?

7. Michele Wolin 06:50 PM

Can they just sell off the air rights above the buildings?

8. Margaret Lenzner 06:51 PM

Can affordable housing be a public use that would prevent surplus and disposition?

9. RONALD EICHNER 06:51 PM

Can a portion of the development rights on a property be declared surplus? e.g., any development rights under zoning after the provision of public uses such as Library and Comm Center/

10. Marie and Bill Hoffman 06:52 PM

Is there a reason not to treat affordable housing as a "public use", so that the determination of ultimate use precedes surplussing?

11. Robin Diener 06:52 PM

DMPED's Giles Stuckert(sp?) said at the ANC session that the surplus hearing (now scheduled for Thursday) could result in a no surplus decision. I note that the SAP process never spoke to the surplus option. Almost everyone was taken completely by surprise. Once plans are presented to the public and approved by the public would be the time to hold a surplus hearing.

12. Andrea Rosen 06:53 PM

On the most basic level, how does the government declare a portion of the public property surplus without identifying the size and location of the property being declared surplus?

13. Michael Gibbons 06:53 PM

I assume the Ch Chase community wants to use all the land for public use(s). Does the city want to NOT do that?

14. Carol Aten 06:53 PM

Isn't affordable housing a public purpose?

15. Robin Diener 06:55 PM

This is the first community in my experience of 25 years to have developed an SAP and then been asked to surplus and dispose without there being any prior discussion.

16. Ellen McCarthy 06:55 PM

It seems to me very sensible, before the city plans to use its land for a particular new purpose, in this case, new affordable housing, that it formally checks to make sure that there are no other DC agencies who need the site, other than the Library and the Community Center, which are to remain. The question before DMPED is a very limited one -- to make sure that there is no other DC government use for the site. THEN, once it is clear that there are extra development rights available on the site, and only then, can an RFP be issued to solicit competitive bids for developing those unused "air rights". DMPED has agreed to seek community input as to what the RFP should request, so the issue of what will be built, in addition to a new Library and a Community Center, will be determined later. That is NOT on the agenda re: surplusing.

17. Carol Spiegel 06:55 PM

How can the city justify sacrificing a successfully functioning neighborhood community under the guise of needing to create a community? If we lose everything that we love about Chevy Chase, we can't get it back. DC is a city of history and that history shouldn't be lost.

18. Marie and Bill Hoffman 06:55 PM

Who all (Council + DMPED + Community) defines what is a needed use? Don't we in the community get to say up front (and not just in walk-about talks with the office of planning) what is NEEDED?

19. Michael Gibbons 06:55 PM

Is it a basic tenet of "sweetened" development strategy?

20. Allyson Kapin 06:56 PM

How many people are on the zoom? 67 or 167?

21. Andrea Rosen 06:56 PM

Since the mayor has declared additional housing, and in particular additional affordable housing, a priority for the city; and since OP has pledged to provide 30% affordability in housing built on the site (per the Small Area Plan), why is housing and affordable housing not a "public use"?

22. Michael Gibbons 06:56 PM

Is partial privatization the ideology?

23. Luke Beatty 06:57 PM

We have existing FY23 capital budget for community center and library, regardless of any surplus disposition for housing...correct? \$20-30 mil

24. Andrea McCabe 06:57 PM

Must non-handicapped parking be designated and retained as serving a public use for a facility in the middle of the city on public transportation lines?

25. Pam Janis 06:57 PM

Here's the thing though: what if the city says the property isn't needed and the residents say it is? If what's "surplus" is a done deal, be honest about it. In which case our "input" feels performative.

26. Cal 06:58 PM

Do we have/can we create an opportunity for a new creative way of going about this?

27. Mara Verheyden-Hilliard 06:58 PM

Why is there a rush to give away public land to private developers just as the District is poised to pass the Green New Deal for Housing through which the District can actually create real affordable housing, including social housing, rather than exacerbating the housing crisis and racial displacement through private development. Why not be in step with this progressive change in policy and use this space for real meaningful affordable housing, including social housing?

28. Anonymous Attendee 06:58 PM

Caitlin Cocilova mentioned that there are many properties in DC under consideration for surplus and disposition. Is there a posted list of properties under consideration? Are there others in CCDC for example?

29. Anonymous Attendee 06:59 PM

Can you please put the experts names on the screen and tell us what their affiliation is? thank you

30. Mara Verheyden-Hilliard 07:00 PM

And why have the moderators set the questions and chat such that community members cannot see each other's questions and thoughts?

31. Robin Diener 07:04 PM

Was Mr. Gordon's question answered as to whether the law requires we surplus before we plan? I'm sorry I missed the answer....

32. Carol Grunewald 07:06 PM

How much of the space (including air rights) to be surplussed is of utmost importance. How large will the community center and library be? How much space will be taken up by outdoor recreational facilities and green space? Is the rest of the available space up for surplussing? If so, how much space will that comprise? Is that for housing only? How large will the center and library be vis a vis the housing? How much space is the housing going to take up? Are we going for maximum allowed under zoning? Who decides how large the center and library are? What if the developers decide to maximize their space for housing to the detriment of the center and library, and rec facilities and green space?

33. Rob Leardo 07:06 PM

What is the name of the subsidy program that he said is the biggest thing going in Affordable housing....

34. Luke Beatty 07:08 PM

Why don't we get panelists who are experts at creating the best DPR facilities with all the best programs available for seniors, low income Ward members, etc? Also, why don't we have panelists who are experts in developing the best libraries that serve children of low income families, seniors, etc.?

This process seems to be - we should prioritize the best community center design, the best library design to attract the most needy of the community — then see if there is any room afterwards for some housing?

35. Robin Diener 07:11 PM

How was the city able to afford to build transitional housing for homeless families at 7 sites across the city? These are publicly owned, managed by nonprofit service providers. Why were we able to afford to build that housing but are not able to build this housing at Chevy Chase?

36. Anonymous Attendee 07:12 PM

So, if more land on the site is available, we can build more housing, including market rate housing, on the site. So how can we say land is surplus now?

37. Anonymous Attendee 07:12 PM

If a decision were made to put the residential portion of the property in a community land trust, would the city still have to go through the surplussing process to accomplish that?

38. Jamie Butler 07:13 PM

The mayor has committed to using the HPTF for this development. It's my understanding that there is already money in the budget to pay for the library and the budget. Assuming that these are facts, what are the other challenges to building affordable housing on the site?

39. Oana Leahu-Aluas 07:13 PM

This hasn't been exactly answered yet: are there other methods to upgrade the public space and include affordable housing that are not surplus and disposition?

40. Greg Schmidt 07:13 PM

Please make the Q&A and Chat visible to all attendees - I cannot see them.

41. Jane Delgado 07:14 PM

Will the new units on Wisconsin Ave have affordable housing?

42. RONALD EICHNER 07:16 PM

@Max: would any development of this site even if done by a Community Land Trust or other non-profit still require a surplus action?

43. Mary Rowse 07:16 PM

I see only two questions. Can we see the others?

44. Cheryl Wasserman 07:17 PM

From a common sense perspective it makes most sense to have competition of design that integrates Community Center, Library and the existing amenities with residential affordable housing BEFORE the land is surplus and disposed of. The rationale is that developers would not invest in developing a proposal because it would not be profitable. From what I have seen here that is not the case. Can you comment on that?

45. Michael Gibbons 07:17 PM

Library and community center are public. Is affordable housing "public use"?

46. Jamie Butler 07:18 PM

If our Chevy Chase community supports affordable housing at the Civic Core and if that surplussing does not exceed its reach and there is adequate land for our community center and library, what are the down side of surplussing now?

CHAT

1. Cheryl Wasserman to All Panelists 06:31 PM

What happened to you Peter? Is it routine cataract or something more serious?

2. From Ronald Kahn to All Panelists 06:31 PM

Peter seems to have 2 white lines in his face.

3. From Cheryl Wasserman to All Panelists 06:31 PM

We wish you well

4. From MLS to All Panelists 06:43 PM

Will we still have a library and community center, or not?

5. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 06:44 PM

The community center, library, and basketball court are very much used.

There is not enough recreational space for DC residents.

6. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 06:45 PM

The amount of recreational space on this area is woefully inadequate and now the very little we have is going to be taken away???

7. From Cheryl Wasserman to All Panelists 06:46 PM

Q I dont understand the ORDER of activity. It would make more sense to me to have a PLAN first, which then might identify a need to go private for some of the land, or whether there are alternatives like a TRUST?

8. From Karen Abrams to All Panelists 06:46 PM

Has their been another example in DC where this surplus authority has been used? Or is this proposal for the CC library and rec center the first?

9. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 06:47 PM

Why is the default setting for our texts only visible to hosts and panelists and not other residents?

10. From Karen Abrams to All Panelists 06:49 PM

And how does the city determine an area is no longer needed for public use? Are there metrics? Factors that are considered consistently across the city?

11. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 06:49 PM

Why has this property even been identified as "surplus" when many of us use these facilities so often?

12. From Mara Verheyden-Hilliard to All Panelists 06:49 PM

Why is there this rush to giveaway public land to private developers just as the District is poised to pass the Green New Deal for Housing through which the District can actually create real affordable housing, including social housing, rather than exacerbating the housing crises and racial displacement through private development. Why not be in step with this progressive change in policy?

13. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 06:52 PM

If anything has to be change here, the goal should be

to refurbish and update the community center

Agree with you, Peter.

14. From Mara Verheyden-Hilliard to All Panelists 06:52 PM

Also - why is the chat and the text muted to the larger audience so that we can't see each other's questions and thoughts?

15. From Jack Sullivan to All Panelists 06:52 PM

it seems undeniable that most, if not all of the property is useful and continued to be used, there has been some suggestion that part of it is either not being used or constitutes surplus property. what portion of the property are they talking about?

16. From Ronald Kahn to All Panelists 06:54 PM

Should the community see the mayor's reason(s) for surplus prior to the meeting / hearing on the 12th? I'm not aware of that content - seems common sense.

17. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 06:55 PM

Takoma Park has a community center, Shaw has a community center, other neighborhoods have community centers - why shouldn't we have this space. It's so small. The basketball court is mini. The city should not take this away from us.

18. From Jane Delgado to All Panelists 06:55 PM

From the beginning I have raised the issue that the pandemic changed where people work and want to live and yet this has not been taken into account. This process has been about checking the boxes to say there has been community input and not for listening to homeowners. Wisconsin Ave/Friendship Heights reflects the errors in current planning efforts.

19. From Randy Speck to All Panelists 06:56 PM

It should be made clear that the "surplus" could be the air rights above a fully functional Community Center and Library. With the zoning changes permitted under the Comp Plan and the

SAP, there will be space above the Community Center and Library that will not be used for public purposes.

20. From Cheryl Wasserman to All Panelists 06:57 PM

Q in my experience if something makes no sense there is probably a reason it makes no sense.

21. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 06:58 PM

Why should we have to drive to MD or VA for basic recreational space?

22. From RONALD EICHNER to All Panelists 07:01 PM

he is describing a 9 story building

23. From Randy Speck to All Panelists 07:03 PM

Will Avram's spreadsheets be on the ANC website?

24. From Michele Wolin to All Panelists 07:04 PM

7 Stories? Norm Knickle, who ran for the ANC, went door to door in his campaign and told me that no one wants more than 3 or 4 stories. I don't think the community agrees that we want to go as big as possible to get more affordable housing. That is the goal of Ward 3 Vision and other smart growth groups -- not most of this community! This is why the ANC needs to do a survey!

25. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:04 PM

7 stories is way to high. That would totally change the character of our neighborhood.

26. From Jane Delgado to All Panelists 07:06 PM

So we would have to pay

To build the community space...

Will the new units on Wisconsin Avenue have affordable housing?

27. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:11 PM

Connecticut Ave is loaded with apartment buildings and there are tons of new glassy condos that have recently been built all around the city. Why not do what NYC does and require that a portion of residential units, e.g., 5%, be delegated for affordable housing instead of getting rid of the little green space we have.

10 stories??? That's massive and awful!

Again, why is there a presumption that something has to be built here?

28. From Randy Speck to All Panelists 07:12 PM

There is at least \$30 million in the current capital budget to build the new Community Center and Library and we could go to the mayor and Council for more if necessary. The housing should not subsidize the Community Center and Library.

29. From Andrea Rosen to All Panelists 07:13 PM

The government built transitional housing/shelters in each ward of the city lickety-split and kept the land. The city builds rec centers and libraries and (usually) keeps the land.

30. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:16 PM

Go Peter!

31. From Connor McCarthy to All Panelists 07:19 PM

Are any of these surplus properties highly utilized community centers? I would love a comp similar to our community center. 2 Patterson is/was a parking lot. Thank you!

32. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:20 PM

We NEED our green space.

Our children need safe places to recreate.

33. From Meg Maguire to All Panelists 07:21 PM

Let's assume that affordable housing IS a public good, then would it not make sense for DMPED to pay for a master planner to bring together the community, the DCPL and DPR with the CLT to define what could happen on the site and then decide exactly what would be "disposed" of through a lease with the CLT?

34. From Allyson Kapin to All Panelists 07:22 PM
Panelists there are questions in the Q&A part of the zoom.

35. From Connor McCarthy to All Panelists 07:24 PM
Thank you, Caitlin!

36. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:25 PM
We don't need more housing here. We're already densely populated. Again - tons of apartments on Connecticut Ave. We don't want to live in a concrete jungle. We want open space.

37. From Loretta Kiron to All Panelists 07:25 PM
this discussion about "surplus property" is focusing on affordable housing. The city should recognize that there has been a clear neglect about adding a senior center on the property. Ward 3 has no senior center yet has the most seniors. A need to include them and keep the property for the community is necessary in my opinion.

38. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:25 PM
Robert - Yes!!!!

39. From Nancy Wilson to All Panelists 07:27 PM
The parking lot is also a very important part of the exterior space that we would like to retain.

40. From Andrea Rosen to All Panelists 07:27 PM
On the most rudimentary level, how does the government declare a portion of the public property surplus without identifying the future use and thus the size and location of the property being declared surplus?

41. From RONALD EICHNER to All Panelists 07:29 PM
@Peter: parking is a function of zoning. It will be required

42. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:30 PM
I still don't understand why this process is even taking place? The space currently has a public library, open space and recreational space and a community center offering class rooms, etc. It is serving a much needed and desired community service. The community wants this space, particularly the recreational space which is tiny. How is this need and desire being ignored?

43. From Karen Zuckerstein to All Panelists 07:31 PM
Key issue is what is a public use—do we allow for green space, outdoor recreation area, courts etc.

44. From Karen Abrams to All Panelists 07:31 PM
What is the public/private ownership structure of the west end library with library on the ground floor and housing on top? who owns the land? was that surplussed?

45. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:32 PM
The Mayor seemingly wants to run roughshod over this community and force her agenda down our throats.

46. From Nanci Link to All Panelists 07:35 PM
But this is NOT surplus. This is where we vote & need to park quick; go to library & drop off books: come to center for an hour exercise & as a senior park. This land was donated to people in this area for community and not for the city to take away,

47. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:37 PM

I see vacant or unused property throughout the district and existing housing desperately in need of refurbishing yet this area is going to lose the little recreational space available instead of utilizing empty space or deteriorating properties in other areas of the city?

48. From ALFRED HARF to All Panelists 07:39 PM

If we start with the proposition that the "public purpose" aims are to see the site redeveloped with a library, community center, specified recreational uses, and (say) 100 affordable housing units, what prevents the City from simply issuing an RFP calling for proposals to implement this at public expense? Granted, I'm oversimplifying what would need to be specified, but you get the idea.

49. From Andrea Rosen to All Panelists 07:40 PM

The Council approves \$1 sales of land. So why wouldn't they sell the land at Chevy Chase?

50. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:43 PM

And if this parcel of land is considered "surplus" which makes no sense, then why can't the city update the aging library, community center, and recreational space?

Removing the neighborhood's tiny sliver of community/recreational space to just jam more people into the area is counterproductive - building a city that no one wants to live in.

51. From RONALD EICHNER to All Panelists 07:44 PM

Found lease is also good because the developers lenders will require the developer to not be in default of the lease

52. From Nancy Wilson to All Panelists 07:45 PM

Does the Voucher Program, which provides many vouchers to residents living in rental apartments along the Connecticut Ave. corridor provide affordable housing for the area? If so, why can't the property remain as a recreation area, parking, a Library and a Community Center?

53. From Carren Kaston to All Panelists 07:46 PM

CAN AVRAM FECHTER PLEASE PUT HIS CONTACT INFO IN THE CHAT?

54. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:46 PM

Exactly Robert!!!

55. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:46 PM

Robert - you hit the nail on the head!

56. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:46 PM

We are not citizens that are being heard

57. From Cal to All Panelists 07:47 PM

Qs for Caitlin:

a. Have the many projects you've been referring to tended to use non-profit developers?

b. Can we find out why the Smith design - that that community was highly invested in - wasn't used, and what happened there?

58. From Nancy Wilson to All Panelists 07:47 PM

If there is a ground rental situation who pays the rent, can the City raise the rent? Who maintains the rental housing?

59. From Avram Fechter to All Panelists 07:48 PM

afechter@equityplusllc.com

60. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:49 PM

Peter - not sure what you mean by "innovative."

61. From RONALD EICHNER to All Panelists 07:49 PM

@Max: would any development of this site even if done by a Community Land Trust or other non-profit still require a surplus action?

62. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:50 PM

Peter - Hello, an alternative would be to update the community center. We don't need more housing here.

63. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:51 PM

Not sure what Peter means by "innovative" but we need recreational space and a library. Not just a place to warehouse more people with no recreational outlets.

64. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:54 PM

YES!

From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:54 PM

Well my vote is for recreational space, but a senior center is not as objectionable as just using the land for other suggestions.

From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:56 PM

Exactly!

Go Mara!!!!

Mara - you are so right!

From Oana Leahu-Aluas to All Panelists 07:56 PM

I GREATLY appreciate that you all limited chat because it is so disruptive to have that publicly available. And thank you so much for gathering this panel of experts.

From Ellen McCarthy to All Panelists 07:56 PM

Rather than have a separate senior center, we can be sure to ask DPR to include a large percentage of the new Community Center for the use of seniors, but this way, there is also flexibility for other groups to use when seniors are not using it.

From Nancy Wilson to All Panelists 07:56 PM

Amen!!!

From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:56 PM

Absolutely right, Mara. This is not "surplus" property.

From Richard Tempchin to All Panelists 07:57 PM

I agree with her 100%!!!!

Please answer her question!!!

From Stephen Connors to All Panelists 07:57 PM

Cannot agree more with Ms. Verheyden-Hilliard. Why should we s a community have to agree to this insane surplus definition? It's a joke (but no one in our community is laughing) and has been forced upon us. And why can't we see the Q and A and the running chat? Dumb...

65. From Robin Miles-McLean to All Panelists 07:58 PM

I can't see the chat either -- why is it set up this way today? As Mara said - this is NOT a dialog when done this way. Also agree 100% that assuming private developers to fix the problem they made while giving them the opportunity to line their pockets is insane.

66. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:58 PM

Agreed - It is not surplus - that designation is a complete and brazen sham.

67. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 07:58 PM
Correct!

68. From Mary Rowse to All Panelists 07:59 PM
Community residents will have to do more than testify if people are opposed to surplus. Picketing the site, lobbying the Council. The mayor can legally override the public's opposition and get away with surplus the land.

69. From K Simmons to All Panelists 07:59 PM
Can the hosts please reiterate that the community space is not going away through surplus

70. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 07:59 PM
Yes, yes and yes!! The children and the adults in the community use and very much want and need that space

71. From Matthew Frumin to All Panelists 07:59 PM
I need to call it a night at 8 pm. Nice to see you.

72. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 08:01 PM
No Sheryl - many of us don't want more development here.

73. From Elizabeth McPike to All Panelists 08:02 PM
Why are you not allowing us to see what others are saying in Chat and Q&A???

74. From Mara Verheyden-Hilliard to All Panelists 08:03 PM
No - because that concedes that this should be surplus. We don't have to agree that our public property should be given away to developers.

75. From Ellen McCarthy to All Panelists 08:04 PM
Thanks for the shout out, Caitlin. If you look at the 2006 Comp Plan which we developed when I was at OP, we were very clear that development should be channeled first into largely vacant sections of the District, like downtown, Mt. Vernon Square, NoMA, Hill East specifically to minimize gentrification, because those areas were mostly parking lots at that point. Then we developed the initial plan for New Communities, which was designed to take areas like the Sursum Corda neighborhood, replace all the affordable units on at least a 1:1 basis, but use the unused density to add workforce housing and market rate housing to cross-subsidize the development. Gentrification has been at least partly occasioned by the fact that our economic was growing, more than 2/3 of the employees in the District lived outside the city, and the construction of new housing units grossly lagged behind the increased demand to live here.

76. From Caitlin Cocilova to Me (Direct Message) 08:05 PM
Link to surplus/dispo projects, if helpful to share with attendees later:
<https://dmped.dc.gov/page/land-surplus-and-disposition-agreements>

77. From Mara Verheyden-Hilliard to All Panelists 08:05 PM
This is a land grab by developers prior to the green new deal and new policies regarding district property take force.

78. From Elizabeth McPike to All Panelists 08:08 PM
There is other property in this neighborhood that the city could acquire for affordable housing. Why this site, which is so obviously needed for community center and library??

79. From Cal to All Panelists 08:10 PM
I thought I was next after Cheryl.

80. From MLS to All Panelists 08:10 PM
Why can't we just renovate the library and community center and playground? The land is being used to meet these actual community needs now. And renovation would be more cost-effective than building something new.

81. From Chris Otten to All Panelists 08:14 PM
Is this being recorded, and will it be posted?

Chapter 8. Sale of Public Lands.

Subchapter I. General. §§ 10-801 – 10-807

Subchapter II. Special Disposal Procedures for Certain Properties. §§ 10-831 – 10-839

§ 10–801 (a-1)(1) If the Mayor believes that real property is no longer required for public purposes, the Mayor shall submit to the Council a proposed resolution which includes a finding that the real property is no longer required for public purposes. In the proposed resolution submitted to the Council, the Mayor shall also provide a description of the real property.

(2) The proposed resolution shall be accompanied by an analysis setting forth:

(A) Whether the real property could have any use by the District, including a description of the District's current needs for real property, a description of potential public uses considered by the Mayor, the square footage of green space on the real property, and a narrative explaining why the real property is unsuited for each public use considered;

(B) A detailed explanation as to why the real property

82. From Chris Otten to All Panelists 08:14 PM
<https://code.dccouncil.gov/us/dc/council/code/titles/10/chapters/8/>

83. From Elizabeth McPike to All Panelists 08:15 PM
Before you adjourn, could you please explain why you are isolating neighbor from neighbor, by not allowing what others are saying in Char and Q&A.

84. From Mara Verheyden-Hilliard to All Panelists 08:16 PM
Again - why are we talking about the ultimate developer plan when we are not agreeing that this is surplus. This is a land grab and telling people that they should discuss *how* they want it disposed is a way of creating false consensus that it *should* be disposed.

85. From Elizabeth McPike to All Panelists 08:17 PM
by not allowing us to see what others are saying is what I meant to write.

This is a classic way of keep power in the hands of a few.

86. From Robin Miles-McLean to All Panelists 08:17 PM
It completely feels like a blank check - an already signed and forcefully handed over blank check. When community leaders came from other parts of the City to talk to us (in our public ANC meetings) about the Small Area Plan it was clear that even with a lot of community engagement the City/DCRA did not honor the agreements that they made. There are many legitimate reasons to be skeptical and cynical about all of this.

87. From Mara Verheyden-Hilliard to All Panelists 08:17 PM
Private developers will always put profit before community needs and housing needs. They should not be given this piece of property.

88. From Cal to All Panelists 08:18 PM
I was called on but someone else jumped in.

89. From Mara Verheyden-Hilliard to All Panelists 08:18 PM
The SAP process was a farce and this is a follow up to that. But if people are clear that this is not surplus and they don't agree with the give away at Thursday's meeting, that is important. Please show up.

90. From Oana Leahu-Aluas to All Panelists 08:18 PM
12th

91. From Carol Grigsby to All Panelists 08:19 PM
Jan 12 not 14

92. From Andrea Rosen to All Panelists 08:19 PM
January 12! Not 14

93. From Nanci Link to All Panelists 08:19 PM
Before covid shut down. The seniors programs were 6 days a week and classes were over filled and we were requesting more space for senior programs

94. From Lisa Gore to All Panelists 08:19 PM
It's the 12th

95. From Mara Verheyden-Hilliard to All Panelists 08:19 PM
These communications should be public to the attendees.

96. From Gary Thompson to All Panelists 08:20 PM
Thanks for doing this

97. From Lisa Gore to All Panelists 08:20 PM
Obertust copy and paste it

98. From Stephen Connors to All Panelists 08:20 PM
Would be nice to see a list of people who are attending this call.

99. From Leora Hochstein to All Panelists 08:21 PM
Mara is right - you're not enabling us to communicate with each other.

100. From Andrea Rosen to All Panelists 08:21 PM
Thank you, Caitlin, Max, and Evram!

101. From Eniko Miksche to All Panelists 08:21 PM
well you may not call it a conspiracy, but it definitely feels nefarious

102. From Lisa Gore to All Panelists 08:22 PM
Copy and paste it please Luke Beatty 06:37 PM

On Jan 12