

**Potomac Yard Working Draft I Comments**

**Key:**  
*Incorporated* Comment is consistent with the intent of the Plan, and will be incorporated.  
*Acknowledged* Comment is inconsistent with the intent of the Plan, and will not be incorporated.  
*Discussion* Comment may be consistent with the plan, and will be further discussed.  
*CDD Condition* Comment can be addressed in CDD Conditions.  
*No action* Comment does not require any action.

Comment #	Commenter	Chapter	Page	Figure	Table	Rec.	Comment	Action
<b>Chapter 1</b>								
1	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	1, etc.	4, etc.	1			East Reed Avenue should terminate at Water Street.	Discussion
2	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	1, etc.	4, etc.	1			Blocks 7 and 10 should be combined into a single block to allow for a larger retail user	Discussion
3	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	1, etc.	4, etc.	1			Potomac Avenue should be located adjacent to Landbay K with no buildings located east of Potomac Avenue	Acknowledged
4	Dan McCaffery	1	4	1			We have heard the community state unequivocally that they wish to retain Target as a tenant. To be fully assured of such, our plan calls for the combining of Blocks 7 and 10 in order to provide Target with the floor plate they insist upon. It is our understanding that Target will not agree to remain in the development if forced to consider a two-story store. Given that they will be one of the first blocks developed, there will not be sufficient density to satisfy their criteria for a two level store unless blocks 7 and 10 are combined.	Incorporated

5	Dan McCaffery	1	4	1		We strongly object to the curvature of Potomac Avenue and the resulting placement of buildings on the east side bordering the public park. We believe the curvature compromises the public nature of the park; creates unacceptable building footplates on the eastern-most buildings; necessitates an application and hearings in front of the historic commission to permit the buildings and to increase their heights; threatens to lessen the amount of office space gathered around the Metro; causes an unduly long walk way to the Metro station and platform that is out of sight for such distance and unnecessarily increases public safety concerns; creates a situation whereby all those riding the Metro must cross Potomac Avenue, an Avenue that will arguably be the second most heavily used avenue in the area; and eliminates any opportunity to create a comprehensive transit hub and thus threatens ridership and best sustainability practices.	Acknowledged
6	Dan McCaffery	1	4	1		In order to encourage public use of all transportation modes and in particular the Metro station, we support the creation of a central transit hub. Our plan clearly provides for the safe and convenient mix of local buses, BRT and the Metro. While doing so it also addresses and clearly accommodates drop off and pick up as well as taxi waiting areas. It is a comprehensive urban transportation hub serving all of the needs for convenient public transportation. Equally important is the fact that the anticipated heavy use of the Metro will not require the passengers to cross Potomac Avenue. Eliminating this crossing allows the safe passage for passengers, the traffic to not be unnecessarily impeded, and the access to the station to be as safe as possible. (cont.)	Acknowledged
7	Dan McCaffery	1	4	1		(Cont from previous comment) Conversely, staff's suggested location of the metro station requires that the majority of the development must cross Potomac Avenue to get to the metro station. Potomac Avenue is going to be a large street and will be a barrier to accessing a metro station. Additionally, the access from the metro station to the metro platform in the staff's plan is a bridge that crosses from the back of buildings over the park and railroad tracks. We suggest that it would be safer to have the bridge cross over Potomac Avenue as there will be more activity and thus eyes on the bridge providing a much safer atmosphere. Therefore, the metro station should not be located on the east side of Potomac Avenue.	Acknowledged

8	Dan McCaffery	1	4	1		The staff plan shows block 21, adjacent to Landbay G's collector parking garage, as being a prime entertainment and pedestrian thru-way. We strongly oppose the plan recognizing that the adjacent block on land bay G is a parking garage wall and the street is classified as a C street. The wall of the garage is 42 feet high and approximately 300 feet long. This wall will discourage the proposed pedestrian aspects of the plan for that block.	Discussion
9	Dan McCaffery	1	4	1		The staff had encouraged a modification in the developer plan that permitted Water Street to be a connecting street with landbay G. We accepted the suggestion integrated the suggestion into our plan. We support Water Street being a through street.	Acknowledged
10	Fred Rothmeijer	1	4	1		The Master Plan depicts an asterix located at the SWMP in Landbay K. On page 41 the Small Area Plan outlines that the area to south of the three proposed buildings adjacent to the Metrorail Station is not part of the area, but is part of the approved Landbay K. It further states that while there is a potential for an additional building at this location, this plan does not recommend a building because of the impact on planned open space. This leaves the door open however to revisit the creation of an additional building site at a later plan date. Turning the planned SWMP into a building site would significantly impact the SWM solution for Landbay G and negatively affect the views related to the Landbay G buildings.	Incorporated/Discussion
11	Deborah Johnson	1	6			2. Economic Sustainability. Agree with statement that "growth...requires the provision of a future Metrorail station."	No action
12	Deborah Johnson	1	6			2. Economic Sustainability. Add families and shoppers	Incorporated
13	Deborah Johnson	1	6			2. Economic Sustainability. Suggest this concept be added: Given the rapid pace of changes in retail shopping technology, we need to closely monitor and evaluate the amount of retail in comparison to office development. While we definitely need retail (to include restaurants and entertainment) to have an active and safe night-time community, we need long-term office tenants and owners for long-term economic sustainability.	Discussion/CDD Condition
14	Deborah Johnson	1	6			I don't recall "social sustainability" being singled as a "primary element" in our discussions or community group reports. However, we have had discussions and agreement on the need for both an environmentally and economically sustainable community.	Acknowledged
15	Deborah Johnson	1	6			Unfortunately, while economic and social sustainability are both important goals, we may introduce planning conflict having them both as "primary elements" of the plan.	Acknowledged
<b>Chapter 2</b>							
16	Deborah Johnson	2				Retain Chapter title as-is (i.e., "Sustainability")	Acknowledged

17	Deborah Johnson	2				Have two sections—one on environmental sustainability, which is already included. Add a section supporting the requirement that the community be economically sustainable. It is important to have a section on this given the city's commitment to the Mayor's Economic Sustainability Task Force.	Acknowledged
18	Danielle Fidler	2				I am especially impressed with the front and center role of sustainability in all aspects of the project - economically, socially, and environmentally. Including the portion on climate change and the goal of carbon neutrality is also really impressive. If built as currently envisioned, I truly believe that it could set the benchmark for sustainable development on the East Coast.	No action
19	Deborah Johnson	2	9			Carbon Neutrality—express commitment to carbon reductions without using today's jargon.	Discussion
20	Deborah Johnson	2	9			The final paragraph in this section well describes the plan's intent to respect our environment and to require design and construction around that intent.	No action
21	Garrett Erdle	2	9			I am against the "carbon neutral" requirement as it is so undefined and enforceable.	Discussion
22	Garrett Erdle	2	9			How do we define Green Roofs? Is a high SFI roof membrane acceptable?	Acknowledged
23	Garrett Erdle	2	9			I believe greywater reuqling should be a decision a developer should make on their own as it is already a possible credit for LEED.	Acknowledged
24	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	2	10		2.1	The concept of 'carbon neutrality, as exhibited by the PYPAG discussion, has more to do with 'politics' than a master plan development. Many factors beyond the control of a property owner or developer have an impact on any related goal. These include technology developments, energy generation, etc. This concept should be stricken form this plan.	Discussion
25	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	2, etc.	10, etc.		2.1	The USGBC through its LEED-NC program has a strong track record of challenging old assumptions and implementing changes. Establishing a LEED certified standard or comparable goal is suggested. If future goals are to be ratcheted up after redevelopment has taken hold, the next level of Silver could be implemented. Increased costs for certification have been included in pricing assumptions. In other words, Silver certification will increase costs further than assumed thus far.	Discussion
26	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	2, etc.	10, etc.		2.2	The phasing of sustainable goals is a laudable concept but somewhat impractical. We encourage a goal of utilizing LEED-ND or a comparable standard for good neighborhood planning. Once this and other technology assumptions are set in place through engineering and construction these concepts become fixed and it will not be possible to change directions on issues such as stormwater or sanitary concepts.	Discussion

27	Garrett Erdle	2	10			2.3	Requiring onsite renewable energy production seems a bit unrealistic. If a developer wants to pursue this as a credit under LEED then it should be their choice.	Acknowledged
28	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	2	10			2.5	Delete the use of 'ultra or'. Low flow fixtures are assumed to be provided. This could read 'low flow or better' if desired.	Incorporated
29	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	2	10			2.7	District energy sources could be explored but this would take land and development away from Metro funding options.	Acknowledged
30	Fred Rothmeijer	2, etc.	10, etc.				Environmental Sustainability requirements for Landbay F should adhere to the Green Building Policy of the City. Not only do USGBC LEED standards evolve, so will the City's Green Building Policy. The main goal is to have Metrorail Station funded – establishing a higher than "market" standard impedes this goal. In addition, it creates an unequal playing field for Landbay F thereby impacting possible Metrorail funding and plan feasibility. This same concept should apply towards affordable housing proffers.	Discussion
31	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	2	10				Sustainability — The SAP should recommend that future development applications comply with the green building policy in place at the time of the application. The task force created by Council to discuss green building initiatives spent a lot of time and effort to determine the appropriate green building policy, which has been endorsed by the Planning Commission and City Council and as such, the City's Small Area Plans should be consistent with that policy as it is amended over time.	Discussion
32	Garrett Erdle	2	10				I feel like the timeline for movement from Phase 1 to Phase 3 sustainability compliance is unnecessary. Each version of LEED expects a higher level of compliance so I recommend we pick a single, high threshold.	Discussion
<b>Chapter 3</b>								
33	Fred Rothmeijer	3, etc.	14, etc.	2			The Master Plan depicts an asterix located at the SWMP in Landbay K. On page 41 the Small Area Plan outlines that the area to south of the three proposed buildings adjacent to the Metrorail Station is not part of the area, but is part of the approved Landbay K. It further states that while there is a potential for an additional building at this location, this plan does not recommend a building because of the impact on planned open space. This leaves the door open however to revisit the creation of an additional building site at a later plan date. Turning the planned SWMP into a building site would significantly impact the SWM solution for Landbay G and negatively affect the views related to the Landbay G buildings.	Incorporated/Discussion

34	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	3	15			Potomac Avenue – The SAP reflects a revised and realigned Potomac Avenue. The SAP should acknowledge that the current alignment of Potomac Avenue will be constructed by PYD as shown on the City released approved plans and that the entire length of Potomac Avenue must remain operational until such time as the new road is constructed and accepted.	CDD Condition
35	Deborah Johnson	3	15			Typo: change compliment to complement	Incorporated
36	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	16	3		Water Street should be a “B” Street, not an “A” street as illustrated.	Incorporated
37	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	18			Makes reference to internal pedestrian streets. Eliminate.	Discussion
38	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	18			Makes reference to a theatre in Metro Square. Location yet to be determined. Eliminate.	Acknowledged
39	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	19			Remove “this neighborhood is also a possible location for a school.”	Acknowledged
40	Deborah Johnson	3	19			Crescent Gateway Neighborhood. -Add “people” uses to this section and not just discuss buildings and roads, eg, family oriented activities, recreation, etc.	Incorporated
41	Deborah Johnson	3	19			Crescent Gateway Neighborhood. Second to last sentence: add reference to “views of the Potomac”	Incorporated
42	Deborah Johnson	3	19			Crescent Gateway Neighborhood. -Last sentence: This sentence could be interpreted as committing to building a school in North Potomac Yard and that this neighborhood is where it could be located. Suggest instead: If a school is to be built in North Potomac Yard, Crescent Gateway might be considered.	Discussion
43	Deborah Johnson	3	19			D. Gateways and Vistas. -Add more on possible ways to take advantage of the Yard’s proximity to the Potomac in text AND add comments on this topic to recommendations page	Acknowledged
44	Deborah Johnson	3	20			F. Public Art and History. -‘not sure how definitive you want to be about developer’s final participation: consider “would likely require developer’s financial participation vs. “would require...”	Incorporated
45	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	21	5		Extend “Signature Facades” along entire length of Reed Avenue.	Incorporated
46	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22		3.1	Add the concept of phasing.	CDD condition

47	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.2	We don't understand the concept being articulated.	Acknowledged
48	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.4	Add 'where the development plan allows'.	Acknowledged
49	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.5	Add 'with buildings and landscaping'.	Incorporated
50	Deborah Johnson	3	22			3.5	Add consideration of neighborhoods across Route 1 by designing tiers on the fronts of buildings...	Discussion
51	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.8	What does 'a mix of innovative building typologies' mean?	Acknowledged
52	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.9	Suggest this read 'Provide opportunities for passive and active cultural and civic uses...'	Acknowledged
53	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.9	Such that these programs are subject to funding through the public benefit contributions.	Acknowledged
54	Deborah Johnson	3	22			3.9	Add recreational uses	Acknowledged
55	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.10	Add 'such as depicted in the Plan'.	Acknowledged
56	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.17	This seems redundant.	Incorporated
57	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.19	Practically it will be difficult to implement a plan of 'minimum building heights'. Implicitly however the City has approval control on this through the DSUP process. Suggest deleting this.	Acknowledged
58	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.20	Such that these programs are subject to funding through the public benefit contributions.	Acknowledged
59	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	3	22			3.21	Such that these programs are subject to funding through the public benefit contributions.	Acknowledged
<b>Chapter 4</b>								
60	Deborah Johnson	4					Are we open to more than one hotel? If so, then depict that on the map/legend or in the text.	Acknowledged

61	Deborah Johnson	4				I agree with the comment made at the 11/30/2009 meeting to add statements relating to deliveries to retail and office buildings, (as well as trash pick-up needs for all buildings). I believe a statement related to this is mentioned elsewhere in the plan.	CDD Condition
62	Deborah Johnson	4				For aesthetics and “curb” appeal: At least minimal green space or a water feature is needed between Wesmond Drive and East Reed Avenue. Even with the trees along Jefferson Davis Highway, it could have the wall effect.	Acknowledged
63	Deborah Johnson	4	25			I am concerned about the requirement for more residential than office development. Could this result in our having more people use Metro to leave the City to go to work elsewhere rather than have more come into the City to work? It also seems the higher residential density would require more new funding from the city to build and operate schools and provide other services residents will need. This seems counter to one of our primary goals of economic sustainability. Given the success of dense commercial development to the north, Potomac Yard is the prime location for the city to build up its commercial office development and reap those tax benefits.	Discussion
64	Fred Rothmeijer	4	25			We support the flexibility provided in the use between residential and office for the different blocks. However, there should be a minimum total amount of office use required since this is an important driver to the ultimate funding for the Metrorail Station. Does the flexibility in uses lead to significant differences in impacts on traffic and sanitary and storm sewer capacities?	Discussion
65	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4, etc.	26, etc.	6		Block #16 should be a Mix of Office and Residential uses, not only Office use as shown.	Discussion
66	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	26	6		Office buildings in southern portion of Landbay K - An office building is shown in the area of Landbay K that is currently occupied by a stormwater management pond/open space within Landbay K. There is also an asterisk and text in the SAP indicating the potential for another office building as part of a future planning process. PYD has an obligation under its existing CDD to expand the original stormwater management pond and make substantial improvements to that pond to create an amenity within the park. Placing a building on a portion of the pond will necessarily impact the remainder of the pond. (cont)	Acknowledged

67	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	26	6		(cont. from previous comment) What is the proposed solution for this conflict? Also, if buildings are to be placed in this area, PYD should not have to expend additional dollars beautifying the pond and surrounding area as an amenity to Landbay K if it is going to go away. Furthermore, if a building is to be built on PYD's portion of Landbay K, then PYD retains the right to be the developer of that building. PYD does not agree to dedicate this portion of Landbay K to the City as a public benefit only to have it turned over to another entity for future development	Acknowledged
68	Deborah Johnson	4, etc.	26, etc.	6		With the designated Residential (Yellow) and the mix of office and residential (Orange) and with the statement that there is preference for more residential, it seems we are building Metro to take residents (those requiring services) out of the city during the day over office buildings (low demands on city services, particularly for additional schools).	Discussion
69	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4, etc.	27, etc.	7		The required Retail locations are too stringent.....there needs to be more flexibility within the blocks.	Incorporated
70	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	27	7		Mix of uses – While PYD supports flexibility for the location of office and residential on certain blocks as shown on the SAP, there should be a minimum amount of office required within these blocks to make sure there is an appropriate balance of uses. Also, what impact, if any, does this flexibility have on the assumptions in the metro feasibility studies?	Discussion
71	Fred Rothmeijer	4, etc.	27, etc.	7		Main Street Retail Connection LB G and F – Page 15 of Landbay G DSUP Staff Report states the following: “The Retail Study stressed the importance of Connections and coordination between the redeveloped Potomac Yard Retail Center and the Town Center, preferably along a single “main street”. In order to maintain viable retail to the south end of Landbay F and establish the “Main Street” retail concept that was critical to the City in approval of the Landbay G plan, the Small Area Plan should require a minimum size high-end quality national anchor of 30,000 square foot to be located in either block 22 or 23. (cont)	Discussion
72	Fred Rothmeijer	4, etc.	27, etc.	7		(Cont. from previous comment) The image on page 27 needs to be updated to reflect required retail on “Main Street” in blocks 22 and 23.	Discussion
73	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	29			The metrorail density table contradicts the table on page 45 (totals)	Incorporated
74	Deborah Johnson	4	29		1	I would like to see some minimum office square footage requirement.	Discussion
75	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	30			5th paragraph: In the 2nd line change this to read ‘and provide a connection along Mainline Av to Landbay G’.	Discussion

76	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	30			paragraph 2 under Section D refers to a management plan. The management plan should not be in regard to ownership but rather management and maintenance issues. Please remove references to ownership in the paragraph.	Acknowledged
77	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	30			New CDD – The SAP envisions the creation of a new CDD through a rezoning process, thereby removing the property from the existing CDD. The SAP should clarify that any rezoning would require the owner/developer of the property within the new CDD to continue to coordinate with the owners/developers in the existing CDD to permit existing obligations under the existing CDD to be fulfilled by the remaining owners/developers. However, it should also be clear that the new CDD does not place any additional obligations on owners outside the new CDD.	Acknowledged
78	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	30			Extension of Main Street Retail – A vibrant Town Center in Landbay G is critical to the success of PYD's Landbays. As such, it is important that there be a strong retail connection between Landbay G and Landbay F. Therefore, retail should be required, not preferred, along Main Street from the connection with Landbay G northward as recommended during the retail analysis associated with the Landbay G Town Center approvals.	Discussion
79	Fred Rothmeijer	4	30			How can a new CDD #19 be created for Landbay F when the Landbay is part of CDD #10 without amending CDD #10 and addressing the conditions and boundary relationships between the two CDD's?	CDD condition
80	Garrett Erdle	4	30			Requiring retail on ground floor in certain areas may lead to empty storefronts. Arlington County is confronting this reality at this exact time.	Acknowledged
81	Garrett Erdle	4	31	11		Requiring retail on ground floor in certain areas may lead to empty storefronts. Arlington County is confronting this reality at this exact time.	Acknowledged
82	Mary Catherine Gibbs on behalf of Taylor Holdings, LLC	4	32			Any contribution for financing these infrastructure improvements from properties outside of the plan area should come as a result of future up-zoning of these properties, not from redevelopment of these properties at the levels for which they are currently zoned. The existing zoning on the properties west of Route One did not generate the need for these infrastructure improvements. These properties should not bear the financial burden of infrastructure costs based on the increased density of others. While future upzoning may well call for participation in the cost of infrastructure improvements related to the rezoning requested, there is no lawful basis for requiring infrastructure cost sharing unless the infrastructure need is brought about by the redevelopment.	Incorporated

83	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	33	12		Figure is missing.	Incorporated
84	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	34			Eliminate comment requiring all parking for blocks 2, 5 and 21 to be below grade.	Acknowledged
85	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	34			Parking – The proposal to permit above-grade embedded parking and reduce the parking requirements is a departure from the requirements of the existing CDD. PYD supports the concept but will be at a competitive disadvantage unless and until the City relieves the parking requirements under the existing CDD.	Acknowledged
86	Deborah Johnson	4	34			typo: change “recommendation” to “recommending”	Incorporated
87	Fred Rothmeijer	4	34			Parking Configuration – The Small Area Plan outlines that each building and block is required to provide a minimum of one level of underground parking. Above-grade structured parking may be located within the central portion of the block at grade, provided each level of the entire perimeter of each street and/or park frontage is devoted to active uses. We are in support of this approach/policy however this was not allowed under approvals for Landbay G which puts our property at a competitive disadvantage. Prior to CDD approvals on Landbay F approvals for Landbay G and H should be provided to create an equal playing field.	Acknowledged
88	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	35	14		The height shown on block 16 is not correct;	Incorporated
89	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	35	14		The heights shown on blocks 7, 8, and 10 are incorrect. The North side of block 7 should be 140. The North side of block 8 should be 160 and the North side of block 10 should be 120 (per height restrictions and previous conversations with Staff.)	Incorporated/Acknowledged
90	Fred Rothmeijer	4	35	14		Adjust the Old Historic Easement for block 14 such that a 100 foot building is allowed under the SAP.	Incorporated
91	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	36	15		Blocks #10, #15, #16, #21, and #23 should have lower minimum heights consistent with the other surrounding blocks.	Acknowledged
92	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	37			The last sentence requires active use to fully encompass above grade parking in all conditions. We have entire floors of above grade parking next to Rt. 1 that is not encompassed by active use.	Acknowledged
93	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	37			Accommodation for loading and alleys must be considered.	Acknowledged
94	Deborah Johnson	4	37			typo: change “above-trade” to “above-grade”	Incorporated

95	Fred Rothmeijer	4	38	2		Parking Ratios w Metro – the current Landbay G parking ratios do not anticipate the arrival of a new Metro Station. If such new Metro Station becomes reality the parking ratios at Landbay G need to be adjusted. These adjustments and accompanying approvals need to be granted prior to approvals of Landbay F.	Acknowledged
96	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4, etc.	39, etc.			H. The ground level open space requirement is 10% not 15%, and central ground level spaces within the blocks does not exist and therefore 25% cannot be achieved.	Acknowledged
97	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	39			Landbay E – The SAP envisions improvements on Landbay E, which is outside the SAP area and on property currently owned by PYD. The SAP needs to clarify that these improvements cannot be made without PYD's consent or until PYD transfers ownership to the City, nor are they PYD's responsibility <i>as</i> PYD already has an approved SUP that sets forth its obligations relative to Landbay E.	Acknowledged
98	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	40			Metro Square needs to be 0.65 acre rather than the 0.75 acres listed.	Incorporated
99	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	40			Landbay K - Improvements shown in the SAP conflict with PYD's obligations under its current approvals. The SAP needs to ensure that the developer of Landbay F coordinate the timing and design of its improvements in Landbay K so that PYD is not precluded from meeting its current obligations relative to the northern phase of Landbay K.	Acknowledged
100	Deborah Johnson	4	40			Metro Square. I agree with locating all transit modes together.	Acknowledged
101	Deborah Johnson	4	40			Metro Square. Would like to see best parts of the “city” and “developer” plan brought together	Acknowledged
102	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	41			Does not apply to MI plan (internal pedestrian street).	Incorporated
103	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	42			Clarify that the size of Crescent Park includes the strip along Four Mile Run. The size of just Crescent Park is 2.25 acres and does not include the strip along Four Mile Run to the West.	Incorporated
104	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	42	23		Figure is missing.	Incorporated
105	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	43			Affordable Housing — There is an existing affordable housing policy that is applied uniformly throughout the City. The SAP should recommend that future development applications be consistent with the affordable housing policy in place at the time of the application.	Discussion
106	Garrett Erdle	4	43			Making roof top space available to the public could liek a safety issue for tenants of residential. A stranger should not be allowed access inside the building envelope without being invited by a tenant.	Acknowledged

107	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	45	3		Delete 'Required Retail' column.	Acknowledged
108	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	45	3		Block #5 should have a Maximum Permitted Development Area for residential of 600,000sf rather than the 510,000sf shown.	Incorporated
109	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	45	3		The Maximum Permitted Development Residential Area Subtotal for "The Crescent Gateway Neighborhood" should be 1,570,000sf, rather than the 1,480,000sf shown.	Incorporated
110	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	45	3		The Total Maximum Permitted Development Area (office and residential) should be 6,485,000sf rather than the 6,395,000sf shown.	Incorporated
111	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	4	45	3		Mix of uses – While PYD supports flexibility for the location of office and residential on certain blocks as shown on the SAP, there should be a minimum amount of office required within these blocks to make sure there is an appropriate balance of uses. Also, what impact, if any, does this flexibility have on the assumptions in the metro feasibility studies?	Discussion
112	Fred Rothmeijer	4	45	3		We support the flexibility provided in the use between residential and office for the different blocks. However, there should be a minimum total amount of office use required since this is an important driver to the ultimate funding for the Metrorail Station. Does the flexibility in uses lead to significant differences in impacts on traffic and sanitary and storm sewer capacities?	Discussion
113	Garrett Erdle	4	45	3		The matrix should allow for retail in Blocks 2 - 5 if the developer feels like it is appropriate.	Acknowledged
114	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	46		4.2	Practically it will be difficult to implement a plan of 'minimum densities'. As with building height however the City implicitly has approval control on this through the DSUP process. Suggest deleting this.	Acknowledged
115	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	46		4.5	Requiring a 'theater/live performance space' other than a movie theater is not a real possibility. Further providing a movie theater in Metro Square may not be appropriate or desirable from the tenant's point of view. Suggest that the language be moved to a general category rather than a neighborhood and read: 'Provide a movie theater or theater/live performance space as market demands allow.'	Acknowledged
116	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	46		4.9	'Requiring retail in locations depicted in this Plan' is inconsistent with the plan itself. Figure 11 has 'required' and 'preferred' locations for retail.	Incorporated
117	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	46		4.13	Suggest 'Require' be substituted with 'Encourage' and delete the reference to particular neighborhoods.	Incorporated

118	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	46			4.17	Add 'such as depicted in the Plan'.	Acknowledged
119	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	46			4.18	Add 'such as depicted in the Plan'.	Acknowledged
120	Deborah Johnson	4	46				add statement, here also, to transition building heights at Route 1	Discussion
121	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	47			4.20	This is redundant with 3.19. Suggest deleting this.	Incorporated
122	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	47			4.21	Suggest that 'Require' be replaced with 'Explore' or 'Encourage'.	Acknowledged
123	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	47			4.22	If 'unbundled' means 'shared', we suggest that 'Provide' be replaced with 'Encourage'.	Acknowledged
124	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	47			4.29	Crescent Park can only be dedicated if the city and applicant make an agreement about locating the BMP on public land. It is the applicant's preference that the parks be dedicated to the public with a SSA to maintain.	Acknowledged
125	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	47			4.30	is more than has been required by staff. The applicant has been showing 11% ground level and 34% overall open space. 25% cannot be achieved above the street based on footprints necessary to achieve the density described.	Acknowledged
126	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	47			4.31	Suggest that 'required for Block 21 and' be deleted. If this language is not deleted, this premium would need to be assigned against the total public benefit contributions	Acknowledged
127	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	47			4.35	Suggest that this be deleted.	Acknowledged
128	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	48			4.35	Suggest that this be deleted or changed to indicate that the requirement is not on the developer to provide playing fields off site.	Acknowledged
129	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	48			4.38	Discuss how this provision is offset by affordable housing contribution.	Discussion
130	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	4	48			4.42	Similar to 4.38. Discuss how this provision is offset by affordable housing contribution.	Discussion
<b>Chapter 5</b>								
131	Deborah Johnson	5	53				Consider combining the Potomac Yard Community Center and the youth center	Acknowledged

132	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	5	54			6.1	The provisions for an on site school have not been accommodated and would be difficult given the height limitations. Suggest this be deleted.	Discussion
133	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	5	54			6.5	Suggest that the second sentence be deleted.	Acknowledged
<b>Chapter 6</b>								
134	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	6					PYD has significant concerns with the proposed alternative location for Metro. Relocating the metro to the north away from the existing reservation will result in significant economic benefit to the City and McCaffery, but stands to harm PYD's ability to develop its portion of the Yard, particularly Landbay H. Moving the metro location north will locate portions of PYD's property outside of the 1/4 mile and 1/2 mile walking distance to the metro. It will also negatively impact PYD's ability to attract office users to Landbay H in the foreseeable future given the fact that office tenants will gravitate to the north where the new metro is proposed and the only current office demand in the market is for GSA tenants. (cont)	Acknowledged
135	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	6					(Cont from previous comment) In addition Landbay F would enjoy other economic advantages in competing against Landbay H, such as larger block sizes and reduced parking costs. If the station is relocated, accommodations will need to be made by the City to permit GSA tenants to occupy office space in Landbay H in order to make that office development viable in the near term.	Acknowledged
136	Danielle Fidler	6					Perhaps if the bike-priority lanes were moved to other streets [other than Reed Avenue] that were redesigned as one-way streets with one lane of traffic and a dedicated bike lane, this would be a better way to encourage bicycle transit and reduce risk of accidents (and would open up more opportunities for pedestrian traffic and traffic calming).	Acknowledged
137	Danielle Fidler	6					I think the City should consider having some of its streets (maybe the one with the bike lanes) without any on-street parking (Reed is the obvious candidate to me as it is designed to be the pedestrian mall/shopping gateway), to better encourage people to (A) take public transit and (B) use underground parking instead of circling around (wasting fuel, polluting air) in hopes of getting a free spot. It would also free up more space for sidewalk dining.	Acknowledged
138	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	60				References to improving traffic intersections 'before the rezoning can occur' must be clarified.	Acknowledged

139	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	61			Second paragraph under Section E, the last sentence that reads “Without the new transit infrastructure traffic congestion will overwhelm the street network capacity and the transportation network will fail” needs to either be deleted or revised to be more consistent with the traffic report which does not report overwhelming failures of the traffic network.	Acknowledged
140	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	63	25		As described above, the BRT should cross the metro station in order to create a traffic hub.	Discussion
141	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	63	25		The BRT Route should extend down Potomac Avenue in front of the Metro Station and turn onto Wesmond Avenue, rather than onto Diamond Avenue as shown	Acknowledged
142	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	63			Legend is wrong, reverse.	Incorporated
143	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	63	26		Route 1 Sections, Figure is missing.	Incorporated
144	Dan McCaffery	6	63	25		The location of the BRT stop on Potomac Avenue shown on the staff plan is not preferred. We strongly prefer it to be located as shown on the developer plan which calls for an integrated transit hub adjacent to the Metro station. The stop noted on the staff plan causes a walk to the center of the Metro station, nearly two times the distance of the developer plan location.	Acknowledged
145	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	65			Section F, next to the last sentence should include an allowance for loading and deliveries on B Streets if a C Street is not available.	Acknowledged
146	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	68	28		No bicycle lanes through the center of combined Blocks #7 and #10.	Acknowledged
147	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	68			Dedicated lane added to Evans. It is not a sharrow.	Incorporated
148	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	69		6.1	Suggest that ‘Water St.’ be added to the streets connecting.	Discussion
149	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	69		6.4	As described above, Reed Avenue should not connect to Potomac Avenue. Pedestrian connection.	Discussion
150	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	69		6.7	These recommendations need to be clarified to determine how these intersections are going to be addressed before a rezoning and who would be responsible for the construction of these improvements.	CDD Condition

151	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	69		6.8	These recommendations need to be clarified to determine how these intersections are going to be addressed before a rezoning and who would be responsible for the construction of these improvements.	CDD Condition
152	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	69		6.9	Suggest adding 'In conjunction with other public agencies the city should' to the beginning of the first sentence.	Acknowledged
153	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	69		6.10	Suggest adding 'In conjunction with other public agencies the city should' to the beginning of the first sentence.	Incorporate
154	Deborah Johnson	6	69		6.9	End sentence after "agreeing to a financial plan."	Acknowledged
155	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	70		6.19	See comment on 4.22. If 'unbundled' means 'shared', we suggest that 'Provide' be replaced with 'Encourage'.	Acknowledged
156	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	70		6.20	Coordinate with 6.19 above. See comment on 4.22. If 'unbundled' means 'shared', we suggest that 'Provide' be replaced with 'Encourage'.	Acknowledged
157	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	70		6.21	Add language encouraging short term usage of on street parking.	Acknowledged
158	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	70		6.22	Add 'in conjunction with Metro station development'.	Incorporated
159	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	6	70		6.23	Add 'in conjunction with Metro station development'.	Incorporated
<b>Chapter 7</b>							
160	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC					Stormwater and Sanitary Sewer –The SAP requires that a storm and wastewater management plan be submitted prior to rezoning or CDD approval. The SAP should require that it be submitted and approved by the City prior to rezoning or CDD approval. It should also explicitly state that any wastewater management plan should not rely on existing remaining capacity in the transmission lines or at the treatment plant. That additional capacity in the transmission lines was built by PYD and its predecessor at great expense as a public benefit to address existing deficiencies in the City's sanitary sewer system, not to benefit a future private developer. If Landbay F is permitted to use any of the existing capacity then PYD should be reimbursed for those costs.	Acknowledged
161	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	73			First paragraph, delete "reusing grey water".	Acknowledged

162	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	73			A "water Management Master Plan" has never been prepared before in the City. The requirements of this and the "goals" need further definition before we can prepare this kind of report.	Acknowledged
163	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	73			The first sentence under "B. Stormwater Management" is not true as this site is currently one parcel and has a coordinated storm water system, approved and by the City and in operation for the last decade.	Acknowledged
164	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	73			The words water quantity should be removed from the first paragraph under B. We are not required to provide water quantity detention on the site.	Acknowledged
165	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	73			In the same paragraph, the word 'Parcel" should be defined.	Incorporated
166	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	73			In the same paragraph, it states that "reuse the majority of the amount remaining" and is speaking to storm water. Revise to clarify that this is the reuse of the storm water for irrigation.	Incorporated
167	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	73			This paragraph speaks to the possibility of the storm water infrastructure in public spaces. This paragraph should be strengthened. It should also be specific for if we build Potomac Ave over the existing onsite storm water facility in the south east corner of the site. It should also say Potomac Ave and the new land bay k.	Acknowledged
168	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	73			The last paragraph in B talks about preserving the RPA along Four Mile Run. Right now it is railroad bridges and Gabion channel. There is nothing to protect. It will be "rebuilt" as part of the City's master plan. It should say we will not aggravate an already bad situation, we will build our SWM facility and park adjacent and in the RPA as shown on the plans.	Acknowledged
169	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	74			first paragraph, last sentence, add "but can be conveyed to the wwtp".	Acknowledged
170	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	74			Last sentence in the third paragraph requests "significant funds" that are undefined. Any funds allocated to this cost will decrease the amount of funds allocated for the public benefit contributions including the metro station. We request that this sentence be deleted.	Acknowledged
171	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	74			Last sentence in the fifth paragraph again asks for "significant funds". Comment same as above.	Acknowledged
172	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	75		7.2	Delete 'public' in example.	Incorporated
173	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	75		7.7	Delete 'and reuse of greywater'.	Acknowledged

174	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	75			7.8	This recommendation is open ended and undefined and will add costs to the project that are not possible if the funding for public benefit contributions including the metro is provided.	CDD Condition
175	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	7	75			7.9	Delete as not compatible with land uses.	Acknowledged
<b>Chapter 8</b>								
176	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	8	82			8.1	“Require the developer to provide a monetary contribution to prepare a strategy.....for traffic calming....in the neighborhoods West of Potomac Yard....” This can only be required if there is enough funding left in the “bucket” after the public benefit contributions including the metro contribution is determined.	Acknowledged
<b>Chapter 9</b>								
177	Joanna C. Frizzell on behalf of RREEF/McCaffery Interests	9					This chapter was not included in the draft plan but a draft chapter dated November 30, 2009 titled Overview of Financing the Potomac Yard Metrorail Station was handed out at PYPAG. Our comments to this chapter are as discussed with staff in the meetings and correspondence regarding the metro financing.	No action
178	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC	9					As the entire SAP is predicated upon a new metro station in a new location, PYD believes that no SAP or rezoning of Landbay F should occur until the owner/developer of Landbay F commits to the necessary funding to cover any gap in financing for metro. In addition, no such approvals shall occur until the following issues have been addressed.	Acknowledged
179	Fred Rothmeijer	9					Since the Small Area Plan shifts the location of the Metrorail Station the Small Area Plan can <u>NOT</u> be approved prior to resolution of the funding for the Metrorail Station.	Acknowledged
180	Fred Rothmeijer	9					Main Street Connection – Landbay F owner should be required to provide necessary easements and construct “Main Street” connection at earliest date possible after approval of CDD. In no event should a DSUP submission be accepted prior to completion of this connection by Landbay F owner.	Acknowledged
181	Fred Rothmeijer	9					Contribution to Metro – Even at recent public meetings City officials continue to state that Landbay G and H owners should contribute \$10/FAR towards Metro Station funding <u>in addition</u> to the proposed and proffered Special Tax District. Landbay G has an approved DSUP for all its buildings and is only willing to participate in the creation of a Special Tax District. (cont)	Acknowledged
182	Fred Rothmeijer	9					(cont from previous comment) Landbay G ownership is willing to allow the Metro Station location to be shifted north after the financing gap has been resolved. The major benefactors of the new Metro Station in the alternate location are Landbay F owner and the City. The City needs to drop the additional contribution ask. (cont)	Acknowledged

183	Fred Rothmeijer	9				(cont from previous comment) It is odd that the latest numbers have not been shared with us when the City keeps stating that additional contributions are reasonable to request. Since we did not have access to the latest financial feasibility numbers we came up with the following calculations: (cont)	Acknowledged
184	Fred Rothmeijer	9				(Cont from previous comment) · Special Tax for Landbay G at full build-out in today's dollars are estimated to be at least \$1.2 M. Assuming property values will escalate 3% annually the cumulative amount paid by Landbay G after 50 years equals \$135 M. This represents close to 50% of the overall \$275 M cost of the Metro Station whereas Landbay G only represents 14% of the overall density in the Yard. (cont)	Acknowledged
185	Fred Rothmeijer	9				(cont from previous comment) ·Because of the Metrorail Station Landbay F can accommodate an additional 6.9 MSF. Assuming that the raw land value of the 7.5 MSF equals \$30/SF and the current 600,000 SF asset is valued at \$150 M then the added value of the rezoning equals \$75 M. Half of this value would fund the current \$35 M financial gap. (cont)	Acknowledged
186	Fred Rothmeijer	9				(cont from previous comment) ·Based on the Landbay G DSUP staff report the City nets approximately \$4.7 per FAR SF in taxes annually (on average over the mix of uses) which at full build out of Landbay F in today's dollars would equal \$35 M. When the \$35 M is capitalized at 5% the overall value of the additional density in net taxes to the City equals \$700 M. Calculated a different way - assuming the annual net tax revenue to the City escalates 3% the cumulative amount received by City after 50 years equals \$3.9 Billion. (cont)	Acknowledged
187	Fred Rothmeijer	9				(cont from previous comment) ·The City in its May 2009 Financial Feasibility Study indicates that there is in excess of \$115 M net present value benefit to the City by moving the Metrorail Station location further north.	Acknowledged
188	Fred Rothmeijer	9				The second southern entrance to the proposed revised Metrorail Station is a requirement for Landbay G ownership and not "an added benefit to Landbay G and H" as the City has stated. Landbay G ownership relied on the existence of the metro reservation when it bought the property. Connections to that possible future Metrorail Station were a big source of discussion and focus in the Landbay G plan. While we understand that moving the Metrorail Station to the north is a significant benefit to the Landbay F ownership and the City, Landbay G ownership opposes the relocation unless that southern leg is an integral component of the Metrorail Station.	Acknowledged

189	Fred Rothmeijer	9					Potomac Avenue – In the Landbay F plan Potomac Avenue is relocated and the current Potomac Avenue transforms into Water Street. Potomac Avenue is currently under construction and will be finalized in 2010. The Plan needs to provide sufficient guarantees that the “new” Potomac Avenue is constructed prior to the conversion to minimize negative traffic impacts.	CDD Condition
190	Deborah Johnson	9					even though the City has been told there are minimal federal dollars available for this metro location, could we not start that process and secure whatever we can?	Acknowledged
<b>Additional Comments</b>								
191	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC						PYD's financial obligation to support a metro station in Potomac Yard is set forth in condition 30 of the existing CDD which states, in relevant part "In the event funding from sources other than CAP [PYD as its successor in interest] becomes available in the future for the construction of a WMATA rail station at the Metro Site [i.e. location A], and the City concurs in the decision to proceed with such construction, CAP shall...(ii) if requested by the City, cooperate in the establishment of a special service tax district, another district or area having a comparable purpose, within the CDD, or a portion thereof, to assist in financing the construction of the rail station, in accordance with the requirements of law." (cont)	Acknowledged
192	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC						(cont from previous comment) Although the City keeps assuming an additional \$10/square foot payment to be paid by PYD over and above a special tax district, PYD is not obligated to make such payment. In fact, if the metro is moved away from the "Metro Site" [location A], as defined in the CDD conditions, PYD is not obligated to participate in a special service tax district either. While PYD might be willing to participate in a special service tax district if its concerns are addressed, it will not agree to any additional contributions toward metro, especially in light of the significant public benefits already conferred upon the City by PYD to date. The City needs to acknowledge PYD's rights and remove the additional financial contribution from its analysis immediately.	Acknowledged
193	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC						To the extent that metro is moved to the north, a southern entrance should be a requirement, not an option for that station and should be funded by sources other than PYD.	Acknowledged

194	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC					PYD notes that if the metro station is relocated to north, under its existing approvals, PYD has an obligation to build a pedestrian bridge in the existing metro reservation [Location A] connecting Landbay K to Potomac Greens. This requirement seems redundant if pedestrian access for Potomac Greens is incorporated into the northern metro location as has been discussed <i>as</i> part of the metro feasibility analysis.	Acknowledged
195	Stephen Collins, Potomac Yard Development LLC					As previously discussed with the City, any relocation of metro will require the acquisition of easements from PYD to cross the rail corridor (parcels 518), which PYD owns. This fact has not been acknowledged or addressed to date.	Acknowledged
196	Deborah Johnson					Since we plan to build an urban metrorail station, it seems could use as a model the Metro stations in downtown DC. Many of those stations are located in majority commercial office & retail surroundings and seem to exceed desired ridership.	Acknowledged