

March 28, 2017

To: North Potomac Yard Advisory Group  
Planning Staff

Re: Clarifications to draft document, North Potomac Yard Small Area Plan

All,

I am deeply sorry to miss our meeting on 3/28. I am traveling on business, and won't land at DCA until you are finished for the night. I may attempt to listen to the beginning of the meeting by conference call, but that is always difficult.

In the last moments of our February meeting, I attempted to clarify a couple outstanding items in the Sustainability chapter. I will do so again here, so that it can be a part of your discussion Tuesday.

There seemed to be a great deal of confusion regarding how energy performance would be gradually improved over time.

Regarding **Environmental Leadership #1**: "North Potomac Yard shall achieve carbon neutrality by 2040." The intent of this statement, consistent with the previous plan, is for the entire plan area to be carbon-neutral at that time. This is retroactive / compensatory for earlier phases not held to so high a standard. This is why it is 2040, not 2030. This will require a sustainability plan from the developer that anticipates gradual and continuing improvement, and may require technology and utility cooperation that does not yet exist.

Regarding **Reduce Energy Use #4**: "Explore a minimum of LEED Silver or comparable, or the city's green building standards and requirements..." The intent here was to tie the the energy and "green" requirements to the EAP, which itself describes a stepped approach that gradually exceeds LEED Silver. An alternative would be to return to providing a stepped requirement in the Plan itself. Keep in mind, as we have discussed, both Energy Code and LEED requirements, themselves, are gradually increasing. So a LEED Silver building in 2016 is not the same as a LEED Silver building in 2020.

I do not have it with me to insert here, but Staff has a copy of the original language I had suggested which adapted the EAP "steps" to our plan, if that is something the Committee feels should be explicit.

In the other chapters, I offer the following comment, based upon feedback from an attendee at last month's meeting:

The Transportation chapter should note the possibility of coordinating with adjacent property to provide a bicycle bridge across the detention pond, if feasible, for the purpose of 1) reducing pedestrian/bike conflict at the adjacent pinch point, and 2) providing visual interest. Staff has already reacted positively to this suggestion

Sincerely,

Jeremy Fretts  
Member, North Potomac Yard Advisory Group  
Member, Potomac Yard Design Advisory Commission