



District of Columbia Government
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A
PO Box 15020
Washington, DC 20003



August 14, 2026

Mr. Alex Freedman
alex.freedman@dc.gov
Senior Community Planner, Office of Planning

Re: ANC 6A Comments regarding RFK Master Plan

Dear Mr. Freedman:

At a regularly scheduled and properly noticed¹ meeting on July 9, 2026, Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A voted 6-0-0 (with four Commissioners (4) required for a quorum) to authorize Chair Gove and Commissioners Shapiro and Conley to finalize and submit the comments below, based on feedback from Commissioners, Committee Members and Residents.²

A Note on Historical References

This draft cites material from the ANC 6A website archive to illustrate institutional memory from the past two decades. Where used, it is clearly marked below in “**Historical context**” call-outs and is included only to point OP/DDOT/DMPED back to past ANC infrastructure priorities. It is not offered as, and should not be read as, the Commission's current position on land use limitations.

This matters here because the Commission's own outlook may have changed substantially over time. Today's ANC 6A is especially supportive of housing growth, urban density, and transit-oriented development. We are focused on building a campus—and a city—that works for residents across a range of ages, abilities, socioeconomic, and other groups, building on lessons from the 8-to-80 Cities movement.³

1. Overarching Comment: Require Binding Commitments, Timelines, and Unified Governance

Our strongest and most consistent piece of feedback is that while the master plan presents an aspirational and attractive multi-generational vision, it remains largely speculative. Aside from the stadium itself and immediate support operations, the plan lacks concrete timelines, funding

¹ ANC 6A meetings are advertised electronically on anc-6a@googlegroups.com, and in newhilleast@groups.io, at www.anc6a.org, and through print advertisements in the *Hill Rag*.

² Comments summarized with the support of AI tools Gemini Flash and Claude Sonnet.

³ The 8-to-80 cities theory states that if a city's public spaces and streets are safe and fun for an 8-year-old child and an 80-year-old senior citizen, they will be safe and great for everyone. Created by [8 80 Cities](http://www.880cities.org/) founder Gil Peñalosa, it shifts urban planning away from favoring fast cars and healthy, athletic adults. <https://www.880cities.org/>

streams, or clear governance structures for the housing, retail, and recreational components, which have long been high priorities for the community.

Specific gaps we demand OP address in the next phase:

- **Establish Firm Timelines:** The plan needs explicit schedules for map amendments, zoning adjustments, and BZA approvals required for non-stadium development to move forward. Leaving Kingman development to an open-ended DMPED process without explicit timelines invites perpetual stagnation.
- **Unified Maintenance and Security Entity:** The current proposed "hodgepodge" split between DPR, DGS, and the Washington Commanders is a recipe for operational failure. The District must establish a centralized, accountable entity responsible for the maintenance, safety, and security of public spaces, Kingman Island, and the Anacostia pathways year-round, not just on event days.
- **Enforceable Sustainability and Amenities:** Speculative mentions of grocery stores, pharmacies, libraries, and public schools must be converted into hard planning requirements. Furthermore, net-zero goals, gray-water reuse, solar panel mandates, and provision of shade and other strategies for environmentally friendly cooling in a warming environment must be explicitly codified into the building design guidelines rather than left as passive suggestions.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT: In past cycles, such as our [2019 Response to the RFK Stadium Redevelopment](#), this Commission expressed deep skepticism regarding massive sports infrastructure and stadium impacts. While we remain highly protective of public funds and adjacent residential neighborhoods, our current position actively embraces the opportunity to build a dense, mixed-use, master-planned community. We welcome growth and density, provided it is bound to enforceable commitments that deliver genuine community amenities.

2. Housing, Density, and Multi-Generational Community

Consistent with our updated vision, the plan must maximize residential density and ensure neighborhood-building is structurally prioritized over purely event-day entertainment.

Specific neighborhood requirements:

- **Prioritize the Metro Walkshed:** Housing construction must be aggressively prioritized within the immediate 0.5-mile walkshed of the Stadium-Armory Metro station.
- **Sequence Safeguards and Penalties:** There must be strict regulatory and contractual penalties for prioritizing stadium construction over the enduring mixed-use neighborhood. The stadium complex must not be permitted to outpace the delivery of housing, adequate non-automobile transportation infrastructure, and local retail.
- **Multi-Level Senior Care Housing:** The plan mentions senior housing, but fails to account for a market-rate, multi-level continuum of care facility (independent living,

assisted living, and skilled nursing). Currently, our aging neighbors are forced to leave our community and, often the District entirely, for these services. The plan must mandate these facilities so residents can age in place.

- **Affordable Housing Requirements:** Every phase of new residential development on the campus must include binding, codified, affordable housing commitments—not aspirational targets—so the neighborhood remains attainable for existing Ward 6, 7, and 8 residents as the campus builds out.

3. Transportation, Access, and Parking: Prioritize People Over Cars

Claims that this will be a "transit-first" development will continue to ring hollow so long as 12-story parking garages and enormous surface lots remain core features of the master plan. Investment in mass transit and non-vehicular upgrades must be prioritized over car-centric construction, particularly as the District has already recorded 27 traffic deaths in 2026 through mid-August, compared with 32 for all of 2025.

- **Acknowledge and Protect Existing Wins:** We commend the master plan for preserving the 19th Street NE protected bike lane — a facility that could easily have been sacrificed to campus redesign — and for beginning to establish a protected bike facility along East Capitol Street. These are exactly the kind of concrete, non-negotiable commitments we are asking the plan to extend campus-wide.
- **Extend Protected Bike Infrastructure Beyond the Campus Boundary:** The master plan's bike network cannot stop at the campus edge. We reiterate the request in our Strategic Bike Plan letter⁴ to DDOT for continuous, protected bike infrastructure connecting Union Station to the RFK campus along the East Capitol Street, Massachusetts Avenue, 4th Street, and 6th Street corridor, which we expect to become the primary route for micromobility users traveling from Metro and the H Street corridor to the campus.
- **Ground Bike Infrastructure Demands in Existing District Policy:** The District's own moveDC 2021 plan already commits to fully protected bikeways on East Capitol Street, Benning Road NE, and Pennsylvania Avenue SE — commitments DDOT has since retreated from, as seen when protected lanes were stripped from the East Capitol Street Safety and Mobility Improvements project design. The RFK master plan must not repeat this pattern. We ask that fully protected bikeways across the Anacostia River and along these arterials be treated as a binding baseline, not a negotiable design option, and that this commitment extend into Wards 7 and 8 — connecting Mayfair, Fort Dupont, Capitol View, and Randle Highlands, neighborhoods that have long been underserved by safe cycling infrastructure.

⁴ <https://anc6a.org/wp-content/uploads/TPS-10-2025-Strategic-Bikeways-Plan.pdf>

- **Require True Grade Separation, Not Paint:** To be effective, protected bike lanes on campus must be grade-separated with physical barriers — flex posts and painted lanes alone are insufficient and will be routinely obstructed by game-day parking overflow.
- **Mandate Dedicated Bike Valet Service:** The master plan should explicitly commit to bike valet service — modeled on the well-documented success at Nationals Park and Audi Field — at three to four locations across the campus (including the sports complex, not just the stadium), to prevent standard bike racks from being overwhelmed on event days.
- **Plan for Micromobility Parking Capacity:** Given the volume of micromobility users expected on the campus, particularly on game days, the plan should specify a concrete strategy — developed jointly with DDOT and device operators — for where thousands of bikes and scooters will be safely and securely parked.
- **Reconsider Sports Complex and Parking Structure Siting:** The current siting places the parking structure closer to D Street while the sports complex sits at Benning Road and Oklahoma Avenue. This routes drivers into the residential neighborhood to reach parking that is only marginally closer to the stadium. The parking structure should instead be sited along Benning Road, consistent with the sports complex, to keep game-day traffic out of the neighborhood.
- **Address the Broader 10–15 Minute Bike-Ride Catchment:** The master plan identifies a 10–15 minute bike-ride radius around the campus but does not address infrastructure needs within that broader area. We ask OP to extend its planning commentary to this catchment zone, which includes H Street corridor businesses (e.g., the 400 block of H Street) that depend on safe bike access to and from the campus.
- **Eliminate Standalone Car Parking:** Massive parking structures sit vacant 340 days a year, invite severe event-day congestion, and run counter to the District’s Vision Zero initiatives. No additional standalone parking structures should be allowed beyond the baseline agreements with the Commanders. If large lots are built, they must be multi-purpose assets utilized for retail, residential, and/or solar-canopy energy generation throughout the year.
- **Mandate Non-Negotiable Protected Bike Lanes (PBLs):** The draft plan routinely uses the word "may" rather than "will" when describing bike and micromobility rights-of-way. **ALL rights-of-way throughout the campus must mandate grade-separated, protected bike/micromobility lanes** from inception. We should explicitly look to the nearby C Street NE bike lane project—one of the best low-stress cycling corridors in the city—as our baseline standard.
- **Separate Wheels from Pedestrians:** Major thoroughfares like the Anacostia Commons must physically segregate higher-speed micromobility pathways from pedestrian walkways intended for joggers, strollers, and wheelchairs. Additionally, future

micromobility vendor contracts must enforce strict geofencing, camera monitoring, automatic speed caps, user verification rules, and other safety features within the campus.

- **Preserve and Expand Bridge Bike Connections:** Safe, protected bike infrastructure connecting the campus to surrounding neighborhoods must be preserved and expanded, and at minimum, existing protected bike lanes across the bridges into the campus must be maintained rather than removed or narrowed during construction.
- **Mitigate Residential Parking and Congestion Spillover:** The plan must include concrete, funded measures—such as residential parking protection zones and event-day traffic management—to prevent stadium and campus parking demand from spilling into and congesting adjacent residential streets.
- **Regional Transit Expansions:** The plan must include explicit next steps for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and deep coordination with WMATA. We formally request the integration of the following transit upgrades:
 - Upgrading the Stadium-Armory station to match the high-capacity throughput design of the Navy Yard station.
 - Building the originally planned Oklahoma Ave Metro infill station.
 - Establishing the proposed Gold Line transit hub on Benning Road near Langston Golf Course, complete with a vibrant pedestrian promenade connecting directly to the campus. This transit link should make limited but sufficient local stops to support local businesses along H Street and Benning Road rather than running as an express service. Also, this line should operate throughout the year and not just on game days.
- **Clarification on Traffic Mitigation:** The plan must clarify how far west the proposed two-way conversion of Independence Avenue will extend, and outline explicit operational strategies to prevent game-day traffic from overwhelming surrounding residential streets.
- **Reduce the Roadway Footprint with Barcelona-Style Superblocks:** The current roadway network dedicates far more of the campus to vehicle infrastructure than a walkable, transit-first neighborhood requires. Rather than gridding the residential portions of the campus with a conventional dense street network, the District should apply a superblock model — consolidating through-traffic onto the perimeter arterials and converting the interior residential grid into low-speed, pedestrian- and bike-priority streets closed to all but local access, deliveries, and emergency vehicles. This approach, pioneered in Barcelona and increasingly adopted in dense urban infill projects, would reclaim significant land currently allocated to roadway for parks, play areas, and green infrastructure, reduce cut-through and game-day traffic in the neighborhood core, and reinforce a multi-generational/multi-ability friendly design approach. We ask OP to

evaluate a superblock reconfiguration for the residential portions of the campus before the roadway network is finalized.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT: ANC 6A has a multi-decade record of demanding reliable, high-capacity transit links along our boundaries, including our [2021 Resolution Supporting the Extension of the Streetcar](#) and our subsequent advocacy for dedicated bus and transit lanes. Our current demand for comprehensive regional transit integration at the RFK site represents direct continuity with twenty years of consistent, transit-first advocacy.

4. Public Space, Streetscape and Material Standards, and Recreation

We support expanding public spaces for humans but the current plan relies on fragmented, low-value parcels to satisfy open space requirements within an overly dense 65% coverage limit.

Public space enhancements:

- **Human-Scale Pedestrian Plazas:** The District should replace planned surface parking lots for large, permanently pedestrianized plazas and community amphitheaters modeled after successful civic spaces like Canal Park or Eastern Market Metro Plaza. The current four acre park in the Kingman District is woefully inadequate for community gathering. The parking structure should be reduced in size and the park (p. 64 item 9) should be increased in size.
- **Reject Brick for Pedestrian Rights-of-Way:** The District has learned tough, costly lessons regarding injuries, impaired accessibility, high maintenance costs, and liability associated with brick pedestrian pathways. While porous materials are essential for managing stormwater runoff, the design standards should specify durable, flat, modern porous compounds instead of standard brick or cobblestone.
- **Olympic-Sized Pool and Indoor Track for Regional Athletics:** The recreational amenities program should include an Olympic competition-sized swimming pool and an indoor track facility sized to support sanctioned DC-based athletic competitions. Nearby Eastern High School has no pool of its own, and DC-based indoor track competitions currently must be held at the PG County Sports and Learning Complex, forcing DC families to leave the District just to watch their own scholar-athletes compete. A regulation facility at RFK would fill a genuine, currently unmet need for DC Public Schools, DC-based swim and track clubs, and the broader Ward 6/7/8 community — consistent with our vision of a campus that serves residents from ages 8 to 80, not just event-day visitors.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT: Our caution regarding streetscape materials draws directly from institutional experience; back in 2007, ANC 6A submitted comprehensive recommendations regarding H Street sidewalk materials and streetscape construction warning against non-durable choices. Pointing OP and DDOT back to these past outcomes ensures the District does not replicate legacy maintenance failures on the new RFK campus.

5. Environmental Review, Stormwater Management, and Climate Resilience

The campus sits directly along the Anacostia River and adjacent to Kingman Lake and Kingman Island, and the scale of the redevelopment warrants a rigorous, enforceable environmental review and management framework—both during construction and over the life of the campus.

Environmental and climate requirements:

- **Commission a Full Environmental Impact Statement:** Given the site's size, environmental sensitivity, and riverfront location, the District should commission a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the campus rather than relying on a more limited review.
- **Strict Compliance with Stormwater and Soil Laws:** All applicable District laws and regulations governing stormwater runoff and retention, and toxic or contaminated soil removal and remediation, must be strictly followed and independently verified throughout every phase of redevelopment.
- **Gold-Standard Construction-Phase Management:** The District must require and actively maintain gold-standard stormwater, sediment, and litter management practices during all demolition and construction activities, not only after buildings are occupied.
- **Future-Sized Green Infrastructure:** Bioretention and other green stormwater infrastructure for the completed campus must comply with all District laws and be sized for the rain intensity expected at the end of the stadium's assumed useful life, not present-day rainfall patterns.
- **Wetlands Restoration for Sea-Level Rise:** The plan should restore wetlands in Kingman Lake and in upland areas expected to become wetlands by the end of the stadium's assumed life, given sea-level rise currently conservatively projected at 3.4 feet by 2080.
- **Comprehensive Litter Management:** The plan should prioritize reusable containers over single-use plastics and build out recycling infrastructure across the stadium and campus, and install trash traps—such as Bandalong or Bandit litter traps—in open-air stormwater conveyances before they discharge into Kingman Lake. The stadium should be required to allow visitors to bring in one small plastic water bottle per person, aligned with regulations at Nats Park,⁵ to reduce waste.
- **Protect Kingman Island:** Redevelopment activity must be designed and managed to avoid and mitigate environmental impacts on Kingman Island's natural areas, which should be treated as an asset to protect, not a buffer to build around.

⁵ <https://www.mlb.com/nationals/ballpark/information/guide#b-content>

- **Equitable River Recreation Access:** The campus should provide equitable recreational access to the river for all residents, including trails, docks, and small-craft launches, not only amenities oriented toward stadium visitors.
- **Noise and Light Pollution Mitigation:** The plan must include specific noise and light pollution mitigation measures to protect surrounding residential neighborhoods, both for day-to-day operations and on event days.

6. Zoning and Riverfront Preservation

- **Dismantle the Riverfront "Wall":** The current Riverfront District Zoning and Design Guidance makes the counterintuitive recommendation to place the tallest, 11-story buildings right along the river perimeter. This layout risks creating an oppressive, monolithic wall of buildings that detaches the neighborhood, and indeed the entire RFK development, from the riverfront.
- **Demand Microclimate Studies:** We request that OP conduct and publish comprehensive shade and wind-tunnel simulations for the proposed zoning shapes. We must ensure these blocks do not turn public spaces into dark, wind-swept canyons.

7. Economic Development, Local Retail, H Street NE, and Community Benefits

The plan's economic opportunities—both retail and employment—should be structured to directly benefit existing Ward 6, 7, and 8 residents and businesses, not only new arrivals to the campus.

Economic development requirements:

- **Local and BIPOC Small Business Preferences:** Retail leasing, vending, and concessions policies for the campus should include explicit preferences and support (such as reduced up-front costs or dedicated storefronts) for local and BIPOC-owned small businesses, consistent with the District's anti-displacement goals.
- **Target Local and Youth Employment:** Consistent with the plan's stated hiring priority for Wards 7 and 8, the District should set explicit, trackable targets for permanent jobs and dedicated youth employment opportunities, and report publicly on progress against those targets.
- **Design Game-Day Traffic to Benefit, Not Bypass, H Street Businesses:** RFK's opening is the single biggest economic opportunity for H Street in years, but only if game-day and event traffic is designed to route people through the corridor — shopping, eating, and stopping — rather than around it via shuttles that skip directly to the stadium.
- **Make Shared Parking Commitments Binding, Not Aspirational:** The master plan already notes that the two committed parking garages "should be considered for potential shared parking options" to serve special events, retail, and other daily users — but this remains aspirational language, not a binding commitment. We ask that this shared-use

function be made a firm requirement for both garages (Kingman Commons and Riverfront), so that these facilities serve daily campus use and events, H Street business and resident parking demand year-round, not just game days, rather than sitting underused 340 days a year.

- **Cross-Reference Companion Planning Efforts:** The final master plan should explicitly cross-reference the Gold Line BRT planning process and the H Street NE Land Use Study, so that all three efforts point toward the complementary transit and land use outcomes rather than drifting apart.

8. Connect RFK to H Street's Revitalization, Not Apart From It

Despite sitting at the western edge of the RFK campus's zone of influence and serving as the corridor connecting the campus to Union Station, H Street NE appears only once in the entire master plan — in a passing reference to a closed grocery store. This is a significant omission. The District cannot treat RFK's redevelopment and H Street's revitalization as unrelated exercises: RFK will be the eastern gateway to this part of the District, and H Street is the corridor that connects that gateway to Union Station and downtown. Planned together, they represent a once-in-a-generation opportunity for a continuous, walkable spine from Union Station, across the Hopscotch Bridge, the length of H Street, through the Starburst Plaza intersection, and out to the campus. Planned apart, as they are being planned now, H Street risks becoming the corridor that visitors and investment pass through on the way to somewhere else — a real risk given that OP's own data shows a 20% drop in H Street visitation since 2019, 26% ground-floor vacancy, and a 36% visitation decline on the corridor's eastern segment, which sits closest to RFK. The city has an obligation to ensure H Street is treated as integral to the RFK campus's success, not left behind by it.

H Street integration requirements:

- **State Explicitly How the Two Plans Coordinate:** We ask that the final RFK master plan explicitly document how its recommendations align with the H Street NE Land Use and Market Study, just as we have asked the H Street study to state how its recommendations align with RFK, so neither process treats the other as an afterthought.
- **Design Transit to Serve H Street, Not Bypass It:** The plan references a future WMATA-recommended Campus Transit Center with dedicated bus lanes linking RFK to Union Station, but does not specify whether that connection routes through, or serves, H Street NE. With DC Streetcar service having ended on March 31, 2026, the corridor currently has no dedicated transit spine of its own. We ask that whatever transit ultimately connects RFK to Union Station — Gold Line, the WMATA-recommended bus priority infrastructure, or otherwise — include several stops along H Street, not just terminal stops at Union Station and the campus, so corridor businesses actually benefit from RFK-driven ridership on both event and non-event days.

- **Bridge the Gap Until Gold Line Opens:** Since the Gold Line is not expected to be operational until RFK opens in 2030, an interim transit connection between Union Station and the campus, potentially via H Street, on the model of the Kennedy Center's Foggy Bottom shuttle, should be evaluated now, rather than leaving H Street without a reliable link to the RFK campus.
- **Treat Starburst Plaza as Shared Connective Tissue:** The eventual reimagining of the Starburst Plaza/Hechinger Mall intersection is H Street's eastern gateway and sits between H Street and the RFK campus. The master plan should explicitly integrate its planning with the Starburst Plaza redevelopment rather than treating it as a separate, later exercise.
- **Evaluate Shared Redevelopment Financing:** Given RFK's scale as an economic driver, we ask OP to evaluate a Tax Increment Financing district or similar mechanism spanning H Street, Starburst Plaza, Hechinger Mall, and the RFK campus, so that revitalization funding for the corridor is not siloed away from the investment RFK itself will generate next door.

Thank you for giving great weight to the views of ANC 6A. Should you wish to discuss this letter with the Commission, please feel free to reach out to me at 6A04@anc.dc.gov.

On behalf of the Commission,



Amber Gove
Chair, Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A