

Agenda
ANC 6A Transportation & Public Space Committee Meeting
Monday, July 20, 2026 at 7:00 pm
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

For those attending via Zoom, use this link: <https://dc-gov.zoom.us/j/81191234139>

Call-in Number: 1 301 715 8592

Webinar ID (access code): 811 9123 4139

One tap mobile: +16469313860,,81191234139#

Public Meeting – All are welcome

Community comment welcome; may be limited to two minutes to provide opportunity for all to speak. Community comment time will be opened after each Old and New Business item.

- I. Call meeting to order.
- II. Introductions & Announcements.
- III. Old Business
 - A. Micromobility - Staff from DC's shared micromobility companies (Lime, Hopp, and Veo) will join to discuss issues related to micromobility operation in the district. (Draft letter attached.)
 - B. DC Office of Planning H Street Land Use and Market Study - ANC 6A has prepared a preliminary draft comment letter (Draft letter attached) in response to the [Preliminary Findings](#) report. Committee members and community will have the opportunity to provide additional comment before the letter is finalized. (Individuals can also submit their comments by July 26, 2026 at <https://publicinput.com/hstreetstudyfeedback>.)
- IV. New Business
 - A. RFK Master Plan - DC Government released their [draft master plan](#) for development of the RFK site. (Draft letter attached.) Committee members and community will have the opportunity to provide additional comment before the letter is finalized. (Individuals can also submit their comments by August 14, 2026 at <https://publicinput.com/rfkmasterplan>) There will also be an opportunity for in-person testimony on August 1, 2026 at St. Coletta of Greater Washington (1901 Independence Avenue, SE) – 10 am – 2 pm.)
- V. Additional community comment (time permitting).
- VI. Adjourn meeting.

July XX, 2026

Councilmember Charles Allen
Chair, Committee on Transportation and the Environment
callen@dccouncil.gov

Re: ANC 6A Request for Hearing on Micromobility

Dear Councilmember Allen:

At a regularly scheduled and properly noticed¹ meeting on July 9, 2026, Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A voted X-X-X (with four Commissioners (4) required for a quorum) to urge the Committee on Transportation and the Environment to convene public oversight hearings regarding the management, infrastructure integration, and regulatory framework of micromobility devices in the District. Furthermore, we explicitly request that these hearings occur sufficiently in advance of the District's next Request for Proposals (RFP) cycle and contract renewals for micromobility providers so that findings can directly inform future vendor requirements.

The Success of Micromobility Outpaces Current Infrastructure

As a transit-supportive Commission, ANC 6A celebrates the incredible growth of sustainable transportation in Washington, DC. Data presented to our Transportation and Public Space Committee by the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) highlights that the District is a national leader in this space: for-hire micromobility trips have doubled from 9 million in 2022 to 18 million in 2025. This massive modal shift is a testament to the dedication of DDOT and local advocates in providing viable, green alternatives to private vehicle use.

However, the spectacular success of these programs has fundamentally outpaced our current physical, contractual, and regulatory infrastructure. This gap has created friction on our streets and sidewalks, resulting in rising safety concerns for both micromobility users and pedestrians—particularly our most vulnerable neighbors, including children, seniors, and the visually or hearing-impaired. District health data reflects this urgency: according to recent data shared by DDOT with our Transportation and Public Space Committee, hospital discharges related to micromobility and cycling injuries rose from 252 in 2022 to 653 in 2025. This trend requires proactive structural interventions rather than ad-hoc reactions.

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*.

Key Structural Challenges to Address

To optimize micromobility as a safe, permanent fixture of DC's transportation network, we believe the Council must evaluate several systemic pressure points:

1. **The Infrastructure Gap:** A primary driver of sidewalk riding is the lack of a continuous, connected network of protected bike lanes (PBLs). When riders feel unsafe sharing the roadway with heavy vehicular traffic, they default to sidewalks.
2. **Speed and Fleet Regulations:** Current speed caps on some devices may inadvertently make riders feel too slow to safely integrate with the flow of street traffic. Concurrently, a rise in un-geofenced, high-speed throttle devices (some capable of dangerous, non-compliant speeds) requires strict market and enforcement boundaries.
3. **Sidewalk Riding & Geofencing Constraints:** Sidewalk riding restrictions remain largely confined to the Central Business District. We need to evaluate whether technological interventions like precision geofencing and automatic speed governors are mature enough to enforce sidewalk restrictions in high-pedestrian commercial corridors like H Street NE.
4. **Accountability and Vendor Management:** There is a critical lack of timely enforcement tools to hold corporate micromobility providers accountable for improper device parking (which blocks ADA ramps and sidewalks) and systemic underage usage. Modernizing contract terms to penalize vendors for non-compliance could create a dedicated revenue stream to fund further PBL construction.
5. **Public Safety and Enforcement Alterations:** MPD's First District has noted a rise in youth-related offenses utilizing micromobility devices. We must explore regulatory or contractual accountability mechanisms for individuals who illicitly enable underage use of corporate devices.

Recommended Scope of the Hearing

To ensure the next generation of micromobility contracts serves the holistic safety of the District, we encourage the Committee to host comprehensive hearings to:

- **Solicit Stakeholder Testimony:** Gather feedback from residents, pedestrian advocacy groups, micromobility users, and industry representatives.
- **Analyze Comprehensive Data:** Review precise usage patterns, vehicle-type safety distinctions (e.g., throttle vs. pedal-assist), and granular injury statistics.
- **Evaluate Peer-City Best Practices:** Examine how other global metropolitan areas handle sidewalk riding, corporate accountability, and parking compliance.

- **Measure Transit Integration:** Assess how micromobility serves as a first-mile/last-mile solution and its direct impact on reducing private automobile reliance.

By aligning these hearings ahead of the next vendor RFP process, the Council can ensure that future District contracts mandate the necessary technological, safety, and operational standards required to protect everyone who moves around DC.

Lastly, while we recognize that micromobility devices are not the source of fatal traffic violence in DC, managing their integration is essential to ensuring all residents feel secure, no matter how they get around. According to historical crash data maintained by MPD and DDOT, motor vehicles are involved in 100% of the District's traffic fatalities, including every recorded death of a pedestrian or micromobility user. While automobiles remain the true threat to life on our streets, optimizing our infrastructure and regulatory frameworks is critical to eliminating the friction between modes and keeping both pedestrians and riders safe on our streets and sidewalks.

Thank you for your continued leadership and commitment to a safe, multi-modal transportation network and 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, or Commissioner Shapiro at 6A03@anc.dc.gov.

On behalf of the Commission,

Amber Gove
Chair, Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A

July xx, 2026

H Street Land Use and Market Study
Office of Planning
hstreetstudy@dc.gov
<https://publicinput.com/hstreetstudyfeedback>

Re: ANC 6A Comments regarding H Street Land Use and Market Study

Dear Office of Planning:

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

Below is a high-level summary of comments drafted with the support of Claude Sonnet 5 and includes a review of the historical record, compiled as of July 6, 2026, to be refined prior to the July 26, 2026 submission date.

These draft comments are offered to organize and frame discussion at our July 9 ANC meeting, to include a discussion on the Office of Planning's (OP) H Street NE Land Use and Market Study interim report. They are built directly on the compilation of comments submitted by our committee chairs and commissioners — and are intended as a starting point, not a final ANC position. Nothing here is binding until the full Commission discusses, amends, and votes to authorize the Chair and Commissioners Butler, Hammer, Scott and Shapiro to finalize comments for submission to OP ahead of the July 26 deadline.

A Note on Historical References

This draft also cites material from the ANC 6A website archive going back roughly two decades. Where used, it is clearly marked below in shaded “Historical context” callouts and is included only as institutional memory — evidence that an issue has a long track record, or a citation OP/DDOT/DMPED can be pointed back to. It is not offered as, and should not be read as, the Commission's current position.

This matters here in particular because the Commission's own outlook has changed substantially since much of that archive was written. Today's ANC 6A is markedly more supportive of housing growth and density, more skeptical of parking minimums and use restrictions that sit empty storefronts, and more focused on building a corridor — and a city — that works for residents “8 to 80.” Where an older position (for example, our 2010–11 opposition to up-zoning on H Street) runs counter to that current outlook, this draft says so explicitly, so OP does not mistake archival material for where the Commission stands today.

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*.

1. Overarching Comment: Match the Ambition to the Moment

Our strongest and most consistent piece of feedback is that OP's preliminary recommendations, while individually reasonable, do not yet rise to the scale of the opportunity — or the risk — facing H Street. As RJS put it in her summary comments, the data in this report (a 20% drop in visitation since 2019, 26% ground-floor vacancy, an eastern segment down 36% in visitation) describes a corridor that is "like a trauma patient that can survive with appropriate care," but OP's recommendations "often constitute little more than plastic surgery."

We believe the final plan should be bold and comprehensive and should explicitly integrate H Street with the Starburst Plaza/Hechinger Mall redevelopment and the DDOT/WMATA planning already underway for the new RFK Stadium campus (opening 2030). This is a narrow window: an integrated, fast-tracked, and creatively funded redevelopment strategy for H Street timed to RFK's opening could be transformative, while a piecemeal approach risks leaving the corridor further behind as investment concentrates around Union Market, NoMa, and RFK itself.

Current position — specific gaps we would like OP to address in the next phase:

- A redefinition of how properties are classified and taxed as “vacant and blighted,” paired with earmarking of incremental tax revenue for redevelopment and re-occupancy incentives along the corridor.
- A real gap analysis identifying and specifically recruiting missing anchor uses — through zoning relief, expedited permitting, and/or tax incentives — such as replacement transit service between Union Station and RFK; a relocated DC Children's Museum or similar tourist/community draw; market-rate multi-level senior housing; a multi-specialty medical center; a hotel; or an independent movie house.
- Serious evaluation of a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district or similar mechanism spanning H Street, Starburst Plaza, and Hechinger Mall, with incremental tax flows dedicated to revitalization. We understand a TIF was discussed for H Street as far back as 2007 but never implemented — this study should determine why, and whether the calculus has changed given RFK.
- A properly funded Business Improvement District (BID) — as more than a dozen other DC commercial corridors already have — to provide year-round, professional management focused on safety, cleanliness, vibrancy, and equitable commercial sustainability.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): This is a long-standing, consistent concern for the Commission, not a new one — and unlike the zoning history further below, it lines up comfortably with where we stand today. ANC 6A previously pushed for a [redefinition of “blighted” properties](#) (2011), requested that DCRA [join a pilot program on vacant properties](#) and provide [greater transparency on vacant property procedures](#), and supported the [2007 Nuisance Property Abatement & Real Property Classification Amendment](#). We also wrote to then-Councilmembers on [vacant property legislation \(Bills 18-488 and 18-546\)](#). Our recent [2025 letter on the vacant property at 1000–1014 H St NE](#) shows this remains active and unresolved — useful continuity to cite, not a change in view. Similarly, ANC 6A requested an [H Street NE Parking Increment Financing District](#) around 2007 — a financing tool related to the TIF idea above that appears to have gone nowhere and may be worth OP revisiting given RFK.

2. Transportation, Access & Parking

Feedback (Patrick/PB, RJS, Ashley Blake) was clear that the plan under-addresses mobility, particularly on the eastern half of the corridor. This is an area where the Commission's current pro-transit, pro-density outlook and its historical advocacy point in the same direction, so the archive material below is cited as reinforcing continuity rather than as a contrast.

- The plan notably lacks transit recommendations for the eastern end of H Street, where visitation has declined most steeply.
- The plan should prioritize people over parking. DC Government and H Street business owners continue to plan around assumptions about how visitors arrive that do not match the reality that most people walk, bike, or take transit to the corridor. Converting surface parking to housing — even a swap of roughly 40 parking spaces for 200 residential units — would do far more for corridor economics than preserving parking supply, and better serves a corridor meant to work for residents 8 to 80.
- The end of streetcar service will further erode H Street visitation. We need an interim transit solution connecting Union Station through the corridor now, and we need assurance that whatever serves RFK (Gold Line or otherwise) runs on non-game days with enough stops along H Street to support local businesses.
- The H Street Bus Priority Project already did substantial work studying, gathering feedback on, and designing pickup/drop-off zones along the corridor. That work should be salvaged and implemented now — even simple, low-cost interim measures like priority lane paint from 3rd to 15th Streets — rather than waiting on longer-term decisions about the Gold Line.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): The Commission has advocated for reliable H Street transit for nearly two decades: our 2007-era [request for an interim bus route on the H St/Benning Rd corridor](#) and [multi-ANC support for light rail on H Street](#), our [2015 request to complete and launch the streetcar](#), our [2016 request for seven-day streetcar service](#), our [2021 Resolution supporting extension of the streetcar to Benning Road](#), and our [subsequent letter supporting completion of the streetcar from Benning Road to Georgetown](#). Unlike the zoning history in Section 4, there is no daylight here between past and present —citing twenty years of consistent advocacy strengthens rather than complicates our current ask.

3. Public Space & Streetscape

We support OP's public realm recommendations (RECs 1–8) directionally, but see specific gaps and opportunities:

- The report does not address the 8th and H Street NE intersection — a busy bus transfer point with heavy foot traffic — despite the plan elsewhere noting the need for seating and shade at transit stops. This should be added explicitly as a priority location.
- Significant public space could be gained by closing select intersections to car traffic and paving them over, particularly at 9th and H St NE, where H Street does not run through the superblock south of H and no parking would be lost. This would create shaded gathering space near restaurants, shops, and housing without displacing existing uses.

- Cross streets could receive continuous sidewalk treatment (similar to C Street near Eastern Market) to prioritize pedestrians without affecting vehicle access.
- The Throne public restroom pilot should be expanded to 8th and H and to Starburst Plaza — though we would flag that the 8th and H corner specifically has been an ongoing site of drug activity and other nuisance behavior, and any restroom sitting there should be paired with safety measures.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT: REC 4's proposal to replace the cobblestone strips echoes a concern the Commission raised at the corridor's last major streetscape rebuild when we submitted [recommendations on H Street sidewalk materials](#) and broader [H Street streetscape construction recommendations](#) back in 2007. Purely a factual/procedural precedent — worth asking OP/DDOT why the 2007 material choice did not hold up, so the replacement does not repeat the same mistake. No shift in Commission philosophy involved here.

4. Zoning & Land Use

On OP's land use and zoning recommendations (RECs 17–20), current committee feedback (SB) supports greater flexibility across the board. This section is where the gap between the Commission's historical positions and its current outlook is widest, so we have been deliberate about separating the two below.

Current Committee Position (2026) — Supportive of Growth

- Support expanding permitted ground-floor uses to include general retail in the Arts sub-district (REC 17), given the documented link between the Arts sub-district's restrictive use limitations and its 31% vacancy rate — the highest on the corridor.
- Support removing the special exception requirement for lots over 6,000 SF (REC 18), which the report itself identifies as adding uncertainty, cost, and delay without a clear corresponding benefit.
- OP should evaluate whether current zoning is compatible with single-stair apartment construction on H Street's typical lot sizes — this could be a meaningful lever for unlocking small- and mid-scale residential infill that the corridor badly needs.
- Support consideration of additional building height and FAR to enable financially viable apartment construction on the eastern end of the corridor (REC 19), consistent with the report's own finding that current market conditions cannot support buildings over seven stories without additional density flexibility.

Taken together, this is a distinctly YIMBY, growth-oriented position: more housing, fewer procedural chokepoints, and more flexible ground-floor uses so vacancy comes down and the corridor works for residents of all ages and incomes — not just today's mix of uses.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): This is the one place where our own archive cuts against today's committee position, and we think OP should hear us say so plainly rather than discover it independently. In 2010–11, ANC 6A [petitioned against up-zoning as part of PUDs](#) and sought a [five-year moratorium on up-zoning under the H Street Overlay](#). That reflected a different Commission, at a different moment for the corridor, with a different, more cautious view of density. It is not our position today. The current Commission is substantially more supportive of housing growth and additional density as tools for corridor recovery, and we would rather flag that evolution ourselves

— clearly, and without apology — than have OP or a future commenter cite the 2010–11 letters as if they still represented ANC 6A's view. If anything, the fact that the Commission has moved this far should reassure OP that support for REC 19 today reflects genuine, considered consensus rather than a reflexive position.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): On REC 21's design standards: the Commission asked OP/DDOT to revisit H Street's design guidelines before — see our 2007 [request to revise the H St NE Design Guidelines](#). This one is procedural rather than philosophical — worth checking what became of that request before this round produces a new one — and does not carry the same historical baggage as the up-zoning question above.

5. Historic Preservation

- We encourage OP to evaluate preservation and adaptive reuse options for Douglas Memorial Methodist Church (800 11th St NE) as part of the corridor's broader historic fabric strategy, particularly given the Arts sub-district's high concentration of pre-1958 buildings. Adaptive reuse — keeping a building's shell while enabling new, more intensive uses inside it — is very much in keeping with the Commission's current growth-oriented approach; it is not in tension with our support for added density elsewhere on the corridor.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): The Commission engaged with this building once before, supporting a [2013 BZA variance for the church \(BZA 18662\)](#); that record may be a useful factual starting point for OP's evaluation.

6. Relevant ANC 6A Correspondence

This is not the Commission's first engagement with H Street planning. Twenty years ago, we supported the [H Street Small Area Plan designation \(PR 15-80\)](#) and the [H Street Transportation Study](#) that preceded the 2004 Strategic Development Plan, and even [testified to DC Council on the H Street development budget](#) that year. Worth keeping in mind that we have been here before and pressing OP on what is genuinely different this time, given how much both the corridor and the Commission have changed since. Below, current/recent letters (2024–2025) are grouped separately from older archival material so it is clear at a glance which reflect where the Commission stands today.

Current & Recent (reflects today's Commission, 2024–2025)

- [ANC 6A Comments Regarding the H Street NE Land Use and Market Study](#) — our prior comments to OP on this same study process.
- [Comments on the Premature End to H Street/Benning Road NE Streetcar Service](#) (to Mayor Bowser, DDOT, WMATA, and Councilmember Allen) — directly supports our comment above on the need for an interim transit solution.
- [Reaffirmation of Support for the H St NE Bus Priority Project](#) — supports salvaging and implementing that project's work now.
- [Support for H Street NE Bus and Streetcar-Only Lanes \(NOI 24-07-TDD\)](#) and DDOT's response — additional, recent transit priority history.

- [Concerns about the Vacant Property at 1000–1014 H St NE and Related Dila Development Proposal](#) (to DC Council, DOB, and BZA) — relevant to our vacancy and “vacant and blighted” taxation comments.
- [Request Regarding Withheld Capital Improvement Grant Funds for Atlas Performing Arts Center, Theater Alliance, and Project Create](#) — supports the report's emphasis on the Arts sub-district's anchor institutions.
- [Conditional Support for H Street Main Street's DCAH Grant Application](#) and our [Letter of Support for H Street Main Street's Public Art Building Communities Grant](#) — relevant to REC 6 and REC 12 on public art and corridor identity.
- [Support for Special Exception, 1000–1016 H St NE \(BZA 20880\)](#) and [Support for Extension of BZA Order, 1207 H St NE \(BZA 20943A\)](#) — precedent showing the current Commission's approach to recent development review along the corridor (1207 H St is also the site of OP's June 24 Open House #2).

Archival / Historical (useful institutional memory — not necessarily current Commission position)

- [H Street Small Area Plan designation support \(PR 15-80\)](#) and the [H Street Transportation Study](#) (2005) — precursors to the 2004 Strategic Development Plan this study updates.
- [Vacant/blighted property classification and legislation letters](#) (2007–2011) and the [H Street NE Parking Increment Financing District request](#) (c. 2007) — background for Section 1; consistent with current thinking.
- [Streetcar and light rail advocacy](#) (2007–2021) — background for Section 2; consistent with current thinking.
- [H Street sidewalk material and streetscape construction recommendations](#) (2007) — background for Section 3; procedural, not philosophical.
- Petition against up-zoning under the H Street Overlay and request for a five-year up-zoning moratorium (2010–11, linked in Section 4) — **does not reflect the current Commission's substantially more pro-growth position and should not be cited by others as still representing ANC 6A's view.**
- [2013 BZA variance support, Douglas Memorial Methodist Church \(BZA 18662\)](#) — background for Section 5.

7. Process & Next Steps

- Discuss and refine these comments at our upcoming meeting and at Committee meetings in July, incorporating any additional committee and commissioner input not yet captured.
- Finalize and submit formal ANC 6A comments to OP (HStreetStudy@dc.gov) before the July 26, 2026 deadline, following the Commission's standard vote/resolution process and authorization for Chair Gove and Commissioners Butler, Hammer, Shapiro and Scott to finalize the draft.
- Consider whether any items above (e.g., the TIF/BID request, the vacant-and-blighted tax classification issue) warrant a separate, stand-alone letter to the Mayor and Council rather than routing solely through the OP comment process, given their reach beyond OP's scope.

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

July xx, 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 X-X-X (with four Commissioners (4) required for a quorum) to authorize Chair Gove and Commissioner Shapiro to finalize and submit the below comments, based on feedback from Commissioners, Committee Members and Residents.

The below is a high-level summary of comments drafted with the support of Gemini Flash to organize and frame discussion at our upcoming ANC meeting regarding the Draft RFK Campus Master Plan. They are built directly on the compilation of comments submitted by our committee chairs and commissioners—and are intended as a starting point, not a final ANC position. Nothing here is binding until the full Commission discusses, amends, and votes to authorize final comments for submission ahead of the **August 14, 2026** deadline.

A Note on Historical References

This draft cites material from the ANC 6A website archive going back to illustrate institutional memory from the past two decades. Where used, it is clearly marked below in shaded **“Historical context”** callouts and is included only to point OP/DDOT/DMPED back to long-standing 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 has changed substantially. Today's ANC 6A is more supportive of housing growth, urban density, and transit-oriented development. We are focused on building a campus—and a city—that works for residents from ages **8 to 80**.

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

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*.

the stadium itself and immediate support operations, the plan lacks concrete timelines, funding streams, or clear governance structures for the housing, retail, and recreational components.

Current position—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, and solar panel mandates must be explicitly codified into the building design guidelines rather than left as passive suggestions.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): 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.

Current position—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 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 the District entirely for these services. The plan must mandate these facilities so residents can age in place.

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.

Current position—transit and infrastructure mandates:

- **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, 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, automatic speed caps, and user verification rules within the campus.
- **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 local stops to support local businesses along H Street and Benning Road rather than running as an express service.
- **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.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): 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

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

Current position—public space enhancements:

- **Human-Scale Pedestrian Plazas:** The District should substitute surface parking lots for large, permanently pedestrianized plazas and community amphitheaters modeled after successful civic spaces like Canal Park or Eastern Market Metro Plaza.
- **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.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): 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. Zoning, Riverfront Preservation, and Environmental Impact

- **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 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.

6. Process & Next Steps

1. Discuss, amend, and refine these high-level draft comments during our upcoming July ANC and Committee meetings to incorporate any outstanding neighborhood feedback.
2. Finalize and submit formal ANC 6A comments to OP prior to the **August 14, 2026** deadline.
3. Coordinate a strong presence and clear testimony for the in-person public hearing on **August 1, 2026** at St. Coletta of Greater Washington.

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, or Commissioner Shapiro at 6A03@anc.dc.gov.

On behalf of the Commission,

Amber Gove
Chair, Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A