

Site Plan Review Committee
Community Engagement Comments and Responses
Project – 101 12th Street South

Project Contacts:

SPRC Chair & Co-Chair

Tenley Peterson
tenley.arlington@gmail.com

Elizabeth Gearin
EGearin@egearin.com

County Staff Contact

CPHD Planner
Courtney Badger
703-228-0770
cbadger@arlingtonva.us

DES Planner
Robert Gibson
703-228-4833
rgibson@arlingtonva.us

Applicant Contact

JBG Smith
Robert Vaughan
240-333-3836
rvaughan@jbgsmith.com

Represented by Venable
Kedrick Whitmore
703-905-1514
knwhitmore@venable.com

Site Plan Project Information

Project Name: 101 12th Street South

Items Requested: Block plan, rezoning, site plan amendment, new site plan

Engagement Session #1: July 27 – August 3, 2020

Review Focus Topics: Open Space, Construction Implementation, Community Benefits



About this Document

This document contains all the comments received as a part of the second Site Plan Review Committee’s (SPRC) online engagement for the 101 12th St. project. The comments are sorted by the topics that were highlighted in this review (open space, construction implementation, and community benefits) with SPRC member comments appearing first in the document. All comments beyond the review focus topics are in the “Other Comments” section. In order to sort of the comments by topic, some comments have been split and included in multiple tables. Additionally, you can use the table of contents to easily jump to a particular section or click on the “Return to Table of Contents” link at the bottom of each page to return to the first page of this document.

Contents

About this Document.....	1
Letter from the SPRC Chair	2
Open Space SPRC Comments.....	3
Construction Implementation SPRC Comments.....	8
Community Benefits SPRC Comments.....	9
Other SPRC Comments	15
Community Member Comments	20
Open Space Comments from Community Members.....	20
Construction Implementation Comments from Community Members.....	22
Community Benefits Comments from Community Members.....	23
Other Comments from Community Members	28

Letter from the SPRC Chair

Thank you again to my fellow SPRC members—as well as members of the public—for their work in reviewing updates to the 101 12th St S. project proposal and providing feedback as part of comment period #2. Several changes to the project were introduced since our last comment period, and during this timeframe we looked at open space, construction implementation, and community benefits. While we are still building consensus for the project overall, there were several areas where many members collectively saw improvements.

1. **Improvements** - Since the last comment period, many SPRC members and the public were encouraged to see the applicant’s plan to seek LEED Gold certification. This will help the county meet the energy goals established in the Community Energy Plan. Likewise, the latest proposal saw improved biophilic designs—which would aid in stormwater mitigation and reduce the heat island effect—including expanded green roofs and more trees. In addition, there was considerable support for the bird friendly glass on the east side of the building (though several members called for it to be expanded to wrap around the entire building). SPRC members and the public called for more biophilic features, where possible, as well as more information on the proposed features.
2. **Ball Street Connector** - Members of the SPRC appreciate the improvements made to the Ball Street connector, but several called for more information about why this is considered a community benefit and why staff feel this road will not be used for cut-through traffic. Moreover, safety concerns for pedestrians and bikers on this road (as well as 12th Street South) still need to be addressed.
3. **Open Spaces** - More information is needed about the three green spaces adjacent to this project, including the timeline and process for when those spaces will be improved and accessible to the public. Also, SPRC members and the public need clarification on the legal mechanisms that will give the public access to these areas, as well as the public path to the north of the proposed building. The project is on an open (albeit privately-owned) space that has been used by the neighborhood as a park area, so reassurances for access to green space is appreciated.
4. **Architectural Feature** - Amongst members of the SPRC and the public, there was disagreement about whether the updated proposal was adequate to be considered an architectural feature. While some appreciated the subtle design, to be complemented with public art, others felt the “feature” continues to be unconvincing, especially at such a prominent point in Crystal City.
5. **Environmental Concerns** - While there was consensus that moving to LEED Gold is commendable, it has been noted that if Arlington is to meet our ambitious Community Energy Plan goals, every new building must be designed as carbon neutral or “carbon neutral ready.” Moreover, SPRC members called for more biophilic features, for example bird friend glass around the *entire* building, as well as more information on the biophilic features currently proposed.
6. **Construction** - It is essential that this project be executed with the safety of the neighborhood in mind. Moreover, it needs to follow reasonable guidelines about the appropriate time for staging, deliveries, construction, etc.

The comments in this report, in addition to the feedback provided during comment period #1, have given the applicant and Arlington County staff helpful guidance in furthering this project. This second comment period has positioned us well for our third and final comment period—our live, virtual meeting in mid-September.

As a reminder, this virtual SPRC process is the first of its kind for Arlington County, in light of the coronavirus pandemic. It is, therefore, a pilot process, so we welcome your input about what is working well and what could be improved upon. It is the Planning Commission’s hope that this pilot, regardless of the catalyst, results in effective new engagement tactics that can remain post-pandemic.



Thank you for your contributions to our community.

Tenley Peterson
SPRC Chair Planning Commission

Open Space SPRC Comments

#	Name	Connection to the Project	Open Space Comments	Responses
OS-1	Carrie Thompson & John Bloom	SPRC – E2C2	Open space and biophilic design: We appreciate the addition of more than 6,000 sf of green rooftop, covering 48% of the building’s footprint, progress in reducing the amount of impervious surface, and the addition of trees and plantings due to the downsizing of the cul-de-sac. We encourage further improvements in all of these areas wherever possible to improve stormwater management, reduce the heat island effect, and improve the health and well-being of the community.	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for you comment.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG SMITH will continue to look for opportunities to improve storwater management and reduce heat island effects as the building design matures.</p>
OS-2	David Howell	SPRC – Parks and Recreation Commission	<p>To clarify, and since Arlington has had some issues on this topic, what is the legal mechanism for the open spaces identified in the presentation? It is described as JBGS owned to be dedicated to Arlington County. Is dedicated a legal term? What is the nature of this dedication and how long does that last?</p> <p>As part of the landscaping plan, please provide more detailed information about the design and vegetative assembly on the various green roofs.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG SMITH will dedicate the land for Gateway Park in fee simple, which is a legal means of conveying the land to the County. Arlington would retain this dedication so long as the site is used for a public purpose.</p> <p>Please refer to the original 4.1 submission for details on the design and vegetative assembly of the terraces and roof decks. JBG SMITH will provide additional detail on the design and landscaping of the green roof in an upcoming public meeting.</p>
OS-3	Elizabeth Morton	SPRC – Planning Commissioner	<p>OPEN SPACE: I do feel that "Park 1" should be acknowledged in some more specific way. I'm excited about the potential of the open spaces to the east. I know most planning for these comes later, but I hope that even at this stage a very strong relationship is established between the two parcels to reinforce the fact that they are publicly accessible and that they provide a gateway to a significant public asset (Long Bridge Park).</p>	<p>Staff Response: The applicant will be updating the block plan to acknowledge the Park 1 space and show that it will be provided when that parcel is redeveloped. Additionally, an interim open space area will be provided.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for sharing your feedback on the planned open spaces.</p>

#	Name	Connection to the Project	Open Space Comments	Responses
			<p>This may appear somewhere in the 4.1 or presentations (I did look), but I'd like to see a head on view of the small staircase on the east side leading from the terrace to the finished grade. Ideally this can help activate Gateway Park and provide a strong, and welcoming, connection to the project.</p> <p>I like the wood decking especially on the interior street, which provides a warm, organic, feeling not so typical of Crystal City. I imagine the applicant and staff have/will discuss maintenance, and know it's in the applicant's best interest to carefully consider maintenance issues.</p>	<p>As we have mentioned previously, nothing in the site plan is precluding the possibility of providing Park 1 at some point in the future. The timing for this delivery will be with the eventual redevelopment of the existing 201 12th Street building. The proposed landscape design seeks to reinforce the connectivity between 10th Street, Long Bridge Park, and Gateway Park. Please refer to Sheet A-730 in the submitted 4.1 application for the most relevant currently available rendering of the interaction between the proposed building and the to-be-planned Gateway Park. The exact interaction between the staircase and the planned park will be determined during the County-run design process for Gateway Park.</p> <p>Wood decking used through the northern landscaping will be maintained by JBG SMITH as the operator of the proposed building.</p>
	Jane Siegel	SPRC – Planning Commission	<p>OPEN SPACE: To suggest the open space immediately to the east of the proposed new building can substitute for what is prescribed in the Plan as a distinctive architectural feature either misses the point or is very creative. The revised building design--the glass wrap around the entire east facing facade, however, should be given more time for discussion. I am persuaded by Commissioner Morton's comments to the extent that there is a (likely missed) opportunity here for a more dramatic building with additional articulation. I myself have been impressed with the new buildings JBG Smith has proposed for Central Business district and other sites, using color and higher grade materials but maintaining the CC facade grid design. That is important for a sense of a coherent place, and helps telegraph that one is in a distinct community. All of Paris is made of sandstone, for example. Nevertheless, this site is a gateway, and should announce and celebrate the entrance to LB park. Therefore, please provide more drawings and discussion about how the light might play on the glass frontage; what sort of glass is to</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG SMITH will provide updates on the details of the materials planned for the proposed building as part of the updated 4.1 submission ahead of review by the County Board. In the interim, please refer to the existing renderings of the site for an approximation of how the design will interact with light. Since public art would be placed within the space to be dedicated in fee simple as Gateway Park, the specific design,</p>

#	Name	Connection to the Project	Open Space Comments	Responses
			be used; and, perhaps what sort of art might substitute for the distinctive architectural feature described in the Plan.	requirements, and selection of the art will be part of a County-led process.
	Judy Freshman	SPRC – Crystal City Civic Association	The site is currently an open space favorite of many neighbors but it is planned for development. We can hope that the project isn't begun for years but short of the County purchasing the parcel for open space, the tree canopy and cooling impact of the open space will eventually yield to a building with some constructed landscaping. While small, the proposed new open space adjacent to the entrance to Long Bridge Park should be rich and inviting.	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback and suggestions. Please refer to our response above to Committee Member Chrstier Ahl with regard to the provision of community benefits with this proposed site plan.</p>
	Pamela Van Hine	SPRC – Pedestrian Advisory Commission	<p>Open Space: I also submitted comments about pedestrian routes around several open spaces, which were not included in the first round. I am resubmitting them with additional comments italicized.</p> <p><i>Northern Landscape Corridor (L-105 4.1):</i> Where does it go on its eastern end? The 4.1 plan shows it splitting towards the eastern end. Will the north end connect to the sidewalk network of The Lofts? Does the south end go beyond the yoga studio? How do pedestrians get onto the terrace from the corridor? How will pedestrians get to the Long Bridge Promenade, which is much higher, with a valley in between? Lots of wayfinding signs will be needed.</p> <p><i>Note: I appreciate that significant changes were made to the Northern Landscape Corridor with the removal of the roundabout and better stormwater management. Expanding the NLC area into part of the area that was occupied by the roundabout is a great idea. I am still not clear what happens on the eastern end or how it might connect to the Long Bridge Esplanade, given the grade change. Unfortunately the YouTube video is too blurry to see details of the new plan.</i></p> <p><i>Roundabout Removal: The YouTube video is too blurry to see all the details, but removing it seems to improve both travel space and green space. The existing roundabout, however, has a lovely fountain and landscaping. Can these features be added elsewhere on the site? Maybe a fountain could be added by the SE corner of the building to emphasize it's connection to the park and water and its history.</i></p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. The eastern-edge of the northern landscaping pedestrian path is intended to connect with the to-be-designed Gateway Park. Beyond the connections within the northern landscaping, pathways through the park may provide additional connections to the path along Crystal Lofts. The park will also likely provide connectivity around the building to 12th Street and Long Bridge Park. The feedback on the roundabout removal is taken under advisement. The northern segment of the terrace is associated with the office and is for the use of office tenants. In order to meet building code and typical security requirements, access to this area of the terrace will be limited. The southern area of the terrace located closer to 12th Street is associated with retail uses, and will be accessible to retail patrons. The terrace itself is designed with be level with 12th Street; JBG SMITH has met with the Disability Advisory</p>

#	Name	Connection to the Project	Open Space Comments	Responses
			<p><i>Terrace (no changes to text submitted in first round):</i> The terrace is described as being partially private space, yet pedestrians can access the terrace to visit the retail on the SE corner and take the wooden stairs to the park area. Is the rest of the terrace truly private? If so, how are pedestrians kept out of it? Gates would ruin the aesthetics and create mobility challenges. Any café zone needs to be very small and only on one side. A visual shows tables/chairs on both sides – and does not match the 4.1 proposal. The terrace seems to have too much plantings and seating throughout – leaving insufficient space for pedestrians. How accessible is the terrace? Is it level with the sidewalks on 12th Street? Is there sufficient space for people using wheelchairs to move through the terrace easily? What is the accessible alternative to the stairs – either into the park or down to the circle?</p> <p><i>Gateway Park:</i> I am very happy with the existing section of Gateway Park just the way it is. I hope it stays primarily a lush casual space and does not include the courts described in the CCSP. The pre-planning process with JBGS-BID seems helpful for this park. I think that the parkland next to 101 12th will be hard to program because of the grade changes and I don't think it's a good spot for a playground, as shown in the CCSP, because it's too close to a major intersection and the grade is too challenging.</p>	<p>Commission and can confirm the accessibility of the site and the terrace in particular.</p>
	Steve Sockwell	SPRC – Urban Forestry Commission	<p>We understand that the planning for Gateway Park will be a separate process. Will this also include planning for North Gateway Plaza (designated as area #1 on slides)? If not, when will this park planning process occur?</p>	<p>Staff Response: The applicant will update their submitted block plan to show that the North Gateway Plaza will be delivered with the redevelopment of the western building parcel.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. The planning process for Gateway Park will focus exclusively on the open space east of the proposed building. JBG SMITH is not dedicating the land for North Gateway Plaza to the County nor undertaking any design work for that site at this time. JBG SMITH is exploring other alternative for</p>

#	Name	Connection to the Project	Open Space Comments	Responses
				providing an open space amenity elsewhere within the block as an interim solution.

Construction Implementation SPRC Comments

#	Name	Connection to Project	Construction Implementation Comments	Responses
	Steve Sockwell	SPRC – Urban Forestry Commission	Since there are now mature trees on the parcel that will become Gateway Park, the Urban Forestry Commission strongly recommends preservation of those trees during the construction process.	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for sharing your feedback. Please refer to the submitted 4.1 application for details on the proposed site’s tree preservation plan. JBG SMITH will continue to look for additional opportunities to preserve existing mature trees on the site where possible.</p>
	Pamela Van Hine	SPRC – Pedestrian Advisory Commission	<p>Construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian access around site during construction: If the sidewalk on the north side of 12th will be closed (not ideal), what will be the route for us around the site and at what points will the sidewalk be closed? I suggest just west of the LBP Esplanade on the east end and just east of the major crosswalk that connects to the existing building and PUDO zone to the building exit on the south side. That way pedestrians can still access LBP from Crystal Drive and pedestrians can still use the first crosswalk east of Long Bridge Drive. Please also keep the crosswalk at the intersection of Crystal Drive and 12th open as well. • Keeping the 12th St. sidewalk open and covered would be preferable though, so please explain why it needs to be closed. • Haul Route: What will be the haul route for this project? 	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. We will take your suggestions under advisement as the construction implementation plan is further refined. Full details will be available as part of the Civil Engineering Plan review and approval process, and JBG SMITH will comply with all County standard requirements for construction management.</p>

Community Benefits SPRC Comments

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Benefits SPRC Comments	Responses
	Carrie Thompson & John Bloom	SPRC – E2C2	<p><u>Community Benefits:</u></p> <p>Carbon neutrality: In light of the ongoing and accelerating climate crisis, we believe an essential goal is to achieve carbon neutrality in all new construction in Arlington. Where there is a technical barrier to complete carbon neutrality, we ask for carbon neutral-ready buildings – highly efficient, near-carbon-neutral buildings designed to achieve carbon neutrality with minimal alterations.</p> <p>For Crystal City, achieving carbon neutrality has been a core policy directive (S.1) in the Sector Plan (Section 3.4) since its adoption in 2010. (See, https://projects.arlingtonva.us/neighborhoods/crystal-city-development/crystal-city-sector-plan/) That long-standing policy has been strongly reinforced now that Arlington has made carbon neutrality its community-wide goal for all sectors as part of its Community Energy Plan, along with 100% renewable electricity by 2035.</p> <p>Unless new developments are designed to be carbon neutral, every new building will move us farther away from our goal. Our success depends on a strong partnership between Arlington County and the development community to meet the challenge of carbon neutral development.</p> <p>LEED Scoresheet: We would like to see a copy of the revised LEED Scoresheet as soon as it is available.</p> <p>Zero Carbon evaluation: We are pleased that JBG Smith is evaluating this site for possible Zero Carbon certification. This would be a major step forward, one we are confident the company can achieve. Will JBG Smith share its evaluation with the SPRC and E2C2 at the earliest opportunity?</p> <p>Electrification: We are pleased that the building will be all-electric above the ground floor. We urge JBG Smith to take the next step and make the ground floor tenant spaces all-electric as well. Many coffee shops and similar</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG SMITH understand the importance of aggressive action to tackle the climate crisis and hope to serve as a partner in achieving the County’s sustainability goals. To confirm, the Zero Carbon evaluation will be shared with Arlington County to inform its Green Buildings program and help chart a future path to carbon neutral bulidings. The carbon impact of the materials used in this project will be considered as part of this evaluation.</p> <p>JBG SMITH will also share an updated LEED scoresheet when available.</p> <p>As planned, the current garage will contain four charging stations that would support 8 cars/parking spaces.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Benefits SPRC Comments	Responses
			<p>businesses would prefer to be part of a carbon neutral building and do not require gas connections.</p> <p>Energy efficiency: We look forward to hearing more information on the site’s revised energy efficiency score and Energy Use Intensity (EUI). We support achieving the Zero Carbon certification minimum of a 25% reduction from the ASHRAE 2010 baseline.</p> <p>Renewable energy: We are pleased to hear that onsite and offsite options are under consideration for this site. We continue to urge consideration of a large scale VPPA or similar approach to offset multiple sites at minimal cost.</p> <p>Reducing the life-cycle impact of building materials: We would like information on JBG Smith’s approach to reducing the GHG and environmental impact of concrete, steel and other building materials on this project.</p> <p>Electric Vehicle charging: This site proposes a total of 323 parking spaces, with 255 of them located in an adjacent building, 201 12th St. Unless the adjacent building is planning to provide a large number of charging stations and EV-ready parking spaces, that means that a high percentage of the 68 spaces at 101 12th St. should include charging stations, and the remaining parking spaces should be EV-ready. Properly managed, this approach could help address charging needs at both buildings. Taking this opportunity to address the needs of both buildings makes sense in light of the expectation that EV usage in Crystal City will be high within the next decade, with charging availability emerging as a serious challenge. Will JBG Smith provide information on the number of charging stations it plans to provide, and how many additional spaces will be EV ready?</p>	
	Christer Ahl	SPRC – Crystal City Citizen Review Committee	<p>Sustainability: The expanded and more explicit efforts under this rubric are very much appreciated, even though, in most respects they should really be seen as standard.</p> <p>Community Benefits: I have already commented at length on the proposal for a new street between 12th and 10th Street. But in the context of ‘community benefits’, it must be repeated that this street is something that, as they now openly admit, the applicant specifically needs (for loading dock access). It is</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments on the proejct. Additional analysis of the new road connection it’s benefits to the community can be found in the updated SPRC Staff Report on the project page.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Benefits SPRC Comments	Responses
			<p>then absolutely inappropriate to have the implementation of this street regarded as a ‘community benefit’!</p> <p>The corresponding scope or requirement for contributions should instead to go two other areas. First, seen from the perspective of the Block Plan, the need for a usable public open space at the corner of 12th Street and Long Bridge Drive most not be left unmet until some uncertain future date. Currently, this is not a welcoming or attractive area, but with its prominent location it should urgently be converted into a place of respite for both workers and residents, and at the same also a location for some art work or other feature marking it as a true gateway both for Crystal City and Long Bridge Park. This is urgent in part because of the loss of the de facto ‘open space’ on the site for the proposed 101 12th Street building.</p> <p>Second, this would presumably leave room for the recognition of all or some of the proposed site-specific storm water management effort as a ‘community benefit’. (By contrast, the green roof and the upgrade from a modest LEED Silver to LEED Gold should not be afforded such recognition).</p> <p>Architectural Feature: The proposed ‘wrap-around’ of the glass wall appears to be an acceptable way of distinguishing the southeast corner in response to the Sector Plan requirement in this regard.</p> <p>‘Bottom line’: This proposal now appears ready to move forward to the more formal stages of the review process. The project has been expected all along under the Sector Plan, and the issue has always been when it would be built and not whether it should be built. There is no element of surprise in this. Block B will have open space, and the ‘real’ park, i.e., Gateway Park, remains. Frustrations from neighbors are understandable but not determinant.</p>	<p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback on the site's sustainability commitments, revised architectural feature, and on the project overall.</p> <p>Nothing in the site plan precludes the ability to provide Park #1 as a public open space in the future. JBG SMITH anticipates that full build-out and delivery of Park #1 will occur in conjunction with the eventual redevelopment of the existing 201 12th Street S office building. JBG SMITH is exploring enhancement to alternative spaces within the block plan area to provide an interim open space amenity.</p>
	David Howell	SPRC – Parks and Recreation Commission	The upgraded LEED target from silver to gold is an improvement in commitment and benefit. The reconfiguration of the traffic circle, accompanied by a better design approach to the north side landscaping is one example, as well as the somewhat expanded green roof area. These	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for sharing your feedback. The latest information on the use of bird-friendly glass can be found in</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Benefits SPRC Comments	Responses
			<p>improvements allow a nearly 50% area that has bioretention capacity, as well as mitigating heat island effects.</p> <p>Is there any update on the design/materials decisions on the commitment to a bird-friendly approach to the building's facade? Is the upgraded LEED goal benefited by the Arlington LEED priorities?</p>	<p>SPRC #2. JBG SMITH and the design team are continuing to evaluate materials to determine the right combination that preserves the aesthetics of the building while also limiting the threat of bird strike. For the upgraded LEED goal, regional priorities were already factored into the original LEED Silver commitment. The building design was further refined to enable the LEED Gold commitment.</p>
	Elizabeth Morton	SPRC – Planning Commission	<p>COMMUNITY BENEFITS:</p> <p>I hope you use the methodology developed for POPS as you consider the plans for the public spaces.</p> <p>I know community benefits are considered in an overall package that varies from project to project. However, when we are asked to weigh in on the contributions to park planning (in this case \$300K), it would be helpful to get a sense of what percentage of the park planning the contribution will cover and how the contribution compares to those for other parks.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments. The County's Department of Park and Recreation will lead the park planning process.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. Please refer to staff with regard to public design and planning processes. While the County Staff will ultimately control this process, we assume that the POPS methodology will be employed in this process. The commitment included in the PDSP is intended to assist in engaging a design firm to fully program and design the open space through the future Staff-led effort.</p>
	Jane Siegel	SPRC – Planning Commission	<p>COMMUNITY BENEFITS: S. Ball/10th Street Connector, I agree with Daren Buck, TC SPRC rep. I am not convinced that the narrowed (from the CCSP) 10th Street Connector will take on the rush hour cut through traffic that is feared by the community. I also strongly agree that additional traffic calming measures, speed limits, bollards, speed humps and/or designation as a shared street be provided. I looked at the multi-model transportation analysis and do not understand whether the data provided characterizes existing conditions or what is anticipated as the connection is made. Please explain. I also request that map/exhibits showing the new street AND Crystal Drive in</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. The MMTA provides analysis for three scenarios: 2019 roadway capacity under current conditions (pg. 67), 2023 roadway capacity without the proposed development (pg. 69), and 2023 roadway</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Benefits SPRC Comments	Responses
			<p>one frame, along with the new configuration of what had been the traffic circle as another way of presenting to the community why applicant and staff do not believe that the new street will be crowded with cut through traffic during rush hours.</p>	<p>capacity with the proposed development (pg. 72). JBG SMITH will provide the requested visuals in a future updated MMTA. The anticipated traffic impacts are expected to be minimal.</p>
	Judy Freshman	SPRC – Crystal City Civic Association	<p>The proposed new street on the western edge of the subject site is on County plans. It apparently is needed by the developer, so this proposal meets a County goal at the developer's expense. It is NOT, however, a community benefit. The Civic Association members are very concerned about traffic circulation, exacerbating traffic on 12th Street at the proposed new intersection, and traffic conflicting with garages entrances on the south side of 12th Street. If plans for the new street persist, the new street extension should be narrowed as much as possible and enhanced with wide sidewalks and plantings; mitigation for impacts from vehicles using the new street in both directions should be implemented.</p> <p>Stormwater management is vital to the site especially with ongoing flooding issues in the buildings on the south side of 12th Street. Site improvements are key to managing runoff on the subject site; properly designed they will also benefit adjacent properties.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments. Additional analysis of the new road connection it's benefits to the community can be found in the updated SPRC Staff Report on the project page.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback and suggestions. Please refer to our response above to Christer Ahl with regard to the provision of community benefits with this proposed site plan.</p>
	Pam Van Hine	SPRC – Pedestrian Advisory Commission	<p>Community benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEED Gold should be the minimum for a community benefit (did applicant already commit to that?) • The new Ball Street is not a community benefit, as it primarily will serve the needs of the new office building. 	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments, JBG originally agreed to LEED Silver, but has since furthered the commitment to LEED Gold. Additionally, the new street connector is identified in the Sector Plan and was included in the Crystal City Phases Development Plan.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for sharing your feedback. As part of the negotiated PDSP that includes 101 12th Street, all projects will achieve a minimum of LEED Silver. The project team at JBG SMITH committed to LEED Gold in the SPRC #2 presentation based on further refinements to the building design. Additionally, the S.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Benefits SPRC Comments	Responses
				Ball Street connector is called for in the Crystal City Sector Plan and was included in the previously negotiated PDSP with Arlington County as a community benefit.
	Steve Sockwell	SPRC – Urban Forestry Commission	The topic of sustainability is sometimes lumped together with discussion of Community Benefits. We appreciate the increased green roof areas and reconfiguration of the Cul-de-sac to allow for more bioretention. We recommend that additional trees be planted in these areas since, among other benefits, trees provide green infrastructure that both absorbs storm water and provides shade, reducing the effects of a heat island. Also, we appreciate the use of bird-friendly glass on the eastern facade of the building. Will the rest of this mostly glass building use such glass? If not, we recommend the use to prevent bird strikes.	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. With regard to bird-friendly glass, the design team is evaluating materials and approaches for the building to limit the threat of bird strike while maintaining the aesthetics of the current design.</p>

Other SPRC Comments

#	Name	Connection to Project	Other SPRC Comments	Responses
	Carrie Thompson & John Bloom	SPRC – E2C2	<p>Block Plan B Comment (belated)</p> <p>We note that the Block Plan does not meaningfully discuss sustainability, which is a major section of the Sector Plan that has only grown in importance since its adoption in 2010. We ask that a section be added on this topic. We believe that unless the Site Plan is carbon neutral, it should be noted that this is a deviation from policy directive S.1 calling for Crystal City to achieve operational carbon neutrality. The text should describe how the Block Plan and Site Plan will or will not advance the Sector Plan’s sustainability policy directives, and how it will or will not advance Arlington’s Community Energy Plan goals of carbon neutrality no later than 2050 and 100% renewable electricity by 2035.</p> <p>Water use: We were pleased by the range of water-saving measures under consideration and look forward to an update on the measures JBG Smith will take.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback and suggestions. JBG SMITH defers to staff’s guidance with regard to requiring the inclusion of a specific section on sustainability within the future block plan submission. However, it is worth nothing that much of the work to achieve the County’s sustainability and carbon neutral goals will occur at the building/site plan level (versus the block plan level) and the SPRC process allows for robust public engagement and review.</p>
	Darren Buck	SPRC – Transportation Commission	<p>I do not feel that my prior comments about potential upgrades to adjacent pedestrian and bicycling facilities were adequately addressed in the first round of comment reconciliation. The space constraint for nonmotorized users appears further exacerbated by the applicant’s consideration of using 'flex-zone' space for bioretention. I offered specific recommendations to upgrade a minimal streetscape that is an effective downgrade for people walking and biking to this exciting new open space, without moving build-to lines. A more substantive response was provided regarding the safety of birds than the safety of my daughter and I.</p> <p>This Gateway Park open space is effectively useless to me, as a resident living 1.3 miles away, if I cannot get to it. That is a distance that I am unlikely to walk, and if i am driving to it, that's a problem. The rational way for me to get here should be by bicycle. And the open space is truly the only community proffer considered a "benefit" by the community, as the ambivalent response to the 10th Street S link shows.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG SMITH recognizes the importance of accommodating a wide range of users in the streetscape design along 12th Street. JBG SMITH is continuing to work with Arlington County on this matter.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Other SPRC Comments	Responses
			<p>If the County and applicant are indeed thinking through the actionable recommendations that I made to take advantage of the opportunity presented by reconstruction of two adjacent parcels, I would like to hear how and when those joint efforts will result in true reconciliation of my input. In the 1900 Crystal Dr PDSP, DES staff was guided by the Board to look holistically at this corridor, and to date, no information or progress updates have been provided about that effort. That effort has not been referenced in this site plan review, except by me.</p>	
	David Howell	SPRC – Parks and Recreation Commission	<p>The building design and materials achieve the architectural vision articulated in the first SPRC video. However, there are two unknowns that still need to be addressed. One is the special "gateway" feature, on or in front of the northeast corner, that will be the placemaking, signature. The other is the character and features of the park area between the building and the entry path to Long Bridge Park. These will function, de facto, with the building facade to create the visual identity of the site. I recognize that the park design will be an activity conducted by DPR after approval. And, I recognize that the gateway feature is not technically part of the SPRC2 agenda. But they both interact substantively with the open space/community benefit themes this time. So this is for the record: Those three elements are a single visual concept.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments. The park design will be conducted by Department of Parks and Recreation after the approval of the site plan.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for sharing your additional feedback. We look forward to continuing the discussion of the architectural feature at the upcoming SPRC virtual meeting.</p>
	Elizabeth Morton	SPRC – Planning Commission	<p>PROGRESS SINCE LAST TIME (some of which might fall into Open Space or Community Benefits):</p> <p>I'm glad the project has progressed to LEED Gold.</p> <p>I appreciate the additional space devoted to green roofs and the expansion to the outdoor terraces. To the extent possible, please consider the visual contributions of these green roofs to passersby and adjacent buildings, along with building tenants.</p> <p>I do not feel that wrapping the curtain wall around the corner constitutes a distinct architectural feature. To me this new design is not an improvement in this respect. The "feature" language is indeed broad, I would hope to encourage creativity, but it does seem to call for something more distinctive to mark this prominent gateway location.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments. The comments about the process are appreciated and we hope to be improving with each project, so your feedback is very helpful.</p> <p>Applicant Response: We appreciate your feedback on the progress since our last SPRC presentation and we'll do our best to better verbally "footnote" in future presentations where specific details can be found in additional resources. We look forward to continuing the discussion of the architectural feature at the upcoming SPRC virtual meeting.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Other SPRC Comments	Responses
			<p>GENERAL:</p> <p>I appreciate the general clarity of both Mr. Vaughn's and Ms. Badger's presentations (especially her color highlighting). The amount of information and presentations on the project website is already a bit overwhelming, so I appreciate it when staff or applicant refers to something specific for more information (e.g. when Mr. Vaughn's directs people to the MMTA and notes where it is on the web page, or when Ms. Badger notes that you could get more views of the landscape design in the applicant's presentation). As we accumulate even more information and revisions, I'd encourage you to be as specific as possible if there is something important, contentious, or simply changed, that people might want a closer look at (even referring to sections of the 4.1). I know you can't possibly feature every view and issue in 10 minutes. There have been requests to include the actual slide presentation as a complement to video; that would enable presenters (and SPRC members!) to refer to "slide 6 of the June presentation," e.g.</p>	
	Pam Van Hine	SPRC – Pedestrian Advisory Commission	<p>12th Street Sidewalk: In my comments in Round 1, I noted that the existing Clear Zone was being cut from 10' to 8' and recommended these changes (which were included in the matrix):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand proposed Landscaping Zone to promote tree growth: CCMTS recommends a minimum of 6' Landscaping Zone for 12th Street. Proposed Landscaping Zone is insufficient to support healthy tree growth. Minimum width should match Urban Forestry recommendations. Reduce 5.5' Flex Zone to 3.5' Shy Zone (maximum) so that Clear Zone can remain 10' wide. Note: Do not put tables/chairs by sidewalk as shows in L-102 – there is not enough space. Move them around onto the terrace, if needed (remove some of the plantings shown). <p><u>Not</u> included in the matrix were my justifications for keeping the 10 Clear Zone, so I am resubmitting them (I also italicized a bit of new text):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 12th Street Clear Zone should remain a minimum of 10' wide because: The CCSP recommends: "Great, not just adequate, sidewalks should be provided on both sides of every street." (3.6.4 – with "most are 8' and 10' minimum"). This section of the CCSP further states: "Over time, sidewalk accommodations should continue to be assessed and upgraded as part of development projects to adequately accommodate the prevailing flows of people travelling to and from Crystal City" and "Enhancing the street-level 	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for all of your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG SMITH is studying the inclusion of a 10' clear zone along 12th Street and its impact on planned retail uses as well as on planned stormwater bio-retention facilities along the building.</p> <p>JBG SMITH will provide updated plans for the pedestrian experience along 10th Street in a future update.</p> <p>JBG SMITH is in conversations with Staff to determine the appropriate place for PUDO along 12th Street versus the new S. Ball Street. The PUDO at the back of the proposed building near Crystal Lofts is currently</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Other SPRC Comments	Responses
			<p>pedestrian experience through sidewalk and street improvements is a major objective of this Plan.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CCMTS recommends a 10’ Clear Zone for 12th St. east of Route One; the MTP Street Element recommends between 6-12’ minimum, per MMTA • This sidewalk is close to one of the main entrances to Long Bridge Park – it needs to be a welcoming, expanded space – and it always has heavy pedestrian traffic going to and from the park. • 12th Street is a key pedestrian route in our neighborhood, as acknowledged in the MMTA. Pedestrians are funneled onto either 12th or 18th to move between Crystal City and the neighborhoods on the other side of Route One. We have no other safe alternatives. • The 12th Street sidewalk is the main link between Crystal City and the Pentagon City Metro stop and the critically needed retail along 12th in Pentagon City. Currently Crystal City has neither a grocery store nor a drug store, but both are available further west along 12th Street. • Pedestrians travel east on the 12th Street sidewalks to reach the Crystal City Connector, the VRE station, Water Park, and restaurants and retail along Crystal Drive. • During Covid-time we are stressed by trying to walk on sidewalks that are too narrow and too crowded to support safe social distancing - a major problem throughout 22202 <i>and a new County emergency ordinance to maintain social distance</i>. Let’s build the 12th Street sidewalks at least 10’ wide to make walking on them pleasant and restorative – <i>and safe for everyone</i>. <p>I regret that the plans for the 12th Street sidewalk have not been changed in response to the many comments you received. I feel strongly that there is no room for a café zone outside the café on the south side and that the café zone around the corner – and the park space beyond – should suffice. Please pull back the 5.5’ “flex zone” to no more than a 3.5’ shy zone, which should be more than sufficient for building entry, and return the space to the clear zone.</p> <p>What is the <i>enhanced pedestrian experience</i> between the two buildings? What is the pedestrian path between parking at 201 and offices at 101 12th? Please illustrate the path and the “enhancements.” Will this experience be available to all</p>	<p>planned to accommodate two passenger vehicles.</p> <p>Employee bicycle parking is located within the ground floor of the proposed building, next to the proposed shower and changing room facilities. Please refer to sheet L-102 for details on the location of bicycle racks along 12th Street. The proposed site plan for 101 12th Street does not currently include a bikeshare station; this could be added at a later date or incorporated into the design of Gateway Park (which will be led by the County).</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Other SPRC Comments	Responses
			<p>pedestrians? (<i>My comments were neither posted nor addressed in the initial round, so I am resubmitting them</i>).</p> <p>No <i>PUDO zone</i> is described or illustrated (that I could find) <i>in the first round</i>. Where will very short term parking for <i>PUDO</i> be located? <i>PUDO</i> should not be along 12th Street because of conflicts and insufficient space. Existing taxi zones are too far from the new building. <i>Note: A PUDO zone has been added to some of the space reclaimed by the removal of the roundabout. How does this space interact with the revised Northern Landscape Corridor? How will passengers enter the building from the PUDO zone? How many spaces are available? How will people reach the retail on 12th if they are dropped off in PUDO zone, especially if they have disabilities?</i></p> <p><i>Bike and micromobile parking</i>, especially for visitors: Where will scooters park (employee-owned and visiting rented)? Will a bike-share station be added? Close to the park entrance would be great! Can more outside temporary bike parking be added?</p> <p>Miscellaneous:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architectural feature: Using curtain glass going around the corner is an improvement. What does the building look like from the south with this change? • Existing broken sidewalk on 10th: Please fix the sidewalk on the south side of 10th, next to the existing JBG building. The sidewalk is in terrible shape, with bad curb cuts for driveways and lots of damage. Thanks. 	

Community Member Comments

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
Open Space Comments from Community Members				
	Ben D'Avanzo		<p>From the renderings, it appears the pedestrian pathway along the building (made of wood) duplicates the existing pedestrian paved path by the Lofts. If so, is there a way these can be more holistically combined into one shared path of pavement and wood? Perhaps meeting at times and separating, whereas now it appears the path has a barrier the entire time except for once. Or maybe incorporating art elements into the new path? Otherwise I think it may not be well utilized.</p> <p>To clarify my question from SPRC 1, will the terrace that overlooks the north side of the building, but appears connected to 12th st, be open to the public or only for building occupants?</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for sharing your feedback. The current design has connection points at the current cul-de-sac, midway down the path (with the steps), and also with Gateway Park. Links between Gateway Park and the paved path along Crystal Lofts will be decided during a later design & public planning process for the park.</p> <p>With regard to the terrace, the portion closest to 12th Street is planned outdoor seating for the adjacent retailer; the northern portion of the terrace is for the private use of the office tenant.</p>
	Carol Fuller		<p>OpenSpace</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Although the redesign of Gateway park would come during a separate process, there is great concern in the community about losing the tranquil 12th Street park. The loss of mature trees there must be compensated for with trees and a forest walk in Gateway Park. •Why can the applicant not consider a green wall facing the Esplanade and park instead of a solid glass wall, no matter how bird friendly the glass might be? This could be the architectural feature and complement the open space in the parks. 	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback on the site's proposed open spaces. The site's landscape design has been intentionally crafted to potentially connect with the to-be-designed Gateway Park. JBG SMITH appreciates the architectural design comments and takes them under advisement.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Pleased to see that the applicant is reconsidering providing Leed Gold rather than just the minimum Silver and also considering expanding the green roof. This should be required as part of the approval process in accordance with the County’s energy goals. These are small compensation for destroying the 12th Street park (even though it is private) with its mature trees. Replacement of the tree canopy with a concrete structure will increase the urban heat island effect in our area. This problem has been widely studied across the architecture and landscape architecture industries. There are plenty of studies that indicate increased development is cause for concern if the heat island effect is not taken into consideration. This includes potential health problems. 	
	Laura K. Larson		<p>Please do not build or develop that wonderful little park.</p> <p>Please do not develop that beautiful park on 12th street and crystal drive. We need those trees and green space.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback.</p>
	Nancy Iacomini		<p>Open Space:</p> <p>The changes to the walkway along the Northern edge are thoughtful and the use of the wooden walkways interesting. The improvements seem to be on JBG land – but intended for public use. Will there be a public access easement on the walkway area?</p> <p>Since the building at this point is speculative and won’t be constructed until there’s tenant there is a possibility a tenant may want to limit public access near the building, and this could mean the area meant as a public walkway would not be public. This could also occur with the landscaping along the rear of the building as it faces Long Bridge Park.</p> <p>We are being told now these areas will be “public” but absent an easement there is no guarantee of the “public-ness” of these areas.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. The current landscape design provides opportunities to connect 10th Street with Long Bridge Park via the to-be-designed Gateway Park. Per the commitments in the PDSP, JBG SMITH is dedicating in fee simple the space for Gateway Park, but that dedication does not include the northern portion of site between the proposed building and Crystal City lofts.</p>
	Nancy Springer		<p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this project, and thanks for being innovative and providing this platform to solicit community input despite the current limitations on in-person forums.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>Open Spaces: The proposed building will occupy a substantial portion of the current passive green space. That loss is immitigable; however, the PDSP attempts to lessen the impact by tying together the entirety of Crystal City's green, open spaces, including the portion of the proposed Gateway Park located slightly south & east of the building.</p> <p>The additional green plantings and green roof space, as described in the updated applicant brief, are beneficial in that they increase the pervious areas, decrease the heat island effect, and assist in managing storm water.</p>	<p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback.</p>
<p>Construction Implementation Comments from Community Members</p>				
	Carol Fuller		<p>Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the disruption construction will cause, the applicant should be required to sign pre-lease agreements at 25% occupancy before construction starts. Pile driving must be limited in hours to avoid the extensive disruption to residents during the construction of HQ2 on S. Eads Street. Haul Route: What will the route be for construction vehicles? Construction trucks for 101 S 12ath Street should be limited to 12th Street and then to 395. Noise is a major disturbance for residential areas when loaded trucks violate this rule. 	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: As noted above, JBG Smith does not intend to start construction of 101 12th Street without an anchor tenant that has pre-leased for the site. JBG SMITH will comply with standard County conditions for keeping the community informed about site construction. Additional construction details will be available through Civil Engineering Plan (CEP) approval process, specifically in the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) section.</p>
	Eric Cassel		<p>Construction Activities.</p> <p>Given the residential nature of the surrounding buildings, it is important to understand the construction hours and times. For two years, I do not want to be woken up at 5AM. What about weekends? Will the residents ever get any sleep?</p> <p>In addition, providing parking is essential for the community. The applicant has extra parking space in the nearby building and forcing workers to park on the street is bad for the community.</p>	<p>Staff Response: County Code has limits on days and hours of construction activities. Those standards can be found here on the County's Code Enforcement website.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG SMITH will comply with standard County conditions</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
				<p>regarding permitted hours for construction activities. The exact times will be agreed upon within the forthcoming Site Plan Conditions.</p> <p>As noted in the 4.1 submission and in our SPRC presentations, the parking required for 101 12th Street will be provided in part by a small parking deck on the bottom floor of the proposed building and in part by excess capacity in the 201 12th Street Garage.</p>
	Nancy Springer		<p>Construction Implementation:</p> <p>The JBG Smith presentation's briefer noted that the construction start is contingent upon acquiring an "anchor tenant." In addition to ensuring an anchor tenant pre-lease, will the County impose a minimum number (or percentage) of additional pre-lease commitments prior to authorizing the project start? My concern is additional commercial vacancies in the area.</p> <p>The briefer noted that JBG Smith plans to use portions of 10th & 12th Street for staging during construction. What is the company's communications plan to fully inform the community of disruptions, traffic or otherwise, this action will likely cause?</p>	<p>Staff Response: The project will be conditioned based on County permitting milestones.</p> <p>Applicant Response: As noted above, JBG Smith does not intend to start construction of 101 12th Street without an anchor tenant pre-leased for the site. JBG SMITH will comply with standard County conditions for keeping the community informed about site construction, including scheduling a pre-construction community meeting. Additional details will be available through Civil Engineering Plan (CEP) approval process in the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) section.</p>
Community Benefits Comments from Community Members				
	Barbara Selfridge		<p>Community Benefits</p> <p>The 10th Street Connection</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>The 10th Street Connection “will link 10th and 12th Streets and provide a direct connection to development north of 12th Street and to the west.” (Sector Plan p. 34) This goal of the Sector Plan reflects the aim of creating an urban street grid throughout Crystal City.</p> <p>While the proposed plan will link 10th and 12th Streets, it will not “provide a direct connection to development north of 12th Street or to the west.”</p> <p>As aerial pictures in the staff and applicant materials suggest, the connector and 101 12th Street site can be seen as part of a larger block. This block is bounded by 12th Street on the north, Long Bridge on the west, 6th Street on the south, and the esplanade to the east.</p> <p>The most notable thing about this large block is the fact that the existing streets, alley and the proposed connector cannot be extended any further during the foreseeable future.</p> <p>--Long Bridge Drive is flanked by the high wall of elevated Route 1. The VDOT study about bringing Route 1 down to grade does not extend to this area. With the wall remaining, there will be no new grid sections to the west. Both 10th and 6th Streets will end at Long Bridge Drive.</p> <p>--The Sector Plan does not envision changes to the existing building group on the north side of 12th Street, and the complex arrangements among the buildings suggest that changes across the street from the proposed connector are unlikely. For example, the pool area of a condominium that faces Crystal Drive extends into the area of 12th Street across from the proposed connector. It appears that a part of the garage entry/exit may as well.</p> <p>These facts suggest two things: (1) The proposed connector should not be deemed a community benefit and (2) if the connector is necessary because there is no modification that can be made to handle loading/trash elsewhere on the site, the connector be structured not as a public street but more as a private lane.</p>	<p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG Smith’s provision of the 10th Street Connection is in accordance with the recommendations of the Sector Plan and the requests of staff.</p> <p>Likewise, we have proposed the dedication of the park area in accordance with the recommendations of the Sector Plan and the requests of staff. Staff will be facilitating an open space design process to take into account community feedback on the design and use of the park.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>Green Space On West Side of the Esplanade</p> <p>Less Green Space than Sector Plan Shows: The proposed building is sited closer to the esplanade than the conceptual building for the site in the Sector Plan, diminishing the amount of green space adjacent to current entrance to Long Bridge Park.</p> <p>The Sector Plan shows the east facade of the conceptual building for the site being significantly west of the adjacent Loft building's east side. Especially because all of the neighboring buildings to the north and south of the now-proposed building existed when the Sector Plan was published, this siting to the west of the Lofts' east facade suggests that the placement of the conceptual nbuilding was done on purpose.</p> <p>In fact, residents were assured during the development of the Sector Plan that the building that would go on that site would not block the views of residents living in the condominiums across the way on Crystal Drive. I have confirmed this fact with the Sector Plan's Crystal City Representative. The proposed building violates the promise.</p> <p>In doing so, the building described as “hugging the park,” hugs it too tightly, changing the existing, inviting green abutting the entrance to the looming facade of a building.</p> <p>Green Space, Met Park Feedback, and the Pandemic: The overall feedback on Met Park plans suggests that respondents generally preferred the “Forest Walk” to the “Social Gardens.” This general preference for biophilia has also expressed itself in many of the comments made to date on the 101 12th Street project.</p> <p>With the pandemic, the importance of green space and wide sidewalks has grown in importance. People are crossing streets and walking in them to avoid being close to others. The green spaces in the northeastern part of Crystal City are being increasing used: real grass areas in Long Bridge Park are peopled throughout the day and evenings, especially for long periods under the not-so-many trees; yogi classes, picnics, and small g</p>	

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
	Carol Fuller		<p>Community Benefits: This section of comments was not included in the matrix of the first round and is therefore repeated here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Increase and the proposed 10th Street Connection: The question that arises is: Whom would the street benefit? Not residents. What is the problem that this street would actually solve? This is not a community benefit that the community has requested, but one which the County seems to want. The community would much rather see an increased community benefit from this site plan for parks in Crystal City. • Crystal Drive was not designed to handle the level of traffic and varied transportation levels we are currently experiencing, including the soon to come Metroway to Pentagon City which will come up to 12th Street, round a dangerous 90-degree curve and travel down 12th Street. • The community opposes a full service urban center road. It would aggravate the growing traffic problems we are seeing on Crystal Drive and 12th Street, especially during rush hour. Cars regularly back up on 12th Street now from the light at Long Bridge Drive around the corner to Crystal Drive during peak hours. • This road would quickly become a cut through for commuters to reach 395, going either north or south. Putting traffic down a steep grade to the residential circle on 10th Street in order to avoid the traffic light and cut through to Long Bridge Drive would not benefit anyone but commuters. Traffic volume is likely to increase when the new Aquatic Center opens in 2021. • Safety Concerns: It is difficult to exit the garages on 12th Street from the Crystal Gateway block during rush hour now, given the traffic and the parking spaces on both sides of the garage exits which hinder visibility of traffic. The proposed 10th Street connection would be directly across from the garage exits and make a dangerous situation worse. • The County should not consider this a community benefit. Consider other design options. At least why not a pedestrian priority street with a tree canopy, wide enough only to allow access for emergency vehicles and access to the loading dock? 	<p>Staff Response: The road connection is identified in the Crystal City Sector Plan and was a part of the community benefits approved in the Crystal City Phased Development Plan. Please see the staff SPRC report for more information and analysis of the new 10th St. connector road.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG Smith’s provision of the 10th Street Connection is in accordance with the recommendations of the Sector Plan and the requests of staff. The original MMTA found no significant traffic impacts from the provision of S. Ball Street/10th Street Connection.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
	Nancy Springer		<p>Community Benefits:</p> <p>Can you define, or list, the County goals that the developer's actions will satisfy, such as advancing County energy goals by building to LEED standards? I erroneously included community benefits comments as part of my online engagement session #1 input. My comments pointed out the potential benefits to the developer, versus the community, by improving the property & making it more attractive to potential tenants. Part of the response noted that though the community benefits may aid the developer, they also advance County goals.</p>	<p>Staff Response: The community benefits are based on Sector Plan Goals (which can be seen here). Additionally, this project's community benefits were a part of the Crystal City Phased Development plan, which included a full discussion. That report can be found here (discussion starting on p. 14).</p> <p>Applicant Response: As noted in prior presentations, the proposed site will achieve LEED Gold status, incorporate bird-friendly materials, include an expanded green roof and substantial landscaping to mitigate heat island effect, provide a net increase in pervious surfaces on the site, and improve stormwater management over current conditions, all of which are beyond the commitments made in the PDSP that was approved by the County Board in March. The PDSP agreement includes the dedication of the 54K sf Gateway Park in fee simple, \$300K to aid the county in planning efforts, as well as an energy use reduction commitment.</p>
	Susan English		<p>I do not live in Crystal City; I'm a representative of ARCA on the Crystal City Citizen Review Council. I support the project, as the development of new Class A office space is part of a long term plan, and a benefit for CC and the area. I believe the project provides an opportunity for the transition area between the project and Gateway Park (and the entrance to Long Bridge) to have a welcoming and aesthetically pleasing design. I remain disappointed that the 'community benefit' is a street needed for a building loading dock, when addressing stormwater problems in the immediate area of Gateway Park could have truly benefited many neighbors in the area, including the Lofts.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments, please see the past presentations for more information on the stormwater management and the design of the new road connection.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. We kindly refer you to review the SPRC #2 presentation for</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
				<p>details on the stormwater management program. The site plan proposes 1.39 acres of impervious surface, but introduces 1.5 acres of either green roof, bio-retention, or impervious surface connected to a manufactured treatment device. As designed, over 75% of the building's stormwater will be managed by bio-retention facilities onsite; the remainder is detained in an onsite underground vault. The proposed design results in a runoff reduction that exceeds state requirements.</p>
<p>Other Comments from Community Members</p>				
	Ben D'Avanzo		<p>Thank you for the presentation and the responses to the comments in SPRC1. I think the improvements you made to the architectural feature and the cul-de-sac are in the right direction, though the former still lacks for distinctiveness. More green roof and LEED gold are great as well, though of course, I would encourage you to always strive higher.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback.</p>
	Eric Cassel		<p>Architecture Feature</p> <p>While I appreciate the problem this item has been for the applicant, a feature is required. What the community is looking for is something that makes the building stand out. A feature that emphasizes the building's relationship to the local setting. A pure glass wall is not a feature. There is nothing unique or interesting about a glass wall.</p> <p>For example, at 1400 Crystal Drive they added an interesting light feature that highlighted the building. A feature is something original and unique, not a boring wall. Something creative. Something that grabs a person's attention.</p> <p>How about working with a creative visual artist to add a light or LED feature?</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments. See the staff report prepared for the SPRC process for more analysis about the road.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. Your comments are taken under advisement. JBG SMITH continues to work with Arlington County on the appropriate design for the new S. Ball Street between 12th Street and 10th Street.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>Or on the corner make it a rounded glass turret? Something that you go WOW.</p> <p>12th Street</p> <p>The latest design is an improvement. But what about making the new road a pedestrian road with local access vs a normal vehicle road?</p>	
	Greg Zacharias		<p>In an earlier window for community responses I had several questions which I do not feel were adequately answered. They are as follows:</p> <p>First, under CC-6, I asked about the proposed height, and had two questions about same. I asked how the ASE of 26.8' was calculated, which from the applicant's drawings show it to be about 3' below the highest site elevation on the 12th St side of the site. The zoning ordinance calls for it to be calculated based on the average elevation on the perimeter of the property. Since the property slopes uniformly down from 12th St to 10th St on the north side of the site, by about 14', one would expect an ASE lower by about 14'/2, or 7' lower, or closer to an ASE of 20'. How is it mathematically possible to arrive at the higher figure claimed? That was why I asked to see how the ASE was calculated, and if it was in conformance with the zoning regulations. The Staff Response was that that ASE was required to be calculated in a certain manner, and the Applicant Response was that it was calculated in a certain manner. However, no actual calculations were provided. Without seeing specifically how the calculations were performed, how can one see that it is in conformance with the zoning regulations? Please provide a more specific response to my original question: what actual calculations were made to determine the ASE of 26.8'?</p> <p>Second, also under CC-6, I asked about the more general issue of spot zoning requested by the applicant and the associated potential for increased density and development expansion. The area is currently zoned for C-O-1.5, which is very permissive in terms of building heights, floor area ratios and the like. Why is this kind of spot zoning change to C-O Crystal City Commercial Mixed Use being requested? The Staff Response was that this is common practice, and the Applicant Response was that this is not "spot zoning", and, even if it were, that it's justified because of the "community benefits" provided by the spot zoning change. Obviously, it is spot zoning by any working definition of the term</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments. Please see past staff responses to your comments in addition to the information provided below:</p> <p>For more information on rezoning to C-O Crystal City, please see page 134 of the Crystal City Sector Plan.</p> <p>Each site plan project has a set of conditions that are attached to the staff report that goes to the County Board for approval. Those conditions are in place until there is a request for an amendment. The process for an amendment varies depending on the nature of the request, but often requires additional County Board action.</p> <p>More information about the site plan process (including standard site plan conditions) can be found on the County's webpage.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. Please refer back to our responses from SPRC #1.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>when you change the zone of an individual site within a more broadly zoned area, generally so the developer can exceed the originally zoned constraints on development. And as for the “community benefits”, the community is clearly up in arms about the **loss** of benefits, including the loss of open space, the increase in traffic, and the drop in automobile/pedestrian safety due to the proposed Ball St cut through.</p> <p>The answers I received with respect to this spot zoning issue, from the staff, was: “The C-O Crystal City district allows for the community benefits in exchange for additional density.” And just what benefits are those? Extra housing, better views, more open space, less traffic density? And from the applicant, the answer was: “To develop this site as envisioned in the Crystal City Sector Plan, the applicant needed to pursue a rezoning.” The first response is not an answer, and does not account for the **reduction** in community benefits that will result from this development. And the second is clearly a non-response masquerading as one.</p> <p>We are being presented with a particular site plan that may or may not be in conformance with C-O-1.5 regulations. Should the spot zoning change be allowed to C-O Crystal City, what kind of agreement is the applicant willing to enter into that assures us that the development will not violate the already dense parameters of building height, FAR, parking, and the like? What is to stop someone, say a different developer, several years from now, from proposing an entirely different design that imposes even more egregious loads on the community. The Staff Response to my earlier question of a similar nature was: “...there will be extensive conditions that “run with the land” and require any future owner of the property to abide by the conditions or seek an amendment.” What are these conditions, and how can they be amended? As far as I can tell from the published record, there was no response from the applicant.</p> <p>Third, under CC-21, I asked (1) if the parking space count was in conformance with regulations under either C-O-1.5 or proposed C-O Crystal City zones, (2) whether the potentially usable parking at 201 12 St S was being “double counted” for both sites, and (3) whether 201 12 St S would be non-conforming if some sort of in-perpetuity agreement were struck between the two</p>	

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>buildings, irrespective of current or future ownership. There was no Staff Response to any of these questions. The Applicant Response was that “The garage at 201 12th Street is currently both overparked and underutilized.” This is a hard answer to parse. I would appreciate an answer from the staff on how this planning for inadequate parking at 101 12th St S will be dealt without a “spot parking requirements” change to the regulations for this particular site, or that of 201 12th St S, or both.</p> <p>Finally, also under CC-21, I expressed concern earlier that the proposed Ball St cut through not only adds another intersection within a few car lengths of an existing 90 deg turn that connects the main thoroughfare of Crystal Drive with 12th St, but it also places the intersection almost directly next to the only exit/entry from the garage serving 1200 Crystal Drive and 200 12th St S. If I’m reading the referenced Transportation Assessment correctly, particularly Figs 34 and 35, that garage entrance does not seem to be part of the traffic study. As I noted earlier, the traffic study seems to show only one garage entrance on 12th St, closer to S Clark St, but not the one nearest to the proposed intersection. I think some clarification is called for here, especially since this garage entrance also serves as a loading dock for both buildings, requiring many delivery trucks to enter, back out, and double park throughout the day to effect their deliveries. Making this area into an active intersection seems particularly antithetical to good traffic safety design fundamentals. I would be interested in a more specific Staff Response, one that elaborates on the previous response: “You can view the Transportation Assessment that was done on the project webpage.”</p>	
	John Seymour		<p>As the representative of EcoAction Arlington, I welcome the opportunity to comment on this project. EcoAction Arlington’s mission is to protect and improve water, air, and open spaces in the Arlington community by promoting stewardship of our natural resources and overall environmental sustainability.</p> <p>Energy Use: EcoAction Arlington believes that, overall, the proposal’s energy saving goals have improved in recent weeks. Similar to other commenters, EcoAction Arlington believes that the original goal of LEED Silver did not sufficiently advance the County’s carbon neutrality goal. We understand that the project has now committed to achieve LEED Gold, at a minimum, and</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG SMITH is committed to sustainable building design, and has committed to a LEED Gold certification for the project that is beyond the LEED Silver commitment from the PDSP. Additionally, the project will complete Zero Carbon Evaluation in order to help</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>welcome that change. We look forward to a revised proposal that fully implements that commitment.</p> <p>We remain concerned, however, that the project has not committed to conduct a Zero Carbon evaluation. As you know, Arlington County’s Community Energy Plan has established a goal of carbon neutrality and has issued a Green Building Density Incentive Program to help achieve that goal. Among other recommendations, the Program established Zero Carbon Certification as an acceptable compliance path for Site Plan projects, like this one, seeking bonus density.</p> <p>In order to earn certification, Zero Carbon buildings must, among other things, off-set 100% of the project’s energy use through newly installed on-site or off-site renewable energy. We understand from the project’s public statements that it is now “exploring the potential to include on-site solar and/or purchase renewable energy.” We also understand that the project engineers will be “evaluating the feasibility of zero carbon certification.” We strongly urge the project designers and engineers to incorporate renewable energy into the project design and seek zero carbon certification.</p> <p>As you know, Arlington County and Amazon have recently partnered with Dominion Energy to purchase renewable energy certificates from the new Amazon/Arlington solar farm. Arlington has, in the past, purchased such certificates from other non-Virginia sources to reduce its own carbon footprint. We hope that JBG, which owns and operates a large portfolio of buildings in Arlington, undertakes similar investments in renewable energy to help the County achieve its energy goals.</p> <p>Stormwater:</p> <p>EcoAction Arlington is also pleased that the project’s green space has been increased substantially in the most recent plans. The original plans provided for a number of small scattered parcels. The acreage now proposed for green roofs has been increased, we believe, to 1.5 acres. The proposed narrowing of Ball Street will also, we understand, provide for much wider street median planting areas, as well as larger planting boxes. The enlarged green spaces</p>	<p>advise Green Building Staff on the tradeoffs associated with achieving such a commitment.</p> <p>We kindly refer you to review the SPRC #2 presentation for details on the stormwater management program. The site plan proposes 1.39 acres of impervious surface, but introduces 1.5 acres of either green roof, bio-retention, or impervious surface connected to a manufactured treatment device. As designed, over 75% of the building’s stormwater will be managed by bio-retention facilities onsite; the remainder is detained in an onsite underground vault. The proposed design results in a runoff reduction that exceeds state requirements.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>should both improve on-site management of stormwater and reduce the documented serious heat island effect experienced by Crystal City residents today.</p> <p>We would hope, however, that the project team provides additional information on the various elements of its biophilic design. The materials provided to date do not provide sufficient detail on how the proposal will achieve its goal of “meeting or exceeding” Arlington’s stormwater management goals. In particular, although the engineers note that they will design “a cohesive, linked, site-wide rainwater management strategy that best mimics the site’s natural hydrology,” there is little detail provided on pervious surfaces, bio-retention facilities, rain gardens, or other elements of this strategy. We urge the design team to provide additional information on these key design features and clarify how stormwater management will achieve Arlington’s stormwater goals and reduce pollutant releases to the Chesapeake Bay.</p> <p>Arlington’s stormwater system is aging and, in many areas, is seriously under-capacity. The project area has been subject to flooding in the past. Arlington’s stormwater system is aging and, in many areas, is seriously under-capacity. The project area has been subject to flooding in the past. We note the developer’s commitment to “explore opportunities to enhance stormwater management facilities in adjacent public spaces,” but the project plans provide no detail into what these opportunities might be. We are pleased that the project engineers recognize the need for coordinated and area-wide approaches to stormwater management and urge them to continue to work closely with Arlington County on solutions. The documented recent problems with Arlington’s stormwater capacity, together with the proximity of the Potomac River and Roaches Run, underscore the need for innovative engineering solutions to reduce urban stormwater in Crystal City.</p> <p>Community Benefits: The project’s “community benefits” appear to respond appropriately to the significant concerns raised by many civic associations and community members about the loss of passive green space caused by the new building. We understand that the developer has committed to dedicate 54,000 square feet of adjacent area for a new Gateway Park, to be linked to the Long</p>	

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			Bridge Esplanade. The developer has also agreed to provide an additional \$300,000 in park planning funding.	
	Joyce Barr		<p>With future increased density, I am interested in any workarounds or plans to enable more pedestrian traffic along with the inevitable increased scooter, jogger and bicycle use on Crystal Drive and 12th Street South.</p> <p>I am worried that the proposed cut through from 12th to 10th street will create a perilous traffic situation as cars use this route to access I 395.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments, see the staff SPRC report for more analysis on the traffic and the new road.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. JBG SMITH and Arlington County are continuing to evaluate the streetscape along 12th Street with regard to pedestrian and micromobility uses.</p>
	Nancy Iacomini		<p>Comments on Follow Up:</p> <p>I appreciate the applicant working with staff on the creation of the absent architectural feature. The proposed change – to have the eastern façade wrap the corner – is interesting. However, it still does not comport with the definition of architectural feature. It does not provide a unique marker – it is an extension of a façade. A change in material for augmentation of existing material for an emphasis on the corner that is different from either façade could create an architectural feature without having to interject any new materials. It still needs work.</p> <p>The increase in the amount of green roof is a good addition to the project.</p> <p>The updates to South Bell Street that eliminate impervious surface are very welcome.</p> <p>The changes to the walkway along the Northern edge are thoughtful and the use of the wooden walkways interesting. The improvements seem to be on JBG land – but intended for public use. Will there be a public access easement on the walkway area?</p> <p>Since the building at this point is speculative and won't be constructed until there's a tenant there is a possibility a tenant may want to limit public access</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for sharing your feedback. As detailed above, the current landscape design seeks to connect 10th Street with Long Bridge Park via the to-be-designed Gateway Park. Per the commitments in the PDSP, JBG SMITH is dedicating in fee simple the space for Gateway Park, but that dedication does not include the northern portion of site between the proposed building and Crystal City lofts. JBG SMITH is not providing an easement for space in question.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>near the building, and this could mean the area meant as a public walkway would not be public. This could also occur with the landscaping along the rear of the building as it faces Long Bridge Park.</p> <p>We are being told now these areas will be “public” but absent an easement there is no guarantee of the “public-ness” of these areas.</p>	
	Patricia Heath		<p>Any encroachment onto Crystal Drive to provide construction room would be a mistake, in my opinion. Taking away a parking lane in this already overcrowded area will exacerbate all current problems. Plus, as we've seen between 15th and 18th, shutting off one lane tends to "creep" so it's really a-lane-and-a-couple-feet-more, which pushes traffic into the oncoming lane where, as here, there's only one lane in the first place. I'm not sure either 12th Street or the sidewalk on the non-construction side can safely absorb all the pedestrian/vehicular traffic.</p> <p>I don't think the "architecture feature" is impactful, nor does it achieve the stated goal.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for sharing your feedback. Construction staging will consistent with standard Arlington County site plan conditions. Additional details will be available through the County’s Civil Engineering Plan approval process.</p>
	Robert Schellman		<p>Dear Arlington County</p> <p>Restating the opening paragraph of above reference b., I again wish to remind the County Officials that the sector plan guidance recognizes that a sector plan provides guidance not rules therefore, they are intended to be flexible. This SPRC period is intended to provide comments that should result in appropriate changes to the sector plan that covers this project.</p> <p>Following are my comments and questions as related to this project:</p> <p>1. The SE corner Gateway and architecture feature design is being delayed until after the site plan is approved. Why is this? It is strongly recommended that this design be part of the site plan approval and, assuming 101 12th St is built then, the construction of this feature should coincide with its construction. Doing so would avoid further inconveniencing residents and users of the park, the sidewalks and roadways that would result from non-concurrent construction.</p>	<p>Staff Response: Thank you for your comments. Please see the staff SPRC report for more information and analysis of the new 10th St. connector road.</p> <p>Applicant Response: Thank you for your feedback. Please refer to JBG SMITH's SPRC#2 presentation which includes images of a proposed alternative for the architectural feature on the southeastern portion of the building.</p> <p>Please refer back to both JBG SMITH and Staff's SPRC#2 presentation for an overview of the community benefits included with this proposed site plan.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>2. The community quality of life benefits for the residents of Crystal City specific to this project remain vague. Removing the consideration resulting from the JBG Smith bartering for additional density for its combined proposed 3 x project, please completely and fully details the community benefits specific solely to the 101 12th St building. Please address individually, the proposed building and the proposed S Bell St extension.</p> <p>3. Please address, in detail, why the need for class A office space cannot be satisfied by either the renovation of existing empty local office buildings or the demolition of existing local office buildings replacing them with a newly constructed class A office building.</p> <p>4. Please address specifically and in detail why the building cannot be designed for the loading dock and parking entrance on the buildings north side thus eliminating the need for the S Ball St extension.</p> <p>5. WRT a traffic study, the County points to a 21 Feb 20 Multimodal Traffic Assessment (MMTA), 101 12th St. South which does a decent job of addressing the multimodal transportation available to the project but seems to fail as a detailed traffic study. A detailed, non-covid period traffic study is required to be completed BEFORE the plan is approved. When will this be accomplished? Some high-level observations from this assessment:</p> <p>a. External factors completely ignore the additional traffic and significant hazards presented by the alignment of the S Ball St intersection on 12th St specifically wrt pedestrian traffic on both sides of 12th St, the entrance to the building complexes across the street and, the parking and loading areas along 12th St across from the S Ball St intersection on 12th St. Please explain why these situations are ignored and how it is possible there are no negative elements mentioned in this MMTA.</p> <p>b. The MMTA seems to provide only positive elements for this project with no negatives. This is hard to fathom especially considering that, of the stated six (6) positive elements, none address actual traffic. There are two (2) addressing bicycles, one (1) each addressing proximity to modes of transportation, showers/lockers, pedestrians, and an included Transportation Management</p>	<p>As previously communicated, JBG SMITH believes that National Landing office market needs a diverse set of offerings in order to meet the space requirements for a wide range of potential tenants. While there is a significant amount of existing office space located within Crystal City, the physical layouts, the mechanical and electrical systems, the elevator capacity and the light and windows all have some limitations compared to what we design and build today to meet current (and evolving) tenant needs.</p> <p>The Crystal City Sector Plan and the PDSP agreement with Arlington County both call for creating S. Ball Street. The current site plan reflects those county goals and requirements. In satisfying the S. Ball Street requirement, the design places the loading dock where it can best balance the needs for parking, utility location, vehicular access, stormwater management, and preservation of existing trees on site.</p> <p>With regard to the MMTA, JBG SMITH only notes that the study was completed prior to the start of social distancing and reflect current and projected future traffic impacts using "normal" traffic counts. JBG SMITH and the design team will release an updated MMTA in the near future that captures the evolution</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Community Member Comment	Responses
			<p>Plan (TMP). Please explain why this is and what criteria was used by the County to enable it to consider this MMTA a traffic study.</p> <p>c. The included Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is particularly slim and appears to solely focuses on encouraging reductions in the use of private, single occupancy vehicle use. Please explain why this is and what is the Counties intended use for this TMP.</p>	<p>in the design and alignment of S. Ball Street since it was first submitted.</p> <p>With respect to the TMP, JBG SMITH will comply with all County standard TMP requirements, which include a number of measures designed to encourage a broad range of transportation modes.</p>