

## **II. INTRODUCTION**

Table 2.1 Historic Milestones

St. Elizabeths Hospital - West Campus Historic Milestones	
1852	Construction of Center Building started
1855	Began operations as the "Government Hospital for the Insane"
1860s	Buildings used as Civil War Hospital
1902	Construction started on East Campus
1916	Renamed "St. Elizabeths Hospital" by Congress
1979	Listed on the National Register of Historic Places
1984	St. Elizabeths Hospital and District of Columbia Mental Health Services Act passed
1991	Designated a National Historic Landmark
1991	Civil War Cemetery rehabilitated
2000	Center Building stabilized and mothballed
2001	Environmental Phase I completed
2002	Environmental Phase II nearly complete
2003	Environmental remediation began
2004	Federal transfer from HHS to GSA

## II. INTRODUCTION

### Site Background

The St. Elizabeths campus occupies a bluff overlooking the Anacostia River, with sweeping views of the Monumental Core of Washington, DC. The St. Elizabeths Hospital historic district is an exceptionally rich collection of buildings, landscaping, and green spaces, with views and vistas that are extraordinary in their design or natural character. Nationally recognized architects and landscape architects are responsible for its planning, design, and construction.

St. Elizabeths Hospital began operations in 1855 as the "Government Hospital for the Insane," one of the nation's earliest asylums to offer "moral treatment" and enlightened "human care" to persons with mental illness. For more than a century, St. Elizabeths was internationally recognized as a leading clinical and training institution.

During the Civil War, the property was also used to house wounded soldiers. Soldiers reluctant to write home stating that they were recuperating at the "Government Hospital for the Insane" gave rise to the use of the name "St. Elizabeths," which was the historic name of the old royal land grant, of which the campus was a part. Thereafter, the institution was informally referred to as "St. Elizabeths" until Congress formally changed the name in 1916 (without the apostrophe). The section of St. Elizabeths now known as the West Campus contains the oldest structures on the hospital grounds.

The 61 buildings on the West Campus are arranged in two principal clusters. The first and older grouping dates from 1852 to 1899, and is dominated by the large Gothic Revival style Center Building. The second grouping dates from the early 1900s and was built as part of a major congressionally funded expansion. In all, the buildings contain approximately 1.1 million gross square feet.

St. Elizabeths Hospital was listed as a historic district on the National Register of Historic Places in 1979 and designated a National Historic Landmark in 1991.

### Purpose and Goals

GSA is seeking to determine the maximum development potential of the St. Elizabeths West Campus. GSA directed the Jones Lang LaSalle Team to prepare a Land Use Feasibility Analysis and a campus mater plan to house federal agency tenants. The Land Use Feasibility Analysis is the first step in this process. The Jones Lang LaSalle Team adopted the understanding that "feasibility," in the context of this project, is determined not only by site size and construction issues, but also by the likelihood of securing timely approvals from oversight bodies (and avoiding the objections and delaying tactics of interested parties) so as not to imperil GSA's schedule for a fully approved Master Plan by September 2006. This feasibility is not only determined by the physical aspects of the property but also by the legal protections and the National Historic Landmark status of the property.

GSA developed an initial set of project goals and high level program requirements, whose primary objectives are to:

- Achieve maximum build-out for federal use, while maintaining the historic character of the West Campus;
- Provide a federal workplace of world-class design created by the nation's leading architects that reflects the guiding principles of GSA's Design Excellence Program;
- Use federal development in ways that consider community development goals and efforts;
- Satisfy federal security requirements in a manner that remains sensitive to neighboring communities;
- Preserve, to a practicable extent, the natural context of the site;
- Promote sustainable development to achieve a "Silver" Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating;
- Facilitate an open and inclusive process;
- Improve transportation access to the campus;
- Optimize the federal investment;

As the feasibility analysis progressed, additional requirements were identified and added. The LUF Team determined that the maximum build-out would require a minimum of 3 million rentable square feet (rsf). Additionally, the Team tested some specific development scenarios requested by GSA to assess their feasibility.

The Jones Lang LaSalle Team then developed a set of objectives that would support GSA's overall project goals as well as take into consideration the defining characteristics of the site. These objectives were to:

- Maximize the Usable Square Feet (usf) on site for a secure federal campus (Minimum of 3 million RSF);
- Limit the impact on historic resources as part of the National Historic Landmark;
- Limit impact on the environment;
- Employ the existing road networks and access to support the new development;
- Create a balanced reuse of existing buildings with new construction;
- Optimize development dollars;
- Respect the governmental approval schedule.

**Approach**

To fully evaluate the feasibility, constraints, and impact of development on this site, the Jones Lang LaSalle Team drew upon the resources of each of the consulting Team members, in the following functions:

Jones Lang LaSalle -- Land Use Feasibility Analysis

- Greenhorne & O'Mara -- NEPA Compliance
- Oehrlein & Associates Architects -- Historic Resources (Section 106)
- Robinson & Associates -- Historic Resources (Section 106)
- SAKO -- Security Planning
- SmithGroup, Inc. -- Campus Master Planning
- Symmetra Design, LLC -- Transportation Analysis

**METHODOLOGY**

This team followed a structured methodology in performing the Land Use Feasibility Analysis as summarized in the table below and discussed in greater detail in the text which follows:

**Table 2.2 Methodology**

Analysis Steps	Activities Conducted
Project kick-off	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish and clarify GSA goals and objectives</li> </ul>
Review existing site information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-site tours</li> <li>• Examine previous land use studies, Historic Resource Management plans, DC government information relating to the site</li> <li>• Identify potential constraints on redevelopment and/or new construction</li> </ul>
Assess reuse potential of existing facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine building condition, ongoing building, late, gross/rentable square footage, age structural composition, historical significance</li> </ul>
Determine land suitable/unsuitable for development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subdivide site into parcels for evaluation</li> <li>• Examine size (acres), potential building heights/massing, cultural landscape constraints, topography, floodplains/wetlands, existing structures, security setbacks</li> </ul>
Generate development scenarios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assemble development parcels into development scenarios</li> <li>• Perform financial analysis of scenario alternatives</li> <li>• Determine feasibility based on scenario evaluation criteria</li> </ul>

**1. Kick-Off – Establishment of GSA Goals and Objectives**

The Jones Lang LaSalle Team’s analysis began with a series of kick-off meetings with the GSA team. These initial meetings served to establish and further clarify GSA goals and Land Use Feasibility Analysis objectives including high level development program requirements. These initial

objectives shifted over the course of the project based on further definition of tenant requirements combined with results of the analysis in each following task. Frequent interaction and coordination with GSA staff has helped to ensure Land Use Feasibility Analysis goals remained in alignment with program and tenant requirements.

**2. Review Existing Site Information**

The Jones Lang LaSalle Team collected publicly-available data, and examined the documents made available for review relating to the St. Elizabeths site. The existing information the Team leveraged included the following sources:

- Local and Regional Planning Agencies – D.C. Office of Planning, D.C. Office of Business and Economic Development, National Capital Planning Commission
- Federal and Municipal Governmental Agencies – U.S. General Accounting Office, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, DC Department of Mental Health, DC State Historic Preservation Office, The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Neighborhood Organizations and Community Groups – Local ANCs, National Association to Restore Pride in America’s Capital (NARPAC), DC Preservation League
- Real Estate, Land Use Policy, and related Research Institutions – Urban Land Institute, The Brookings Institution, National Trust for Historic Preservation

This information, together with site visits and past studies of the St. Elizabeths West Campus formed the basis for launching the Land Use Feasibility Analysis.

**3. Assess Reuse Potential of Existing Facilities**

To understand fully the reuse potential of the diverse assortment of structures on the West Campus, the team developed a database of all existing facilities that includes the following elements and descriptors:

- Location on the campus;
- Total (gross) square footage;

## II. INTRODUCTION

- Rentable/useable square footage;
- Building condition (level of deterioration);
- Structural composition and constraints;
- Age and historical significance;
- Suitability for reconfiguration or renovation;
- Approaches for reuse (e.g., preservation, renovation, addition) or demolition.

This information built upon the existing research that was previously conducted on the site. The further assessment of existing structures will be closely coordinated with the historic preservation, archaeological survey, and NEPA compliance processes, intrinsic to this project.

The outcome of this phase of the analysis was an inventory and assessment of reuse potential of existing facilities. This inventory is provided in the Appendix A, Building Matrix. Additionally, this information was utilized in the “Determination of Land Suitable for Development” discussed below.

### 4. Determine Land Suitable/Unsuitable for New Development

Similar to the detailed review and analysis of the existing facilities, the Jones Lang LaSalle Team conducted a review and analysis of unimproved land on the St Elizabeths campus. Utilizing the NEPA/NHPA expertise within our team, we identified environmental, historic preservation, cultural landscapes or archaeological factors that impacted development suitability. Our analysis divided the site into several parcels for the purpose of analysis and classification.

For each of these parcels, the team developed a database of factors that determined suitability for development. These factors included:

- Location, size, shape, description
- Potential use
- Maximum potential square footage and building footprint, height, massing
- Constraints (including federal construction costs, security setback requirements or other unique features or limitations)

- Historic preservation, cultural landscapes, and archeological resources
- Topography (impact by slope conditions, degree of cut and fill requirements, and cost implications)
- Floodplains and Wetlands
- Utilities (location and size of existing water mains, sanitary sewers and storm sewers)
- Circulation requirements (vehicular, etc.)
- Surrounding land uses (investigations of surrounding land uses and any development activity that may be planned for the adjacent or nearby properties to gauge impact on use of parcels on the St Elizabeths campus)

The outcome of this analysis is an inventory of land parcels available for development on the St. Elizabeths campus. This inventory reflects the development potential and constraints associated with each parcel, including reuse of existing structures and/or new construction. This information is located in “Section 4 – Assessment of Land and Buildings”.

### 5. Generate Development Scenarios

The Team utilized the assessment of the existing facilities and parcels of land that comprise the site as building blocks, combined them into development scenarios, then evaluated each of the scenarios against the parameters described below. Those scenarios that most favorably address these parameters formed the basis for the final three scenarios. Each of the resultant development scenarios follow GSA’s required focus on use of the campus for a high security federal enclave and the proposed development scenarios are suitable for either a multi- or single-tenanted campus.

#### Highest and Best Use

Given that GSA programmatic requirements envision the utilization of the entire campus for choosing federal tenants, our highest and best use study was limited to an investigation of how to maximize the value of the existing St. Elizabeths campus. This takes into account GSA tenant needs, physical characteristics of the site and existing facilities, as well as location and costs. The focus was on office use, along with supporting ancillary functions; other uses such as residential, retail, industrial, or hospitality were not evaluated as part of this feasibility analysis.

### Development, Federal Construction Costs, and Financial Feasibility

The existence of over one million gross square feet existing structures together with GSA’s need for up to three million rentable square feet of space resulted in scenarios that incorporate varying combinations of new and renovated space. For each scenario, Jones Lang LaSalle developed a financial model that takes into account development and construction and modernization costs.

Jones Lang LaSalle evaluated cost drivers on a per square foot basis to provide a consistent means of comparison across these different scenarios. The Jones Lang LaSalle Team worked with existing cost databases for the local market, such as RS Means, supplemented by input by local area general contractors who have developed projects of this magnitude and scale. For existing structures, our analysis presents the estimated costs associated with preserving, renovating, expanding or demolishing existing structures.

Future areas of investigation will include assessing the structural integrity and operational efficiency of the facility to ascertain the most probable redevelopment alternatives given the buildings’ opportunities and constraints. The redevelopment portions of the scenarios will ultimately be informed by Section 106 NHPA determinations of architectural significance and tailored to conform to emerging design guidelines as articulated in the Master Plan.

Items factored into the square-foot construction cost assessment included HVAC, roofing systems, life safety, ADA compliance and retro-fit requirements, core and shell, deferred maintenance, ongoing operating, maintenance and repair requirements, environmental issues, historic issues, total floor area needed, etc. Additional assessments will be made regarding the ability to retro-fit the building for various uses with particular focus on the location of utility corridors, stair wells and elevator locations, loading docks, divisible floor plates, ceiling height, etc.

Given GSA’s desire to begin tenant occupancy as early as 2008, the team evaluated the schedule implications of each development scenario. As above, this schedule analysis incorporates site work and infrastructure as well as the time required to remediate work within structures prior to renovation or demolition.

This analysis assessed the economic viability of given development alternative based on budgetary and scheduling considerations.

**Constraints**

Given the complex nature of the St. Elizabeths West Campus, we expect that any development scenarios face constraints in any or all of the areas below:

- Legal Constraints – Easements, covenants, zoning, code requirements
- Historic/Cultural – Preservation of historic structures, views, cultural landscapes and archeological resources
- Environmental – Toxic materials, runoff, vegetation
- Physical – Site topography, drainage, height limitations, adjacent or surrounding uses
- Social / Political – Community needs/wants; GSA good neighbor policies
- Security / Access – Setback requirements, vehicle and pedestrian movement

The Team assessed the impact of each of these constraints on the proposed development scenarios, identifying alternative approaches toward addressing these constraints while maximizing the development potential of the site in each scenario.

**Risks**

While the constraints above can be assessed and quantified, there are several risks that could impact the feasibility of development or redevelopment on the St. Elizabeths West Campus, including, for example, identification of hidden or unforeseen conditions (site and structures), escalation of construction costs, and political and community risks (impact of federal and/or local initiatives on site uses).

In evaluating development scenario alternatives the related risks are with each scenario; the likelihood of the risk is determined; the potential impact to redevelopment is quantified and; and mitigation approaches to such risks are suggested. The Team grouped these various risks into four categories of evaluation criteria as described in Table 2.3.

The criteria are incorporated into a summary matrix that will facilitate the selection of the most optimal scenarios for GSA to pursue, based on the level of risk the organization is willing to accept.

**Location, size, use, and description of development types.**

Utilizing the highest and best use, costs, constraints, and risk criteria, the Team created development scenarios for each parcel on the site.

**Outcome of Development Scenario Alternatives**

The Jones Lang LaSalle Team generated a comparison matrix, providing highlights of each scenario and associated risks. This matrix defines the key risks, timeline and economic costs associated with each scenario. It also takes into account environmental, historic, and community impacts. The team worked closely with GSA to determine the validity of the development parameters that would reflect the agency’s objectives and expectations.

The Team does not expect any of the development scenarios to be selected outright, but anticipates that several of the concepts will be preferred. Through an iterative process the Jones Lang LaSalle team in concert with GSA will identify the most attractive elements of each option. These will form the basis for further development as part of the master planning effort.

The outcome of this stage is a matrix of key parameters and detailed development scenario alternatives as a summary matrix of the eight development scenarios evaluated.

**Table 2.3 Evaluation Criteria**

GSA St. Elizabeths West Campus -- Evaluation Criteria	
Internal Stakeholders (GSA and Tenants)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programmatic Requirements</li> <li>• Development Economics</li> <li>• Security Requirements</li> <li>• Schedule / Timeline</li> </ul>
External Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrounding Community</li> </ul>
Review/Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NHPA Section 106</li> <li>• NCPC</li> </ul>
Physical Aspects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access/Transportation</li> <li>• Environmental</li> <li>• Infrastructure/Utilities</li> </ul>