“Near Southeast” is one of Washington, D.C.’s forgotten neighborhoods. Merely blocks from the U.S. Capitol, it is severed from Capitol Hill by a railroad and an elevated freeway, saturated with public housing and sealed off from the Anacostia River by the Washington Navy Yard and the Southeast Federal Center (SEFC), a mostly fallow tract of federal land.

But Near Southeast’s time finally may have come. The Navy is doubling its workforce there, moving in 5,000 personnel and inducing thousands of contractors to locate nearby. Meanwhile, Washington’s new mayor, Anthony Williams, is determined to make Washington a city of vibrant waterfront neighborhoods. Near Southeast is his, and perhaps best, chance to make a mark.

The U.S. General Services Administration, which manages federal real-estate operations, has patiently been planning for this day. It had already started environmental clean-up on the site and, after trying for a decade to develop SEFC as a federal office center, recently began considering a mixed-use future there.

So as opportunities for redeveloping SEFC come into focus, GSA’s National Capital Region and the city’s Office of Planning, with help from GSA’s Center for Urban Development and the Congress for the New Urbanism, sponsored a public charrette to examine the area’s future in more detail.

GSA’s goal was to help federal, city and local stakeholders sort out their visions, synchronize them and work out a plausible development plan. “We wanted to engage the neighbors, to introduce a bit of openness that we haven’t had,” said Tony Costa, assistant regional administrator of GSA’s National Capital Region.

District officials hoped to draw more local participants—already concerned about changes they were seeing—into its waterfront planning process. And they wanted to send a clear message: “Southeast Federal Center is part of the waterfront and part of the neighborhood,” planning director Andrew Altman said.

An Historic Alignment

The Southeast Federal Center, once part of the Navy Yard, comprises 55 acres of factories and workshops that were decommissioned and transferred to GSA in 1963. In the early 1990s, GSA developed a plan for federal offices (5.6 million s.f., space for 23,500 employees) and supporting retail, but subsequently concluded that a broader mix of uses would be more viable.

Progress has come haltingly, though. In 1991, a Metrorail station opened next to SEFC, linking it to the regional rail network, but federal agencies were still reluctant to relocate there. A stronger catalyst has been the Navy’s decision to consolidate operations at the Navy Yard. The Navy has added one million s.f. of new office space on its...
base, and developers are erecting two new build-

ings along M Street for contractors. The city and federal governments are hoping
to accelerate the area’s redevelopment while posi-
tioning it firmly within the city’s broader water-
front vision. While the city is gearing up for an
Anacostia waterfront master plan, Congress is
reviewing legislation that would allow gsa to team
with private developers to build non-federal pro-
jects, such as housing, at sefc.

In March, local and federal agencies launched
the “Anacostia Waterfront Initiative,” committing
their energies towards making the riverfront “a
cohesive, attractive mixture of commercial, resi-
dential, recreational and open space.” The compact
provides the strongest hope Near Southeast has
had in a long time, charrette leader Ken Green-
berg observed: “This may be the moment when
the people with the will and ability to pull this off
are in the right seat at the right time.”

The Charrette
The charrette focused on what a new urban
neighborhood, not a federal enclave or Harbor-
front-style destination, might look like. The work
proceeded in an iterative process, with the plan-
ing team working in short, intense sessions inter-
spersed with public workshops and presentations.

Ultimately, the charrette ratified the emerging
concept of a mixed-use urban neighborhood—
proposing “appropriately scaled” residential,
public and commercial uses, including a park,
museum, offices, shops and restaurants; various
types and sizes of housing, affordable to a range of
incomes; walkable streets and squares; and public
waterfront access through the sefc and Navy Yard.

The charrette also focused on a framework of
big picture issues that are rarely resolved, and
often not even addressed, in the normal course of
events—but have the power to make specific
planning and development decisions work
together better:

- How can the barriers that sever Near Southeast
from nearby neighborhoods and the waterfront be pen-
etrated? The charrette proposed north-south cor-
rridors along four streets, each with a distinct
visual, spatial or land-use character; pedestrian
and ferry links across the river; narrowing M
Street to tame traffic; and eventually replacing the
freeway with a boulevard.
- How can the scale of buildings and spaces be more
intimate than is typical in new development? The
charrette proposed re-inserting streets mapped in
the L’Enfant–Banneker plan (reducing block size)
and recommended infill housing that reflects the
density and texture of nearby Capitol Hill.
- What form should the “green” and “blue” net-
works take? The charrette proposed configuring
the floodplain as wetlands or public space; provid-
ing public walkways along both sides of the river
and piers, boats and bridges giving access over the
river; daylighting a historic canal that leads into
the city; and extending the L’Enfant-Banneker
plan’s pattern of formal public spaces into sefc,
culminating at a waterfront square.
- How can revitalization proceed without creating
a sense of winners and losers? The charrette pro-
posed a “social contract” of implementation
processes that would provide access to decision-
making and share the benefits of development. It
proposed no net loss of public housing and
employment-readiness efforts that link local resi-
dents to the influx of new jobs.

New Roles for GSA
gsa’s charge is not only to serve other federal
agencies, but also to manage public resources pru-
dently and to pursue real-estate strategies that
support local goals. The Southeast Federal
Center initiative will challenge, and expand, gsa’s
ability to balance these goals in several ways.

The breadth of the collaboration. The Anacostia
Waterfront Initiative had numerous signatories,
from the local planning and housing agencies to
GSA and the National Park Service. The cooperative engagement of Navy officials, residents and property owners is unusual as well.

The depth of the partnership with local government. GSA co-sponsored the charrette with the District’s planning office, and both agree on the fundamental vision of SEFC as the heart of a new urban neighborhood.

The wide area considered in the planning study. The charrette studied more than twice the area controlled by GSA and the Navy, with consensus that the implications of developing SEFC could reach even further. Thus, GSA clearly acknowledged that its activities can have a wide-ranging impact, and that it should actively engage those who are affected.

The consideration of GSA’s typical development practices. Several charrette suggestions—such as joining with developers to build housing; setting aside valuable waterfront land for open space; and shifting storm and wastewater capital funds to “green infrastructure” and open space—would require GSA to adopt new ways of evaluating customer, public and community benefits.

The collaboration with professional resources. Teaming with the Congress for the New Urbanism advanced the Center’s goal of providing the communities where it is working with professional expertise. One outcome: the charrette’s design and planning approach was influenced by a wider range of thinking than previous federal plans were.

Next Steps

Charrettes, by focusing intense energy on complex problems for short periods of time, can convey a sense of clarity and purpose that dissipates all too easily when participants go their separate ways. Who takes the next step, and how far can they stride, when there is no clear coordinating authority?

The District, even as it assembles a long-term waterfront planning apparatus (an RFP for an Anacostia waterfront master plan was issued this summer), faces a current zoning crisis: The existing development rules for the areas around SEFC are inconsistent with the charrette’s visions, and the site itself is not zoned, an issue if GSA spins land off to private developers.

GSA must decide what charrette recommendations to accept and how to formalize them; Costa says the ideas will be incorporated into a request for proposals that GSA hopes to circulate for public review in September. More immediately, GSA is considering whether to sell a site at SEFC to the Department of Transportation, and what the design requirements for that project might be.

One immediate issue will be timing: Will GSA’s schedule for its RFP and the District’s planning process keep pace with each other? Another will be paying for public infrastructure, such as the waterfront walkway, streets and squares, which will set expectations for the quality and character of the development.

Neither GSA nor the city can realize its goals without the other’s cooperation, involvement and assistance. The charrette revealed that both share a similar vision, that both are ready to move forward, and that the new prospects for Near Southeast have energized the public. Their challenge is to find a mechanism for keeping the vision and the momentum alive, as decisions about the neighborhood continue to be made by many players.