GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

FEBRUARY 26, 2018

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 5:50 p.m., Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS) PETER SHAPIRO, Commissioner MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director, Development Review & Historic Preservation
JOEL LAWSON
STEPHEN J. MORDFIN
STEPHEN COCHRAN
ELISE VITALE
BRANDICE ELLIOTT
ANNE FOTHERGILL

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

HILLARY LOVICK, ESQ. JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular meeting held on February 26, 2018.

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S	
Call to Order	5
Call for Closed Meeting	5
Consent Calendar Case #04-13B 1210C R Street LLC - Minor Modification	9
Case #08-060 Office of Planning - Minor Modification to ZC Order 08-06A	13
Case #10-21B V Street SW, LLC - Design Review Modification of Consequence @ Square 667S	16
ZC Case #13-05C Forest City Washington	18
Case #11-07H American University - Technical Correction to Condition No. 14 of Z.C. Order No. 11-07	41
Hearing Action Case #17-21 As You Like It, LLC - Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment @ Square 498	22
Case #17-14 UM 500 Penn Street NE, LLC & UDR, Inc Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment @ Square 3594	27
Case #08-34H Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington - 2nd-Stage PUD @ Square 568	35
Correspondence Case #15-18A Initio - Request for Reconsideration from Committee of 100 and Applicants Response	38
Agenda Item: 06-10 Copy of Letter from Zoning Administrator to Applicant re: Matter-of-Right Charter School Use	40

Final Action

Case #11-07G

American University - Campus Plan

and Further Processing

Adjournment

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(5:52 p.m.)
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: This meeting will please come to
4	order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public
5	meeting of the Zoning Commission for the District of
6	Columbia.
7	My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are
8	Commissioner Turnbull, Commissioner May and Commissioner
9	Shapiro. I will be providing additional information, if
10	needed, at our 6:30 proceedings.
11	But we're convening today at this point,
12	Commissioners, we just convened to see whether or not any
13	believe that we should have a closed meeting to obtain legal
14	advice and deliberate and not to deliberate but to vote
15	on the contested cases scheduled for tonight's hearing.
16	Let me read this what I have here. I digress from
17	the script. It says, I would like to know whether any of you
18	believe we should hold a closed hearing to obtain legal
19	advice from our counsel, but not to vote on the contested
20	cases scheduled for tonight's hearing.
21	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So moved, Mr. Chair.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, it's been moved that we have
23	a
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
•	

1	seconded. Let me ask for clarification that you all think
2	we need a closed meeting.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: We do, yes.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and
5	seconded. Any further discussion?
6	All in favor?
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
9	Okay, also Vice Chair Miller as well votes in
10	affirmative.
11	Ms. Schellin, will you please record the vote?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote 5 to
13	0 to 0 to approve to having a closed meeting. Commissioner
14	Shapiro moving, Commissioner May seconding. Commissioners
15	Hood, Miller and Turnbull voting in favor.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. The Commission has voted
17	to hold a closed session.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry. Let me do a roll call
19	vote instead.
20	Chairman Hood?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Vice Chair Miller?
23	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: He voted yes walking in.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: Well, he said that he said yes when
25	he

	<i>'</i>
1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. He said yes, but he's back
2	in the back now.
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Turnbull?
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner May?
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Shapiro?
10	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Can we just get Commissioner Miller
12	out here to have him on the record?
13	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Sorry.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: If we can just get you on the
15	record. Vice Chair Miller?
16	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Ms. Schellin
19	MS. SCHELLIN: The motion passes.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will convene at 6:30.
21	Anything else?
22	All right, thank you.
23	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
24	record at 5:54 p.m. and resumed at 6:51 p.m.)
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, are we ready to get started?

This meeting will please come to order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public meeting of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia.

My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Turnbull, Commissioner Shapiro and Commissioner May. We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, as well as the Office of Attorney General Mr. Ritting and Ms. Lovick, Office of Planning, Ms. Steingasser and Mr. Lawson, Mr. Cochran, Ms. Vitale and Mr. Mordfin. Okay.

And we have others who I think are in the audience. I think I saw some in the audience who will come up at a later time and they'll acknowledge themselves when they come up.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to you and are located in a bin near the door. We do not take any public testimony at our meetings unless the Commission requests someone to come forward.

Please be advised this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live. Accordingly, I must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room including the display of any signs or objects.

Please turn off all your electronic devices at this time.

2.0

1 Does the staff have any preliminary matters? No, sir. 2 MS. SCHELLIN: CHAIRMAN HOOD: 3 I do have one. Depending upon how the Commission moves, I'm going to, if we get to that point I'm going to ask that we move -- under Final Action we have 5 Zoning Commission case number 11-07G. I'm going to ask that 6 7 we move that to our last case for the evening, unless there's some objection. 8 9 No objection. COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: 10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing objections, okay, Ms. 11 Schellin, could you call the first case? The first case on the 12 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. agenda is under, is case number 04-13B, 1210C R, Street LLC. 13 It's a request for a minor modification at Square 0277, and the applicant is seeking a minor modification with regard to 15 the benefits and amenities approved in this previously 16 17 approved PUD case. 18 At Exhibit 5 we have an OP report which stated that they are not opposed to the relocation of the universal 19 design unit, but they do believe this is a, I'm sorry, is not 2.0 21 modification modification minor but rather а of significance or a modification of consequence. 22 Ask the Commission to consider this case this evening. 23 24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioners, Okay. my first 25 question, does anyone believe that this case should come off

1	the consent calendar?
2	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair?
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Regardless of whether
5	there's opposition or concerns about it or who supports it
6	or who doesn't, just based upon the nature of the
7	modification it feels like a modification of significance to
8	me.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All it takes is one. I
10	would agree, Mr. Shapiro. Any others? But all it takes is
11	one, so.
12	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Significance.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's of significance.
14	Okay, I seem to be getting, going brain dead already and we
15	just started and that's a bad sign. So I guess we need to
16	schedule it and that'll be, all it takes is one person to
17	take it off.
18	And you mentioned it's a modification of
19	significance
20	MS. SCHELLIN: That's a hearing.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: which would entitle us to go
22	to a hearing, so we need to do some scheduling, correct?
23	MS. SCHELLIN: No. They actually, they would
24	actually, you would direct the applicant to go back and file
25	an application for a modification of significance.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So the applicant of Zoning Commission case number 04-13B, this has been taken off the 2 3 Consent Calendar tonight as you've heard. We would direct ask you to go back and file а modification of 5 significance for the case to be heard and at that time we 6 will do scheduling. 7 I just wanted to add a little bit MR. RITTING: of information for the attorney if he's here tonight. 8 The applicable section for you to look at for the application is Subtitle Z Section 704. 10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know, I need to read something 11 that I should have read earlier. Let me just go back, so 12 13 we're going to move in that fashion, okay. 14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: But are you going off of that 15 case? CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to go back to 16 Yes. something I've missed. 17 18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. But I just want to add I would agree on the direction we're 19 something on that. going in because I think the rules are pretty clear that a 2.0 21 per change to a proper public benefit, especially if this one's going offsite three miles away, I would just encourage 22 the applicant also as we move forward in this to look at the 23

because I think I agree with those as well.

OP's condition that they suggested on page 2 of their report,

24

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me, this goes back to 2 opening statement. I would ask that this statement be 3 incorporated. For cases under the hearing action portion of the 4 agenda, the only documents in the record before us this 5 6 evening are the application, the ANC set down report and the 7 Office of Planning report. All other documents in the record will be reviewed at the time of the hearing. 9 important and that's think that's very 10 So if you don't hear us deliberating important statement. 11 on certain documents then you'll understand why, because it's 12 not the appropriate time for us to consider them. Let's move on to Zoning Commission case 13 Okay. number 11-07H, American University - Technical Correction to Condition No. 14 of Zoning Commission Order Number 11-07. 15 Ms. Schellin? 16 17 MS. SCHELLIN: The applicant has filed or Yes. 18 requested a Technical Correction of Condition 14 of Zoning Commission Order Number 11-07 which indicates the number of 19 parking spaces it is required to maintain. 2.0 21 4, Spring Valley Wesley Αt Exhibit Heights Citizens Associations and Neighbors for a Livable Community 22 has filed a joint response to the application in which they 23 believe the applicant should have filed for a modification 24

of significance.

1 We'd ask the Commission to consider the request before them this evening, and that's all that we have. 2 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. There's been an amendment, a request. We're going to do 11-07H before we do the last case. We're going to do them kind of together here, 5 6 okay. 7 All right, so this day is for some reason starting off a little mixed up for me, but anyway let's keep right on 8 9 moving. 10 Zoning Commission case number 08-060, Office of 11 Planning - Minor Modification to Zoning Commission Order Subtitle U, 12 Number 08-06A request for immediate and publication of proposed rulemaking. 13 14 Ms. Schellin? 15 MS. SCHELLIN: OP is requesting a minor Yes. modification to Subtitle U, Section 802 to include large 16 format retail as a special exception use in the PDR zones. 17 18 In the Commission's October 2014 deliberations they actually voted, you actually voted in favor of OP's 19 recommendation to do this. 2.0 However, the language was not 21 included in the final text. Therefore, OP is asking the Commission to approve the immediate publication of a proposed 22 rulemaking with regard to this request that's before it this 23 24 evening.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioners, I think that

1 we have been asked and I think we've read the additional language that's being asked for the retail large format which 2 is subject to conditions that we have had in the report. 3 4 Any questions or comments? Vice Chair Miller? 5 6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 7 I mean I support this, but I just had just had one question. one question of the Office of Planning. 8 9 Are the conditions that you've laid out in the report, the Special Exception Conditions for Large Format 10 11 Retail in a PDR Zone, are they the same special exception conditions that are set forth in the zoning reg. in ZR16 for 12 other zoning districts? 13 This is Elisa Vitale with the Office 14 MS. VITALE: of Planning. The criteria that are laid out for the 15 Yes. large format retail special exception match those in other, 16 it should read similar to the criteria for large format 17 retail in a mixed use zone or other zones. 18 I just, I recall that 19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. being one version of that which had something about economic 2.0 21 I'm not advocating that but I guess that didn't get into the final special economic, special exception conditions 22 information being provided by the 23 about things being, applicant. 24

But that was my only question, but you think it's

1	the same?
2	MS. VITALE: Yes, we did. We pulled the language
3	from another section, so.
4	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay, thank you. That's all.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So on the same note, Ms. Vitale,
6	when we did PDRs we mentioned external effects. Is that the
7	same practice? See, I think we put it all throughout the
8	code now, but would that also be applicable to this? That
9	we also
10	MS. VITALE: Yes. Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, thank you.
12	Any other questions or comments? Do I hear a
13	motion?
14	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would move
15	that we, the Zoning Commission, take action on this
16	modification to the zoning regulation as adopted in case 08-
17	06A for the large format retail in PDR zones, and ask for a
18	second.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and
21	properly seconded. Any further discussion?
22	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, do we, under the
23	schedule do we need to clarify that we're requesting
24	immediate publication of the proposed rulemaking or is that
25	

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think that's as proposed.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: That's what the vote is, yes.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. As proposed, right?
4	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. That's our, yes. But thanks
6	for spelling that out, but as recommended. Okay, so moved
7	and properly seconded, any further discussion?
8	All in favor?
9	(Chorus of ayes.)
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
11	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you please
12	record the vote?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. The vote is, staff recorded
14	the vote at 5 to 0 to 0 to approve immediate publication of
15	a proposed rulemaking for Zoning Commission Case Number 08-
16	060.
17	Commissioner Miller moving, Commissioner Turnbull
18	seconding, Commissioners Hood, May and Shapiro in support.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, we have a
20	modification of consequence so we're going to do
21	deliberations, Zoning Commission Case Number 10-21B, V Street
22	SW, LLC - Design Review Modification of Consequence at Square
23	667S.
24	Ms. Schellin?
25	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. So the Exhibits 6 through

1	6A2, the applicant has provided some supplemental information
2	addressing the issues that the Commission asked for at the
3	time it determined the scheduling.
4	And at Exhibit 7, there's an OP supplemental
5	report which advises that based on the supplemental
6	submission from the applicant it no longer has any objection
7	to the applicant's request. So we'd ask the Commission to
8	consider final action this evening.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioners, thank you.
10	Ms. Schellin, as mentioned, has been presented to
11	us in Exhibit 6A, 6A seems to have answered especially the
12	Office of Planning's questions and issues. Let's see if we
13	have any outstanding other issues. And they're now
14	recommending approval of the modification of consequence.
15	Any questions or comments?
16	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would say that
17	the changes that have been made are definitely improvements
18	and I'm supportive of that moving forward.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other comments? Okay.
20	All right, no comments.
21	So with that I would move approval as amended,
22	Zoning Commission, or modification of consequence for Zoning
23	Commission Case Number 10-21B, V, Street SW, LLC - Design
24	Review Modifications as changed, and ask for a second.
25	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.

	18
1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's moved and properly seconded.
2	Any further discussion?
3	All in favor?
4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
6	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, record the vote.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote 5 to
8	0 to 0 to approve final action Zoning Commission Case Number
9	10-21B. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Miller
10	seconding, Commissioners May, Shapiro and Turnbull in
11	support.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, next. Zoning Commission
13	Case Number 13-05C Forest City Washington, one-year PUD time
14	extension at Square 744S.
15	Ms. Schellin?
16	MS. SCHELLIN: The applicant is seeking a one-year
17	time extension stating the need is due to extensive efforts
18	required to identify and secure funding for an appropriate
19	location facilities that are acceptable to DC Water. This
20	is the second time extension request for the applicant.
21	Exhibit 6, we have an OP report stating that it
22	is satisfied that the situation was beyond the control of the
23	applicant and would support the request for extension and ask
24	the Commission to consider final action on this case.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Commissioners, we have a

1 request before us. I can tell you for me though when I look 2 at this, when I saw the ANC letter says they enthusiastically 3 support the extension. I've actually read it twice because I know that 4 this ANC has a lot of development going on in the ANC and I 5 know they have a lot of work that they're doing, so this says 6 7 a lot about how they've moved forward in this. 8 When I see the word enthusiastically that means 9 I don't even think I read the rest of it after quite a bit. 10 that. But anyway let me open up 11 discussion. Vice Chair Miller? 12 This really has 13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm sorry. nothing to do with the PUD extension request which I support, 15 but this is for the ICON Movie Theater and the above-grade parking associated with it, I think. 16 17 So that above-grade parking just stood out to me. I realize we approved that, but maybe OP can just quickly 18 explain why did we approve above-grade parking? 19 2.0 approve it at George -- you didn't approve it at Georgetown 21 Waterfront. 22 You didn't approve it at the Southwest Waterfront. I realize the ballpark, it did get approved at the ballpark 23 over this Commission's objections as I recall. 24

Why did we approve or you recommend approval of

1	above-grade parking at the Yard site for the movie theater?
2	MR. LAWSON: Sure. Joel Lawson with the Office
3	of Planning. I don't have the OP reports in front of me and
4	I certainly wouldn't speak for the Zoning Commission.
5	VICE CHAIR MILLER: It has nothing to do with this
6	PUD extension request, but.
7	MR. LAWSON: Well, I certainly wouldn't speak for
8	why the Commission elected to approve it. If you would like
9	to know more information we can certainly work with the
10	Office of the Attorney General
11	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'll go with that.
12	MR. LAWSON: and get a copy of that report to
13	you.
14	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you very much.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any further questions or comments?
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. Mr. Chair, I just
17	want to point out that we do have, in Exhibit Number 4, we
18	have a letter from the deputy mayor basically talking about
19	the water issue and that Forest City can't move ahead until
20	the water has been relocated.
21	So I would have no problem in voting for the
22	extension.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, so with that any
24	further discussions? Yes?
25	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Where did the, if Office of

1	Planning knows and you can get it to me later, where did the
2	DC Water facility get relocated? It mentions two sites, but
3	it didn't say where. Are they in the District of Columbia?
4	MR. LAWSON: To be honest with you, we're asking
5	the same question and we have not yet found that answer.
6	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
7	MR. LAWSON: So I'm not sure where that this
8	is, I believe, the fleet maintenance.
9	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right.
10	MR. LAWSON: And I don't
11	(Simultaneous speaking.)
12	MR. LAWSON: I can't say. I don't know.
13	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay, all right.
14	Again I support the extension.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so with that I will move the
16	time extension for Zoning Commission Case Number 13-05C
17	Forest City Washington as proposed, one-year PUD time
18	extension as requested, and ask for a second.
19	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
21	seconded. Any further discussion?
22	All in favor?
23	(Chorus of ayes.)
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
25	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, record the vote.

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote 5 to 0 to 0
2	to approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 13-
3	05C. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Miller
4	seconding, Commissioners May, Shapiro and Turnbull in
5	support.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, I think we go to a
7	hearing action. Zoning Commission Case Number 17-21, As You
8	Like It, LLC - Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment at
9	Square 498.
10	Mr. Cochran, is this your case?
11	MR. COCHRAN: Yes, sir.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Cochran, do you have anything
13	you want to add to it or, because I know this is our second
14	time.
15	MR. COCHRAN: Just a little bit.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
17	MR. COCHRAN: A couple of filings came in today.
18	Exhibits 17 and 18 were filed today and they indicate that
19	the applicant and the ANC have met twice since the project
20	was reviewed by the, or considered by the Commission in
21	January.
22	In Exhibit 17, the applicant states that in
23	response to those meetings it is now working on site plan
24	changes, particularly the location and size of the annex
25	building increasing upper story setbacks mitigating loading

impacts, perhaps design alterations to make the building more compatible with the nearby townhouses and enhancing Shakespeare-oriented public benefits for nearby schools and the neighborhood.

In Exhibit 18, the ANC 6D, Single Member District Commissioner notes that while the ANC welcomes the opportunity to continue dialogue about the case, its previous concerns and its recommendations against set down at this time have not changed.

OP's analysis indicates that the project would not be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan and OP recommends the Commission set down the application for a public hearing.

If the project is set down, OP will work with the applicant on addressing the issues that OP summarized on page 18 of its preliminary report, the concerns that have been expressed by the ANC and matters that have others have already or might raise during the continued dialogue that is set down at a hearing would enable.

And I can certainly answer any questions if you have them.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioners, we have a request for us to set down. I think the big issue is do we believe this is consistent with the comp plan. I think, Mr. Cochran, Office of Planning believes that this is consistent with the

2.0

1 comprehensive plan? 2 MR. COCHRAN: Or technically not inconsistent, 3 yes. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Technically not inconsistent with 4 5 the comprehensive plan. 6 Okay, let me hear from others. Let's open up the 7 comprehensive plan, do we want to discuss that or any issues, 8 actually? Any comments or questions? 9 Mr. Chairman? COMMISSIONER MAY: 10 Yes, Commissioner May. CHAIRMAN HOOD: 11 COMMISSIONER MAY: So yes, I appreciate the fact 12 that there have been a couple of meetings. That was pretty fast to have two meetings between the applicant and the ANC. 13 And I appreciate the fact that the applicant has already started to make some changes. 15 It does seem pretty apparent that there, you know, 16 it's not going to be a matter of tweaking to satisfy the ANC 17 that this is consistent with the comprehensive plan. 18 And I, you know, I don't think that the applicant 19 is prepared to make the kind of drastic changes that I would 2.0 21 expect the ANC might want to see in order to make it consistent with the immediate neighborhood, which is largely 22 townhouses in the immediate vicinity, but, you know, catty-23 corner is a tall apartment building as well and Southwest has 24

a lot of up and down, you know, small development and tall

1 buildings and so on. 2 So it's, you know, I think you could look at it I would just say that at this point 3 a lot of different ways. I don't see a reason to delay set down any further and that 5 we will have to have a hearing. And one of the things that we have to hash out is 6 7 whether in fact this is, whether we agree that this is not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan. 8 9 So I'm in favor of setting it down at this moment. 10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other comments? 11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Vice Chair Miller? 12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would just concur with Commissioner May's comments. 15 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Mr. Chair. I would agree with both of my colleagues. I think although there are 16 aspects of what the ANC is opposed to, I think we should set 17 18 it down. I think we need to talk about this in an open 19 I think the applicant's on notice of what he has to 2.0 21 I think the OP report by Mr. Cochran clearly calls out a lot of the issues that I agree with, and I think that 22 the issues of the comprehensive plan can be talked about in 23 So I'm ready to go ahead and set it down. 24 an open forum.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO:

25

I concur, Mr. Chair.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. In that case, would
2	somebody like to, there's three out of the five of us. Well,
3	there's four out of the five. Well, five out of the five of
4	us, you know, to say that.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I would move
6	that we set down Zoning Case Number 17-21, As You Like It,
7	LLC - Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment at Square 498,
8	and look for a second.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
11	seconded. Any further discussion?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would just want to encourage
13	the Office of Planning and the applicant and the ANC and the
14	interested neighbors to have constructive discussion between
15	now and when we actually have the hearing, because it would
16	be great if there was a better sense of agreement on the
17	direction of this because I think that it will be, in the
18	long run, beneficial to see this site be developed.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so noted. I'm sure the
20	applicant heard as well as other parties involved. Properly
21	seconded moved and properly seconded. Any further
22	discussion?
23	All those in favor?
24	(Chorus of ayes.)
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?

1	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, record the vote.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote 5 to
3	0 to 0 to set down Zoning Commission Case Number 17-21 as a
4	contested case. Commissioner Turnbull moving, Commissioner
5	May seconding, Commissioners Hood, Miller and Shapiro in
6	support.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next set down, we have
8	Zoning Commission Case Number 17-14, UM 500 Penn Street NE,
9	LLC & UDR, Inc Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment
10	at Square 3594.
11	Ms. Vitale? Ms. Vitale.
12	MS. ELLIOTT: I think we took a step back tonight,
13	Mr. Chair. You were doing so well. You were on a winning
14	streak and
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know what. You know what.
16	Oh, and you know what? I remember you saying that Chairman
17	Fred Hill called you Vitale. I'm sorry, Ms. Elliott. That
18	was in my mind. I remember you saying that, so charge that
19	one to Chairman Hill.
20	MS. ELLIOTT: Absolutely, I will let him know.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, because you said one time,
22	didn't you say that at BZA that he called, I think you said
23	he called you Ms. Vitale.
24	MS. ELLIOTT: I believe that you planted the idea
25	in his head and so he started calling me that.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Wasn't she sitting on the end 2 earlier? 3 MS. ELLIOTT: She was. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, that's what, okay. All 5 right, yes, musical chairs. Okay. I'm sorry, Ms. Elliott. 6 I'm used to it, but we'll move on. MS. ELLIOTT: 7 evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. Brandice Elliott 8 For the record, Ι am We recommend that the representing Office of Planning. application for a Consolidated PUD and PUD Related Map 10 11 Amendment for the Maurice Electric site in Florida Avenue 12 Market, located at 500 Penn Street, be set down for a public 13 hearing. 14 The development would consist of a 12-story, 130foot high, mixed-use building with ground floor retail and 15 11 stories of residential use consisting of approximately 300 16 dwelling units. 17 18 The property is currently zoned PDR and the applicant proposes to rezone it to MU9 which would result in 19 2.0 a gain of 80 feet of height and approximately 189,000 square 21 feet of floor area. The original submission was actually filed last 22 June, so over the last eight months, the applicant has made 23 some improvements. The affordable housing has been increased 24 25 from 9 percent to 12 percent with 70 percent of the floor

area reserved for those at 60 percent MFI, and 30 percent of the floor area reserved for those at 50 percent MFI.

The development also includes three-bedroom units. Other offers have also been added or increased including an art display in the residential lobby, a proposed job training and readiness program and participation in First Source agreement.

OP has provided an analysis of the proposed offers and identified the need for additional information regarding some of those as noted on pages 17 through 22 of its report.

The applicant has committed to provide 1,178 square feet of PDR and makerspace onsite and 20,000 square feet on an adjacent site both for a period of five years.

While this is a significant improvement from the proposal which did original not include PDR any ormakerspace, the temporary nature of the space is a concern because the intent of the comprehensive plan is to provide permanent land uses consistent with the future land use map because flexibility gained through the the permanent.

In addition, the Ward 5 Works Industrial Land Transformation Study highlights the need to preserve industrial land to provide affordable spaces for small businesses.

The site is designated high-density residential,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

high-density commercial and PDR on the future land use map, and the proposed PUD would not be inconsistent with this designation provided that the Zoning Commission determines that the applicant has adequately addressed the PDR stride.

The proposal also would not be inconsistent with the policies of the comprehensive plan as detailed in Attachment 2 of OP's report. The PUD would also further the objectives and policies of the Florida Avenue Market small area plan.

Should the Commission set down the application, OP would continue to work with the applicant to provide information as noted in OP's report which includes details regarding certain benefits and amenities, permanent PDR and makerspace, refined architectural drawings and of course anything additional requested by the Commission.

I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Elliott. Let me just ask right off, the employment service amenity or option of employment service I was told, I thought that the city had stopped doing that. Is this something different or are we talking about the same program?

MS. ELLIOTT: So the applicant is working with the ANC to develop a different program. I think we've requested additional information to see what it would actually entail.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, all right. Thank you, Ms.

2.0

1	Elliott. And again I apologize for Commissioner Shapiro not
2	no, I'm just playing. I apologize getting confused. I
3	was doing so well. I feel bad now.
4	Okay, any other questions or comments?
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair?
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Mr. Turnbull.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, thank you. I just
8	wanted to thank OP for their report. But the one thing I
9	agree that I think there's a couple things about the
10	drawings, you had some issues with the clarification, better
11	drawings, and I would agree with that.
12	You also talk about signage that there's no,
13	anything. There's some, a little reference to signage, so
14	I think that ought to be addressed.
15	I would also like to see better drawings regarding
16	the rooftop, the penthouse and the setbacks. I'd like to see
17	that clearly defined and showing that they meet all the
18	setbacks on the project.
19	But other than that I think it was a very
20	excellent report. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions?
22	Commissioner May?
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you, Chairman Miller, I
24	mean Hood.
25	So I agree with the comments from the Office of

Planning and the particular concerns. I mean I think the PDR use is a pretty big issue, also agree on getting better drawing.

And I think one of the very important things for me is the plans for the rest of the lot because the development looks rather odd where it's just sort of half of the Maurice Electric building or the former Maurice Electric building.

There is also an issue that I see with the lack of setback on the rooftop or the penthouse on the east side of the rear wing which presumably is that way because it's a closed corridor.

It's not a yard. It's not facing a public way. But nonetheless it's highly visible because the rest of that lot is not developed, So I would like to understand that better.

I mean if I can know with some certainty that it's not going to be visible for, you know, in the near future or in the immediate lifetime of the building then that's fine. But if it's going to be sitting that way for a long time and we're going to be looking over that two-story Maurice Electric building at a penthouse that's not been set back, then I think it's a problem.

So I'm interested in knowing more about that and I agree with Mr. Turnbull's request as well, thank you.

2.0

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Shapiro?
2	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
3	agree with the comments of my colleagues and especially what
4	the plans are for the rest of the lot. I had those same
5	concerns.
6	And also related to the environmental benefits I
7	would want to hear from the applicant. If they're not able
8	to include solar panels, why not. That this seems like the
9	perfect project where solar panels would benefit. And OP's
10	support and DOE's support of this Commission has repeatedly
11	made it clear that this is an important benefit.
12	And in addition, as OP mentioned they and we
13	should be looking for clarification if the proposed
14	development will be Gold certified through U.S. Green
15	Building Council. And that's all I have, Mr. Chair.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.
17	And one of the things that I would first,
18	anybody else?
19	Vice Chair Miller?
20	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would just concur with my
21	colleagues and thank OP for their comprehensive report and
22	agree with virtually all of their recommendations.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Turnbull?
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair. Yes, I just
25	thought of one other thing and I forgot to add it. The alley

back there, there's two hotels, one we approved about a year ago and then there was one built, I mean one that's up and running.

There's been several, I would like to have a better analysis of the loading and the traffic going in that alley. It looks like the entrance to the garages are at the very end back by those hotels, so I'd like to -- and there's vaults at the other end, so I'm just curious.

And I wouldn't mind seeing like a rendering down that alley to know what the heck it's really going to look like. Very concerned about the impact on how that's really going to work, so that was the only thing I wanted to add.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And also, you know, when I think about certain areas in the city and how it can enhance, I've ran into information about an organization called Rooftop.

Not that I'm promoting any particular organization, but I know Ward 5 that we can, in those conversations that you might be having with the ANC you might want to mention one of the groups of Rooftop Roots because it's a very valuable asset, I think, that we'll be hearing more about in this city.

So when we talk about solar panels and we talk about green roofs, I'm going to be also talking about scenarios like Rooftop Roots. So that's one of the issues I would like to see us talk about with the Ward 5 community

2.0

1	and I'm going to be mentioning that quite a bit across the
2	city.
3	So okay, anything else? Would somebody like to
4	make a motion?
5	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, I move that we
6	set down Zoning Commission Case Number 17-14, UM 500 Penn
7	Street NE, LLC & UDR, Inc Consolidated PUD & Related Map
8	Amendment at Square 3594. Look for a second.
9	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
11	seconded. Any further discussion?
12	All in favor?
13	(Chorus of ayes.)
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
15	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, will you record the
16	vote?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote 5 to
18	0 to 0 to set down Zoning Commission Case Number 17-14 as a
19	
	contested case. Commissioner Shapiro moving, Commissioner
20	Miller seconding, Commissioners Hood, May and Turnbull in
20 21	
	Miller seconding, Commissioners Hood, May and Turnbull in
21	Miller seconding, Commissioners Hood, May and Turnbull in support.
21	Miller seconding, Commissioners Hood, May and Turnbull in support. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to Zoning
21 22 23	Miller seconding, Commissioners Hood, May and Turnbull in support. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to Zoning Commission Case Number 08-34H, Jewish Historical Society of

1 MS. FOTHERGILL: Good evening, Chairman Hood and 2 members of the Commission. For the record, I'm Fothergill with the Office of Planning. 3 OP recommends that the Zoning Commission set down 4 the Jewish Historical Society's request for a 2nd-Stage PUD 5 within the south block of the larger Capitol 6 7 project. 8 In 2011, the Zoning Commission approved a 1st-9 Stage PUD for the subject property. This proposal is not inconsistent with that approval or the comprehensive plan. 10 11 The 2nd-Stage PUD consists of the relocation of the historic synagogue building to the southeast corner of 12 the reconnected 3rd and F Streets Northwest. 13 14 The applicant will construct an adjacent building for museum and office space. The new building would maintain 15 the driveway and garage off 3rd Street and the internal 16 connection to the future building to the east shown in the 17 18 Stage 1 PUD. For the 1st-Stage PUD, the Commission approved up 19 to seven stories and an FAR of 4.09 for this site. 2.0 The 21 applicant is now proposing four stories and an FAR of 2.605 and the new museum building's height would be 68 feet. 22 23 The proposal would comply with the D4 zoning regulations, but the applicant has requested flexibility from 24 25 the penthouse setback requirements.

1	In terms of the comprehensive plan future land use
2	map, this property is appropriate for high-density commercial
3	uses. The proposal is consistent with major policies from
4	various elements of the comprehensive plan.
5	The Office of Planning recommends that the Jewish
6	Historical Society 2nd-Stage PUD application be set down for
7	a public hearing, and I'm happy to take any questions.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Fothergill.
9	Commissioners, is there any questions or comments?
10	Okay. Would somebody like to make a motion, if
11	not?
12	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Mr. Chair, I move that we
13	set down Zoning Commission Case Number 08-34H, Jewish
14	Historical Society of Greater Washington - 2nd-Stage PUD at
15	Square 568, and look for a second.
16	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
18	seconded. Any further discussion?
19	Okay, I guess all the issues that we have we can
20	probably deal with those at the hearing. Any further
21	discussion?
22	All in favor?
23	(Chorus of ayes.)
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
25	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, if you'll record

1	the vote.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote 5 to
3	0 to 0 to set down Zoning Commission Case Number
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Have a nice evening, Ms. Elliott.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: 08-34H as a contested case.
6	Commissioner Shapiro moving, Commissioner Turnbull seconding,
7	Commissioners Hood, May and Miller in support.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We're in correspondence
9	now, I believe. Okay, let's go to Zoning Commission Case
10	Number 15-18A, Initio.
11	Ms. Schellin?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. At Exhibit 9, the Committee
13	of 100 has requested to waive the rules to accept a late
14	filed motion for reconsideration from a non-party and their
15	request for reconsideration.
16	The order in this case was published in the DO
17	Register on February 2nd, and request from parties for
18	reconsideration were due by February 12th.
19	At Exhibit 10, the applicant's objection to the
20	request stating that the is the, I'm sorry, the
21	applicant's objection to the request stating that the
22	Committee of 100's motion must fail because the regulations
23	clearly states that only parties can request reconsideration.
24	And, in addition, the Committee of 100 doesn't seek to

address the merits of the order but to remove language it

1	feels is unnecessary.
2	So it asks the Commission to consider this
3	request.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you, Ms. Schellin.
5	Colleagues, I think due to our rules, and I'm not
6	sure if we've ever done this and I can stand to be corrected.
7	But I think due to our rules of reconsideration and not being
8	a party, but what I do want to make sure is that our language
9	in that case is correct in the order, but I believe it is.
10	But I think this was stated, if the Committee
11	wants to just take something out dealing with, I guess, about
12	50 percent of the waiver of the requirements, but I think we
13	exhaustively discussed that and I don't want to go back into
14	the merits of the case.
15	But I think it goes first on the Committee of 100,
16	first of all, the rules to accept the late filing to a non-
17	party for a request for reconsideration, and I don't think
18	we've ever done that and I think our rules are explicit and
19	I think we just need to be consistent.
20	Let me open up, any comments?
21	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I concur, Mr. Chair.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do I need to vote on this?
23	Okay, anybody else?
24	All right, I move that we deny the request from
25	the Committee of 100 due to our regulations which require you

1	to be a party to request for reconsideration, and ask for a
2	second.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and properly
5	seconded. Any further discussion?
6	All in favor?
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
9	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, will you record the
10	vote?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote 5 to 0 to
12	0 to deny the Committee of 100's request to waive the rule
13	to accept the late filed motion for reconsideration from a
14	non-party. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Turnbull
15	seconding, Commissioners May, Miller and Shapiro also
16	supporting the denial.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, we have Zoning
18	Commission Case Number 06-10, Copy of letter from Zoning
19	Administrator to Applicant re: Matter-of-Right Charter School
20	Use.
21	I don't think this, this doesn't require any
22	action. This is just letting us know, I believe.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: It's, I mean it's up to the
24	Commission whether they want to do anything.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any comments on charter school

41 1 use? 2 Okay, so we will record this as so noted and we 3 are aware of it. Anything, do we need to do anything else? 4 Okay. Do we have anything else before us 5 All right. 6 other than the American University cases? So let me Okay. 7 Does Office of Planning have anything they want to add tonight? 8 9 No, sir. MS. STEINGASSER: 10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's qo to, qo back. 11 to thank those who are here for the 12 University case. This may take us a little longer. let me call the first case and I want to thank Mr. 13

Turnbull for recommending that we put it all together.

Okay, Zoning Commission Case Number 11-07H,

American University - Technical Correction to Condition

Number 14 of Zoning Commission Order Number 11-07.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Again the applicant has requested a technical correction to Condition 14 of Zoning Commission Order 11-07 which indicates the number of parking spaces it is required to maintain.

Exhibit 4 is the Spring Valley Wesley Heights Citizens Association and Neighbors for Livable Communities joint response to the application in which they believe the

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 applicant should have filed for modification of 2 significance, and ask the Commission to consider this request 3 before them. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: The first thing, I quess we need to decide whether or not, first of all, did I ask this 5 question for this one? Does anybody believe this needs to 6 7 come off the consent calendar? 8 Okay, so there's no objections to it being on the 9 consent calendar, so let's move forward with the issue at hand about this being a, does anybody believe this is not a 10 11 technical correction? Mr. Chairman? 12 COMMISSIONER MAY: 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, Mr. May. 14 So as being one of the commissioners who was in the original discussions in this case, 15 present the original hearings in the case, the many, many hearings in 16 this case, I have to say, honestly, I do not recall exactly 17 what the number should have been based 18 just mУ recollection from the hearing. 19 2.0 In reviewing the information that we have on the record on this case, it's not perfectly clear to me that it 21 should be one way or the other. And but I think that, you 22 know, we have evidence in the record to consider whether it 23 should be one way or the other. 24

Certainly, the party in opposition believes that

it should not be changed from the 2,500 as it appears in the condition, and the applicant believes that it really should be 2,200.

Frankly, I think that this is something that it is, I mean I don't think that this is something that warrants another full hearing. I think that there's enough uncertainty about it.

There certainly was a desire on the part of the University to reduce the number of parking spaces and there was support for that from the Office of Planning and others.

Certainly this Commission supported reducing the required number of parking spaces, and the fact that right now they are not running at capacity or even really near capacity I've heard numbers between 70 and 80 percent usage on the existing quantity of parking spaces at 2,400 spaces.

So I think that it's, you know, the number of 2,200 is perfectly reasonable and supportable based on what we have here and I would suggest that we could treat this as a modification of consequence and evaluate it based on the information that we have already received in the record rather than having to hold a hearing, at which point we will hear a lot of the same arguments repeated over and over again.

So I would be ready to move forward with this as a modification of consequence.

2.0

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
May. Let me just add to that.

I believe, and when I looked at this, having dealt with American University and the campus plan since 2000 when the Commission first took back over campus plans, one of the issues though I think, and I know as Commissioner May and Commissioner Turnbull and myself and I think, Commissioner Slater, I can't remember who the other commissioner was at the time, but it was hard-pressed for me to figure that we would not address whether it was 2,500, 2,200, 2,800, whatever the case is, because one thing about this Commission and specifically I'm going to speak about my two colleagues who were here then and myself, we always get into the numbers and the inches. We've always done that.

So I don't know, you know, the condition says, I believe, 2,500. So, you know, and I understand that the assumption of it being a typographical error, but I just don't, I'm sorry.

I'm not saying anyone's trying to misguide us, but I'm hard to believe that this Commission, that the guys that, well, ladies and gentlemen, I knew who were up here at the time, would not get down into whether we have that discussion.

2.0

It's just unfortunate we can't find the trail, well, one says 2,200 and one's 2,500, and I just, it's hard to believe it was a typographical error because we review those conclusions of law and we look at that. And I'm sure, I don't think we would have missed that but then again I guess we might have.

But I just think moving forward I was more inclined to see a modification of significance so we can have results in discussions, but if you all believe that we're going to hear the same information I just thought we could concentrate and kind of figure it out whether it's 2,500 or whether it warrants to go down to 2,200.

That's why I was thinking in terms of moving forward to a limited scope hearing. It doesn't have to be an all-night hearing and we don't have to relitigate and reargue the whole campus plan which we've already done.

But I've heard from Commissioner May we do have a lot in the record and he brings up a good point, will I hear anymore, but I think we could focus on maybe establishing whether there are adverse impacts with downgrading to the 2,200 as being requested.

2.0

1 But anyway those are my comments. 2 Mr. Turnbull? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 3 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would, I'd like to say I can go either way, but I think Commissioner May is right. 5 We're at a point where, I forget how many hearings we had, five 6 7 hearings or four nights of hearings, five nights? had a lot of nights of hearings. 9 And the, I guess, if we go back and look at the language in it, I guess it's a little unclear 10 11 as to what we actually had agreed. But I think I would at this point in time look at it as a matter of 12 consequence and not want to go the, raises to have a 13 separate hearing. I think we can debate this on the dais and go forward. 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 16 Any other comments? 17 Vice Chair Miller? 18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. one who is thankfully not on 19 As original hearing, it was before my term, 2.0 but 21 someone who has reviewed the record from that hearing and from this hearing, from this case, I would agree 22 with Commissioner May and Commissioner Turnbull that 23 24 enough information in we have the record,

submissions, both written submissions and public

1	hearing testimony on the issue of parking that we car
2	proceed to consider this as a modification of
3	consequence.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Shapiro?
5	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr.
6	Chair. I would associate myself with the remarks of
7	Vice Chair Miller.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right, let's,
9	so we'll consider this a modification of consequence.
LO	Do we need to vote on that Ms. Lovick?
11	MS. LOVICK: Well, you can at this point,
12	you can discuss what you find to be the adverse
L3	impacts and you could go ahead and deliberate now
L4	because all the parties have submitted documentation
15	to the record on the issue or you could set
L6	deliberations for a future date.
L7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Commissioners, I
18	think I heard do we want to deliberate now, we're
L9	ready to move forward. Okay, would somebody like to
20	start us off with the deliberations on this 2,500-
21	2,200?
22	Commissioner May?
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: If you can rewind the
24	tape and I can say what I said before? But I would
25	say, I think that this is a circumstance where it is

in the best, broader interest of the city to have reduced parking numbers.

Certainly it doesn't make sense to have a lot of vacant parking spaces which seem to be occurring right now. And I understand there is the potential for, you know, if we were talking about limiting the parking so much that it would drive people to park in the neighborhood, then I think we would need to talk about significant mitigations for that.

But I think we are all familiar with the very aggressive policies the University has for policing the University-related people who park in the neighborhood in making sure that that does not occur. In fact, if anything, one can argue that it's overly aggressive, but I won't go that far.

But I think that this is a, you know, I get the evidence shows that there is ample parking and it can be reduced without a negative impact, so I don't see that there's anything that required further mitigation.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, anybody else?

I would just add that -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I concur with

25 Commissioner May.

2.0

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, anybody else?
2	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I too concur.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I might as well just.
4	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I haven't heard what
5	you're going to say, I may concur with you.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I might as well not say
7	anything now, but let's move on to the next thing.
8	Anybody else?
9	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'll let you
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What I was going to say
11	is, and I know we heard, I try to balance things. A
12	lot of times we hear from those who are affected and
13	a lot of times we don't, and I guess we have to go
14	what's in the merits of what's in the record.
15	I think there was someone who mentioned
16	about how overly aggressive, I think as Commissioner
17	May alluded to, but then there are probably somebody
17 18	May alluded to, but then there are probably somebody who are getting the other side of the coin.
18	who are getting the other side of the coin.
18 19	who are getting the other side of the coin. So, you know, I just try to balance things
18 19 20	who are getting the other side of the coin. So, you know, I just try to balance things out. And I know I have to go on the merits of the
18 19 20 21	who are getting the other side of the coin. So, you know, I just try to balance things out. And I know I have to go on the merits of the record, but it's the silent majority that I'm
18 19 20 21 22	who are getting the other side of the coin. So, you know, I just try to balance things out. And I know I have to go on the merits of the record, but it's the silent majority that I'm concerned about us not hearing from in trying to
18 19 20 21 22 23	who are getting the other side of the coin. So, you know, I just try to balance things out. And I know I have to go on the merits of the record, but it's the silent majority that I'm concerned about us not hearing from in trying to balance it.

1 they are having some adverse impacts of parking. 2 yeah, okay, it might work on this street, but what 3 happens on this street? 4 So anyway I also went to school in the 5 city too, so I know how it is when you come out and have a ticket on your car so I'm aware of how that 6 7 I was probably on that side of being overaggressive that time. 9 And I tell you, look, I'm a student. are they doing this to me? But, so I know it's two 10 11 sides to the coin, but I think this is not 12 showstopper for me. 13 So any other comments? 14 COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chair, one other thing, which I think is worthy of note, which is that 15 the ANC regarded this a technical correction or they 16 would have accepted this as a technical correction. 17 18 So I think that, you know, the ANC would support this reduction in the number of required 19 spaces, otherwise I think they would have raised 2.0 21 concerns in their communication to us. Right, okay. 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: probably had an answer for that too, but I'm going to 23

withhold that. But I think you're right. The front-

line elected officials were in support of it being a

24

1	technical correction.
2	So all right, anything else? Somebody
3	like to make a motion? I'm going to vote for it, but
4	I'm not going to make a motion and I'm not going to
5	second.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would make a motion
7	to approve Zoning Commission Case 11-07H, American
8	University modification of consequence to reduce the
9	number of required parking spaces, the condition in
10	the original order from 2,500 spaces to 2,200 spaces.
11	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and
13	properly seconded. Any further discussion?
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would just
15	clarify that it's condition number 14 in the order.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Yes, condition 14.
17	All right, any further discussion?
18	All in favor?
19	(Chorus of ayes.)
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
21	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, record the
22	vote.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the
24	vote 5 to 0 to 0 to approve Zoning Commission Case
25	Number 11-07H as a modification of consequence in
ļ	I and the state of

1	approving the change of condition number 14 from
2	2,500 parking spaces to 2,200.
3	Commissioner May moving, Commissioner
4	Shapiro seconding, Commissioners Hood, Miller and
5	Turnbull in support.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so.
7	MS. LOVICK: Excuse me. Excuse me. Can
8	you just also note the original case number?
9	It's 11-07?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: 11-07.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: 11-07H.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: No. H is the current
13	case.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, the original case.
15	MS. LOVICK: Yes, 11-07.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: The original campus
17	plan order is 11-07.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: 07.
19	MS. LOVICK: Condition 14.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: And condition number
21	14.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
23	All right, let's see here. Now let's go
24	to final action, Zoning Commission Case Number 11-07
25	was the original case and we're dealing with Zoning

1 Commission Case Number 11-07G, American University 2 Plan Amendment and Further Processing 3 Square 1600. Ms. Schellin? 4 5 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. On this case, 6 Exhibit 66, you have Spring Valley Wesley Heights and 7 Neighbors for a Livable Community's joint response regarding how they came up with the applicant being 9 required to plant over 400 trees and shrubs. In Exhibit 67 through 67B, you have the 10 11 applicant's submission regarding the number of the trees and shrubs to be planted and how many they've 12 actually planted. 13 14 But they agree with the number that the party in opposition came up with and that their 15 original submission was incorrect. That they agree 16 with that number and that they have actually planted 17 over the required amount. 18 So ask the Commission to consider this 19 2.0 case. 21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So did we already reopen the record for the request? There were a couple of 22 things that I saw in here that said reopen the 23 record. Did we already do that? 24 25 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, just wanted to make sure.

All right, Commissioners, we're looking to see a substantial compliance for some of the things that I think the University has admitted in a couple of cases where they were not in compliance, but they got in compliance just before they came in here to see us, for the last few years.

So anyway let me open it up for any discussion or comments. We could really go by some of the outstanding conditions if you want to go in that order. I think it would be better for us to do it that way.

Okay, one of the issues was transportation demand monitoring reports. The applicant had admitted that in 2013 and '14 and '15 provided, the applicant admitted that it failed to provide the reports in 2013, '14 and '15. But the applicant provided the Commission with the copies of the reports filed in 2016 and '17. So.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So I mean, to me that means that now they are in compliance with this particular condition as they are with many of the others.

It also shows that they didn't do a good

2.0

job in the beginning complying with those and they should not have to be reminded about these things and it should have been better, but it is what it is now and they are in compliance with this condition. So I'm okay with that.

I think the same is true with the parking utilization reports, although it's kind of that's a little shakier. You know, it's unfortunate that when we are debating really substantive matters when it comes to campus plan modifications, there's further processings as in this case that's a further processing, that we have to deal with real questions about substantial compliance.

And I mean it's really unfortunate because this should be a matter of checking boxes, right. They should have completed all these reports and submitted the reports in a timely fashion and clearly some of that stuff has not been done over the years.

Again, you know, right now and the TDM reports and parking utilization reports and I think they are in compliance, but it's not been perfect from the beginning.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other comments on that?

I would just say this to start and, you

2.0

know, I don't know if it's a showstopper, but to see something, when you've been around since 2000 and you see the same issues that'll show up 18 years later, then you start having problems.

Because that means that all the nights that we stayed here trying to get on the Metro before it closed at 12 o'clock and all the many hours that we spent down here in trying to help mitigate and put conditions in place which should be followed, and then I look up and see a university or an applicant come down in compliance the next two years.

So basically the message that we're sending is we're going to do conditions, but when you come back and the first three years you can do what you want, but tighten it up before you come back and see the Zoning Commission for the two, that's the signal I think we're sending, and then I have a problem with it.

I don't care for it, because we spent a lot of our time down here and a lot of Office of Planning, Office of Zoning, Office of the Attorney General, the residents of the city, and even the University's time and they know that these are things that we put in place for a reason.

We don't put them in place to come in

2.0

1 compliance two years before you come down and ask for But, you know, maybe, well, no, I 2 something else. it's 3 I'm right. So Ι don't know if showstopper for me, but I have problems with that. Some of these same issues have been around here as 5 long as I've been on the Commission. 6 7 So anyway, any other comments or questions? 8 9 Commissioner Turnbull? 10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just have a, are 11 we going to talk about condition 17 Jacobs Field? 12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You really want to talk Yes, go for it. about that? 13 14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It seems to me we have in the past, back remembering them, the blushing 15 homeowner, Mr. Herzstein, talking about Jacobs Field 16 and the noise in fact that went on back there, I 17 don't believe that the applicant's right that a non-18 University athletic event is a special event. 19 2.0 My own feeling is that an athletic event that is sanctioned by the University for a third-21 party raises the same issues about noise and I think 22 And maybe it's not implicitly 23 that was a concern. stated, or explicitly stated, but implicitly stated 24

is that that is a concern.

And I think an athletic event on that field by a third party raises the same concerns as if was University-sponsored event, concerned. I really don't know if it's a special That's my feeling. And I don't know what the rest of you think. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I would agree, Mr. Turnbull. But I think though, I think that we, I know we spent a lot of time on Jacobs Field. like I know Jacobs Field very well. But to come back and well, there should be now say some misunderstanding, I don't think, I thought it was clear. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I quess I thought it was too. But I think we need to make it clear. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right, okay. Mr. Shapiro? COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, I did not participate in the past, but it Chair. does seem to me that a non-University athletic event is an athletic event and not a special event. And so I would agree with Commissioner Turnbull on the interpretation of this.

I'm not quite clear what we do about that

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

because as I look at their overall, I believe that they're considering all the conditions that they're in substantial compliance.

But I would want the University to hear loud and clear that we feel that there are some areas where they're not in compliance and are interpret, if we concur that we want to be clear with what our interpretation of this is, then they can make a decision about whether or not they choose to be in compliance with what we're mandating.

MS. LOVICK: Excuse me. I would just advise that you would make it clear that a non-University athletic event is not considered a special event and that the Commission is just reiterating and clarifying that you don't find non-University athletic events to be allowable or permissible on Jacobs Field.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull, let me ask you, do you recall, no, it's only been a couple years from now, but do you recall what we said about Jacobs Field? I know we had specificity about that.

And I see what the conditions say, but I know we were specific about it.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: To tell you the truth, I don't. I just remember Mr. Herzstein

2.0

impassionately talking about that field and the noise and the impact and he being supported by others.

And I had a feeling that it was our intent to do whatever we could to mitigate that impact, that the University would do whatever it could to, I mean we have, I thought we were supposed to do like studies of noise, speakers, level of sound. I thought there was a whole menu of conditions that had to be met that they were going to talk about.

So unfortunately I can't remember exactly what we said.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So let me ask this. We need to make sure, and I would ask Ms. Lovick. We need to make sure we write a condition that is predictable and understandable so 18 years from now the Commission won't be sitting here faced with the same thing that some of us are faced with.

So I'm not sure how we get there, how we make this so they understand exactly what we were trying to achieve. Do we give it back to the community to work on or do we do it, or?

MS. LOVICK: No, I mean, I think at this stage you're just clarifying what your intent was because there just was a difference of interpretation between the opposition and the applicant. So.

2.0

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I really don't understand. 2 I'd have to, because I thought we really nailed that We talked about it enough. But anyway, okay, 3 I'll heed the advice. 5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, if I could? 6 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. 8 COMMISSIONER MAY: So I can understand how 9 University would, the you know, reading conditions that we did set out, 17 and then 25, which 10 11 is the section that deals more specifically with special events, I can see how the University might 12 interpret certain athletic events to be considered 13 14 special events. 15 For example, one of the things that I cite is a charitable event such as the Juvenile Diabetes 16 Research Foundation's annual Real Estate Games. 17 I assume that they're not out there playing, you 18 know, board games, they're doing athletic games of 19 2.0 some sort. 21 there's a sporting event So that included within that general description, so I think it's reasonable for the University to have come to 23 that conclusion. 24

Now whether we, you know, that was what we

had in mind beyond that specific example and how broadly it has been interpreted since then by the University is, you know, I don't feel like we have a whole lot of information to judge it on.

I also think that, you know, we're at this point halfway through the life of this plan and it would be rather abrupt for us to simply say that, you know, non-University athletic events are not special events in our view, because I don't know how disruptive that is to the University's practices.

I mean maybe it's no big deal and they're willing to forego such events for the sake of keeping peace with the neighbors, maybe they're not. I think that if we're going to come to some different conclusion about whether a non-University sporting event should or should not be considered a special event, I think that we actually need to hear further from the University before we come to some conclusion about that.

I mean for my purposes I would be, you know, I would not be averse to continuing to find substantial compliance with the conditions of the order with this still as an open issue, because again substantial does not mean a hundred percent.

It mean, you know, they're hitting it on

2.0

most of the, you know, the vast majority of the conditions. It's, I mean there are 41 conditions, so there's a lot of things that they have to comply with.

I mean again as I said before, they're not doing a very good job, or they have not done historically a very good job on complying with some of them, but I think it's still possible for us to find that they're in substantial compliance without seeing that they have crossed every T and dotted every I.

That being said, I understand that the Chairman and Commissioner Turnbull have some resistance to moving, or may have resistance to moving ahead on the assumption that or without making a specific determination that non-University sporting events are not considered special events in order to find substantial compliance.

I mean, even then I think I would rather hear from the University to know how big an issue that is before we head specifically down that road. Otherwise, I would suggest that we need to get a little more information from the University and from the parties before we determine whether in fact this is, they are substantially compliant here or not.

2.0

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just say this about substantial while I'm thinking about it. I know that it says substantial compliance with conditions and to me, even though they have, what, 40, is it 41 conditions, to me, you know, when you look at parking, you look at the vast majority of some of the main outstanding issues, I don't know if for me if it's a numbers game.

I'm not saying anyone's insinuating that.

Okay, I'm in compliance with 30 of them. But, you know, some of them, and I'm sitting here looking at some of them. Some of them may not be to the magnitude and does not have the same weight from my standpoint that others do. Some of them are very adversely impact on the community as well as some of the others.

Just because they're in compliance with 30, even though it's 30 today, they've been at least that we know of that they're in compliance, at least the record show, say that they're in compliance, but those other 11 may have I don't want to say greater weight, but they may be a lot more adversely impacting the community.

So I kind of, I don't think it's a numbers game for me as far as substantially in compliance.

2.0

1 I think for me it's what impacts do the ones that 2 they're of compliance with have the out surrounding community, because that's why we had the 3 conditions to start with to begin with. 5 If everything was rosy and we just did a 6 plan we wouldn't have any conditions. The conditions 7 are to make sure that we balance the use of the University with being within the community and vice 9 versa. So that's what those conditions, the way 10 11 I believe they're written and what they're for, so that's my opinion on the substantial compliance. But 12 I do agree with you, Commissioner May, to a point. 13 14 Let me hear from others. Vice Chair Miller and then I'll go to you, 15 Mr. Turnbull. 16 17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: T'll defer Commissioner Miller, I mean Commissioner Turnbull. 18 Now I haven't done that. 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 2.0 No, getting back 21 to Commissioner May's point about the special events language listed certain specific things, Homecoming, 22 23 and they did mention the, what is it, diabetic blah blah blah as a specific thing, it did 24

it does not condone soccer

mention,

25

not

2 event on the field by a third party. 3 And that's been my concern is that you're going to have major athletic events played on those I mean it sounds like if we put diabetic in 5 field. there that was agreed to by them, I think the 6 7 neighbors and everybody thought that those games, I don't know what's included in those games, if there's three-legged races or sack races or wheelbarrow races 9 or whatever, but I think that's a specific thing that 10 11 I think was agreed upon. 12 think carrying it further But Ι to 13 athletic contests maybe goes beyond the intent of what we, by what at least what this Commissioner thought it was. That's my only fear is that we 15 really need to narrow the scope of this. 16 17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, and I don't disagree with that. I mean I think it's a category 18 of activity that we didn't really explicitly --19 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 2.0 Right. 21 COMMISSIONER MAY: -- try to give direction on in the order ultimately. 22 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But I think --23 24 COMMISSIONER MAY: Again, I don't have a 25 good sense of what the frequencies of these sorts of

football games, lacrosse or any kind of athletic

1 things are, but I don't think it's unreasonable for 2 the University to have interpreted that as a special event. 3 4 Again --Well, 5 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think 6 that's why OAG is saying we need to clarify that. 7 COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, right. And I'm saying if we were to try to clarify it, I wouldn't clarify to it without having want better understanding from the University about what this 10 11 clarification means, or in fact, you know, 12 impactful some of these events truly are. I don't 13 really understand that. I don't really know. 14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Are you saying we need a limited hearing just on that issue? 15 COMMISSIONER MAY: 16 No. I'm suggesting that we might want to, before we try to come to a 17 18 conclusion about narrowing what these conditions mean we probably need further input from the University. 19 2.0 And I mean if it's already in the record 21 on this case, then maybe it's just a matter of them pointing at the right things. 22 And, you know, I can go back and look at 23 it all again and see if I see it there, but, you

know, it would help to have them point us to it or to

68 reiterate some of the arguments that they would want 1 2 to make. Plus, you know, we would want to hear from 3 the parties in opposition. I mean if we're talking a year and they're 5 you know, 50 events outrageously loud, obviously that's a problem. 6 7 if we're talking about like three, you know, they're kids' soccer games, I don't know that that's, how big of a problem that is. 9 10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I quess that 11 would need not only the University but the parties in 12 opposition also. 13 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, yes, of course. 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because I actually thought

we had a limit on non-University use. I can't even remember now.

But let's both get, we're going to go over the other issues, but I think what I'm hearing is we need to get responses from, get it from University. Let's tighten up the language. We need to tighten that language up as Ms. Lovick has already mentioned so it's understandable.

But we, as we said, let's hear from the University and I'm sure they'll share that with the parties as well, including, I guess including the ANC

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

because they're an automatic party. All right.

Yes?

2.0

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I haven't weighed in on this substantial compliance issue at all and we've now gone through three.

In general, from what I, I certainly can't say what three Commissioners or the Commission that was in place at the time what they intended if Commissioners here can't even say what they intended, so I can't opine on that.

But I do agree with Commissioner May that there could be some misinterpretation of the existing definition of University events. You know, some of the neighborhood might have missed part of the University event definition that said sporting camps sponsored by the University, and what's a sporting camp? That might have a broad definition and the charitable athletic events certainly.

But I would say in general, the limiting, in general the limiting, the use of the incredible amenities that the District's universities and colleges and high schools, private schools have to only the students who go to those and precluding the use by the neighborhood of that amenity is something that in general I have an aversion to.

I know in my own neighborhood we have a limitation on the use of, have an incredible athletic facility that's just three blocks from my home. It's underground. It's just, I think, it's a neighborhood — we have these incredible amenities and it should be opened up in general.

I mean there should be limits. It shouldn't become a destination nuisance for the neighborhood where people are fending tour buses or whatever, but there's a balance to be found in the school's use of it and the non-school users because we're lucky to be rich with these facilities and they should be opened up to more than just the immediate occupants of the facility.

But I mean, so I think there's a balance to be found and I think your approach here you set out to get more information from the applicant is a good one.

think but in general so. University is in substantial compliance, collectively, with the conditions now. As Commissioner May pointed out, they haven't always So that's where I am. been.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's talk about the University's, the --

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	MS. LOVICK: The number of trees and
2	shrubs along the east buffer?
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, condition thank
4	you. The number of trees, I think that's beer
5	resolved, right? That we have, so I know
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think, Mr. Chair,
7	that they provided exhibits that demonstrate that
8	they met that condition.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. Yes. I mean and
LO	that might be open to interpretation. I see some
11	heads shaking. But for me that was, I think there's
12	some other more pressing concerns.
13	I mean the trees are fine and I think the
L4	applicant, I thought everybody had agreed that the
15	trees were, had been planted and all that. Am I
L6	misunderstanding something?
L7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean there was a
18	dispute when we were here before
L9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: about the number,
21	and the University has since clarified the number and
22	confirmed that in fact they are more than what was
23	shown on the plans that were originally approved.
24	Now some of those, 90-some of them, were
25	planted subsequently in response to concerns from the

neighbors in Westover Homes or Westover Place, whatever it is.

And I mean, you know, you could look at that as an unfortunate circumstance, oh they did not plant every single tree that they intended to plant and they didn't do it until the neighbors complained, or you could look at it this way in that, you know, they planted it and the neighbors were unhappy and so they came out and added almost a hundred trees.

You know, I don't think we should make too huge a deal over it. I mean we do have a letter in support on this case from Westover Homes, so clearly the organization, maybe not all of the individual homeowners, but the organization is in support of this case moving forward because they feel satisfied with that particular condition in the order.

Т think the tree issue has So resolved. I also do think that, you know, this is another instance where the University is kind of shooting themselves in the foot because if they had just reported the number accurately from beginning we wouldn't be dealing with this issue now.

And they, you know, they underreported it and then got called out on the number of trees and then went out and did their own inventory again and

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

came back with the right number of trees. I mean we shouldn't have to go through that kind of stuff.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And in all cases, in all neighborhoods, you have groups that say they have all these people, and I know because I've lived in one for 20 years and we have 14,000 homes and I only have 30 people coming to the meeting.

So, you know, I'm familiar with how some of this operates. And I'm sure it doesn't necessarily change from community to community. I know how it works in my community and I'm sure other communities as well.

But I thought the tree issue was taken care of. I know that the homeowners, what's the name of the street, Westover, Westover homeowners, and then I also read a submission that said that all of them weren't included.

So, you know, again it's a balancing. And then the submission we got from the University as well, so again it goes back to the balancing. You know, we have to try to deal with the facts.

And for me, when I looked at these conditions which, one, were really, really majorly critical in adverse impacts as to the community and having that letter also helped out even though it

2.0

might not include everybody, but I think that that board at least spoke for the majority, probably.

Let's go to the CLC. One of the things, this is the University's Community Liaison Committee. One of the things is we noticed from the party in opposition that they said that the neighborhood collaborative was more of a part of the community engagement. I can't really speak to that. That was not properly before this Commission.

We talked about the community liaison commission, I mean the Community Liaison Committee, and I believe that that is what is in our order. That is what the Commission worked hard on to try to get them to work with now.

If the University, I expect for the University, and I don't know what credence or what they're doing with the collaborative, but I expect for them to follow the order.

And I'm not saying they didn't, but to follow order and what we, the terms that we have for the Community Liaison Committee. Whatever they're doing with all these other groups is how they operate, but I think that they need to follow our condition number 16 as outlined. Engage with the AU neighbors as outlined in our condition.

2.0

1 So let open any questions up 2 comments other than that. Well, I would 3 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 4 agree with you, Mr. Chair. I think from standpoint what we look at is what's in the order. 5 And the CLC is the governing organization that we're 6 7 looking to that they've gone to resolve problems, work out issues and come to some kind of an agreement 9 with the community as to what's going on. if 10 Ι don't, this neighborhood So collaborative is a subset to this that's one thing. 11 And if they wanted to change they should have come 12 back to the Commission for a modification and worked 13 with the community on how to redo this. 15 So I'm not sure if, to me the neighborhood 16 collaborative cannot preclude or remove the CLC from 17 the process. So I don't know if that's like a subset before you get to the CLC, and if the CLC is now 18 still working towards what we thought it was going to 19 20 be working to. 21 So I'm confused as to what extent the University is now subletting the responsibility of 22 the neighborhood to this neighborhood collaborative. 23 I'm confused. 24 So what if, and I don't 25 CHAIRMAN HOOD:

know, do we have this in the record, the members of the committee, the CLC, because this goes back to 2001. I'm sure if you work in the community neighborhood long enough you probably quit and retire and give it to somebody else and I'm sure that's probably happened.

And we'd like to get some updates on this CLC and I don't think we saw a whole lot, at least I don't remember seeing a whole lot of evidence in the record about the CLC.

I heard more probably about the neighborhood collaborative. I want to see, I want to hear some more about our CLC which this Commission put in place in 2000-, and help with the applicant as well as the community put in place in 2001 in the campus plan.

And there was something else. Is the University still giving those, what was it, flyers or something when they have events? They were supposed it American? I might be getting to, was universities mixed up now. I thought somebody was be passing out flyers to to community know they were having events.

Is that what American University still -- you can just shake your head to help me, okay, so

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

they're still going.

2.0

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I do recall that they put, when the Northwest Current was regularly operating that there were regular notices in there about events and they invited the community to participate --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- in discussions, seminars, whatever.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So if we can get an update on the CLC and who the members are, because I'm sure it's changed since 2001, and how often they meet and if it's in the record just point me to it. I might have missed it.

Mr. Turnbull, anything else about the CLC?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, no. I think they ought to get into the process, I mean with the CLC, the responsibility and how this neighborhood collaborative is feeding into all of this. Is it totally separate? Do they operate independently? Is it feeding up to the CLC?

I mean because as you said, the CLC is what's in the order as supposed to be the governing body that looks to solving issues, so I'm, is it unwieldy? Is it too big? Is that why they have the

1	neighborhood collaborative?
2	And to what extent then are they using or
3	not using the CLC?
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything else on
5	the CLC?
6	All right, let's go to lighting and
7	landscape buffer. The applicant's proffered that
8	they will install shades for the lamps at the
9	northwest corner of the buildings programmed to go
10	down every night at dusk and raise every morning at
11	dawn.
12	And these Spring Valley Wesley Heights
13	Citizens Association and Neighbors for Livable
14	Communities, in addition to the applicant's
15	commitment they should also install automatic shades
16	on all windows of the building facing the
17	neighborhood including the 31-foot glass enclosed
18	section of hallways and stairway space.
19	That's still an outstanding issue. Any
20	comments up here on that?
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't know, maybe I'm
24	the only person that thinks this, but the, I don't
25	really see a huge issue with the lighting. Ninety

1 percent of the visible light would be addressed with 2 the shades. There are certainly other lights on campus 3 that one can see from a distance, but it's not like they are so bright that they are lighting up the 5 neighborhood beyond and projecting a lot of light. 6 7 I mean it's the amount of, I mean the foot-candles of light that actually reach other properties across that field, I think, has to be 10 So I don't, I think the University has minuscule. 11 adequately addressed the issue and I don't see a need for any further mitigations. 12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other comments and any 13 issues on the landscape? 15 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm satisfied with the applicant's proffers. 16 17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So on the issues, Okay. on the outstanding issues that we still have to work 18 through, I believe, and this Jacob, the use of Jacobs 19 Field by third parties and there's another one. 2.0 21 the CLC. 22 Now there was some other issues that were 23 brought up that were not necessarily germane to this. The increased traffic in the increased undergraduate 24

enrollment, they weren't necessarily germane for this

application.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

But I think they will probably be something we can deal with in the future, in the future plan, but right now I don't think those are germane to this application. Any objections to that?

Am I correct?

All right, so we only have two outstanding issues we need to really work on and I'm looking at, did we also need to serve the ANC? I guess we need to serve the ANC as well. But they seem to be pretty, they were fine with everything I believe, correct? Okay.

So those are the two issues, Jacobs Field and the CLC. And that's kind of narrowing them right down to where I am, Jacobs Field and the CLC.

Commissioners, any other guidance we want to give? Do we need to give anymore?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I just want to go, I don't want to beat this thing to death, but I think it was our intent, my intent that the CLC would have been the principal means to engage the neighbors, the AU neighbors, outlined in as condition 16.

I think that was our intent that was, so if there's another body now that's involved it should

1 have been brought before us. It should have been 2 clarified as part of the CLC. So I think that needs to be clarified, doesn't it? 3 I mean as far as I'm concerned if there is 4 a working body, this neighborhood collaborative, the 5 AU can do whatever they want as a separate body. But 6 7 in dealing with the whole neighborhood as an entity and going back, the CLC was still the principal entity that was to be used. 9 And maybe the neighborhood collaborative 10 11 was intent to help that, I don't know. I think AU 12 needs to explain that. 13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I think we did get some information on the record that good any collaborative was intended, and intended to help, 15 because the community engagement part of AU's whole 16 process has had its challenges over the years with 17 that and then the CLC was in the, you know, order. 18 But so I think they created that to try to 19 That's what I recall from the 2.0 help that process. 21 hearing testimony. But we'll get more information from all the parties. 22 23 Commissioner CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Shapiro? 24 25 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I agree with Vice

1	Chairman Miller. That's where I was.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: That's my memory
4	from the hearing.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me say this before I
6	go to you, Commissioner May.
7	I'm rethinking what you said, Vice Chair
8	Miller, about limiting the use of our college fields,
9	because now that you mention it you all have an
10	underground place over here. I didn't know that.
11	So maybe I'll get all my friends and we'll
12	come over in your area and use the underground. Is
13	it open for public use?
14	VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, it's limited.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. Okay.
16	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Per the BZA or
17	whatever.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so the BZA did that.
19	But I think
20	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I don't know if you
21	sat on it.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, I probably, but I
23	think you bring up a good point and it's something we
24	need to think about.
25	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. I think it's

1 just a matter of finding a balance. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's actually a good 3 point because I know there was some issues with the tennis courts at UDC some years ago and some other things like that. 5 And I noticed though when I ride around in 6 7 the city, my problem is we can find ourselves using these facilities, but anytime I'd look up and I see the cars on the street they're from Maryland and Virginia using our facilities. 10 11 So, you know, and then I know that --12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, yes. The UDC tennis courts, the door is locked --13 14 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay. 15 VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- when I'm -- that was several years ago. I don't know if they've 16 changed that policy. 17 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Commissioner May? I was going to say I 19 COMMISSIONER MAY: think I generally agree with what Vice Chair Miller 2.0 21 said with regard to the CLC. I mean I think the key question for us is not whether something like the 22 neighborhood collaborative exists, it's whether the 23 CLC which is defined in the order and required by the 24

order is functioning at a high level.

If it's not functioning at a high level then the University needs to take steps to fix it. Maybe that's what they were trying to do with the neighborhood collaborative, but clearly if that was the intent that's not really working out as broadly as we would like.

And I think that, you know, maybe it is a matter of them having to focus more energy on the CLC and being able to report that to us or maybe it means, I don't know, broader participation in the neighborhood collaborative just so long as that funnels up to the CLC, whatever it takes. The CLC is the thing that we have to use and have to measure.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Or as you said at the hearing as I recall, Mr. Chairman, or giving us the language and as you suggested to modify it to if the ANC and the community is in general support of it, which they may not be, but they may be, and putting that as modifying the community engagement process to reflect what's actually happening.

If it's working, it hasn't been working, you know, previously, but I think the neighborhood collaborative was established to try to improve the community engagement process and to help out.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, you know,

2.0

another thing that I do want and it might have been in here and I just, there's so much to read and we have so many cases, but I want to make sure that we narrow down, I want to know why the University chose to get out of compliance.

I'm having problems with this. You chose to be out of -- and, Mr. Tummonds, I think you're a great guy. You represent your clients well. But I need you to find out from this client why they chose to be out of compliance for two years and then two years, I want that specific question answered, and if it's here I didn't read it.

I want to know why we chose to be out of compliance for two years and two years before you come back in front of the Commission you chose to try to get back in compliance. I'd like to know that. Just because we just wanted to or because we could? That's where I am.

A lot of people don't have the same problem I have with, because, you know, we work hard. And my former colleagues and my colleagues now, we work hard trying to mitigate some of these things, and just chose to be out of compliance doesn't rest well with me.

So I'd like to know why we were out of

2.0

1 compliance two or three years. Was it a staffing issue? Was it layoffs at the University? Nobody had 2 time to do it or did we just regard it? 3 4 You all have been truthful to say you were out of compliance, just tell me we just wanted to 5 disregard your order and I promise you I won't get 6 7 I want you to just tell me the truth. mad. 8 Okay, anything else on this? 9 Now what do we need to do now, Ms. Lovick or Ms. Schellin? 10 11 MS. SCHELLIN: Dates. How much time? MS. LOVICK: Yes. Well, since you're not 12 13 in a position at this point to make a finding of substantial compliance with all the conditions, you're requesting information on three issues, I 15 believe, I would just reconfirm what those are and 16 a time for the applicant 17 set to file a submission and then a time frame for the opposition 18 19 to file a response. 2.0 Before we do that CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 21 I see Mr. Tummonds has come to, maybe he's going to answer why they decided not to be in compliance. 22 23 Tummonds? 24 TUMMONDS: Yes, good evening, 25 Tummonds with Goulston & Storrs.

1 So I think first answer to Chairman's 2 question, I was, some of you were talking about the failure to provide the parking reports and 3 4 parking utilization and TDM reports for those three. 5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, everything that you 6 all admitted that you, you know, I don't need a 20-7 page. 8 MR. TUMMONDS: Yes, just one sentence and 9 we'll be fine. 10 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just a bullet point. 11 Yes, one sentence, then give me, at least give me 12 three sentences. Okay. 13 MR. TUMMONDS: I know that Ms. Lovick talked about, you know, all of these things we're 15 discussing deal with the notion of substantial noncompliance or, you know, what was there. 16 think Peter May, Commissioner May talks about, you 17 know, are we there or not? 18 think we will provide 19 so Ι information on use of Jacobs Field for third parties 2.0 21 and the CLC and I think that will be very, it will not be difficult for us to address in either way. 22 And I think the Vice Chairman and Commissioner 23 24 Shapiro are, that's what we will be getting you, 25 information that you thought you remembered from the

hearing itself.

2.0

I would note that because of, you know, where we are, the University is with regards to having a building in operation, occupancy by the fall semester of 2020 requires them to move very expeditiously.

And I think what we've talked about today, the issues with regards to the building itself, the special exception standards, the further processing standards, or would this Hall of Science Building create adverse impacts, I think we've addressed and I think the Commission has found that they have been adequately addressed.

So one of the issues we have is the ability for AU to move forward with the design of that building so it can be ready for Fall 2020.

So with that I think that is somewhat of our plea to say we would like to do this as quickly as possible because we think that we can prepare this information and get it back to you as quickly as possible and come back and have your final deliberations on these three issues so that the Hall of Science Building can occur.

MS. SCHELLIN: Can you do it tomorrow?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It was nice to meet you.

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Can you respond by
2	tomorrow? That would be the quickest way to get it
3	on our next meeting agenda.
4	MR. TUMMONDS: Yes. We can do it
5	tomorrow.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So if you can
7	provide your response by
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, wait a minute. Does
9	that give the parties
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
11	MR. TUMMONDS: Yes, she's going to yes.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's two weeks away.
13	MS. SCHELLIN: So if you can respond by
14	5:00 tomorrow, which is the 27th, then the parties
15	have until 5:00, March 6, and then we can put it on
16	for March 12th. That's the fastest we can do.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, let me say this.
18	You know, I got in my ear, this ear I can hear real
19	well. I've heard that's ridiculous, oh Jesus, and a
20	couple of things like that.
21	So what I'm going to do is, what I would
22	suggest because it's put the onus on volunteers and
23	I don't want to put the onus on volunteers, what I
24	would suggest that we do is find a date that we don't
25	have I shouldn't say this because it's always a

1	problem, that we don't have a lot on our agenda
2	between the second meeting and the last meeting in
3	March, and give the community a little more time, at
4	least another week or so to be able to respond
5	because they don't do this full time.
6	Do we have a meeting coming up sometime in
7	March, like the week after our second meeting?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: We have a, you mean a
9	hearing?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. I guess I mean a
11	hearing, but we can do it before.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: We have one on the 15th
13	which would be four days later or we have one on the
14	19th.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I'm offering the 15th
16	or the 19th, some additional time. Whoever's going
17	to represent the day, Mr. Smith, come to the table,
18	but I'm going to give you some additional time
19	because I heard this is ridiculous and
20	MR. SMITH: I'm sorry, the 15th or the
21	19th for a hearing or for
22	MS. SCHELLIN: For a meeting.
23	MR. SMITH: For a meeting, I'm sorry, for
24	a meeting. So when would we have our filing due?
25	MS. SCHELLIN: For which one, the 15th or

1	the 19th?
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Which date do you want,
3	the 15th or 19th?
4	MR. SMITH: We'll take the 19th, it's the
5	latest so it means more time.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: So the applicant would
7	submit by the 5th.
8	MR. SMITH: We'd have until the 12th.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: And you'd have until the
10	12th.
11	MR. SMITH: Okay.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Is that what you want?
13	MR. SMITH: If that's the best we can get
14	that's what we'll take.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So is that better?
16	MR. SMITH: It's better, yes.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so we balanced it,
18	right?
19	MR. SMITH: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. At least that,
21	that's better than what I heard previously.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: So then, yes. If we could
23	get, and the submissions would be due by, to make it
24	even more helpful how about if we make all
25	submissions due by 3:00 p.m. then?

1	That way you get it a little earlier, 3:00
2	p.m. on the 5th, serve the parties and then the
3	parties' responses would also be due by 3:00 p.m. on
4	the 12th.
5	MR. SMITH: It would be very helpful if we
6	could ask the party to email
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
8	MR. SMITH: the material to us.
9	MR. TUMMONDS: Sure.
10	MR. SMITH: Because we've been getting it
11	in the mail and it comes four
12	MR. TUMMONDS: Incorrect. The last one
13	you did because there was no response was allowed.
14	MR. SMITH: Excuse me. We've been getting
15	most of the documents from AU in these cases by mail
16	and they've been coming four days later, so.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so this time we're
18	going to get it by email.
19	MR. TUMMONDS: Absolutely.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And then that way we've
21	got it both ways.
22	MR. TUMMONDS: Absolutely.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Easy, easy fix.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: Even the ANC's, Mr.
25	Tummonds, can be emailed now.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Tummonds, do
2	you have all the emails?
3	MR. TUMMONDS: Oh yes.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so anything else,
7	Ms. Lovick or
8	MR. TUMMONDS: So I'm sorry. So then this
9	would be, is it 6:00 p.m. on the 19th?
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Do you guys need that much
11	time, an hour? It would be half an hour. Is that
12	enough time?
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can we do 5:45?
14	MS. SCHELLIN: You can do whatever time
15	you want.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I know that. I was
17	just asking, I'd really be asking them can we do
18	5:00
19	MS. SCHELLIN: So 5:45?
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I really, even though Ms.
21	Schellin and I were saying can we do 5:45
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: but I was asking them.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: You're asking them.
25	MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, may I ask just

1	for clarification
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes.
3	MR. SMITH: with respect to Jacobs
4	Field, and actually Dr. Herzstein asked me to ask
5	this, are we talking just about special events or are
6	we talking about issues of noise as well that are
7	related to the events that are held there?
8	We just would like to have a little bit of
9	clarification on that. Are we talking about impacts
10	as well as the
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I thought we dealt with
12	the noise.
13	MR. SMITH: Well, the noise is a factor of
14	the events that are held there.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think for this
16	proceeding we were specifically talking about events.
17	MR. SMITH: Okay. That's what
18	MS. SCHELLIN: So you guys are just going
19	to respond to whatever he
20	MR. SMITH: Right.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: they bring up, so.
22	MR. SMITH: You got it.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And let's nail it down to
25	where we all understand it.

1 MR. TUMMONDS: It is my understanding that we are going to address the question of use of Jacobs 2 Field for third-party athletic events. 3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I believe that was the 4 5 thrust of our questions. 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. 7 Well, and I think it COMMISSIONER MAY: goes beyond just, you know, the question of how many It's also a question of how, are there and so on. you know, are they treated any differently and what's 10 11 the, you know, what mitigations there might, you know, what mitigations are in place right now for any 12 impacts associated with those 13 potential adverse 14 events. 15 it is You know, again of part 16 understanding what kinds of events they actually are, but then depending on what events they are how is it, 17 you know, how much noise do they generate, how do you 18 mitigate that? 19 2.0 MS. HERZSTEIN: Commissioners, it has to deal also with all of the events, because as much as 21 least 22 special events add at several 23 several days of extra noise per month on some months, it's the overall. 24 25 Many days it's from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

with games all day including on the weekends and the noise is incredible. And I think at the November meeting we were talking about not having dealt with the mediation of the noise issues over these 18 years.

We started in discussion with AU after that in December and they were talking about a noise barrier which we had written about subsequently in January and said this looks good, we're talking. And then they broke down and they haven't communicated with us at all.

So there's no, the noise continues to increase with more amplification, more games, more people at the games screaming at the top of their lungs, more shot clocks, et cetera. So I still think that the noise issue itself is to be discussed, here, as part of compliance.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioners, anybody wants to bring the noise?

COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, I don't think that this is an opportunity for us to relitigate the entirety of the noise issue. I think that this is a very specific question because the order already specified what was required from the University.

There's an issue that is unclear which is

2.0

1 the treatment of non-University athletic events as special events, which, you know, the University has 2 interpreted to be allowed. 3 So I think it's a matter of understanding 4 better what's involved with those particular kinds of 5 events and then what the impacts would be and what 6 7 the mitigations might be for those impacts. 8 So I mean I think it's really focused on, 9 that's not to say I'm not sympathetic to the issue, but it is something that was discussed and decided 10 11 previously and we're, you know, we don't, we try not to reopen every case every single time. 12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: But I don't know if we can 13 parse the noise out because that is a part of compliance, I think, and I can't remember exactly 15 So let's see what you come back with. 16 what it is. And I think we do, because that is part of 17 compliance. 18 19 Am I correct, Ms. Lovick? I mean the 2.0 noise is part of it. 21 Well, I mean this, well, the MS. LOVICK: issue was specific to the use of the field for non-22 University athletic events, so. 23 24 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So that's germane? 25 MS. LOVICK: Yes. That's germane.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So the noise is germane,
2	okay, so let's make sure we comment on the noise.
3	But I really would like to know why we
4	were out of compliance two years and then we decided
5	to come into compliance before you came, three years,
6	and then you decided, I mean
7	MS. LOVICK: Well, the noise specific to
8	non-University athletic events.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. That's, no, I went
10	back to my first issue.
11	MS. LOVICK: Okay.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Tummonds, he knows
13	exactly what I'm looking for, okay.
14	All right, anything else?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: I think that she was saying
16	that the noise overall was not open, only for the
17	non-University use is what
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: For the third party.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, only for the third
20	party, not overall.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right, from the third
22	party. Not for the regular overall, because I think,
23	yes, for the, because that was additional. But then
24	also I don't want this to be a, because I'm really
25	pondering what the Vice Chair mentioned about

1	excluded.
2	(Off-microphone comment.)
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, yes. No, I'm just
4	making a record where I'm coming from. Everybody
5	else is, you know, I'm sure they will make an account
6	to where they're coming from, but that's where I'm
7	coming from as well.
8	Okay, anything else on this?
9	MS. LOVICK: Well, I would just ask that
10	you would clarify specifically what you'd like with
11	regard to the CLC and clarify, I mean you've already
12	kind of explained what you wanted in terms of an
13	explanation for the noncompliance with conditions 13
14	and 14.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So you want us to
16	well, I think Mr. Turnbull had mentioned how he
17	wanted us to find. How's the CLC work?
18	MS. LOVICK: Right. I mean as in clear on
19	what you
20	MR. TUMMONDS: I think we will be able to
21	I'm, yes.
22	MS. LOVICK: Okay.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are you clear on
24	everything that we need?
25	MR. TUMMONDS: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, all right. If not
2	we'll just kick it on down the road and keep on until
3	we get it straight, but I think we will.
4	Okay, so we have the days straight.
5	All right, anything else, Commissioners?
6	Ms. Schellin, do we have anything else?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Nothing.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So work that one,
9	I think, Commissioner Shapiro.
10	I want to thank everyone for their
11	participation, this meeting's adjourned.
12	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
13	off the record at 8:39 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Regular Meeting

Before: DC ZC

Date: 02-26-18

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &