

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING

VIA WEBEX

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2024

The Public Hearing by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via videoconference pursuant to notice at 4:02 p.m. EST, Anthony Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson
ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson
JOSEPH S. IMAMURA, Commissioner
TAMMY STIDHAM, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN, Secretary
PAUL YOUNG, Data Specialist

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, Esquire

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on February 26, 2024.

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

1426 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(202) 467-9200

C O N T E N T S

	<u>PAGE</u>
Preliminary Matters	4
Case No. 23-02 Map Amendment Submitted by Office of Planning to Rezone from the MU-4 Zone to the MU-10 Zone the Contiguous Properties at 1617 U Street, N.W. (Square 175, Lot 826) and at 1620 V Street, N.W. (Square 175, Lot 827) and to Apply IZ Plus	14

P R O C E E D I N G S

(4:02 p.m.)

CHAIR HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Today's date is February 26th, 2024. We are broadcasting this public hearing by videoconferencing.

My name is Anthony Hood, and I'm joined by Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Stidham, and Commissioner Imamura. Also, the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations, as well as our counsel, Mr. Jake Ritting.

I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time. We have an order in which we are going in. We are picking up from our last case, which was a reference to this case, and incorporate the opening statement as well as I've done previously, is Zoning Commission Case Number 23-02.

Before I go to Ms. Schellin, I see Mr. Ritting has turned his camera on already. Mr. Ritting? You're on mute.

MR. RITTING: I have nothing to say. I just wanted to show my ugly look.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Schellin, do we have anything before we -- can you give us the order, or do we have anything preliminary? Any preliminary matters? If not, can you give us the order

1 for the hearing?

2

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

3

4

5

6

MS. SCHELLIN: We have a motion for postponement again in the record at Exhibit 664 that was filed today. It's a joint motion for postponement for the Commission to consider.

7

8

9

CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I have reviewed the motion from Empower DC and the Committee 100, and I will preface my statements with -- I think it was between them two.

10

11

12

13

14

15

MS. SCHELLIN: No.

CHAIR HOOD: Oh.

MS. SCHELLIN: It's actually the Homeowners Within -- there were two letters attached from those two entities, but it's actually from the Homeowners Within 200 Feet, the Black Neighbors, and DCCA.

16

17

CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Because I noticed that a lot of the --

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. SCHELLIN: Three joint -- three parties.

CHAIR HOOD: I'm just saying this to all of the parties. I notice that a lot of what I said previous about postponing and about OP, we've been through this before. I think this is duplicative. We kept moving, and which, you know, the -- stating what I said, I was thinking out loud, which I always do.

25

I understand the concerns, but I've -- without me

1 deliberating, I will -- I will move that we -- well, let me
2 hear from others. I believe this motion is duplicative,
3 even though it's different -- maybe some other parties added
4 to it, and I don't think that we -- we are rehashing
5 something that we've already been through. The Commission
6 has already made a decision on this case, but let me hear
7 from others. Vice Chair Miller?

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 Yeah. I would agree with you and also say that -- that we
10 have been advised by our counsel that the Commission's rules
11 are clear, that such requests at this postponement or this
12 motion for a postponement should be in the form of a motion
13 made to the Commission. It was?

14 MR. RITTING: Yeah. There were two -- there were
15 two that --

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: So this is a different one?

17 MR. RITTING: This is -- and the advice you're
18 mentioning refers to the second one that we'll take up
19 later.

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Oh, okay.

21 MR. RITTING: This was filed as a motion.

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

23 CHAIR HOOD: So this is in order. This is -- Vice
24 Chair, this one is in order.

25 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, I appreciate that

1 clarification, and I agree with what you've said about it.

2 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Stidham, any
3 comments on this?

4 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. I agree also.

5 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. And Commissioner Imamura?

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Nothing to add,
7 Mr. Chairman. I'm in agreement.

8 CHAIR HOOD: So, you know, while I appreciate
9 everyone's enthusiasm, and also passion, sometimes you
10 create stuff and send us something every Monday. I would
11 ask that we focus again on the zoning. You know, don't harp
12 on what I've said or what Councilmember -- former
13 Councilmember Evans said. We have a case. We have a
14 specific issue we're looking at.

15 A lot of times people get disturbed. So don't
16 keep throwing that back at me of what I said. I say a lot
17 of things, and then after further deliberations -- and I
18 thank my colleagues for helping us to keep pressing on -- a
19 lot of stuff reveals itself, and I'll leave it at that.

20 So with that, I will move that we deny this
21 request by whoever the parties were, Ms. Schellin, Black
22 Neighbors of U Street, I think -- I thought it was Empower
23 DC, and the Committee of 100. I think we can -- we can plow
24 through it like we've been doing. And if I don't -- if I
25 leave out any parties, then we can add those. I will leave

1 room for staff to make corrections.

2 So with that, I will move that we deny this
3 request and continue to move on and ask for a second.

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.

5 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. It has been moved and properly
6 seconded. Any further discussion?

7 Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you do a roll
8 call vote, please?

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Chairman Hood?

10 CHAIR HOOD: Yes.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller?

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Imamura?

14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham?

16 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is four to zero to one to
18 deny the joint motion to postpone filed by Black Neighbors,
19 the Dupont Circle Citizens Association, and the Homeowners
20 Within 200 Feet of Lots 826 and 827, the minus one being the
21 third mayoral appointee position which is vacant. Thank
22 you.

23 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, do we have
24 anything else before us?

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Ritting, do we need to go ahead

1 and bring up the other requests that were received in email?
2 Okay. So I received an email from Mr. Hanlon advising that
3 he is ill this afternoon, and his party is okay with the
4 Commission moving forward with testimony from the public.
5 But he would -- I think it kind of goes along with the
6 request before of not going forward with the presentations
7 of the parties in opposition.

8 So I just want to put that out there for the
9 Commission to see if they still want to proceed as our regs
10 state, and maybe put his party last. It's --

11 CHAIR HOOD: So one of the things -- and I'm
12 talking to my colleagues. What I -- what I would probably
13 like to do is rule when we get there on that. But now that
14 I think about it, I know people want predictability, but I
15 would also say this, and let me say this, Mr. Ritting, and
16 I'll come straight to you.

17 Mr. Hanlon, you have to submit -- I don't think
18 this was -- this is appropriate -- appropriately in front of
19 us. It's not an email. It needs to be a motion like the
20 parties did previously. Again, these Friday -- or these
21 weekend thoughts, and then something is thrown into the
22 record before we have a hearing, we're not going to be
23 distracted. We're going to continue to do our job.

24 I am prepared to move forward. I am very sorry,
25 Mr. Hanlon, that you are not feeling well. We all go

1 through that point. We will -- we have accommodated you as
2 much as -- you and your party as much as we can. We will
3 continue to do that, especially with your illness, and we
4 hope that you get better quickly.

5 So what I will suggest and I -- you know, I don't
6 know -- let me -- let me talk to my colleague. Let me go to
7 Mr. Ritting first. Did you want to ask something,
8 Mr. Ritting? You're on mute. You must -- you're on mute.

9 MR. RITTING: Sorry. I keep making that mistake.
10 I want -- I did want to add one thing, and I wanted to just
11 clarify that this is in fact the request that Mr. Miller was
12 referring to before, and that in your statement you were
13 sort of teeing up the notion that this email request should
14 be in the record, which I agree with. It should be in the
15 form of a motion.

16 And if you decide to place this email on the
17 record, I also suggest that you redact any sensitive health
18 information from the email message, and the staff of course
19 will do that if you decide to put it in the record. That's
20 all I had to say.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I don't -- I don't have an
22 issue with putting it in the record, and I would agree with
23 Mr. Ritting that we take out any health concerns that have
24 been mentioned in that letter. We don't want to violate any
25 HIPAA laws or anything of that concern, so let's do that.

1 And let me hear from my colleagues. Any
2 objections to moving like in that direction? Okay. I'm
3 seeing heads nod.

4 All right. So, again, I would ask -- and I know
5 you're under the weather, but this has been going on every
6 week. So, I mean, I know it's not necessarily germane to
7 being sick, so we -- we, again, hope that you feel better.

8 Ms. Schellin, what I would like to do -- and let
9 me ask my colleagues -- going forward, I would like to go
10 ahead and hear from those who are -- we're doing party in --
11 I mean, persons in opposition, correct? Okay. I would like
12 -- did we hear from all those who were in support?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. We heard from those in
14 support, so we still have the remaining individuals and
15 entities in opposition and undeclared to hear from as far as
16 the public.

17 CHAIR HOOD: And we had about 100 people left, or
18 was it 50 or so?

19 MS. SCHELLIN: I think it was -- we still had
20 around 62 maybe.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I'm just trying to give the
22 parties some predictability. I do understand that they have
23 -- let me ask --

24 MS. SCHELLIN: We only have -- we have 38 people
25 on right now.

1 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. Well, people will come -- they
2 know how long this has been taking. They'll come on later.

3 Let me -- let me ask this to my colleagues. Two
4 ways to move forward. I need some help on this one, because
5 I -- it's just like playing a number, and I never -- but,
6 then, I don't play. So, but either way, you have to know
7 the number, and I don't really -- I can't predict what's
8 going to happen.

9 So either we could hear everyone who -- every
10 individual who is in opposition and cut it off there, or we
11 can hear all our opposition and start with the parties
12 tonight or we start a fresh day with the parties as
13 requested. So let me see what you all think. Commissioner
14 Imamura? I can go either way.

15 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. Thank you,
16 Mr. Chairman. I'm supportive of setting a hard stop at
17 9:00. And if that means that includes all of the
18 individuals in opposition and we're able to get a party or
19 two in opposition, and continue the hearing on another day,
20 I think that would help move this case along expeditiously.

21 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Thank you.

22 Commissioner Stidham, any comments?

23 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I agree with Commissioner
24 Imamura.

25 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller?

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I concur that we should get as
2 much done as we can. I has already been about 20 hours of
3 hearing. I can't keep track. But, yeah.

4 CHAIR HOOD: So, Ms. Schellin, do we know who our
5 first two parties would be? We'll at least try to get our
6 first two.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: It would Ms. Akel, Deborah Akel,
8 with her group of neighbors, and the next group will be -- I
9 just got the email, so let me see. Sorry, I've got to look.
10 Just received it. So after that, the next party will be
11 Randy Jones.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. We're going to try to get to
13 at least those two parties. But we will do another
14 evaluation, say, about 6:30. Let me -- the problem is, I
15 don't know how this is going to run. Let's see how this is
16 going to run. Right now, everybody stand ready. I'm sorry
17 to keep everybody on wait, but we have went through many,
18 many hours, especially with cross-examination.

19 So why don't we just stick around, and in about
20 two hours, Ms. Schellin, remind me to do another update and
21 see where we are, how we're moving. Okay? I'm sorry, I
22 can't be no more -- I can't do no more than that.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Thank you.

24 CHAIR HOOD: All right. So with that, what I'd
25 like to do at this time is call -- or go into a closed

1 meeting in accordance with 4 -- I think I'm reading the
2 right statute, Mr. Ritting. If not, Ms. Schellin, you all
3 help me. In accordance with 405C of the Open Meetings Act,
4 D.C. Official Code 2-575, I move that the Zoning Commission
5 hold a closed meeting for 10 minutes on -- to especially
6 call a closed meeting, which I think we announced already,
7 for --

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Right. That's -- you've already
9 voted on it, so --

10 CHAIR HOOD: I've done that?

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. You've already voted, so now
12 it's just a matter of just -- of just taking the break for
13 the closed meeting.

14 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So with that, we will take
15 about a 10-minute break, and we will be back. We'll go to
16 the closed -- our closed meeting. And, colleagues, we have
17 the additional link, so we'll do it in that order. Thank
18 you.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Do we -- that's what I was
20 going to ask. Do we have it? Or maybe you could send it
21 again?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Yes, it was -- it was sent
23 already.

24 CHAIR HOOD: It was just -- it was sent. It was
25 sent. Well, send it again just in case, please.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

3 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you.

4 (Brief recess from 4:15 p.m. until 4:29 p.m.)

5 CHAIR HOOD: Again, we're back from a closed
6 meeting. We will reconvene this hearing.

7 So, Ms. Schellin, I would ask that you call our
8 first witnesses today for Zoning Commission Case Number 23-
9 02.

10 CASE NUMBER 23-02

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Going back to the
12 opposition list, I have Austin Chiles. I don't remember if
13 he testified or not. Did he? Maybe he did. I've got some
14 duplicate names on here. That's why I'm asking. Laura
15 Richards, Nancy Shia, S-h-i-a, Ronald Valencia, Pamela
16 McKinney.

17 Mr. Young, you have to tell me if you have four
18 because I'm on a different screen.

19 MR. YOUNG: I don't see any of those names on.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Let's move on, then, to Page
21 Seaborn, Eleanor Shevlin, Wendy Schumacher, Anne Hoffman.
22 How about that?

23 CHAIR HOOD: So far we only have one,
24 Ms. Schellin.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

1 CHAIR HOOD: That's Paige Seaborn.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Ren Lee, R-e-n Lee, Maria Gellem --
3 Gillem, she's the young lady that had problems last time
4 getting on. So hopefully we can get her in this time.
5 Elinor Hart. How about now? Do we have four? Two,
6 three --

7 MR. YOUNG: I have three.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So one more. We're going to
9 make it. Elinor Hart, next page, Eric Blodnikar? Yes?

10 MR. YOUNG: No, I don't see him.

11 MS. SCHELLIN: William Jordan?

12 MR. YOUNG: William Jordan I have. So that's
13 four.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Great. Thank you.

15 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Thank you, all.

16 Ms. Seaborn, we're going to begin with you. You may begin.

17 Ms. Seaborn, I think -- try it now. We're not able to hear
18 you. Do you want to try to log off and come back on?

19 All right. Hold one second. Ms. Seaborn, give me
20 one moment, please.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Young, while Mr. Hood is taking
22 his moment, could you maybe suggest what she should change?
23 I believe it's her audio-video, and maybe select a different
24 audio output. Is that correct?

25 MR. YOUNG: Yes. So if you go to the audio and

1 video tab at the top, you can go to audio settings. And
2 then where it says microphone, there's a drop-down list. So
3 you might just need to select a different one until we can
4 hear you.

5 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. She has logged off. Let's go
6 to --

7 MS. SCHELLIN: She logged off. So --

8 CHAIR HOOD: She'll come back.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: -- if she comes back up, you
10 could --

11 CHAIR HOOD: Bring her back up.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: -- let her back in? Yeah.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: All right. Ms. Schumacher? Yes,
14 we can hear you. You may begin.

15 MS. SCHUMACHER: Thank you. My name is Wendy
16 Schumacher, and I live at 1701 16th Street, Northwest. I am
17 in the fifth generation of Schumachers who have lived in
18 this neighborhood and third generation in The Chastleton.

19 One hundred years ago, three generations of
20 Schumachers lived in the 1500 block of U Street, and the
21 rowhouse can be seen from 1617 U. My Jewish immigrant
22 ancestors were able to live and start small businesses
23 within walking distance. In fact, one of those children
24 opened D.C.'s first natural food store, which is now a Yes!
25 Market.

1 The Committee of 100 email sent February 1st said
2 that MU-10 is not the only option for this parcel. Although
3 changing to MU-10 does not mean that luxury apartments will
4 be built by definition, I have not heard convincing
5 arguments that this would not be the case. My windows face
6 the Scottish Rite luxury apartments. They opened for
7 rentals nearly six months ago, and the weekend before the
8 last hearing I checked and the website showed an inventory
9 of 88 available units.

10 Research needs to be conducted to see if there is
11 demand for more luxury housing. It is already widely known
12 that affordable, and especially deeply affordable housing,
13 is needed in this neighborhood and throughout the District.

14 On a related note, I want to encourage retaining
15 the police and fire services at this location. I also
16 welcome the introduction of library and green space that is
17 controlled by the District and not the federal government.

18 My late uncle, the architectural historian,
19 Thomas L. Schumacher, and I often talked about building
20 context with good design and input from the community will
21 be possible to save the city's services and increase the
22 housing stock while retaining the character of the
23 neighborhood populated by the rowhouses like the one our
24 ancestors lived in.

25 I implore the Commission to allow for further

1 research to see if the black neighbors we have heard from
2 and others who may have been displaced -- who may be
3 displaced are interested in staying in this welcoming
4 community, so that they can have multigenerational memories
5 like mine.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Thank you.

8 Let's go to Ms. Gillem. Ms. Marie Gillem? Okay.
9 Ms. Gillem, you're unmuted now. Ms. Gillem? Ms. Gillem,
10 see if you can call in, because I know we had the same kind
11 of problem last time. So why don't -- why don't you just
12 try to call by phone, and meanwhile, while we're waiting on
13 you, we'll go to Ms. Seaborn.

14 MS. SEABORN: Thank you. Can everybody hear me
15 now?

16 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, we can hear you.

17 MS. SEABORN: Okay. Thanks so much. My sound cut
18 out the instant I tried to join.

19 All right. Thank you so much. So thank you,
20 Commissioners, for my -- for the time to speak today. My
21 name is Paige Seaborn, and I am a community member within
22 200 feet of 1617 U at the corner of 17th and Florida. I
23 will get right into it.

24 So referring back to testimony from the D.C.
25 Office of the Attorney General on January 18th in support of

1 the Office of Planning, I disagree with the OAG that the
2 petition from OP is sufficiently not inconsistent with the
3 comprehensive plan. I am not going to dig into each of the
4 reasons why due to the amount of time I am allotted, and I
5 want to be respectful of everyone's time here. I know the
6 parties and other members of the public will comprehensively
7 and logically explain the community's valid concerns.

8 Where I do agree with OAG, and where I actually
9 think those who spoke in support at the meeting on
10 January 29 would agree, especially Mr. McInerny, whose
11 building went through a PUD and a map amendment process, is
12 on the potential to enforce conditions that would make OP's
13 petition closer to not inconsistent with the plan through
14 map amendment and covenant prior to petition arrival.

15 However, OAG left out several conditions that are
16 essential to maintaining comp plan integrity. Prior to
17 approving OP's petition, and in order to maintain comp plan
18 integrity, the Zoning Commission should require integration
19 of the following: require creation of a landmark that
20 acknowledges and continues the history of U Street as a
21 black business corridor, require the establishment of a
22 cultural use for the sites, require the provision of an
23 additional -- of additional public facilities such as a new
24 public library on the site, and require height transition
25 setbacks to adjacent lower density zones and high-quality

1 architecture which matches the historic surroundings.

2 These specifications are clearly listed in the
3 comp plan, and I would direct the Commission to an exhibit
4 that was actually added on the date of our last hearing
5 called relevant passages from the comprehensive plan and
6 judgment considerations, where these considerations are
7 extracted for ease of reference.

8 If inclusion of these amendments does not happen,
9 the Zoning Commission should find that OP's petition is
10 mostly inconsistent and reject it to preserve the intent of
11 the comprehensive plan. This is especially important
12 considering what we have alarmingly heard about over the
13 course of the Zoning Commission meetings, the lack of
14 outreach with the prior FLUM amendments, lack of outreach
15 prior to this map amendment petition, lack of impact
16 studies, lack of racial equity studies, and, summarily, a
17 lack of compromise with the community.

18 OP seems to want to add to this -- that list lack
19 of compromise with the comprehensive plan, lack of respect
20 for the comprehensive plan intent, and potentially lack of
21 respect for the good intentions of this Zoning Commission.

22 These items, outreach impact studies, racial
23 equity studies, and compromise with the community would be
24 considered absolutely crucial for any private developer to
25 do anything on this site. This discrepancy between

1 preparation done by OP, essentially the government, and
2 preparation routinely required of private developers is
3 notable and alarming.

4 This is what Jack Evans was concerned about during
5 the very first hearing session, and allowing the petition to
6 be approved can demonstrate favoritism, which will erode
7 public trust in public institutions.

8 My final point is that, yes, there are quite a
9 number of members -- number of members of the community
10 here, which was a topic we discussed during one of the
11 recent zoning hearings, and the Zoning Commission took this
12 as a positive in terms of the amount of outreach during the
13 -- during the -- one of the latest hearings.

14 And I'm not saying that that is wrong. It is
15 positive that so many of us are here and participating in
16 this process. However, I do want to point out that the
17 number of community members participating in this hearing is
18 primarily due to the excellent grass-roots outreach of those
19 on the phone. The flyers posted around the neighborhood, in
20 both support and opposition, are from community efforts as
21 well.

22 I am not an expert in planning or planning rules,
23 but it does seem wrong to me that the really impressive
24 amount of community member outreach and community members
25 participating in these hearings mean OP would get a pass on

1 technical outreach requirements just because so many of us
2 proceeded to -- proceeded -- followed up and showed up.

3 So many of us are in opposition, but even showing
4 up in opposition is at risk of being counted as enough
5 outreach for OP. I want to be sure that's not what's
6 happening.

7 So that concludes my testimony, and the final
8 thing I would like to say is that I will send my testimony
9 via email and would like to request that it be included in
10 the public record. Thank you very much for the opportunity
11 to speak this evening, and I really appreciate the
12 Commission's work here and fair consideration of our
13 testimony.

14 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Seaborn. And
15 Ms. Schellin will give us a date that you can submit that.
16 I don't think we have any objections to that coming. I
17 think you can submit that.

18 MS. SEABORN: Thank you very much.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: You can go ahead and submit it
20 today, since those -- those who are asking, Chairman Hood,
21 are probably those who had their testimony sent back because
22 they didn't submit it 24 hours prior to the hearing. So --

23 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: -- that's why. They can go ahead
25 and submit it today.

1 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. Let's go ahead and get that
2 in. Okay. Thank you. Hold tight. We may have some
3 questions for this panel. We have Mr. Jordan.

4 MR. JORDAN: Chairman Hood and Commissioners,
5 today after a year and five public hearings, the applicant,
6 OP, and DMPED, have failed to take seriously and meet its
7 required obligations under the comp plan and land use
8 matters.

9 Specifically, the applicant, after four attempts,
10 has failed to a good faith conduct a credible racial equity
11 lens review of 23-02 to the level required of government
12 planning and development agencies. Instead, they have
13 chosen to craft a rationalized argument for approval as if
14 they were simply a private party seeking zoning relief.

15 Given the applicant's inability and unwillingness
16 to present a credible racial equity lens review, the
17 Commission must postpone further deliberations and seek an
18 independent entity to provide a racial equity lens analysis
19 in order for the Commission to meet its obligations under
20 the comp plan. I recommend that D.C.'s Office of Racial
21 Equity and the Urban Institute be brought in to do that
22 task.

23 The applicant, being composed of government,
24 planning, and development agencies, in particular, they must
25 meet a land use standard. The applicant must advance

1 affordability, racial equity, and opportunity. It cannot
2 simply meet the lower standard of showing that its requests
3 are not inconsistent with some mitigation to make it a
4 little better, as articulated by the Attorney General.

5 Instead, the applicant, in the implementation
6 section, and others make it clear that the standard for the
7 applicant is to advance not -- to advance; in fact,
8 "advance" specifically in relationship to racial equity is
9 used over 42 times in the land use and implementation
10 chapters of the comp plan.

11 By contrast, OP only used "advance" three times,
12 and that was just in quoting the comp plan. So they have
13 the (inaudible).

14 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Jordan, you went on mute.

15 MR. JORDAN: All right. Sorry about that. And
16 this area of Ward 1 has lost half of its black residents
17 since 2000. And so, basically, using these type of projects
18 has driven that outcome. So I think any -- analysis that
19 failed to say that this zoning density project and approach
20 with public-private partnerships that have displaced so many
21 black residents is not even called out in a racial equity
22 analysis is highly problematic.

23 So, in conclusion, again, I think that the
24 applicant, as government agencies, have to advance racial
25 equity, not just simply not be inconsistent. I think if we

1 go through the legislative analysis that got us here we'll
2 find that a comp plan without the racial equity elements was
3 viewed as to exacerbate racial inequities in the District.

4 It is only when it was added -- the racial equity
5 lens elements -- did it come to basically maintaining the
6 status quo of inequity.

7 So I'll -- running out of time, so I'm in there,
8 but I will refer to my submission that clearly the
9 applicant, being government agencies, have not met their
10 standard, and that the Commission needs to consider that and
11 not let them off the hook with what I think is just -- they
12 just threw it out there, and also should consider that this
13 map amendment is being used to get around the racial equity
14 and inclusion process. Thank you.

15 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let's see if we
16 have any questions of this panel. Commissioner Imamura?

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions. Thank you,
18 Mr. Chairman. I appreciate everybody's testimony this
19 afternoon and the time you spent preparing it for us. Thank
20 you for participating in the process and for giving us your
21 perspective.

22 CHAIR HOOD: And Commissioner Stidham, any
23 questions of this panel?

24 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. But thank you for your
25 participation today.

1 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller?

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes.
3 Thank each of you for your testimony today and for the
4 written comments that you've provided thus far and any
5 future written comments you may provide. Thank you.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I do have one question for
7 Ms. Seaborn. As I have been thinking, how many cases has it
8 been now? Five? Is this the fifth night? I get mixed up
9 with everything else we've got going. Is this the fifth
10 night or sixth night?

11 Well, whatever night it is, Ms. Seaborn, do you --

12 MS. SEABORN: Fifth.

13 CHAIR HOOD: I'm sorry. Fifth? Okay. I get this
14 mixed up with two other cases. But anyway, Ms. Seaborn and
15 maybe Mr. Jordan, as I've been thinking about this case, and
16 thinking about the engagement, everybody is harping on what
17 I said at the first or second meeting. But now as -- and
18 I'm glad that we continued, and I'll tell you why, and I'm
19 just asking you all.

20 So we have -- it's not a popularity contest. It's
21 about notice for me. I think we have two ANCs, maybe three,
22 that are in support of this application. And I'm asking
23 you, Ms. Seaborn, those ANCs, to my knowledge, growing up in
24 this city, the ANCs are our front-line elected officials.
25 So unless -- and I may be -- if I got somebody wrong,

1 forgive me, it was off the top of my head -- one of the ANCs
2 -- but I believe they voted in support.

3 I do hear the opposition, and there is a nucleus
4 out there that you don't hear anything from. That's how
5 everything goes in this city, the way I've seen it. And the
6 nucleus that you don't hear anything from are not counted.
7 Again, it's not a popularity. How would you respond to me -
8 - and I'm actually asking because I need assistance in this
9 whole case, and I'm being frankly honest. How would you
10 respond to me with those comments that I just made? Or if
11 you don't have a response, just say, "I don't have a
12 response."

13 MS. SEABORN: I would say that we -- there was one
14 meeting where we had the opportunity to go and speak, and
15 had about two -- two to five minutes to provide our comments
16 and feedback on this and -- two minutes each for our
17 comments, and that because of this, a lot of people did show
18 up to participate, which was great. It's wonderful and to
19 get people to participate and be engaged with the community.

20 But because of that, I think the line to
21 participate in this was so many people long. I know that
22 some of the folks who were kind of, you know, waiting to
23 give their two minutes, I think some of the people in front
24 of us even ended up leaving. So that's what I would add,
25 that there has not been enough opportunities.

1 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I could question that, but let
2 me -- I want to hear from the public. Mr. Jordan, do you
3 want to opine on that? If not, we will keep moving.

4 MR. JORDAN: Yeah. Just so -- I've read the ANC's
5 resolutions. And while they generally support -- they were
6 very -- several of them were very specific in calling out
7 what they actually supported versus a general support. So I
8 -- even though the Commission's -- ANC Commission did
9 support, I think it was very qualified for most of them
10 raising the very points here.

11 And I also think that they are depending on as
12 well a process that from my perspective living in this ward
13 and looking at it, we are putting evidence that the
14 developer/agencies don't follow through on their
15 commitments. Right? In my testimony, I give examples of
16 those, many of those cases where that's not what happens at
17 the end of the day.

18 And then, also, I think under the thinking of
19 racial equity, we are thinking -- and even in the beginning
20 with the original comp plan, there was extra effort to reach
21 out and get people's input before even amending the current
22 comp plan that led us to this day.

23 So I think under racial equity we are not just
24 talking about meeting the basic standard, and neither the
25 ANCs have testified that they went above and beyond, they

1 met the basic standard, and so I think we have to put a
2 little grain of salt only because we know that it takes
3 extra effort, and it clearly was not done.

4 CHAIR HOOD: Give me a quick answer. What is the
5 basic standard?

6 MR. JORDAN: The basic standard seems to be you --
7 ANC puts it in maybe some -- they've got to post it in some
8 newspaper, and maybe send out an email or some kind of
9 electronic communications, and then that ANC has met its
10 obligations. I think they have to do two outreaches about
11 their meeting, and to notify people that the issue is going
12 on.

13 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. JORDAN: That's the basic standard.

15 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. I have no further
16 questions.

17 I, too, want to thank this panel. I appreciate
18 you all indulging -- especially Ms. Seaborn and Mr. Jordan,
19 for indulging me in my questions. So thank you all. We
20 appreciate all of you for taking the time to provide this
21 testimony. Thank you.

22 Ms. Schellin, can we call the next four?

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Martha Logan, William
24 Garber, Mary --

25 CHAIR HOOD: Oh, did Ms. -- let me ask this

1 before. Did Ms. Gillem -- I don't want to leave Ms. Gillem.
2 I've been trying to get Ms. Gillem since our last -- the
3 last meeting. Ms. Gillem, are you able to -- can we hear
4 you now? Can you try? I think we're going to have to have
5 Ms. Gillem call in. I'm not sure what the issue is.

6 Okay. I'm sorry, Ms. Schellin.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Young, could you state again
8 for Ms. Gillem to look in the upper left corner at her audio
9 and video? And then she selects a different audio output,
10 right?

11 MR. YOUNG: Video settings under the audio and
12 video tab. You click audio settings, and under microphone
13 there is a drop-down list of different microphones on your
14 computer. So the one you have selected clearly isn't
15 working. So if you try selecting one, it may work.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Chairman Hood, did we do cross of
17 that last panel?

18 CHAIR HOOD: We sure did not. Okay. So let's --

19 MS. SCHELLIN: I just -- it just hit me.

20 CHAIR HOOD: -- bring them all back up. I'm glad
21 you --

22 MS. SCHELLIN: I guess we should ask the parties,
23 first of all, if they have any cross --

24 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. Let's try that.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: -- of any of them first to know who

1 to bring back up.

2 CHAIR HOOD: So, Mr. Jordan, others, if you all
3 could hold tight, just in case there may be some questions
4 for you? Sorry.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: OP just advised they have no cross,
6 so you can move to the parties.

7 CHAIR HOOD: OP has no cross. Okay. ANC 1B, do
8 you have any cross?

9 MS. HARRIS: I have a question for Ms. Schumacher.

10 CHAIR HOOD: Can we bring back -- let's see if we
11 can bring them all back up. I hope they haven't left.
12 Okay. I know Ms. Schumacher is here.

13 Okay. Chair Harris, you can go ahead and ask a
14 question.

15 MS. HARRIS: Sure. Thank you.

16 Ms. Schumacher, you mentioned in your testimony
17 that you are in favor of an open greenspace. Are you aware
18 that MU-10 requires an open public space?

19 MS. SCHUMACHER: (Inaudible) specifically speaking
20 about a greenspace.

21 MS. HARRIS: How would you define the difference
22 between an open space versus a greenspace?

23 MS. SCHUMACHER: So when I attended the hearings
24 about the remodel of the -- or the revamping of the Reeves
25 Center property, there was going to be like an open plaza,

1 so thinking more like the SunTrust space in Adams Morgan
2 versus a place that would have grass and places for families
3 to congregate and enjoy the scenery.

4 MS. HARRIS: So would you say a family couldn't
5 congregate in an open plaza?

6 MS. SCHUMACHER: Yes. To me, it doesn't seem like
7 it's trying to encourage more use of greenspace.

8 MS. HARRIS: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. SCHUMACHER: You're welcome.

10 MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

11 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Do we have anyone
12 from ANC 2B?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: I don't see --

14 CHAIR HOOD: Zach Adams and Megan -- Meg
15 Roggensack?

16 MS. SCHELLIN: No.

17 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. All right. Mr. Jones? I
18 think Mr. Jones -- Ms. Seaborn, didn't you -- okay. Well,
19 let me just -- I'm looking at my notes. I have your name
20 down. I have you down here.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Randy Jones.

22 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. I have you down here as asking
23 questions for Randy Jones. But anyway, is Randy Jones here?
24 Probably not. Do you have any questions of this panel?

25 MR. R. JONES: I'm trying to get my camera pulled

1 up here, but I can't seem to figure it out on my phone. Can
2 you hear me? I hope.

3 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. We can hear you. Yes.

4 MR. R. JONES: Yeah. Just a quick one for
5 Ms. Schumacher. You mentioned that the MU-10 zone you felt
6 was out of context for this site. Could you elaborate
7 specifically what about the MU-10 zone you feel is out of
8 context?

9 MS. SCHUMACHER: I feel that it's excessive, that
10 the goals that I've heard people say would like to be
11 accomplished could be accomplished with a zoning that
12 doesn't give so much room for the development of very large
13 buildings for luxury buildings, and things like that?

14 As I mentioned, I am listening to many hours of
15 testimony, and I'm not convinced that affordable housing and
16 deeply affordable housing would be available, given that
17 additional flexibility of the MU-10.

18 MR. R. JONES: Right. So I think the OAG has
19 opened up an interesting point here. I mean, would you
20 propose any conditions to the approval that would, you know,
21 allow it to actually achieve, you know, goals? You know, do
22 you feel like if there was a higher threshold for affordable
23 housing, maybe 50 percent, you know, that would be a
24 reasonable compromise for you?

25 MS. SCHUMACHER: A higher threshold or something

1 that's legally binding. Again, I'm looking out the window,
2 staring at the Scottish Rite Apartments, and I've heard this
3 song before, and the units that are affordable, there is a
4 mix of subterranean units, which was part of the design.
5 They seem to be unoccupied. I walked by the property over
6 the weekend to check. I can look out my window. On any
7 given night, I can see that there aren't lights, so no signs
8 of habitation in many of those units.

9 So I think something --

10 MR. R. JONES: Right.

11 MS. SCHUMACHER: -- that would be more legally
12 binding to allow for a higher standard of affordable
13 housing.

14 MR. R. JONES: Was that a map amendment case or a
15 PUD?

16 MS. SCHUMACHER: We've -- well, I know it was
17 zoning-related because this was the case with the -- right
18 behind the Masonic Temple.

19 MR. R. JONES: Yep. I'm familiar. Okay.

20 And then I just had a couple questions for
21 Mr. Jordan as well tying back to the ANC review. I guess
22 you said sort of the support was general at the ANC. Are we
23 to make out that the opposition was a little bit more
24 specific and open to points of compromise? Is that a fair
25 characterization?

1 MR. JORDAN: I can review some of the resolutions,
2 and, you know, I can't quote them 100 percent right now, but
3 many said specifically we support affordable housing, we
4 support XYZ public space, you know, they actually listed out
5 the kinds of things they wanted to see on the site. So it
6 wasn't just we support the submission. We support the
7 following outcomes from the submission is what I heard from
8 -- or gathered from their submissions.

9 MR. R. JONES: More project specific rather than,
10 you know, map amendment or zoning specific. Is that fair?

11 MR. JORDAN: That's how I interpreted it.

12 MR. R. JONES: Yeah. Okay. Is this process -- I
13 think you highlighted, you know, process quite a bit. Is
14 this -- why do you think this process is being done without
15 a project first? I guess it's speculation. That's a bad
16 question.

17 Sorry. You mentioned that the OP's racial
18 equity lens --

19 MR. JORDAN: I'm trying to answer -- I'll try to
20 answer that. I don't think it's speculation.

21 MR. R. JONES: Okay.

22 MR. JORDAN: I think we saw that the upFLUMing
23 leading up to the comprehensive plan was done specifically
24 to move these kind of larger density projects forward,
25 either through PUDs or matter of right. I think that was

1 the intention of the changes to the comp plan. And so that
2 was -- that was done. And so then -- so we know that that's
3 what occurred.

4 MR. R. JONES: Right. And so having that upFLUM
5 and then going for this map amendment now would allow for
6 matter of right development that is not project specific I
7 guess.

8 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Jones? Mr. Jones? I think -- I
9 think we all know the process. I would ask you to be
10 germane to Mr. Jordan's testimony.

11 MR. R. JONES: Yeah. I'm sorry.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. Because we -- we know what's
13 going to happen if we -- if the move is made. We all get
14 that. That's what -- that's what has been -- this is being
15 repetitive.

16 MR. R. JONES: Yeah.

17 CHAIR HOOD: Let's make sure we stay on topic, his
18 testimony.

19 MR. R. JONES: So the really big thing that I
20 wanted you to elaborate on, Mr. Jordan, you made the point
21 that the racial equity lens reviewed by OP was inadequate.
22 You know, I may be paraphrasing, unprofessional. What are
23 you used to seeing in other applications that wasn't here in
24 this one?

25 MR. JORDAN: Well, to be specific is what they're

1 asking, many racial equity reviews is you take each
2 population group that would be normally negatively affected.
3 So, in this case, say it's the African American community,
4 which in itself was diverse in the area. So you would then
5 list how they might benefit from a project like this, and
6 then also the potential harms from a project like this, and
7 that would be used in your evaluation.

8 Basically, we -- what we've seen so far skips to
9 provide what the harms are. They only talk about basically
10 how this project is going to improve things as it relates to
11 racial equity without discussing what the potential harms
12 may be, and then citing evidence that we have from this
13 experience over the last 20 years that clearly illustrate
14 that there are harms specifically to the various black
15 communities and neighborhoods that used to be in Ward 1.
16 Well, we see that because half that population is gone.

17 MR. R. JONES: Yeah. I mean, that's just -- I
18 don't have any further questions. I don't have any comments
19 there. That's --

20 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Well, thank you.

21 Let's go to Gregory Adams, Black Neighbors, any
22 cross?

23 MR. ADAMS: My question is for Mr. Jordan.
24 Mr. Jordan, I heard you mention in your testimony
25 displacement in Ward 1. Do you live in Ward 1?

1 MR. JORDAN: Yes, I do.

2 MR. ADAMS: How long have you lived there?

3 MR. JORDAN: Since '87.

4 MR. ADAMS: Okay.

5 MR. JORDAN: 1987.

6 MR. ADAMS: In your personal experience in that
7 community, have you witnessed what zoning and development
8 like this did to the black community where you are?

9 MR. JORDAN: Yes. We saw how the impact on tax
10 assessments have impacted people. We saw how the rise in
11 land values set off waves of speculation where people were
12 basically harassed to sell their property. And then we saw
13 a series of developments that many people supported that
14 included density but did not follow through on the community
15 benefits that were promised.

16 So in my written testimony I actually talk about a
17 case when I served as an ANC Commissioner where certain
18 housing was promised and a 80-bed shelter SRO was promised
19 and only 40 beds were built. And that's part of the reason
20 we're dealing with a homeless population now in this very
21 community.

22 We had unit sizes reduced, so that many of the
23 family size units or the larger units got replaced by
24 smaller efficiencies and one bedrooms in the process, and
25 this was done over time through the zoning process, meaning

1 the developer will come back and keep asking for more and
2 more relief, and at the end of the day those promises were
3 lost and that made an impact. And I know families made a
4 decision that there is no benefit for us to remain and were
5 displaced.

6 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Jordan.

7 Thank you, Chairman Hood. No more questions.

8 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Ms. Akel, Rochelle
9 Apartments, any cross-examination of this panel?

10 MS. AKEL: Yes. Hello. Can you hear me?

11 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, we can.

12 MS. AKEL: Hi. Yeah. Just two questions for
13 Mr. Jordan. Mr. Jordan, you mentioned in your -- you
14 mentioned in your testimony about the ANC 1B resolutions,
15 and I want to ask you -- or the ANC resolutions.

16 And I want to ask you specifically about what was
17 added to the ANC 1B resolution and whether you saw that
18 under "Further, be it resolved," they said, "We strongly
19 encourage DMPED to consider displacement in the immediate
20 surrounding area for naturally-occurring affordable housing,
21 and DMPED should conduct and publish a displacement risk
22 assessment to determine the impact on the surrounding
23 affordable housing in the neighborhood."

24 Did you happen to see that? Or do you have any
25 comment about that?

1 MR. JORDAN: I did see that, and I would think
2 that some study or some effort like that needs to occur, not
3 just because of this site, but this site is also a precedent
4 because there are other upFLUMing cases that will likely
5 follow this pattern should this go through without full and
6 federal reviews and analysis, particularly on how
7 displacement is going to more than likely impact, in
8 particular, black families in specific.

9 I can tell you it's families that has been hit the
10 hardest because the units -- quantity of units are not
11 family size, and the losses that we have seen recently in
12 terms of public space and other amenities, most of the
13 amenities are geared towards adult singles, and a lot of the
14 amenities that were aimed at families with children have
15 been lost or shut down.

16 I mean, you know, we -- I can guarantee that if a
17 thorough study was done that these things would come out.
18 And since I don't see this in the various studies and
19 analysis, I know that there is a gap. And, you know, it's
20 disturbing to me personally to know that my story doesn't
21 count.

22 MS. AKEL: Thank you. And one other question
23 about your testimony about displacement. You mentioned how
24 severe it has been in Ward 1. And I want to ask, do you
25 think the government adequately considers when they put

1 forth a project like this, and they promise a certain number
2 of IZ units, do you think that they factor in adequately the
3 potential loss of existing affordable housing like ours that
4 is adjacent to the property? And as you testified, when
5 everything goes up, then a lot of times landlords are
6 incentivized to sell, and then people get displaced. Do you
7 think that gets into the balance sheet at all on these
8 projects?

9 MR. JORDAN: I have not seen it, so I have not
10 seen it in a way that we could weigh it off, particularly in
11 a timeline. And I'll give a quick example there. If you
12 build a large building, say it takes three, four, five years
13 to come to market, right? However, the impact that it has
14 on the market is almost immediate.

15 So before you get the new housing, the pressure to
16 displace and take advantage of the rising market happens
17 immediately. And I think if you read lots -- the Urban
18 Institute has done a lot of studies and talks about this a
19 lot, and other things have -- talks about this. So I know
20 there is data.

21 And the fact in D.C. there is often talked about
22 filtering, that if you build new buildings people will go to
23 the older buildings, and that creates more affordability.
24 But, actually, the Urban Institute study has shown that
25 filtering in D.C. is inverse, meaning that the opposite

1 occurs. It has an upward impact. So we do know that there
2 have been studies -- I don't know if it has been pointed to
3 -- specifically to Ward 1, but we do know overall from those
4 studies there is that impact.

5 MS. AKEL: Thank you. That's all.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

7 Let's go to Ms. Feskanich. Any questions, cross-
8 examination?

9 MS. FESKANICH: Yes. Thank you, Chair Hood.

10 I have a question for Ms. Seaborn. Ms. Seaborn,
11 how would you qualify the engagement that you had with the
12 ANC about this major land use challenge?

13 MS. SEABORN: (Inaudible) required as kind of
14 minimally what was required.

15 MS. FESKANICH: So you don't -- okay. And do you
16 think -- continuing with the ANC, do you think your ANC had
17 enough data from the Office of Planning to make informed
18 decisions on this map amendment case?

19 MS. SEABORN: I don't think that's something I can
20 necessarily comment on.

21 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. Well, one last question,
22 Ms. Paige. You said you lived within 200 feet of this
23 proposed rezoning site. Did you receive a public hearing
24 notice in the mail?

25 MS. SEABORN: I've thought about that, too, and

1 no, not -- not to my -- not to the best of my knowledge,
2 which I, too, found pretty strange.

3 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. Thank you.

4 And I have a couple of questions for Mr. Jordan.
5 In Exhibit 663, you testified about Zoning Case 15-34. I
6 believe that was the Wren project where the Whole Foods is
7 now, correct?

8 MR. JORDAN: Yes.

9 MS. FESKANICH: And was that also formerly public
10 land?

11 MR. JORDAN: Yes.

12 MS. FESKANICH: And, in your opinion, how did that
13 turn out for residents and black neighbors in particular?

14 CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Feskanich?

15 MS. FESKANICH: Yes.

16 CHAIR HOOD: Help me understand the nexus between
17 23-02 and 15-04. Help me understand. Go right to your
18 point.

19 MS. FESKANICH: We're talking about public
20 property being rezoned and how that affects neighbors, black
21 neighbors in particular, and displacement, where we're
22 trying to see from the past experience how we might expect
23 things to play out in this case if it were to be rezoned.

24 CHAIR HOOD: How we might expect things -- here's
25 what I -- what I really need, and my colleagues need it as

1 well. We really need some substance stuff that we have to
2 deal with this case. Now if you're going to equate it, give
3 us a comparison, but what might happen, what if, we can't go
4 off of what-ifs. We've got to go what's in front of the
5 record. So I'm just asking you to keep it specific to his
6 testimony and also to 23-02.

7 Now, I will say, I know Mr. Jordan. I don't know
8 if he's an expert on 15-04, but you know what? Answer,
9 Mr. Jordan, as quickly as possible, because we need stuff to
10 help us with this case.

11 MR. JORDAN: Well, I think the -- so when I talked
12 about that particular case, what I had in mind was the
13 amenities that are usually expressed for this project and
14 how those come about, right? And so if you followed the
15 project --

16 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Jordan, let me ask you this.

17 MR. JORDAN: Uh-huh.

18 CHAIR HOOD: If this case -- the way the Zoning
19 Commission has right now, does this have any -- do we have
20 any amenities in front of us?

21 MR. JORDAN: Yes.

22 CHAIR HOOD: What are the amenities? Tell me what
23 the amenities are?

24 MR. JORDAN: Right. So the amenities were
25 affordable housing --

1 CHAIR HOOD: I mean, I'm talking about in this
2 case, amenities.

3 MR. JORDAN: Amenities.

4 CHAIR HOOD: We don't have a project in front of
5 us.

6 MR. JORDAN: Well, but that's kind of not fair for
7 a layperson if -- if DMPED and everybody says, "We need this
8 upzoning, so that these things can happen," right? So they
9 refer to amenities.

10 CHAIR HOOD: So, but right now --

11 MR. JORDAN: It's not -- I don't -- I didn't make
12 them up. They said --

13 CHAIR HOOD: We don't --

14 MR. JORDAN: -- if you do this --

15 CHAIR HOOD: They said that in another meeting.
16 In this forum, we're talking about rezone. And I get it,
17 because I say that all the time, but I have a law to go by.
18 And my lawyer is dinging me about the way I'm letting this -
19 - letting this carry on for the zoning record.

20 So I'm going to let you go ahead and answer
21 Ms. Feskanich's question, but I ask you to keep it very
22 limited, because I -- we have to get back to our issues.

23 MR. JORDAN: Okay. So I'll try in this way. The
24 PUD for that site included increasing the density of that
25 particular site, right? So they did upzone in that site.

1 Okay? And so what we can transfer over to this site, we can
2 also see at the height of that building and the impact it
3 had on the things around it as well as we can see the kind
4 of affordable units that came from that building.

5 And what I was told, have been told over and over
6 again, is that the taller the building, the higher the
7 density, the less likely that you will have family size
8 units in that building. And I guess that's the only thing I
9 really can say in keeping fully connected.

10 CHAIR HOOD: Well, I have to give it to you. You
11 really worked that back to where I needed to be. So thank
12 you for doing that.

13 Ms. Feskanich, do you have any additional
14 questions?

15 MS. FESKANICH: I do. Thank you. I know that
16 housing was a big part of the petition to upzone this
17 project, and in the final report that they submitted. So,
18 Mr. Jordan, in your opinion, what are the biggest takeaways
19 from your submitted testimony in Exhibit 585A, which was the
20 Urban Institute's Housing Supply Challenges and Solutions
21 Report.

22 MR. JORDAN: Okay. If it's the report that I'm
23 thinking of, is that what the Urban Institute did was to
24 look at upFLUMing and upzoning in other places, and to see
25 whether the stated outcome, which was lower cost housing,

1 more housing, and all of those things, were translating.

2 And the -- what the report was basically saying is
3 that there is not enough data to come to that -- those
4 conclusions, and that if you look more specifically, very
5 few of their cases have the drastic increase in zoning that
6 we're talking about here. So I think the -- so that's what
7 I took away from that report is that the benefits to
8 upzoning, they just haven't seen that play out in the data
9 yet, because they just don't know. We just don't know at
10 this point.

11 MS. FESKANICH: Thank you. And the same for your
12 Exhibit 585B. What was it about this report that shows the
13 remapping to MU-10 leading to more luxury housing at 1617 U
14 Street won't be helpful to black neighbors?

15 MR. JORDAN: Can you refresh -- what was that
16 particular report? I cited so many.

17 MS. FESKANICH: Mr. Jordan, I believe it was the
18 Supply and Demand Report. Do you recall that?

19 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Jordan, you're on mute.

20 MR. JORDAN: The recent specifically talked about
21 the density and the impact that it would have on housing
22 prices. And basically -- the report basically said that
23 those market forces don't have the level of impact, and that
24 this area has actually more than met its quote of new
25 housing, right?

1 So if we've kind of met our quota of new housing
2 and it hasn't had the effect that people are claiming should
3 occur, then I think we should question the whole concept
4 that we're going here -- that density and upFLUMing is going
5 to result in benefits. And, in fact, the evidence shows the
6 opposite, particularly through a racial equity lens.

7 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. And one more question, if I
8 may. You testified in Exhibit 585 about naturally occurring
9 affordable housing and mapping that out in the affected area
10 around 1617 U Street. OP still hasn't done that in your
11 opinion, and why would that be fatal to this MU-10 rezoning
12 application?

13 MR. JORDAN: Well, again, I would come back to
14 there are certain benefits that are being claimed for
15 density that's driving the -- here, and that if those
16 benefits aren't true or are questionable, that should -- the
17 Zoning Commission should consider that as part of whether it
18 allows it to go forward and weighing off against the other
19 elements and concerns that have been brought up today.

20 MS. FESKANICH: And just a quick follow up. What
21 do you think OP could do to remedy the failure of not using
22 the racial equity lens and tool properly --

23 MR. JORDAN: Oh, I don't --

24 MS. FESKANICH: -- in that application?

25 MR. JORDAN: I think the Commission needs to get a

1 third party in to do it. I don't think OP can do it because
2 they are both the applicant and the evaluator of their
3 application, and I really don't think they can do both, and
4 there needs to be an independent third party.

5 MS. FESKANICH: Thank you. Thank you for your
6 testimony.

7 I don't have any further questions, Chair Hood.

8 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Feskanich.

9 Ms. Schellin, how are we doing with Mr. Hanlon?
10 Is somebody else going to do his -- do his cross, or what
11 are we doing with him, with Dupont?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: He didn't provide anybody to do
13 cross for him. He just said that his client said they were
14 okay with the Commission moving forward with the public
15 testimony. So to me that indicated they would not do any
16 cross, but --

17 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: -- I think when we get to the
19 parties, maybe we should find out if someone is going to do
20 cross.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Again, I want to thank this
22 panel. And, Mr. Jordan, I really want to thank you because,
23 again, and I appreciate the question that Ms. Feskanich
24 brought forward because I heard earlier from someone in
25 opposition that the economics was not part of it, and in

1 your report it specifically talks about it.

2 So I really appreciate that. And while she was
3 talking I was going through looking at it, reviewing it
4 again, and I will continue to review it.

5 So thank you all very much for your -- for you
6 all's testimony. Thank you.

7 Ms. Schellin, let's call the next four up, please.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Martha Logan. Actually,
9 let me make sure that Mr. Young is ready. Yes, it looks
10 like he is. I see Ms. Gillem is back on, hopefully.

11 Ms. Gillem, did you want to try speaking to see if
12 you're working now?

13 William Garber, Barry Karas, and I'm going to go
14 ahead and call one more just in case Ms. Gillem is still
15 having issues. Joseph Milby? And that will be four, plus
16 Ms. Gillem.

17 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: We can look and see if she has
19 called in. I will send a message to Mr. Young if she has.

20 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let's start with
21 Mr. Garber, see him. Are you -- yeah, there you are.

22 MR. GARBER: Sorry. I want to start by saying
23 that I strongly support redevelopment in the District, and I
24 thank all that this Commission and its predecessors have
25 done to make that happen.

1 My wife and I moved to Seaton Street from
2 Rockville in the summer of 2021. In the mid-'80s, I lived
3 at 19th and Kalorama, and then we relocated to 901 6th
4 Street, Southwest, before leaving this area for a number of
5 years. So I know how transformed this city is and the role
6 that redevelopment has played in that process.

7 I want to focus on a few of the key issues to help
8 explain why I support redevelopment for the site but
9 strongly oppose this proposal. I also support more
10 affordable housing, including on this site. I live in an
11 already diverse area. I came here for that very diversity.
12 This proposal does not enhance the existing neighborhood.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: What's up? I'm in a hearing.

14 MR. GARBER: I'm sorry? This proposal --

15 CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Schellin, you may want to mute
16 yourself. All right. Sorry about that. You may continue.

17 MR. GARBER: All right. This proposal does not
18 enhance the existing neighborhoods, and the Commission
19 should give that dimension of the comprehensive plan its
20 rightful weight. This proposal would damage this
21 neighborhood irreparably. It is clear that split zoning is
22 the best solution for enhancing our neighborhood while
23 adding to the stock of affordable housing.

24 The façade of any high rise building should face
25 U Street. Moreover, MU-10 is too high and is inconsistent

1 with the existing neighborhood. It should not be enabled
2 simply because the plan allows it.

3 And what is a neighborhood? In the reading I've
4 done, it is not defined by simple distance but also must
5 include a combination of social interactions and
6 architecture, among other things. ANC Chair Harris asserted
7 that the proximity of The Sonnet somehow proves that MU-10
8 is reasonable. The notion that The Sonnet, surrounded by
9 other high-rise apartments and the Reeves Center, is somehow
10 a prototype for this neighborhood is absurd.

11 Moreover, the high-rise façade of The Sonnet faces
12 only U Street. So even it's very construct is consistent
13 with split zoning, and the notion that anything on the other
14 side of both 16th and 15th Streets is somehow part of this
15 neighborhood is ludicrous. If proximity defines my
16 neighborhood, then the building I can see out my window now
17 that most clearly resembles the rendition in the OP exhibit
18 is the Washington Hilton, an almost identical distance from
19 the site as The Sonnet. Is that appropriate here?

20 The townhomes on V would likely end up with no
21 direct sunlight. This island, as Vice Chair Miller
22 characterized it, would cast a literal and figurative shadow
23 over our neighborhood. The traffic that is disgorged during
24 rush hour will compromise already busy intersections, and
25 finding parking will become a variable nightmare for current

1 residents.

2 Of course there is no specific proposal for
3 development on the site, but we have every reason to believe
4 that the future would realize our worst fears. During
5 testimony, the OP and OAG asserted that building size was
6 irrelevant to the existing neighborhoods because there was
7 no change in zoning proposed for the surrounding
8 neighborhoods themselves. They then repeated that claim
9 over and over. That assertion is, frankly, offensive to me,
10 to my neighbors, and to this Commission.

11 If you build a large factory next to a pristine
12 garden, it does impact the garden. Given that testimony,
13 why should we put any faith in some future process to strike
14 a balance that is so obviously needed. You are the current
15 stewards for the redevelopment journey we are on.

16 The words of Chair Hood have echoed through this
17 hearing. We get it, and I have faith that you do. I
18 implore you to act upon the many flaws that you clearly
19 perceive and exercise the power you have in a reasoned and
20 measured manner to ensure a fair outcome. I thank you for
21 your consideration.

22 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

23 I'm going to go -- who I have on my screen,
24 Mr. Milby?

25 MR. MILBY: Hello. How are you?

1 CHAIR HOOD: Fine. How are you? Good evening.

2 MR. MILBY: Good. My name is Joe Milby. My wife,
3 Helen, and I live at 2034 16th Street, Northwest. We have
4 been here for six years. We are obviously opposed to this
5 and feel a little hoodwinked, to be honest, and we're
6 against the rezoning and development of the site adjacent to
7 our home.

8 To add a little background, my wife is a sixth
9 generation Washingtonian, and we spent a good deal of our
10 life saving up in order to move here and make this
11 neighborhood our home for our family. And we feel that this
12 sort of rezoning to allow a behemoth building will
13 negatively impact the equity in our most valuable asset,
14 which is our home.

15 Like many of the neighbors we have spoken to, you
16 know, we saved for years to purchase this home. We chose it
17 because it boarded vibrant neighborhoods and parks, and it's
18 adjacent to the local police department, which we also
19 cherish.

20 Certainly, a large portion of our home's value is
21 attributed to the unobstructed western views of the
22 Washington skyline, and the potential of looking at the back
23 side of a large apartment building will block most of our
24 sunlight and certainly our view. And we, you know, didn't
25 count on moving here to live in the shadow of a large new

1 building.

2 A number of our wonderful neighbors are also
3 concerned for the same reasons and have said that they would
4 consider selling their homes and moving to quieter
5 neighborhoods with less disruption. I mean, in addition to
6 this, for the past three years, we have endured, I don't
7 know, endless construction of the bus lines on 16th Street
8 and PEPCO's digging on 17th Street to put in new powerlines.
9 Our house, you know, shakes from the construction. It's
10 very old. It was built in 1895.

11 And if you add this to the potential of a multi-
12 year construction project on our block, it's really almost
13 too much to bear. The quality of our life in a once-quiet
14 block of Washington is no longer a peaceful one. We can
15 only take so much, and we feel that -- we hope that you hear
16 our concerns for those of us that make this our home.

17 We feel this particular project is unnecessary and
18 that it's way out of scale, and that it upends the fabric of
19 our historic and modest city block. We feel that this piece
20 of property should not be rezoned, and we hope that you'll
21 put yourselves in our shoes that you make this
22 consideration. And we appreciate your time, and thank you
23 for listening to us.

24 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

25 Barry Karas? Is it Karas? Hopefully I pronounced

1 your name correctly.

2 MR. KARAS: Okay. I'm unmuted. Now I'm going to
3 get video. Sorry. It's Karas, but --

4 CHAIR HOOD: Karas. Okay.

5 MR. KARAS: -- it's okay. I'm hitting start
6 video. Don't allow. Okay.

7 Okay. Here I am. Hello. How are you? I have
8 sat through all of these, and I can't imagine that I have
9 been so good -- I'm sorry, I'm going to sit down. I would
10 like to say to you, Chair Hood -- and, first of all,
11 Mr. Garber, that I could use your testimony and would say
12 exactly how I feel.

13 But, Chair Hood, I just wanted to say you
14 mentioned about the ANCs and their interest in their backing
15 of this project, but every time you've called on anybody
16 from 2B, who I assume voted for this, has not been there.
17 Five meetings, not one Meg Roggensack and the other person,
18 nobody there has taken the time.

19 So one of the problems we have is that when they
20 have meetings, which now since COVID have been on Zoom, they
21 give you like a few minutes to talk, and that's it. There
22 is no real conversation. There is no back and forth to talk
23 to -- so here we are, five meetings, they are not here.
24 Okay?

25 Ms. Harris is here from 1B. Okay. I don't

1 understand why this is the zoning. You have your reasons,
2 but I still, as a layperson, do not understand how we're
3 going to change the zoning and then have the -- sorry, and
4 then have the plans coming. We have no idea of what the
5 plans are.

6 We -- I live in 1820 16th Street, so 16th between
7 Swan and S. And we had a problem with the Masonic Temple
8 building, building that thing that Ms. Schumacher was
9 talking about behind the Temple, promises, promises, there
10 will be a walkway that would be public, it's closed off,
11 it's private.

12 I don't trust developers once they get the license
13 to build to do anything but to optimize their profit. And
14 they are not community-minded. I don't know if you know
15 that neighborhood. I've lived here 12 years, but Ms. Iris
16 Green, who lives right next door, just north of that on 15th
17 Street, she is a black woman who is a lawyer, who is in her
18 seventies I would say, has seen all of her neighbors along
19 15th Street between S and the driveway that now exists where
20 this Temple is, were all townhouses.

21 All black people were living in there, and one by
22 one they were made promises where they were moved out. And
23 then it was promised that it would be a community garden,
24 and then they took the community garden away.

25 So allowing people to have the license to do

1 something, to build something, because you've changed the
2 zoning does not mean that they are going to be responsible.

3 And I next submit that I don't know who in the
4 world really comprehensively thinks that this police station
5 and fire station is going to come back into our
6 neighborhood. It is ridiculous. Do you know that the fire
7 station, in 2016 or so, was redone? I went in and I spoke
8 to the firemen. They redid it.

9 Now, if you moved into a luxury apartment house,
10 would you want a fire station and a police station
11 underneath? It doesn't make sense. The promises that they
12 are going to move it -- and I don't know at what cost or to
13 where they are going to do it -- is going to ever come back.
14 It just does not make realistic sense.

15 So I have been told that MU-10 -- that an MU-4 can
16 produce the same amount of affordable housing time. That's
17 not fair. I've been on this for five different times.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Karas, go ahead. She is just
19 letting me know that your time is up. But I haven't stopped
20 you, so keep going until I stop you.

21 MR. KARAS: Well, I appreciate that. I heard
22 somebody yell "time," and --

23 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. She -- she is doing what she
24 is supposed to be doing.

25 MR. KARAS: I felt -- I felt the hook come out.

1 I'm an actor, so I know what a hook is like, and going on
2 too long.

3 MU-4, you could get the same amount of affordable
4 housing as you would if you had an MU-10. So I just want to
5 -- how many three-bedroom apartments where families are
6 actually going to live there are going to be able to be
7 built? I ask you to go check the Masonic Temple building
8 and see how many people, how many families are there. There
9 are no families. We need affordable housing for families,
10 not for single people in a studio.

11 And I would like to back up what Mr. Garber said
12 about The Sonnet. V Street behind -- which we're talking
13 about V Street behind the property that you're going to
14 rezone, V Street, which has been compared to -- well, if you
15 -- if that's okay, why isn't this okay? There is not one
16 townhouse on V Street that's going to be affected by a tall
17 building. Not one.

18 So we're not talking about families that are going
19 to be affected by this, the St. Augustine Church, and there
20 are a couple of other buildings. It's, you know, mixed in.
21 It's across from a gas station. It's a whole different
22 ballgame.

23 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Give us your closing -- give
24 us your closing thought.

25 MR. KARAS: My closing --

1 CHAIR HOOD: Now that's the hook.

2 MR. KARAS: -- is is that I've been on the Dupont
3 Circle Citizens Association, not right now, but we are -- we
4 were referred to by somebody as old and white people. And
5 we are not just old and white people, and we are people who
6 have lived here many more than I have, and have done things
7 to maintain the neighborhood, from the T Street Park -- I
8 mean, and we tried to get the Masonic Temple -- we tried
9 forever to make it a park. We wanted it to be the Black
10 Heritage Park. And what do we have? We have a 400-unit
11 apartment building that is --

12 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

13 MR. KARAS: -- basically, when I went for a tour,
14 a one bedroom is --

15 CHAIR HOOD: I've asked you -- I've asked you to
16 give us your closing thoughts.

17 MR. KARAS: I know you did.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Yes.

19 MR. KARAS: That's sort of like the way I wrap up.
20 So it's \$2,900 for a one bedroom. That's ridiculous.
21 Anyway --

22 CHAIR HOOD: All right.

23 MR. KARAS: -- there you go. That's me.

24 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very
25 much.

1 Let's see if we -- did we get Ms. Gillem?

2 If this panel can stay, we may have some
3 questions.

4 Ms. Gillem? I don't know what it's going to take
5 to get Ms. Gillem, but we're going to keep trying.

6 All right. I think I've gotten everyone. Let's
7 see if we have any questions of this panel. Commissioner
8 Imamura?

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10 No questions, but thank you all for sharing your perspective
11 with us.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Stidham, any
13 questions, cross? I mean, any questions?

14 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Thank you for your
15 participation.

16 CHAIR HOOD: Vice Chair Miller, any questions?

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I have no questions. Thank
18 each of you for your testimony, and thank you, Mr. Garber,
19 for moving back into the city in 2021 during COVID of all
20 things. I guess we're still in COVID, but maybe not quite
21 as raging. Anyway, thank you all for your testimony and
22 your written comments that you provided.

23 CHAIR HOOD: I, too, want to thank you all for
24 your comments. I will say, Ms. Schellin, if you could
25 remind me, at the first meeting ANC 2B was present, correct?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: I don't think they have been
2 present at all.

3 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Because I went and looked at
4 their letter, and, okay, I just wanted to make sure that we
5 notated that correctly.

6 So, again, I want to thank you all for your
7 testimony. Let's see what the parties may have for you.
8 Does the Office of Planning have any cross of this panel?
9 That would be Mr. Kirschenbaum. Office of Planning? Mr.
10 Lawson, do you have any -- do you all have any cross?

11 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. No cross.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

13 Chair Harris, do you have any cross?

14 MS. HARRIS: No cross, but I did want to mention
15 something, Chairman Hood. The ANC 2B was present for the
16 testifying in the parties' support. So I think Ms. Schellin
17 mentioned that they weren't present at all, and I just
18 wanted to note that, that they were for that.

19 CHAIR HOOD: I think I did remember. Was that the
20 first meeting?

21 MS. HARRIS: They're all blending together, sir.
22 So it might have been the second.

23 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. That's why I asked the
24 question, because you're right, they're all blending
25 together. Thank you.

1 Okay. I knew that they were here once. I just
2 didn't know when. So thank you.

3 I'm going to call again ANC 2B? Okay. Mr. Randy
4 Jones?

5 MR. R. JONES: I don't have any questions, sir,
6 but I did want to just see if you could give me the right to
7 put my screen up. I think maybe that's a question for Paul
8 Young.

9 CHAIR HOOD: I don't -- I don't think we have
10 control of that. If you hover over your video, does it say
11 start video?

12 MR. R. JONES: No. I don't even have that button
13 or that option.

14 CHAIR HOOD: You have to have that. That comes
15 with your package. You should have that. Mr. Young, have
16 you --

17 MR. R. JONES: I didn't get a link to -- I'm using
18 last -- two weeks' ago link. No one sent me a link to be a
19 party tonight. Like I --

20 CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Schellin?

21 MR. R. JONES: Is that the issue?

22 CHAIR HOOD: I'm not sure. I don't -- Mr. Young
23 or Ms. --

24 MR. R. JONES: I'm sorry.

25 CHAIR HOOD: -- Schellin --

1 MR. R. JONES: You can move on if you --

2 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. Let me -- let me find out
3 what's going on. Hold on one second. Do we send a
4 different link at every meeting, Ms. Schellin, for the
5 parties?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: The parties -- we send a link for
7 anyone who has signed up, and I figured out why Mr. Jones
8 did not get his link and it's because he was included in the
9 first group who have already testified. So a link did not
10 go to those who had previously testified, and he was in that
11 group, so he didn't get it. However, the link is on our
12 website, the same link.

13 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Because Mr. Jones wants to
14 turn his camera on. So let's make sure that --

15 MS. SCHELLIN: He's on his phone. I don't think
16 you can do that on a phone.

17 CHAIR HOOD: Oh.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: I'm not sure. I don't know that he
19 can turn it on on his phone.

20 MR. R. JONES: Sorry for the -- sorry for the
21 delay. I don't want to -- I don't want to drag this on to
22 night seven here.

23 CHAIR HOOD: So it's too late to start talking
24 about delaying and, you know, so really the reality is we've
25 gone this far, so now we want to make sure that you're

1 accommodated. If you -- if your video wants to be on, we
2 have accommodated, night seven, five, or four, whatever the
3 case is. We're going to continue to accommodate.

4 MR. R. JONES: I'm going to try to figure
5 something else out. I'm sorry. My camera -- I don't know.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. But just know this. It's
7 not --

8 MR. R. JONES: I'm used to doing these in person.

9 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. It's not us. Just know that
10 it's not us. Okay. So --

11 MR. R. JONES: Thank you.

12 CHAIR HOOD: -- Black Neighbors, Mr. Adams?

13 MR. ADAMS: No questions.

14 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

15 Ms. Akel, any questions? Rochelle? Ms. Akel,
16 Rochelle Apartments?

17 MS. AKEL: I have one question for Mr. Garber. Is
18 he still with us?

19 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, he is.

20 MR. GARBER: Yes, I'm here.

21 MS. AKEL: Hi, Mr. Garber. Since you live in the
22 neighborhood, I wanted to ask you if you had -- if you feel
23 that you had enough public engagement opportunities and
24 notice about this project.

25 MR. GARBER: Yeah. It's interesting. One thing

1 I'd point out that I think hasn't been brought out in
2 earlier testimony is that our little triangle here between
3 Florida and U and 16th was rezoned. We were moved from 1C
4 to 1B in 2023. So that already -- look, I'm not a
5 conspiracy theorist, but -- and then all of a sudden this
6 plot is in that triangle.

7 So I knew -- we were already, then -- and I used
8 to get emails from our ANC rep who came door to door for the
9 vote before we elected in 1C. So there is already a little
10 bit of an odd thing that increases the amount of due
11 diligence that you would have thought that we would have
12 received. So, no, I don't feel we got anywhere near enough
13 notification.

14 MS. AKEL: Thank you. That's all for me. Thank
15 you.

16 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Ms. Feskanich?

17 MS. FESKANICH: A question for Mr. Garber. I
18 wanted to ask you about whether you were aware of the
19 setback proposal from OP and why that would not be
20 sufficient in mitigating the height and bulk of MU-10.

21 MR. GARBER: Yeah. Well, there are a couple of
22 things about the setback. For one, before I answer the
23 question specifically, the notion of the setback flies in
24 the face of their testimony that the size is irrelevant. If
25 the size is irrelevant, then why did they even bring up a

1 setback in the first place? That seems to be a little
2 inconsistent. So I just want to point that out.

3 I looked at the exhibit around the setback, and
4 their assertion is -- and I looked also at the Google Maps
5 on what was the equivalent that they were showing over on
6 M Street between 9th and 10th, the setback addresses the few
7 townhomes on V only, and all it talks about and all it
8 allows for is the site lines basically from their front
9 porch. It does nothing to do -- anything about the --

10 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Garber?

11 MR. GARBER: -- gargantuan building that you would
12 get along 17th Street.

13 CHAIR HOOD: Hold tight for a second.

14 Mr. Ritting, I have a question for you.

15 Mr. Ritting? I'm just asking from a legal perspective --
16 they're talking about a setback. Isn't that another case?

17 MR. RITTING: Yes.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. That's another case, so --

19 MR. RITTING: It's also not the subject of
20 Mr. Garber's testimony.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I'm going to rule that
22 question out of order. Next? Come back in -- when we have
23 that and we can discuss that then. But then we will
24 probably want to discuss this case. So let's do that,
25 Mr. Garber. Let's -- and I know you were asked a question,

1 so, Ms. Feskanich, I got a ruling on that from my legal
2 counsel. I'll rule that out of order for now.

3 Next question, please.

4 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. I brought up the setback
5 issue because it was in an OP presentation about -- to the
6 ANC about this map amendment. So I thought it was
7 appropriate to bring it up because of the --

8 MR. RITTING: It would be a relevant question for
9 the Office of Planning.

10 MS. FESKANICH: All right. Another question for
11 Mr. Garber. You mentioned in your testimony the importance
12 of neighborhood and in the whole zoning process. Could you
13 just elaborate a little bit more about how you would
14 describe the neighborhood and how zoning would affect that?

15 MR. GARBER: Yeah. It's interesting. And I did
16 some reading about the neighborhood because it came up in
17 the last hearing, and I have sat through them all. For me,
18 the neighborhood involves neighbors, right? It involves
19 your foot traffic, and the foot traffic around here is
20 around the low-rise developments that exist.

21 And so that's how I think about it when -- people
22 who you see when you walk your dogs, people who you see when
23 you're out and about, and the notion that proximity alone
24 dictates neighborhood is -- is -- it's an element, but it is
25 not really the essential element.

1 So that's how I think about it, and that's how I -
2 - how I conceived of the neighborhood when we moved here,
3 and, yes, we did move during COVID, and we would have moved
4 in 2020, if not for the immediacy and the lack of
5 vaccinations at the time. But thank you for the question.

6 MS. FESKANICH: Thank you, Mr. Garber.

7 I have a question for Mr. Milby. Mr. Milby, in
8 your testimony you talked about disruption from all the
9 construction that's occurring in your area right now. Are
10 you at all concerned about the lack of impact studies that
11 have been -- have not been conducted in regards to this
12 project and what some of those impacts might be on your
13 property?

14 MR. MILBY: I certainly am. You know, we've been
15 sort of very left in the dark I feel here, especially with
16 the current construction that has been going on. We knew a
17 little bit about the bus lanes on 16th Street and that
18 construction, and -- but then PEPCO has been doing something
19 with a substation. And I know that V and 16th has literally
20 for 24 months been dug up, and they are still working out
21 there today.

22 The impact from that is tremendous. We have
23 cracks all over our house, our house shakes, you know, the
24 parking is gone. It's like driving on the moon. It has
25 been horrible, and I can only imagine that if they tear down

1 everything, it seems like half the block across the alley
2 from us, it will be just as bad, if not worse. We certainly
3 love our house. It's a historic landmark. Its façade is
4 protected by the L'Enfant Trust, and we take a lot of pride
5 in our house. But it's becoming impossible to keep up with
6 the repairs because of the ongoing construction and the
7 damage that we sustain as a side effect.

8 MS. FESKANICH: Yeah. Thank you. And one more
9 question for you, Mr. Milby. How would you qualify your
10 engagement with the ANC?

11 MR. MILBY: Little to none. We rarely hear
12 anything from the ANC. I think it's shameful. It's
13 terrible. I have tried to reach out to our City
14 Councilmember on a number of occasions to try to get some
15 feedback and information and without much positive result
16 there either.

17 MS. FESKANICH: Thank you, Mr. Milby.

18 I don't have any other questions, Chair Hood.
19 Thank you.

20 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

21 And, again, I believe Mr. Hanlon is not
22 participating in cross again.

23 Okay. Ms. Schellin?

24 Thank you all. We appreciate all of you for
25 providing your comments.

1 Ms. Schellin, can we get the next four up, please?

2 Do we have Ms. Gillem yet?

3 MS. GILLEM: Can you hear me now?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

5 CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Gillem, thank you. We finally
6 got you. Go right ahead before --

7 MS. GILLEM: AT&T.

8 CHAIR HOOD: -- something happens. Okay. And go
9 right ahead.

10 MS. GILLEM: My name is Maria Gillem. I live at
11 1733 U Street, and my family has been here for quite a
12 while. My grandfather bought the house in 1913. First, my
13 apologies for my audio issues. This is a big deal, a really
14 big deal. The public land at 1617 U Street is a gold mine
15 for real estate development. And if a developer gets both
16 the Reeves Center and 1617 U Street, it's even a bigger
17 deal.

18 We've been talking about affordable housing, but
19 ironically we are here making zone changes so we can have a
20 penthouse apartment that will have some affordable housing
21 that may or may not actually be affordable, with possibly a
22 police department under it. And I'm going to tell you, I
23 have looked everywhere for a year. There is no such a thing
24 as a police department under apartment building.

25 For me, there are three major issues: height,

1 race, and economics. The topography of D.C. is very much
2 like a stadium or theater seating, rising in increments.
3 It's rather -- a rather democratic view that people have
4 down to the federal city that we are risk -- at risk of
5 losing. In this case, it's for a penthouse view.

6 I have watched these luxury apartments with poor
7 doors go up for the past 15 to -- years or so, and they
8 create major changes in communities and surrounding areas.
9 They are enormous social engineering operations that have
10 changed the racial and economic landscape of D.C., evidenced
11 by the fact that historic black neighborhoods like ours are
12 now almost all white and wealthy with more to come.

13 The D.C. government and developers have definitely
14 made D.C. wealthier and whiter. In 1913, when my
15 grandparents moved onto U Street, the talk about the -- the
16 talk was about the electric chair that was built for the
17 D.C. government where the firehouse now sits at 1617 U
18 Street. The city had gone from taking lives to saving
19 lives. Now that's progress.

20 What's proposed for the land today is
21 gentrification on steroids. Progress to some but negative
22 and life-altering for others. At one time, against the
23 odds, D.C. was a thriving black community. From 14th and U
24 down to 10th was considered Black Broadway. 17th and U was
25 residential and called Strivers' Row, even though you could

1 find the same thriving black households all over the area.

2 A more suburban life drew many people out of the
3 inner cities and across the country and -- across the
4 country, same in D.C. Economics shifted and left people
5 more vulnerable to racism and exploitation. Rows of houses
6 were purchased by landlords as families moved out. In a
7 short time, the racism, exploitation, and poverty exploded
8 into the riots at 14th and U and 8th and H at the center.

9 The riots and drugs brought even more urban
10 blight. Revitalization was a constant promise. Well, it
11 came full force some 40 years later, but not for the people
12 that it was promised to for so long. It came for wealthy
13 whites who moved into luxury apartments, and those small
14 pockets of affordable housing that often aren't so
15 affordable.

16 The Sonnet, with its endless pool and great view
17 of the city, sits on land that was once home to affordable
18 housing. Whether you are at 14th and U or 8th and H, stand
19 there for me and look around. It's hard to imagine that not
20 too long ago those were all black communities that white
21 people completely avoided. What happened to those people?
22 To be honest, I can't say a lot of people care.

23 I would like to point out that 14th and U and
24 Strivers' Row and Adams Morgan are very different
25 neighborhoods, and changing the ANC can't change that. 14th

1 and U has been, and still is, more of a business district.
2 Adams Morgan is the blending of white Adams School with
3 black Morgan School, representing the openness and diversity
4 that would make us famous. That's now gone, and that's what
5 Adams Morgan Day used to be all about. We should not let
6 history be forgotten, particularly in today's atmosphere of
7 hate and divisiveness. Diversity protects. It's an
8 umbrella for all of us.

9 Before the 1970s, the D.C. police department was
10 all white and recruited from the deep south. Today the 3rd
11 District is one of the few places you'll find people of
12 color within my block. We are turning into an apartheid-
13 like city where people of color do the service jobs and
14 supervising positions are almost all white.

15 I get to see people that look like me in a group
16 when I go to the grocery store or the -- or on the street
17 where people are in transit. Our city is particularly
18 sensitive to racial balance. We haven't had a large working
19 class or low -- or a low-class like Baltimore or Philly of
20 whites in a very long time.

21 Now the division along economic and racial lines
22 is even larger. It's creating problems now, and we must put
23 it in check. Sadly, I don't think -- see things changing.
24 Young singles, almost all white with high-paying jobs and
25 disposable income, are the city's cash cows.

E V E N I N G S E S S I O N

(6:00 p.m.)

1
2
3 MS. GILLEM: It seems to me that the city will
4 sacrifice even families, and they have -- they have needs as
5 their kids grow. You know, their kids are getting bigger
6 and taller, and they need more space. They would rather
7 create a playground of amenities now. We are high on
8 amenities and low on heart and soul.

9 I propose instead of luxury apartments, which I'm
10 sorry this -- this is going to be, because that's what
11 happens underneath a penthouse, that the D.C. government
12 have Jubilee Housing create affordable land -- affordable
13 housing on that land. They are building at 1764 Kalorama
14 Road right now, and other projects are also in the works.

15 They know how to do affordable housing right, and
16 that's not an easy accomplishment in our country. Just
17 about every luxury apartment that I see has a continuous
18 leasing banner out. Affordable housing has no problem
19 finding residents. So it's a better use of space.

20 We also need to get serious about the issue of
21 policing. That garage may be an eyesore, but nothing
22 compares with what the police see every day. The most
23 effective tool against crime is when the police department
24 and the community can work together. Let's show some
25 respect and build a community-facilitated police station.

1 You can't go robocop like people have recommended.

2 CHAIR HOOD: Give us your -- Ms. Gillem, give us
3 your closing thought, please.

4 MS. GILLEM: My closing thought is that we are
5 spitting in the face of history, that this -- what will be -
6 - what will be built there is a luxury apartment with a poor
7 door. It's going to make our area wealthier and whiter, and
8 that's a spit in the face of history to the people that
9 worked so hard to integrate this city, and which -- which
10 Adams Morgan is all about.

11 And also, I don't think that the people that lived
12 on Strivers' Row want to see this -- would have wanted to
13 see this wealth -- this neighborhood wealthy and whiter.
14 And once you put more white wealth into this community, it
15 will -- it will not be black again or people of color again
16 for a very long time.

17 And diversity has helped all of us. You know,
18 it's actually -- it has been an umbrella. Any kind of
19 issues that any of us have are now protected and considered
20 because of the civil rights movement that we had.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Gillem. That was your
22 closing thought? Thank you very much.

23 MS. GILLEM: That's it.

24 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Let's see if we have --
25 Ms. Schellin, do we have -- let's see if we have any --

1 everyone left? Hmm. Let's see if we have any questions of
2 this panel. Commissioner Imamura? I thought it was a
3 panel. Maybe I called Ms. Gillem by herself. I'm sorry.
4 Commissioner Imamura?

5 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No. Thank you,
6 Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ms. Gillem, for your
7 participation in the public process tonight as well as your
8 perspective.

9 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Stidham, any
10 questions?

11 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, sir.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller, any
13 questions?

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And
15 thank you, Ms. Gillem, for your patience in finally getting
16 to give your testimony.

17 CHAIR HOOD: I, too, want to thank you,
18 Ms. Gillem. We're glad we got you on. Let's see if the
19 parties have any -- any questions. The Office of Planning?

20 MR. LAWSON: No questions. Thank you.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Chair Harris, ANC 1B?
22 I'm not sure, but I'm going to call it anyway
23 because I have to, ANC 2B? Mr. Jones? Randy Jones?

24 MR. R. JONES: No questions. And I'm happy to
25 announce that I think I've got my video, so thanks, guys.

1 CHAIR HOOD: Congratulations.
2 Black Neighbors, Gregory Adams? Okay. Thank you.
3 Rochelle Apartments, Ms. Deborah Akel?

4 MS. AKEL: I have one question for Ms. Gillem.
5 That was very powerful testimony, and I want to ask you,
6 Ms. Gillem, two things. You're my neighbor, and I want to
7 ask you, how does it feel that the Office of Planning hasn't
8 even done -- after all of the displacement that has already
9 happened, especially in this area we lost 12,000 black
10 residents and gained 28,000 white residents. How does --
11 how do you feel about the fact that OP hasn't even done a
12 thorough racial equity or displacement analysis on this
13 project?

14 MS. GILLEM: I think that we're dealing with a
15 very particular type of issue. Being a person of color, and
16 looking to speak up, can be difficult in what is now most --
17 an almost all-white atmosphere, because you can go into a
18 white -- you can -- if the -- there are micro-aggressions
19 that happen where you -- people will treat you like they
20 don't see you. You are invisible. You can be talking or
21 sitting right in their face, and they'll act like they don't
22 see you.

23 People will say, oh, I didn't notice that that
24 street was -- was full of entirely black neighbors, and now
25 it's all white. I didn't notice that. And I think that

1 those kind of micro-aggressions, those things that -- people
2 acting like they're experts on what happened to you as a
3 person of color make people not want to participate in
4 community affairs when there are a lot of whites.

5 So I think people like Empower DC -- I was glad to
6 see them because I think that they can reach into the
7 community, and they can get people to speak or speak for
8 them, because a lot of people are numbed by the treatment
9 that they have had over the years and don't necessarily
10 participate.

11 So I think you really have to do a lot of outreach
12 to get what -- get to people and listen to what they are
13 saying.

14 MS. AKEL: And last question. Since you live in
15 my neighborhood, I wonder if you see what I see when I walk
16 around, which is a lot of vacant -- as you -- as you
17 referred in your testimony, a lot of for lease and first
18 month's rent free, and even ground floor business retail, a
19 lot of it is empty all the way down the corridor.

20 MS. GILLEM: Every luxury apartment has a lease
21 banner hanging from it. And everything that I have said,
22 all I ask people to do is just open up your eyes and look.
23 You know, every single luxury apartment has a leasing sign
24 out, and that's what made me -- I have seen this coming for
25 years. I called -- the project that is going to go up, it's

1 -- they want to put up at 1617 U Street, I call them trojan
2 horses, because they promise you one thing, but they bring a
3 whole -- they completely change your life.

4 And, you know, 14th and U, like I said, nobody
5 wanted to go there. And you wouldn't -- and today you would
6 never even know that it was home to so many black people
7 just 10 years ago.

8 MS. AKEL: Thank you. That's all the questions I
9 have. Thank you, Chair.

10 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

11 Again, I'm going to call it anyway, Mr. Hanlon?
12 The group chose not to do any cross tonight, I believe.

13 All right. So, Ms. Schellin --

14 MS. FESKANICH: Did you pass -- did you miss Black
15 -- I'm sorry, the homeowners' party, Arlene Feskanich?

16 CHAIR HOOD: Oh, Ms. Feskanich. How could I miss
17 you, Ms. Feskanich?

18 MS. FESKANICH: I don't -- I don't know. Here I
19 am.

20 CHAIR HOOD: Go right ahead. I'm sorry. Go right
21 ahead.

22 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. Thank you. I just have one
23 question for Ms. Gillem. Thank you for your testimony. It
24 seems -- I kind of want to go back just a second to what
25 Mr. Karas had to say about broken promises. And it seems in

1 this project or this zoning application we were promised
2 more and more housing, affordable housing, and the
3 reconstruction or -- you know, reconstruction of the police
4 station and the fire station on the same site.

5 And yet you testified that you found nowhere in
6 the United States where they have any kind of housing over a
7 police station. Can you just elaborate on that a bit? Are
8 we -- are we being given false promises here again, or
9 things that are really not achievable?

10 MS. GILLEM: Are you asking me, Ms. Gillem, or
11 Mr. Karas?

12 MS. FESKANICH: Ms. Gillem, yes. I'm sorry. What
13 did I say? Yes, I'm --

14 MS. GILLEM: What was the question again?

15 MS. FESKANICH: Your testimony about housing over
16 a police station, how you've done research, you couldn't
17 find any. And we've been promised that we're going to get
18 housing and a police station and a new fire station, and I'm
19 asking whether you see these as really unreasonable promises
20 and more broken promises that other people have testified
21 to.

22 MS. GILLEM: I don't -- I see the promise of the
23 police station coming back as a broken promise, but the
24 police stations under apartment buildings are just not a
25 thing. It just doesn't make any sense. And, I mean, all

1 you have to do is do a search, an internet search, and I've
2 been searching for a year and I can't find -- if there was
3 one, I am sure that it wouldn't be so hard for me to find.

4 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Gillem.

5 I don't have any other questions, Chair Hood.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. All right. Thank you,
8 Ms. Gillem. We appreciate all of your testimony -- I mean,
9 your responses and your testimony.

10 All right. Ms. Schellin, can we bring up the next
11 four? Well, first, at 6:00, I said I was going to do a --
12 about how many people do we have left, Ms. Schellin?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: I would say, let me see, oh
14 goodness, the machine has locked up on me. Let me check
15 this again. I don't know if they're all here, but two,
16 four, six, seven -- 25. I'm not sure if there are any
17 duplicate names in that 25, but I'd say 25.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So the --

19 MS. SCHELLIN: That's just opposition, then we
20 have seven undeclared.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I'll tell you what. Let me
22 just -- unless my colleagues disagree, why don't we just try
23 to get through that, and we'll hear the parties at the date
24 -- at 7:00, Ms. Schellin, could you find a date that we all
25 could come -- I'll give you until 7:00. We'll just hear all

1 the parties and get through all of it, because the cross-
2 examination, even though some of it is redundant -- and,
3 I'll be frankly honest, is not very helpful to our
4 proceedings -- but to keep interrupting people who are
5 asking cross-examination questions, I just said, you know
6 what, I'll -- and I apologize.

7 Let me say this for the record. I apologize to
8 everybody, but to just keep interrupting just causes much
9 more of a distraction. But, again, I want everybody --
10 bring everybody back -- focus to what we have in front of
11 us, and that doesn't seem to work. And everybody says
12 they've been here so many nights. Guess what? This
13 Commission has been here as well, and we are looking for --
14 we are looking for something out of this. And a lot of
15 times things are redundant, unfocused, and not very helpful.

16 So we need to stay on -- all of us need to stay on
17 task. So I'm asking, but I've been asking since all of the
18 hearings, and it has not happened yet. So I, too, don't
19 hold much hope in that progressing.

20 All right. So, Ms. Schellin, let's bring up the
21 next four, and at 7:00 we'll do an assessment of what date,
22 and why don't we just say -- and let's -- I'm looking at my
23 colleagues. Why don't we just say we're going to start with
24 the parties in opposition. I'm hoping that we can finish
25 tonight, but, again, it depends on the cross-examination of

1 the individuals and the undeclared.

2 So what do you all think, we just automatically
3 say now we're going to start with the parties in opposition
4 at the next hearing date? Is that a fair assessment? Let
5 me hear from all of us, anybody.

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: That sounds reasonable,
7 Mr. Chairman.

8 Sorry, Vice Chairman.

9 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes, I would -- I would agree.
11 And I also agree with your statements about the cross-
12 examination questions by the parties in opposition being
13 redundant and repetitive. That's repetitive and redundant,
14 just put those two words together.

15 And also, to -- also, irrelevant or using
16 inappropriately the cross-examination process to supplement
17 or repeat direct opposition testimony, which just is an
18 inappropriate use of the cross-examination process, which
19 we've stated many times to this -- to the parties in
20 opposition, Mr. Chairman, to no avail. But thank you for
21 your effort.

22 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Stidham, do you
23 have anything to add or --

24 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, sir. I agree with you.

25 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Ms. Schelling, could you

1 -- at 7:00, could you give me a date and we'll start with
2 the parties -- parties, you all will not go tonight. Okay?
3 So you all can finish crossing, but please help us. So at
4 the next meeting -- hearing we can start with you all giving
5 us your testimony, your case -- your case, your presentation
6 and your case. So work with us on your cross-examination
7 questions, so we can get this -- so people won't say, well,
8 this is my eighth night. Well, this is my ninth night. So
9 you all help us. Thank you.

10 All right. Ms. Schellin, can you call the next
11 four up, please?

12 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Ashley DiLorenzo, Marie
13 Celeste Marcoux, Joan Rogliano, and Holly Kilness Packett.

14 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let's -- I'm going
15 to start with Ashley DiLorenzo.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Do we have four?

17 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, you have four.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

19 CHAIR HOOD: Oh, I'm sorry. I counted
20 Mr. Ritting. Can you call another person?

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. One more would be Megan
22 Hustings.

23 MR. YOUNG: I don't see her on.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Sandra Reischel, R-e-i-s-c-h-e-l.

25 MR. YOUNG: I don't see her either.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Thomas Farah?

2 MR. YOUNG: Yes, I have him.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

4 CHAIR HOOD: All right. We have four. Ashley
5 DiLorenzo? Hopefully, I didn't mess up your name too much,
6 but you may begin.

7 MS. DILORENZO: You did a great job. Thank you.
8 So I just wanted to say thank you guys for taking all your
9 time to be here. I've learned so much throughout all of
10 this, but I just have a few points.

11 I live at 1732 V Street, so about a half a block
12 from the project. And my first point is, you know, this is
13 more of a personal opinion, but I think a lot of people
14 agree, that I don't think that the general appearance goes
15 with what we see in our neighborhood. And I think that has
16 been mentioned a lot.

17 Someone had mentioned that The Sonnet is
18 11 stories on U Street, and it's 11 stories on the U Street
19 side, but it's eight stories on the V Street side. So
20 that's not all the way through. And I know that because
21 when they mentioned that, I went out to -- I went over and I
22 took a look. It's also not almost the entire block length.

23 So I do think it is a slightly different concept
24 than what we're dealing with here.

25 I also -- my next point is that, you know, with

1 the proposed 30 percent affordable housing that's happening
2 that's still creating about 70 percent unaffordable housing,
3 kind of worsening the issue that we're having. In the past
4 three years, I have independently had about 10 friends have
5 to move from these kind of more luxury apartment buildings
6 because they offer a lot of discounts for the first year,
7 and then the second year their rents have gone up between
8 600 to \$2,000 per month.

9 And so then people have to move after just one
10 year of living there, and I do think that this promotes a
11 lot of transients, which we already kind of have in the city
12 based on what people do for work, and things like that. But
13 when we have so much transients, that results in less
14 stability and less community investment. There is less
15 people that are invested in the community, and so I think
16 that kind of hurts us.

17 And this is in contrast to somewhere like The
18 Envoy, which is where I lived previously for four years,
19 which is rent controlled, and that there have been many
20 times where there has been wait lists to get in on buildings
21 like that.

22 My next point is something that I don't think we
23 have addressed a lot of, but definitely affects me. I do
24 street parking, and with a huge massive influx of people, it
25 already can be a challenge when I come home from work later

1 to find street parking. And so I'm worried that I will have
2 to then park in a garage which, as we know, usually costs
3 about \$200 a month in the city. So that's another kind of
4 issue that I would like to like address.

5 And then I just wanted to reiterate about
6 community engagement. I, to this day, have not really ever
7 been reached out to anyone but other neighbors kind of
8 concerned about this. And I think it's clear that we can
9 organize ourselves. I have received multiple calls for
10 every hearing from people in our community that are
11 interested.

12 And so I think that we are very accessible if, you
13 know, there is effort put in. And I think that the main
14 thing is that like most people are reasonable, you know,
15 like I think people want to be involved beforehand, though.
16 You know, people want to feel like their opinion matters,
17 and that this community is for them.

18 So I think that there are so many things that
19 could be acceptable, but I -- a lot of things that are
20 really important need to be delineated first, like as many
21 people have said that the police station kind of stay where
22 it is. And so I think with the right guarantees I think
23 that there could be a lot of working together, and that's
24 everything I have to say.

25 Thank you so much, guys.

1 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. If you can stick
2 around, we may have some questions for you.

3 Let's go to Mario Marcoux, Seaton Street
4 Homeowners. Maria. I'm sorry. Maria. Maria Marcoux?

5 MS. MARCOUX: It's Marie Marcoux.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Marcoux.

7 MS. MARCOUX: Do you hear me now?

8 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, we can hear you. I'm sorry.

9 MS. MARCOUX: Okay.

10 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you.

11 MS. MARCOUX: I bought my home in the 1700 block
12 of Seaton Street in 1985. I oppose any upzoning and
13 destruction of the police and fire stations or even their
14 relocation temporarily. And I also oppose building
15 apartments on their sites.

16 I submitted an earlier written statement of
17 opposition in June. In the first place, we need continuous
18 services of our first responders without time for
19 relocation. 3D serves densely-populated Ward 1, and also
20 parts of Wards 2 and 5, with increases in commercial and --
21 excuse me, in crime and commercial development nearby, 3D
22 firefighters and emergency medical services are even more
23 necessary in these areas of entertainment and nightlife and
24 commercial development near -- near our homes.

25 Secondly, destruction of these valuable properties

1 and the construction of a large apartment building will
2 cause excess traffic and safety problems in adjoining
3 streets. I'm here as a 39-year homeowner on an abutting,
4 very narrow street. Have you walked along or tried to drive
5 along V, Seaton, and 17th Streets? Have you seen the danger
6 on narrow Seaton Street with cars parked on both sides on
7 street cleaning days? And anytime people park illegally in
8 restricted -- the restricted side of the street, emergency
9 vehicles can't get through.

10 If the police and fire stations are demolished,
11 God forbid, construction vehicles will continue to impede
12 safe travel on these narrow streets in Strivers' Section
13 Historic District. This will restrict neighbors' access to
14 limited street parking and entry to alleys behind our homes.

15 Lastly, the comprehensive plan stresses the need
16 for delivery of municipal services to improve public health
17 and safety with police, firefighting, and EMS responsible
18 for their own facilities. How can this happen with a
19 proposal to upzone their locations and demolish their
20 stations when the policy -- city policy is that District-
21 owned buildings and lands are to be used effectively to meet
22 the needs of residents?

23 So to all of this I add public land for public
24 purposes. Keep our police and fire stations where they are.
25 We don't need another apartment when there are so many

1 vacancies nearby. I urge you to deny any type of upzoning.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. If you can hold --
4 stick around, we may have some questions.

5 Let's go to Holly Kilness Packett.

6 MS. KILNESS PACKETT: Yes. Hi. Can you hear me?

7 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, we can.

8 MS. KILNESS PACKETT: Hi. Thanks so much for
9 having me on today. I was asked to provide testimony by one
10 of my new neighbors. I live at 1712 V, and I bought this
11 house and moved into it in August. But I have lived in D.C.
12 for 20 years now, and the last 15 of those years I have
13 lived in the Adams Morgan, Dupont, and Logan areas. I have
14 lived in an apartment building, rowhouse apartments, and a
15 condo building during that time.

16 And when I was choosing to buy a house in this
17 neighborhood, honestly, the proximity of the police station
18 to this property was part of my decision. I am a single mom
19 with a child, and in the last 15 years that I've been living
20 in these neighborhoods, in Dupont, Logan, and Adams Morgan,
21 there has been a notable uptick in crime in these areas, not
22 to mention across the entire city.

23 And when I was living at 18th and P Street, which
24 is just a few blocks away, for the last six years, in the
25 course of two years, my car windows were broken and my car

1 was broken into five times. And the car was stolen once.
2 That was an additional -- in addition to those five times.
3 The car was stolen, and D.C. police recovered it two days
4 later in the city and returned it to me, which is
5 remarkable.

6 But it is -- it should be shocking to anyone to
7 hear that the car was broken into and/or stolen five times
8 in a two-year period. And that is just a very normal story
9 in these neighborhoods nowadays.

10 Sorry. Can you all hear me? I --

11 CHAIR HOOD: Yes.

12 MS. KILNESS PACKETT: Sorry. Did I lose the
13 group?

14 CHAIR HOOD: We can -- we can hear you.

15 MS. KILNESS PACKETT: Okay. I'm sorry. I was
16 getting a weird notification about it.

17 Okay. So, anyways, yes, I am -- I am very
18 concerned about the safety of these areas. And I don't want
19 to see the police and fire stations moved to the outskirts
20 of the city to less profitable regions if you will, and to
21 be further away, so that the city can turn more profit in
22 this neighborhood, because I have seen the city grow and
23 expand over the last 15 years and turn a really healthy
24 profit on a lot of locations throughout the city.

25 I mean, everybody has mentioned these condo

1 buildings and these apartment buildings going up, luxury
2 apartments all over the place, all over the city. And the
3 city has, I believe, gained a lot of income from that. But
4 I have not seen the services of the city become better
5 during that time. I have not seen less crime. I have only
6 seen more. I have seen more traffic and a lot less walking
7 areas and walkable areas, a lot less gathering areas in the
8 city. Parks have been replaced by luxury condo buildings,
9 open, you know, areas where you could -- used to be able to
10 like walk your dog or hang out with your kid, again,
11 replaced by luxury condo buildings. And I don't want to see
12 the police and fire station replaced by more luxury condo
13 buildings.

14 I also agree with the person who spoke earlier and
15 said there is not enough parking for the residents that we
16 have in these neighborhoods. And I don't see developers
17 being required to provide enough parking for their
18 residents. I think -- I could be wrong about this, but I
19 think the standard is that they have to provide enough
20 parking for like 20 percent of the residences that they
21 build, and it's not enough, because all of those extra cars
22 spill out into the streets, and there is not enough parking
23 as there is.

24 So, for whatever it's worth, I would rather see
25 the police and fire departments stay there. And if for some

1 reason they're not going to stay there for the other
2 concerns of the city's logistics, I would still like that to
3 be public land that's somehow used to actually better the
4 neighborhood through some other public service department or
5 a school or a park or something like that.

6 I don't think that the city is doing enough to
7 take all of the money and all of the income that it has
8 gained from the growth of the city and actually make the
9 city a better place to live in. I don't see that money
10 coming back into the residents of the city in tangible ways
11 in their lives.

12 So that's why I wanted to call in and say that I
13 oppose this being changed to private land at this time.

14 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

15 Let's move to Thomas Farah. Farah? You can
16 correct me. You can make your --

17 MR. FARAH: It's Tom Farah, but thanks a lot,
18 Chairman Hood.

19 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. FARAH: First of all, I want to thank the
21 Commission, and you, Chairman Hood, for your infinite
22 patience and all of the time that you have -- you have given
23 to people to speak out about this issue. And I think it
24 reflects the fact that a lot of our other government
25 agencies, and elected officials even, have not done that.

1 That's why you're getting this outpouring of concern.

2 The process seems to be backwards. You have
3 noted, and others have noted, that we don't have a project
4 in front of us. So even if an ANC says, "Oh, we're going to
5 have a meeting and this will be the issue," if you go there,
6 they don't have any answers because, "Oh, are the police and
7 fire going to stay?"

8 "Well, we think so."

9 "Well, how are they going to stay?"

10 "We don't know."

11 "Are there going to be two- and three-bedroom
12 apartments for families?"

13 "Well, that's up to somebody else later on."

14 Basically, it's a meaningless hearing or meeting
15 for these folks when they don't have -- when all they have
16 is the zoning issue in front of them or that that's the only
17 thing they're promoting. And all of the really important
18 stuff, well, that's behind the curtain. We'll figure that
19 out later, and it will be too late by the time that happens.

20 The Office of Planning, as has been noted, skipped
21 the racial equity studies basically, ignored a lot of
22 outreach, took a lot of shortcuts to get here, because they
23 and others -- I think they view the residents as not wanting
24 change, but the residents in the neighborhood have probably
25 seen more change and made more change than some of those

1 government officials ever have.

2 And, in fact, I think one of the issues I want to
3 highlight is that the Office of Planning seems to be
4 ignoring the change that they're -- that they need to make,
5 and that is a change related to the fact that when this
6 proposal for upzoning the two-acre parcel was first, you
7 know, conceived, it was like 2020, 2021. We were in the
8 middle of the early parts of COVID.

9 Looking back in the rearview mirror, we now know
10 in 2023/2024 that we have 8.5 million square feet of unused
11 density because so many buildings have been vacated, and
12 they're in prime locations in the city. You don't have to
13 walk far to see one. Many of them are 5 to 10 to 12 stories
14 high already, so you don't have to do anything about
15 upsetting a neighborhood or anything else. You just have to
16 convert them to residential, not easy, financially or in
17 engineering terms, but certainly no more difficult than
18 building a whole new building and taking out public
19 property.

20 In fact, the city has even admitted that turning
21 these commercial buildings into residential units is their
22 key to revitalizing the city. So we have a massive amount
23 of density that we can convert to residential use that has
24 come online since this plan was conceived. And yet the
25 Office of Planning seems to completely ignore that fact and

1 wants to plow ahead with rezoning this to be a massive
2 building, could be 10 to 12 stories high, and it would be,
3 you know, if you walk along V Street and 17th Street, those
4 are narrow, one-way, one-lane streets. It would -- it would
5 face those two-story rowhouses. No question they are going
6 to lose their sunlight, it's going to turn into a -- kind of
7 a canyon for them.

8 There is no reason to have to do that. This
9 property is worth -- two acres of land is 86,000 square feet
10 approximately. I see on Zillow 1,000-square-foot building
11 lots in Columbia Heights going for \$900,000. That means
12 this land is worth 60 million, maybe \$70 million alone.
13 Going to give that to a developer who will profit from the
14 rents and from the appreciation of the property for decades
15 to come, and the city loses the ability to do things with
16 that property as circumstances of the community and city
17 change over decades. It's gone. It's gone forever.

18 So I think given that we have all of this
19 additional density available to convert to housing, what we
20 might consider doing is keeping the city property and using
21 it for city purposes. There are other issues about the city
22 that we need to work on. We could renovate the fire and
23 police stations, if needed. We could put a job training
24 facility there, along with those. It's a perfect safety
25 bubble for young people to come and learn a trade, a skill,

1 train for a new kind of job, put them on a positive
2 trajectory or a better trajectory than they might otherwise
3 be on, and actually build wealth in the city instead of just
4 making a developer rich.

5 It doesn't make any sense to me, and the idea of
6 giving away this land for no particular purpose, when it's
7 not necessary, and overlooking the other parts of the
8 comprehensive plan, which say you're supposed to conserve
9 rowhouse neighborhoods, kind of gives short shrift to that
10 because we have this need for housing density. That's from
11 the past.

12 The current reality is we've got tons of density
13 that's empty. And I think the Office of Planning needs to
14 revisit that as well as follow the procedures that are
15 called for in the comprehensive plan.

16 I thank you for your time. Appreciate it very
17 much.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Well, we thank you, and we
19 thank the panel as well. We thank all of you. I think I've
20 gotten everyone in this panel, so let's see if we have any
21 follow-up questions or comments.

22 Commissioner Imamura?

23 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 Again, no questions for the panelists, but like the
25 panelists before you, thank you for your perspective as well

1 as your participation in the public process. That's
2 important for us to hear, so thank you.

3 CHAIR HOOD: Commissioner Stidham, any questions
4 or comments?

5 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. But I echo the thank
6 you for your participation.

7 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller?

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, each of you, for
9 your testimony tonight and any written comments that you
10 have submitted or that you may submit in the future. Thank
11 you.

12 CHAIR HOOD: I, too, want to join in with my
13 colleagues. Thank you all for coming on as many nights and
14 your patience. And I get it, Mr. Farah. I thank you for
15 your comments as well. Let's just keep pressing forward.

16 Let's -- hold tight, though. Let's see if there
17 are any questions from any of the parties. Does the
18 applicant -- I mean, Office of Planning have any cross?

19 MR. LAWSON: No, sir. Thank you.

20 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you.

21 Chair Harris, do you have any cross?

22 MS. HARRIS: No. Thank you.

23 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. And, again, I'll call on
24 ANC 2B. Mr. Jones, do you have any cross?

25 MR. R. JONES: No, sir. Keep it moving.

1 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Mr. Adams, Black Neighbors, do
2 you have any cross?

3 Okay. And, Rochelle Apartments, Ms. Akel, do you
4 have any cross? Ms. Akel, any -- there you go. Any cross?
5 You went back on mute.

6 MS. AKEL: I'm so sorry.

7 CHAIR HOOD: That's all right.

8 MS. AKEL: No, I have no questions. I just want
9 to thank Mr. Farah especially, and I agree with everything
10 he said in his testimony. Thank you.

11 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. And, Ms. Feskanich, do
12 you have any cross?

13 MS. FESKANICH: Yes. I have one question for
14 Ms. DiLorenzo. You testified that you thought the community
15 engagement was severely lacking. And in light of this, do
16 you think that the position of the ANC accurately represents
17 our immediate community around this site?

18 MS. DILORENZO: It doesn't feel like that, no.

19 MS. FESKANICH: And a question for Ms. Kilness
20 Packett. Would you have engaged with OP regarding the
21 police, the safety issues that you brought up in the
22 relocation or dislocation of police and fire stations if you
23 had been given the opportunity to do so?

24 MS. KILNESS PACKETT: To have had the opportunity
25 to know what the plans were, what was under discussion, and

1 to provide feedback.

2 MS. FESKANICH: Thank you. I don't have any other
3 questions, Chair Hood. Thank you for this panel.

4 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Thank you. All right.
5 We're going to take a 10-minute break. I think my
6 colleagues and I are -- we can take a 10-minute break.
7 We're going to come back at 6:50.

8 Ms. Schellin, about 6:48, can you start calling
9 the next four, please?

10 All right. We're going to take a 10-minute break.

11 (Brief recess from 6:38 p.m. until 6:56 p.m.)

12 CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Schellin, I'm not sure who you
13 called first, so I'm going to look at my -- see what I have
14 first. Let me go with Dr. Sarao? Sarao? I know I messed
15 that up. You can correct me.

16 DR. SARAQ: Okay. That's -- I'm Dr. Sarao.

17 CHAIR HOOD: Sarao.

18 DR. SARAQ: Thank you very much. First of all,
19 thank you, Chairman Hood. Indeed, this has been a long and
20 very tedious 24-plus hours already. And, unfortunately for
21 everyone, while it's very important, it has also been
22 incredibly frustrating to people. I live in what would be
23 called -- defined as the ring area for the development, the
24 proposed development. That is because the fire department
25 and the police services directly serve our block on Corcoran

1 Street, Northwest.

2 I'm the daughter of a native Washingtonian who was
3 born and raised in Washington, D.C. I grew up in New
4 Jersey, but I spent my childhood in Washington visiting
5 family and friends. I returned to -- from New Jersey to
6 Washington, D.C., in 1981, to work at the Federal Reserve.
7 In 1987, I moved to the neighborhood that I presently live
8 in, which is served by the public safety services provided
9 on the public property that is proposed to be upzoned for
10 sale or for long-term lease.

11 Specifically, I am looking at what -- the property
12 which falls within the historic federal city old -- old city
13 line as defined by Washington, L'Enfant, and Banneker.

14 I do not support the upzoning of the public safety
15 -- I do not -- excuse me. I do not support -- I do not
16 support the upzoning of this public property, which is only
17 for the benefit of private developers, not for the
18 taxpayers. Present research shows that there is -- already
19 exists available overflow of commercial property, which is
20 presently being converted and planning to be converted into
21 affordable residential housing without upzoning of present -
22 - those present properties.

23 Indeed, today, Mayor Bowser to The Washington Post
24 spoke about over -- the \$400 million over the next five
25 fiscal years specifically for this, for the downtown

1 revitalization plan, which is to create multi-use housing
2 out of office space buildings that are now empty.

3 Historically, D.C. government has had a woeful
4 track record of monitoring affordable housing beyond the new
5 construction phase and the initial rental and/or even sale
6 of said properties. There is no track record to be pointed
7 to with consistency.

8 Another point, the long-term "lease" of public
9 property, example a 99-year lease which would follow --
10 would be following exactly in those same footsteps as
11 previously disposing of U.S. public property at the cost to
12 the public for the benefit of only the private developers.
13 Beyond housing is the issue to the median and larger
14 communities' public safety, which is at risk with this
15 upzoning accommodation for not just the housing but
16 everything around it would not -- would lose the existing
17 public safety security net, which has proven itself to be
18 highly effective.

19 Councilmember Pinto has personally told me that
20 she is in support of the safety of the citizenry, and she
21 sees this as paramount, and she supports the retention of
22 the fire and police departments exactly where they are
23 presently located.

24 The intent of the city to move forward with
25 minimal initial oversight at best, and the failed past

1 history of monitoring affordable housing, along with no past
2 nor present oversight for safety and protection of the
3 current citizens and taxpayers within the scope of the
4 building -- in other words, as far down as we are even --
5 means that this could be viewed by the public in terms of
6 possible even criminal endangerment by the city for taking
7 tax dollars but not providing the critical services being
8 paid for by the citizens' taxes for those critical services.

9 Everyone, I am not in support of this upzoning as
10 it would be to the detriment of the current citizens and
11 taxpayers of D.C. I have really appreciated hearing
12 everyone else's comments. They have been -- both Mr. Farah
13 and Mr. Garber spoke to many points that expand upon the
14 issues that I have presented.

15 Thank you very much, and I'd like to send this --
16 submit my statement in today, too, for city record.

17 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. You can do that.
18 All right.

19 DR. SARAQ: Can't hear you.

20 CHAIR HOOD: I said thank you. You can do that.

21 DR. SARAQ: Can't hear you. I see your lips
22 moving, Chairman Hood.

23 CHAIR HOOD: Can everybody else hear me?

24 DR. SARAQ: Can't hear anybody. Okay. Now I can
25 hear you.

1 CHAIR HOOD: That's not me. Okay. Okay. So
2 we're good.

3 We're going to move on to Ms. Turnbull.

4 MS. TURNBULL: Yes. My name is Nancy Turnbull. I
5 appreciate the Commission's listening to all of our
6 testimony. It has been a long, long process, I understand.
7 I live on Seaton Street, 1738 Seaton Street, one
8 half block from the 1617 U Street site. I have lived here
9 since 1994 and have lived in the Strivers' Historic District
10 since 1982. I love this neighborhood. I love my neighbors
11 and the area.

12 I'd like to see this property redeveloped with
13 purpose, planning, and community engagement, all of which
14 are lacking. It's crucial to consider the impact of any
15 redevelopment on the character and the quality of life of
16 our neighborhood. I have concerns regarding the current
17 proposal to rezone this site as proposed by the city.

18 There are other options, as you've heard from
19 many, many people, and I will -- I will cut down my
20 testimony from what I submitted in writing because of the
21 duplication. But there are several other options available
22 that address the low-density community here. If the goal is
23 additional affordable housing, a high-density building is
24 not the solution as we have heard from many people.

25 A split zoning approach for the site is supported

1 by the D.C. comprehensive plan and the generalized policy
2 map, which designates the entire northern half of this site
3 as a neighborhood conservation area.

4 You know, I guess my question is, doesn't that
5 designation matter? And doesn't the designation of historic
6 districts that surround this site matter? A high-rise
7 structure would be at odds with the city's position that the
8 Strivers' section is a historic neighborhood worthy of
9 preservation in its historic form.

10 I urge you to consider a split zoning decision
11 with the MU-4 classification for the northern half of the
12 block and a moderate, not a high density, but a moderate
13 density classification for the U Street portion.

14 Our neighborhood is defined by two to three-story
15 rowhouses that are more than 120 years old. The impact -- a
16 10-story building or a 10-story to 12-story building would
17 impact the overall livability for residents. I guess the
18 main point I'd like to make is commonsense -- commonsense
19 should prevail. The maximum allowable heights should not
20 significantly exceed those in the historic districts that
21 surround the site.

22 Community-driven collaboration, planning
23 processes, must occur and drive the redevelopment plans for
24 this public site. To date, details have been held back,
25 studies have not been conducted, and nothing has been

1 discussed with affected residents. I have yet to receive a
2 single call, email, snail mail, anything from the city
3 regarding this project. It has all been from our neighbors.
4 The city has made no attempt to reach out.

5 The disruption of relocating the first responders
6 adds another challenge. The rezoning of 1617 U Street
7 should be compatible with the area. High-density MU-10
8 rezoning is not. Please consider these concerns in addition
9 to the city's lack of community outreach, lack of planning,
10 potential structural and environmental issues to the
11 neighborhood, and the disruption and expense to move the
12 police and fire departments from the public land.

13 Please reject the current proposal and ask for a
14 resubmission with a proposal for split zoning. Thank you
15 very much for your time. Appreciate it.

16 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much.

17 Let's go to Mr. Paul Kervin.

18 MR. KERVIN: Ah. There it is. It's not the pull-
19 down menu. Ah. Good evening, Chairman Hood. you are
20 doing a wonderful job. Commissioners, you are very patient.
21 Neighbors, you're incredibly knowledgeable. I really
22 appreciate your involvement.

23 I'm Paul Kervin. I have a history in Washington.
24 My grandfather was a proofreader at GPO. He lived with my
25 grandmother at 200 Massachusetts Avenue, Northwest, which no

1 longer exists. There's a highway through there now.

2 My grandma's grandpa is memorialized at the Civil
3 War Memorial there at 10th and U Street. He is a member of
4 the 73rd USCT. And I have lived on Corcoran Street near
5 16th since 1970. I graduated from UDC, 1988, with my second
6 degree.

7 I have already submitted written comments, so I
8 won't repeat them. Over the past 20, 24 hours, I have
9 learned a great deal and come to a few realizations.
10 Perhaps the most important lesson from these hearings is
11 that of procedure. There is reasons that these hearings --
12 this hearing has gone on so long. There is an incredible
13 lack of clarity regarding exactly what we're talking about.

14 Therefore, we're sort of talking about everything.
15 There is no building. There is no project. There are no
16 blueprints, no renderings. Therefore, I guess we're talking
17 about policy. And the Commission's decisions could set
18 precedent for the future. The Commissioners' decisions
19 about neither a building nor a project will set policy.

20 Okay. However, you have only limited impact
21 studies, and you have been offered no alternatives to choose
22 from, and setting the policy covers so much of the future.
23 OP presented only an MU-10 option with limited statistics
24 and talk about affordable housing. That's a buzz word like
25 sustainable development. It means nothing anymore.

1 OP did not present the Commission with truly
2 comprehensive information. But if we're going to be here
3 working to set policy, OP should present to the Commission a
4 comparison of what would happen at MU-6, MU-8, MU-9, as well
5 as MU-10, for comparison using MU-4 as a basis, as a
6 minimum.

7 OP did not present their proposal in the larger
8 geographic context. How does this development impact with
9 the Reeves Center? And what about the property at 1325 S
10 Street? There is an acre of land the city owns there that
11 has great potential.

12 The Commission, you guys, have been tremendously
13 disciplined -- disadvantaged by the Office of Planning. OP
14 waives the banner of affordable housing and says approve MU-
15 10; it will be great. But there is no building, no project,
16 no blueprints.

17 Moreover, they have only presented you with a
18 single MU-10 option. There is nothing for you to think
19 about.

20 You, the Commissioners, simply do not have enough
21 information to make a proper decision. And, therefore, you
22 should reject their proposal at this time.

23 Now, I have a second part of my comment that has
24 to do with the aesthetics. My first degree was in
25 industrial design. I designed exhibits for the U.S.

1 Information Agency, international exhibits about America.
2 Most of the world's great cities have human scale. Think of
3 Paris, London, Rome. The world's great cities have
4 architecture that have historic continuity.

5 A 12-story building violates that continuity
6 placing it there. Now we do have 12-story buildings that we
7 can use as a reference. You can go to the Cairo. It's
8 located at 16th and Q. We can see what a 12-story building
9 looks like, and we can see the shadow that it casts.

10 It was the first steel-structured residential
11 building, and it caused tremendous controversy and helped
12 define the current set of attitudes towards building height.
13 The MU-10 would be as tall as the Cairo, and it would loom
14 over the neighboring two- and three-story buildings. As my
15 neighbors have pointed out, the -- we went down there, yeah,
16 on Saturday and visited the site.

17 We walked -- I walked from U Street down -- from
18 16th and to -- all the way to 18th, and all I could picture
19 there was this huge, huge, huge building. See, that's part
20 of my neighborhood. I go to El Tamarindo for food. I go to
21 Ohana for Asian products. The neighborhood is very big.
22 While I personally believe that the city should not violate
23 Washington's vision, I would like to see a more flexible
24 building standard height but not there, on a case-by-case
25 basis.

1 The old city should encompass what Washington had
2 envisioned when he talked to L'Enfant and Banneker and did
3 the original city plan, a gracious international city.

4 Thank you. Thank you for your time. Thank you
5 for your involvement.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. We may have some
7 questions. So, again, this panel, if you can stick around.

8 I have John Hanrahan? Are you able to unmute?
9 There you go. You're unmuted. You muted yourself again.
10 Okay. There you are. There you are.

11 MR. HANRAHAN: Okay. All right. I guess I'm -- I
12 can be heard, but I guess I'm not visible, so I'll go ahead.

13 Chairman Hood and Commission members, my name is
14 John Hanrahan. I've been a D.C. resident for almost
15 60 years, the last 53 of those in Dupont Circle six blocks
16 from the 17th and U site, not directly affected but my
17 neighbors and the whole picture of housing in D.C. is
18 affected by this project.

19 I am testifying in opposition to this upzoning to
20 MU-10 and in support of positions taken by numerous citizens
21 organizations and individuals, the more than 1,000 community
22 residents who signed a petition in opposition to this.

23 In the previous hearings, a few things became very
24 clear to me. And I'm sorry about the repetition on this,
25 but it is the thing that stuck in my mind and in my craw.

1 These included the lack of community outreach, the lack of
2 impact studies on displacement and racial equity analysis,
3 the need to consider alternatives such as split zoning and
4 social housing, instead of yet another plan to give public
5 land to private developers to build high-density, mainly
6 luxury apartments that contribute to rather than reduce
7 displacement while also increasing housing costs. I think
8 we heard some very eloquent testimony earlier about
9 displacement. I hope you can take that very much to heart.

10 To take just one of the shortcomings I mentioned,
11 the matter of community outreach, at the time these serious
12 procedural shortcomings were first called to the attention
13 of the planning officials last June, and then again in
14 October, the Office of Planning still took no steps in
15 intervening months to comply with the regulations by
16 scheduling community outreach sessions of any sort.

17 The fact that citizens' opponents went out on the
18 streets of the 17th and U and V neighborhoods and alerted
19 people to this upzoning proposal, and got more than 1,000
20 signatures in opposition, mostly from residents walking
21 along U Street, is not a substitute for city officials'
22 responsibilities for directly notifying residents who live
23 close to the site, nor is it a substitute for planning
24 officials holding the required meetings to inform and hear
25 from the wider community.

1 Another issue that needs clarity is what the
2 Office of Planning or DMPED promote as the concept of
3 affordable housing through the use of inclusionary zoning
4 based on the area median income, or AMI. With the current
5 minimum wage in D.C. set at \$17 an hour, around \$34,000 a
6 year, and the AMI at 100,000 for an individual and 142,000
7 for a household of four, most of what the city planning
8 officials tout as affordable using inclusionary zoning
9 formulas is beyond the reach of a substantial percentage of
10 working D.C. residents, particularly black residents.

11 Despite contentions by urbanists and smart growth
12 organizations that building any housing, even luxury
13 housing, will redound to the benefit of people who need
14 deeply and modestly affordable housing, people living here
15 over their lifetimes for the last few decades have a lived
16 experience where they see with their own eyes the widespread
17 displacement and have observed example after example in
18 their own neighborhoods and throughout the city of promises
19 of supposed affordable housing failing to materialize.

20 So I just interject that I just don't have a lot
21 of faith in certain promises that are made. We get certain
22 results as a result. Their lived experience has shown that
23 we can't luxury house and inclusionary zone our way into
24 deeply affordable and moderately affordable housing. We
25 should have the public lands for public needs with social

1 housing as a primary tool for taking the profits out of the
2 current developer-oriented system.

3 Thank you very much.

4 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you very much.

5 Let's see if we have any -- I think I've gotten
6 everyone on this panel. Let's see if we have any questions
7 or comments.

8 Commissioner Imamura?

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10 No questions. Just the same comment that I've shared
11 before, appreciate the time that you've all spent to
12 prepare, edit, and deliver your testimony tonight, for your
13 participation as well, and for your stick-to-itiveness.
14 This has been a long hearing.

15 I was particularly struck by Ms. Turnbull, her
16 testimony and delivery. It was very thoughtful, well
17 written, well delivered. So thank you very much.

18 That's all that I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

19 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

20 Commissioner Stidham?

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No comments or questions.
22 Thank you, everyone, for your participation tonight.

23 CHAIR HOOD: And Vice Chair Miler?

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 Thank each of you for your thoughtful testimony

1 this evening.

2 MR. HANRAHAN: Oh, no, this panel. Now they've
3 got to ask -- they have to run through the --

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I don't know who is talking,
5 but --

6 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Hanrahan is letting us know -- he
7 is explaining to somebody that we're running through the
8 process.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I see.

10 CHAIR HOOD: Maybe I should let him chair the
11 hearing. He made --

12 MR. HANRAHAN: What? Am I still on there?

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: He just muted himself.

14 So I just -- the only comment I have, Mr. Kervin,
15 you mentioned how there -- we were just presented with the
16 MU-10 zoning application by the Office of Planning on behalf
17 of DMPED. And you're correct with that. We know that they
18 -- Office of Planning also has proposed a related text
19 amendment to try to set back the building from the V Street
20 side. But we did ask about three hearings ago -- I think it
21 was three hearings ago.

22 I think it may have been the first hearing where I
23 -- I asked, and others asked, Office of Planning to provide
24 us with other alternative zones that might be not
25 inconsistent with the comprehensive plan and what would be

1 gained or lost as a result of that, and as well as the
2 alternative of the split zoning.

3 So we expect to receive at least some analysis or
4 some response from the Office of Planning on that issue. So
5 I appreciate you bringing it up. Thank you.

6 MR. KERVIN: Yes. It's important.

7 CHAIR HOOD: All right. And I, too, want to thank
8 this panel as well, especially the many hearings and staying
9 this late to provide your viewpoint. We greatly appreciate
10 it. It does not go -- nothing goes lost on us.

11 But I will say, Mr. Kervin, I, too want to come to
12 you. You mentioned that we don't -- we're not talking about
13 a project. I will tell you, that's how our regulations go,
14 but not just over here on U Street, but it's citywide. And
15 it's a whole lot to it. I would encourage you, if you have
16 time, to look at our process. And I'm not saying you have
17 to, but that's what we deal with.

18 We deal with no projects, especially when doing
19 map amendments. We're not talking about a project. We
20 don't know what's going to be built. It's about the
21 intensity of the use of the zone from MU-4 to MU-10. So
22 this is not the first time that we have come with none of
23 the utensils that you mentioned. This is -- this is our
24 process. So --

25 MR. KERVIN: There's the right way, the wrong way,

1 and our way.

2 CHAIR HOOD: Well, that's true. There's the right
3 way, the wrong way, and our way, but you know what? It's --
4 that way was here when I got here, and it will probably be
5 here when I leave. So thank you, though. We appreciate it.
6 Let's see if others have any questions or comments.

7 MR. KERVIN: Well, I appreciate your hard work.

8 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Let's see -- don't
9 anybody go anywhere. Does Office of Planning have any cross
10 of this panel?

11 MR. LAWSON: No, sir. Thank you.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Chair Harris, do you have any
13 cross of this panel?

14 MS. HARRIS: No questions. Thank you.

15 CHAIR HOOD: ANC 2B? Mr. Jones, do you have any
16 cross of this panel?

17 MR. R. JONES: Can we bring up the neighborhood
18 conservation with Ms. Turnbull? Hi, Nancy. You're one of
19 the first times we've heard neighborhood conservation zone,
20 and I wondered if you could define what the neighborhood
21 conservation zone is and why it's important to this
22 consideration.

23 MS. TURNBULL: I was reading about it in some
24 historic information that D.C. had created. I think maybe
25 the Conservancy had created some of these materials years

1 ago. And I had never heard of it until I read about it, and
2 also in the comprehensive plan, that this was important in
3 keeping that community, the neighborhood conservation area,
4 keeping the character of that community historically.

5 And I thought, well, this concept and this
6 information should be critical in terms of the planning for
7 this. I'm not an expert in conservation or this, but that
8 just kind of reinforced the whole idea, not just of the
9 Strivers' Historic District but this conservancy area that
10 needed to be -- that should be maintained, and that the city
11 should maintain it.

12 So I'm -- I don't pretend to be an expert, but I
13 can send materials that I've found on this for your
14 consideration.

15 MR. R. JONES: Right. Within the comprehensive
16 plan, you've got generalized policy map, and then the future
17 land use map. So they need to be considered. Sorry, I
18 don't mean to testify. I'll stop talking. Thank you, guys.

19 MS. TURNBULL: Thank you.

20 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

21 All right. Let's go to Mr. Gregory Adams, Black
22 Neighbors?

23 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Chairman Hood.

24 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you.

25 Rochelle Apartments, Ms. Akel?

1 MS. AKEL: Just one question for Ms. Turnbull. Am
2 I correct that this lot that we are talking about was carved
3 out at some point, and that it in fact is surrounded on all
4 four sides by historic district, contrary to the OP set-down
5 report? Is that your understanding?

6 MS. TURNBULL: No. That is the case, that that
7 particular piece of land technically -- not technically --
8 is not part of one of the historic districts, the 16th
9 Street Historic District or the Strivers' Historic District.
10 But it is completely surrounded by those historic districts,
11 yes.

12 MS. AKEL: Okay. Thank you. That's it.

13 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

14 And Ms. Feskanich?

15 MS. FESKANICH: Thank you, Chair Hood.

16 I have a question for Mr. Hanrahan. Did I hear
17 you say in your testimony that the AMI for a single-person
18 household in D.C. is now \$100,000 a year?

19 MR. HANRAHAN: Let me doublecheck that. I'm not a
20 great memoirist. 100,000, yes. And 142 for a household of
21 four.

22 MS. FESKANICH: Yeah. And I think you also
23 testified that the average wage is \$17 an hour, which would
24 only bring it to \$34,000 a year for --

25 MR. HANRAHAN: I think I said -- I think I said

1 minimum, the minimum wage was that.

2 MS. FESKANICH: Oh, minimum. I'm sorry.

3 MR. HANRAHAN: I think --

4 MS. FESKANICH: Yeah.

5 MR. HANRAHAN: I think -- I've only seen figures
6 for over -- white families versus black families. It's
7 about three times as high for white families in the District
8 of Columbia, like 161 -- I'm going by memory on the figure.
9 It's 53,000 to 161,000.

10 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. So --

11 MR. HANRAHAN: For families. When I say
12 "families," households, not families necessarily.

13 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. So for households. So that
14 really wouldn't -- with a yearly income of 34,000, it
15 wouldn't really be affordable if the AMI is set at 100,000 a
16 year. Is that --

17 MR. HANRAHAN: It would be three -- well, I'm --
18 yeah. I'm usually pretty good at math, but I -- when I'm
19 confronted, I'm back in third grade again, and I sort of --
20 uh, what's the answer? Anyway, yeah, it makes it very
21 unaffordable for people at the lower income levels, unless
22 it's just specifically carved out. And, again, I'm not an
23 expert on that. There may be people on the panel who are
24 much more expert on that because I've been amazed at some of
25 the testimony.

1 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. Thank you.

2 And one question for Mr. Kervin. You testified
3 about the human scale of buildings. What would you consider
4 to be a human scale? What would it look like at this
5 particular site?

6 MR. KERVIN: Not too different than what it looks
7 like now. It would be a building where you could walk up to
8 the top floor, where elevators wouldn't be necessary. When
9 you look up, look across the street, you would be able to
10 see sky and not more building. So four story, five story,
11 six or seven, it depends.

12 Architecture can be wonderful or it can be the
13 K Street Cannon -- Canyon. So that would depend -- there
14 are so many possibilities the way that a community can be
15 structured architecturally. But just to let them to put a
16 12-story, wall-to-wall building on two acres of land, is not
17 very inventive, creative, or enjoyable. It doesn't fit the
18 nature.

19 There is a wonderful book about Washington who
20 described how he came there with Banneker and looked down
21 from Meridian Hill at the valley that was created there by
22 the -- near the water of where he saw a capital city. And
23 there's a reason that -- you know, they looked to -- they
24 looked to Paris as an example of a livable, wonderful
25 international city. That's why we have all of these

1 diagonal streets and circles and things.

2 And if you've ever been to Paris, you understand
3 what it is to have these four- and five-story buildings
4 being the biggest things. You know, it's so much nicer.
5 It's not New York City.

6 MS. FESKANICH: Yeah. Thank you for your
7 testimony. I think you were maybe the first person to
8 mention something about human scale, and that was very
9 informative. Thank you.

10 I don't have any other questions, Chair Hood.
11 Thank you.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Feskanich.

13 Let's see, again, Mr. Hanlon is not here tonight.
14 I'm going to keep calling. I'm going to keep saying that,
15 just in case something changes as we move forward.

16 I want to thank this panel again. We really
17 appreciate you all taking the time out of your busy
18 schedules to come down and stick with us all these nights
19 and come and provide your viewpoint.

20 Ms. Schellin, before we call up the next four, did
21 we come up with another date?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: In order to move this as quickly as
23 possible, as the Commission has asked, we will need to
24 proceed on Tuesday, March 5th, at 4:00 p.m.

25 CHAIR HOOD: Let me talk to my colleagues first.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

2 CHAIR HOOD: Tuesday, March 5th. Because, if not,
3 it's going to be a month later, and I --

4 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. I'm going to be out
5 that day.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So they're saying no. So we
7 don't have any Mondays. Any other day besides Monday or
8 Thursdays, or that's it for you two? Let me ask -- let me
9 ask it this way. Is it possible we can do it another -- any
10 other days besides Monday and Thursday? It won't be
11 Friday --

12 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

13 CHAIR HOOD: -- believe me, or Saturday or Sunday,
14 Friday, Saturday, Sunday it won't be.

15 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Not that week, Chair Hood,
16 for me.

17 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Just not that week.

19 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Not that week.

20 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Just not that week.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So let's look at the next
22 week, Ms. Schellin.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: The 13th, that's a Wednesday. I
24 don't know how late BZA has been going. Otherwise, we have
25 Tuesday, the 19th? Actually, you know what? We have

1 Monday, the 18th. I don't think I'll be here unless I can
2 work out something. But you could do it on the 18th. I
3 just won't be here probably.

4 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Let me see. I'd rather --
5 rather have as many of us here as possible. Is
6 Ms. Ackerman --

7 MS. SCHELLIN: But then we have the 25th.

8 CHAIR HOOD: So --

9 MS. SCHELLIN: That's another month. That puts us
10 way out, so --

11 CHAIR HOOD: I don't --

12 MS. SCHELLIN: -- Mr. Young, how late has the BZA
13 been going?

14 MR. YOUNG: I mean, we've gone late a few -- a few
15 days in the past month. I would say I wouldn't risk putting
16 it on a Wednesday, because if I'm still in BZA, I can't do
17 both of these.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

19 CHAIR HOOD: So the issue is that the week -- the
20 issue is, I mean --

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Chairman, consistency is
22 important.

23 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. But I've also got to have
24 somebody to manage the other things that go on that we --
25 some of us don't deal with.

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yep.

2 CHAIR HOOD: Well, what about --

3 MS. SCHELLIN: The 19th, Tuesday, the 19th? Does
4 that work?

5 CHAIR HOOD: What about the 19th? Does that work?
6 That doesn't work? Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. We have another
8 Commission meeting that day that could run long.

9 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yep.

10 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. All right. Well, let's go
11 with the 18th. I will --

12 MS. SCHELLIN: I'll try to change my appointment,
13 see what I can do.

14 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. If not, it's the 25th, right?

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Right. Which puts it a month out,
16 yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: You may still need the
18 25th.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry?

20 CHAIR HOOD: I guess you're right. We better do
21 the 18th and --

22 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: So if it's the 18th, and
23 you -- if it runs long, you still have the 25th, so I
24 would --

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Right.

1 CHAIR HOOD: So, Ms. Schelin, you can --
2 Ms. Ackerman can -- she can cover for me, help me on the
3 18th, and then the 25th, if we -- if we need it, which I
4 hope we don't. Okay.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

6 CHAIR HOOD: All right. So we will -- we will
7 continue on the -- March 18th, but let's -- let's move
8 forward here, so we can get through at least this part, so
9 we can start with the parties on the 18th.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. And I will just try to get
11 somebody else to do my stuff. Okay.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Are you ready for the next panel?

14 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, please.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Let me go back to my split
16 view.

17 CHAIR HOOD: I was about to say, we may be
18 finished in time on the 18th. I don't think I should say --

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. We might. Oops. Let me go
20 back.

21 Okay. So we just did her, Nancy Turnbull. Okay.
22 Did we call -- that's right, he was not here, so let me move
23 to the next page. And we have Alex Neilsen, Joseph Hanna,
24 Robert Johns, and Bonnie McGowan.

25 Mr. Young, let me know if you've got four.

1 MR. YOUNG: None of those.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Mark Mazo, Joseph Goreman,
3 William Brewster.

4 MR. MAZO: I'm here. Mazo is here.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: How many do you have now?

6 MR. YOUNG: I have two.

7 MS. SCHELLIN: Nathan Fleming, Kerry Kemp, and
8 Janet McMahon. She is the last one, and I believe there
9 were two people who have come in since I called their names
10 initially.

11 MR. MAZO: Yeah. Mazo is here.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Mazo, we recognize -- Mr. Mazo is
13 here.

14 MR. MAZO: Thank you.

15 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So I have -- I see three right
16 now. Let's get one more.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Like I said, we've got two
18 names that have now come in since I initially called them.
19 Do you want me to call them both?

20 CHAIR HOOD: Yes. Let's go ahead and call them
21 both.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Pam McKinney and Laura Richards, if
23 they are still on?

24 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Let's start with Bonnie
25 McGowan.

1 MS. MCGOWAN: Can you hear me?

2 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, we can.

3 MS. MCGOWAN: Okay. Great. I know a lot of
4 people have already spoken, and I don't think that my
5 testimony is going to be as eloquent or well researched as a
6 lot of other people. So I will say that I just -- I agree
7 with what a lot of my neighbors have said. I also want to
8 thank you all -- the Commission -- for listening to all of
9 us. It really feels good to know that this is an avenue
10 that I have where I can feel like my voice is being heard in
11 this.

12 My husband and I moved to Seaton Street. We
13 bought our house in August of 2020. And the reason that we
14 bought it, you know, and made a very significant investment,
15 the biggest of our lives so far, and with any luck hopefully
16 we'll never have to buy another place again, you know, we
17 did that because the neighborhood as it is is so special.
18 Seaton Street, in particular, really stole our hearts
19 because it is -- you know, it's the small, historic
20 rowhouses that are so beautiful. It really has this small
21 community feel. You know, the street on one side it's got
22 an elementary school. On the other side it's got a police
23 station.

24 You know, we just recently got married. We're
25 thinking about starting our family soon, and it just -- it

1 had everything that we wanted, you know, that we saw for
2 ourselves for our future. And so it's -- you know, it just
3 adds a lot of uncertainty. The idea that now I could look
4 out my front window and not see the sky, but instead see a
5 glassy skyscraper where there is now hundreds of people that
6 I don't know that live next door to me, or I can't park my
7 car anymore, you know, how would that impact me and, you
8 know, for us, like with our growing family, losing the
9 police station, and also just, you know, the fact that this
10 could happen right out from underneath us.

11 We thought that by, you know, buying a place and
12 putting down roots it would allow us to, you know, develop
13 roots in a neighborhood and sort of have more of a say in
14 some of the specific process. And the way that this has all
15 been handled, you know, feeling like we haven't really had
16 much opportunity to have a say in what's going on in our
17 neighborhood, it has just felt a little bit I guess not very
18 empowering, and we felt a little bit, you know, like we
19 don't have the ability to have a say in the future of this
20 neighborhood that we invested in.

21 And so, you know, I think the only other thing
22 I'll say is that if this is going to happen, you know,
23 obviously, I support great facilities for our first
24 responders, but I just think a smaller building, something
25 shorter, something that is in the character of the

1 neighborhood, you know, if it has to happen, to keep it
2 smaller and keep it something that actually feels like it
3 would fit in, you know, to this historic neighborhood that
4 really is so special and so dear to me.

5 So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Let's go to -- Mr. Mazo?

7 MR. MAZO: Yes.

8 CHAIR HOOD: You can go -- you can begin.

9 MR. MAZO: Thank you. Good evening. I live at
10 1639 V Street, Northwest, in ANC 1B05. I am opposed to the
11 map amendment for the two acres of public land located at
12 1617 U Street, Northwest.

13 I comprehend that a proposed map amendment
14 originating from the City Council follows a different
15 process, but every step undertaken has been wholly
16 inconsistent with Chapter 4 of the DCMR zoning regulations
17 of 2016.

18 While rezoning a portion of the public land is
19 sensible, here are some compelling reasons why the proposed
20 change in its current form is folly. First, there is still
21 a major unsettled question. Have the police, fire, and EMTs
22 been consulted on how the map amendment would impact their
23 operational capacity.

24 Regardless of where one stands on the matter
25 before us, it is poor politics to do anything impacting

1 livelihoods of police, firefighters, and EMTs without their
2 consultation. The process thus far has signaled disregard
3 at least, and contempt at worst, for professionals whose
4 primary objective each workday is to come home alive.

5 Approving the map amendment without their relevant
6 expert knowledge is premature. Without having any idea of
7 their future needs, we are failing to see the whole picture.

8 Second, the legal rationale recommending the map
9 amendment is insufficient. Their testimony of 18 January
10 2024, Alexandra Cain of OAG, stated the OAG recommends
11 approval of the map amendment when the comprehensive plan is
12 taken as a whole. However, a change in the zoning map as it
13 is proposed is it adds -- is at odds with two of the stated
14 aims found in Chapter 11, page 2, of the comprehensive plan
15 of 2021.

16 One, making the District's critical facilities in
17 health and emergency response systems more resilient to
18 chronic stressors and to sudden natural or human-made
19 events. And, two, ensuring that District-owned land and
20 facilities meet the needs of a growing population formed by
21 across-systems public facilities planning.

22 Additionally, OAG recommendation has been
23 Ms. Cain's admission and testimony solely through the lens
24 of affordable housing. If approved, the proposal would grow
25 the population while simultaneously reducing public

1 facilities necessary to serve that growing population. The
2 zoning change would create the sort of stressor the comp
3 plan aspires to avoid.

4 In the marginal analysis, meeting equity goals
5 would have to really outweigh compromising critical public
6 services for the larger to hold. AAG Cain and John
7 Kirschenbaum both described the potential addition of the
8 housing to the housing stock as "significant" repeatedly.
9 However, they provide no standard of what "significant"
10 means and prefer all of us go along with their magical
11 thinking.

12 The third point ties into the first two. The site
13 has 11 lots on two acres. The current proposed map
14 amendment is of one instrument, which crosses the constraint
15 of existing critical public service infrastructure. Fellow
16 citizens opposed to the change in the zoning map have
17 eloquently argued about the feasibility of split zoning
18 already, yet DMPED already has a page advertising
19 presumptive RFP requests. It's a bit naughty given the case
20 is contested.

21 Although setting project parameters before the RFP
22 submission process streamlines development, the site at
23 1617 U is not, as we have seen, a straightforward zoning
24 change.

25 In conclusion, while changing the map to increase

1 the stock of affordable housing is laudable, the current
2 form of the map amendment does not meet the standards
3 necessary for support. For these reasons, please vote
4 against the proposed map change. Thank you for your time,
5 and I apologize for bringing you in from a hockey game.

6 CHAIR HOOD: No problem. Let's -- just one
7 second. Let's go to Ms. Laura Richards.

8 Who is winning the game, Mr. Mazo? Who is
9 winning?

10 MR. MAZO: It was two-two last time I checked,
11 Suns and Caps. Controversial goal.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Oh, okay. Controversial. That seems
13 to be --

14 MR. MAZO: Yeah.

15 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Ms. Richards? Let's come back
16 to Ms. Richards. Ms. McMahon? McMahon? I'm getting
17 tired now, so forgive me if --

18 MS. MCMAHON: No, it's a common mistake. It's
19 McMahon.

20 CHAIR HOOD: McMahon, I'm sorry.

21 MS. MCMAHON: So my name is Janet McMahon, and I
22 live half a block away from 1617 U Street in a small 30-unit
23 condo building, with no elevator by the way.

24 I want to start by saying that just because I'm
25 opposed to the radical upzoning of these two lots of public

1 land does not mean that I am against any redevelopment of
2 the site whatsoever. Instead, I want any redevelopment to
3 be consistent and compatible with the character of the
4 historic district into which it will be inserted.

5 In fact, there is a relatively new apartment
6 building a block west of the police station at the
7 intersection of V, Florida Avenue, and Champlain Street.
8 Although, in my opinion, it doesn't really add anything to
9 the neighborhood aesthetically, it also doesn't loom over
10 and overwhelm its neighbors.

11 That building, Reed Row, is five stories tall. I
12 can't even begin to imagine the effect a 10-story much
13 denser structure would have on the neighborhood. I also
14 believe that public land, what's left of it in the city,
15 should be used for the public good, not for private profit.

16 One component of that public good is greenspace,
17 which is not the same as a concrete plaza. Even now, when
18 it rains hard, the streets and sidewalks here flood. At
19 times it's difficult, if not impossible, to cross 17th and
20 Willard Streets. Surely, at a time of global warming and
21 increasingly intense rain events, we don't want to be paving
22 over our city, leaving water no place else to go.

23 Another aspect of the public good, to my mind, is
24 human scale. When I walk around my neighborhood, I can see
25 the sky, and I appreciate the variety of the homes and

1 businesses I pass by. And some of them are quite modern.

2 Our neighborhood is currently home to a police and
3 fire station, as you well know. This is an undeniable
4 public good, especially in a time of increasing crime. As
5 far as I can tell, there has been no consideration of where
6 these two essential public services might be relocated, even
7 temporarily.

8 I am new to this process. But as I was listening
9 to the Office of Planning's presentation, the words that
10 kept coming to my mind were "The fix is in." It became
11 apparent that the fix was the last-minute change to the
12 comprehensive plan proposed and adopted with little to no
13 public engagement.

14 Even former Councilmember Jack Evans has
15 suspicions as to how and why that happened. And now the
16 Zoning Commission has advised that its task is simply to
17 determine whether the proposed upzoning is not inconsistent
18 with the comprehensive plan. Not only is that disingenuous,
19 since the comprehensive plan was amended precisely to ensure
20 that such a drastic upzoning would be consistent with it.

21 But such a bureaucratic double negative is hardly
22 a positive, much less an imaginative or creative goal.
23 Instead, the goal should be to enhance the livability and
24 affordability of our historic neighborhood. These goals, I
25 would argue, are not mutually exclusive. I, therefore, urge

1 you to deny the Office of Planning's application and
2 demonstrate that this is not how decisions regarding our
3 city's neighborhoods are made. Thank you.

4 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

5 Ms. Richards?

6 MS. RICHARDS: Hello?

7 CHAIR HOOD: Yes. We can hear you now.

8 MS. RICHARDS: Hi.

9 CHAIR HOOD: We can no longer hear you,
10 Ms. Richards.

11 MS. RICHARDS: Hello?

12 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. Now we can hear you.

13 MS. RICHARDS: Okay. Let me go someplace where
14 it's a little quieter, and I'll be right with you. Hang on.

15 CHAIR HOOD: Are you at the hockey game, too?

16 MS. RICHARDS: I was just waiting for my --

17 CHAIR HOOD: Maybe we should -- colleagues, we
18 should go to the hockey game.

19 MS. RICHARDS: I'm sorry? Let's see. I'll be
20 back.

21 CHAIR HOOD: To us or -- Ms. Richards?

22 MS. RICHARDS: Okay.

23 CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Richards? Hello, Ms. Richards?
24 Ms. Richards?

25 Okay. Ms. Schellin, could we mute Ms. Richards,

1 and we'll come back to her. Okay. If she can maybe call
2 you and let us know when she's ready. Let's see if we have
3 any --

4 MS. RICHARDS: Hello?

5 CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Richards, are you ready?

6 Ms. Richards, are you --

7 MS. RICHARDS: I'm ready, Mr. Hood, Chairman Hood.

8 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Go right ahead.

9 MS. RICHARDS: Okay. Thank you for your
10 forbearance. This is a -- I feel as if everything that
11 needed to be said has been said, but not everyone has said
12 it. And I think it's very important for everyone to weigh
13 in on this. So the Commission will understand how
14 widespread the dissatisfaction is to this --

15 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Mazo, I need you -- Mr. Mazo, I
16 need you to mute.

17 Okay. Go right ahead, Ms. Richards.

18 MS. RICHARDS: Okay. That's fine. This is --
19 this is a really bad proposal for all the reasons that have
20 been set forth, but primarily because it's a vehicle for
21 gentrification. We know what will happen. This building
22 will go up. All of the other sites along the corridor will
23 be able to build up as a matter of right. They will only be
24 subject to miniscule IZ requirements because they're not
25 city-owned properties.

1 In addition, the property values will rise. The
2 individual homeowners -- black and white -- will find their
3 assessments and their tax bills skyrocket, and they will be
4 displaced for that reason. The few remaining small
5 businesses face displacement. The Zoning Commission has
6 seen this pattern occur again and again and again across the
7 city for 25 years or more. And I'm not quite sure why it
8 keeps doing the same thing expecting a different outcome.

9 We're all very frustrated, and there are clearly
10 so many better ways to achieve the needed housing without
11 kind of destroying what remains of the middle class and
12 without displacing the very low-income households.

13 So I urge you to just say no, send this back to
14 the drawing board, and kind of ask OP, in conjunction with
15 the affected neighborhoods, to just kind of try to get it
16 right this time. So those are the key points of my
17 testimony, and thank you for the opportunity to weigh in.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Richards.

19 I'm going to ask Ms. Richards a question while --
20 since we are -- since we have you here before you go back.
21 Let me just start off by asking you, so I know you did a
22 term -- a couple of terms on the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

23 MS. RICHARDS: Yes.

24 CHAIR HOOD: Did you see this type of -- was this
25 conversation in the plan when you were on -- when I've been

1 looking at some of your -- the orders when you've -- I've
2 been doing that over the years, but was this type of -- did
3 you see this -- us getting to this type of movement or was
4 that the plan? Because a lot of -- as you know,
5 Ms. Richards, what they always say is things don't just
6 start getting in the pipeline. They start getting in the
7 pipeline years before they start happening.

8 Did you all see -- in your stint on the BZA, what
9 did you see that we don't see now, other than the time
10 difference and things that have happened in the future, but
11 some of these things were etched back in that time? Is that
12 a correct statement?

13 MS. RICHARDS: To a certain extent. Of course,
14 the BZA does not handle this kind of case. And I think --
15 let's see, when I had to think back, what did we really deal
16 with, we dealt with a lot of like CBRFs. That was a very,
17 very fraught issue at the time. And we also dealt with I
18 think runaway -- we did get the pop-up cases. People wanted
19 to put on overly large additions to their individual homes.
20 Pop-ups weren't sort of an industry-wide phenomenon. They
21 were -- it was house by house.

22 But I did deal with this issue in my like kind of
23 volunteer capacity. I worked on the 1986 comprehensive plan
24 for several years with volunteer groups, and the whole
25 concept of living downtown was very much alive then. I gave

1 testimony under the guidance of Ann Hardwell, my great
2 tutor, and we all said we've got to have living downtown
3 include some housing down there.

4 And, frankly, we had trouble even getting retail.
5 We had trouble getting the 15-foot ground floor spaces to
6 accommodate retail. Oliver Carr and his friends wanted
7 floor-to-ceiling office, office, office. And they were
8 pushing the height up -- height up even then, you know, one
9 more story, one more story.

10 So, yeah, the -- now when did we start really
11 discussing, let's see, these issues? So the living downtown
12 was -- came along in '86, and was very narrowly interpreted
13 to mean retail. Then, as the comprehensive plan and plan
14 kind of began to be revamped over the years, we saw, oh
15 gosh, gentrification was -- yes, it became an issue in Mount
16 Pleasant.

17 Okay. First, in Mount Pleasant, Mount Pleasant
18 sort of emptied out a lot of people, but it was primarily
19 house by house. Capitol Hill started emptying out. So then
20 we began to see housing -- let's see, public housing
21 developments kicked out. So this is an old, old story, but
22 it accelerated incredibly quickly, I would say, with --
23 during the tenure of Tony Williams. And Tony Williams and
24 the Council at that time just did not care about poor
25 people. In fact, they could not get them -- rid of them as

1 fast as they could.

2 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

3 MS. RICHARDS: East Capitol Street got emptied out
4 around 2000.

5 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. --

6 MS. RICHARDS: So that gives you some idea.

7 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Richards. I do
8 know, having lived here my whole life and a lot of this
9 stuff even started when my father was living, my father has
10 been passed for over 30 years. So I get it because he was
11 very involved. And one thing is -- I did as a child was
12 listen. So I'm just saying it. Are we at this -- that's
13 why I wanted to ask you because I know you serve on the
14 board. Even though you didn't do exactly this, you were in
15 the area of what was going on, and you would have had front
16 row knowledge of --

17 MS. RICHARDS: Yes.

18 CHAIR HOOD: -- kind of where we got it. So thank
19 you for -- and I don't want to hold you up. Do my
20 colleagues have any other questions of anyone on this panel?

21 Okay. Well --

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No questions. Thank each of
23 you for your engagement, and, Ms. Richards, for your
24 engagement over many decades. Thank you.

25 MS. RICHARDS: Thank you for taking me out of

1 line, gentlemen. Carry on. Bye-bye.

2 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you
3 all. I thank this panel. Let's see if we have any cross,
4 though, Ms. Richards, if you've got a minute.

5 MS. RICHARDS: Okay.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. And so you can -- we'll let
7 you get right back and we'll get Mr. Mazo back to his hockey
8 game. Does Office of Planning have any cross?

9 MR. LAWSON: No, sir. Thank you.

10 CHAIR HOOD: Chair Harris, do you have any cross?

11 ANC 2B? They'll let me know when they -- if they
12 show up, somebody will let me know.

13 Randy Jones, do you have any cross?

14 MR. R. JONES: No, sir. You can keep moving.

15 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Black Neighbors, Gregory
16 Adams?

17 MR. ADAMS: No, thank you.

18 MS. RICHARDS: Okay.

19 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Rochelle Apartments, Ms. Akel?

20 MS. AKEL: No, thank you.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

22 And, Ms. Feskanich, any cross?

23 MS. FESKANICH: One question for Ms. Richards.

24 Ms. Richards, you are quite experienced with all of this
25 zoning jargon and the comprehensive plan. And so I'm

1 curious, do you know the history of the comp plan changes
2 with regards to this site at 17th and U, particularly about
3 community input or any impact studies to the future land use
4 map for this site?

5 MS. RICHARDS: Well, I think we all remember the
6 Council hearing on the next-to-the-last hearing of the 2021
7 amendments. And when this was brought up, and I remember
8 Phil Mendelson, as has been testified here, kind of
9 imploring his fellow Councilmembers don't go this far, don't
10 go this far, this is not the right site, this is, you know -
11 - and kind of being shot down.

12 It was really quite surprising. Phil can normally
13 I guess get what he wants a little more. And I'm sure he
14 feels very vindicated by all of this.

15 But, yeah, that's -- this kind of came out of the
16 blue. Some members of the Council said build up as much as
17 possible, max it out. This isn't the only one. I mean,
18 Tacoma Metro, same thing, the Maggiano's site, and then of
19 course across the -- well, there's the entire like southwest
20 quadrant, and then you have the Barry Farms site.

21 So it's really everything everywhere all at once,
22 and it's not going to get any better. And my own little
23 Ward 7 neighborhood is facing some upzoning, and, frankly,
24 we are concerned. We are concerned.

25 MS. FESKANICH: And just as a quick follow up,

1 Ms. Richards. Do you know of any impact studies that led up
2 to this future land use map change, the one we were just
3 referring to?

4 MS. RICHARDS: You're referring to the impact
5 studies for this particular site? No, they weren't done for
6 -- for this site. The idea of doing racial impact analysis
7 came into, you know, full being with these amendments we
8 have just passed. We have done impact studies, but they
9 were always very, you know, like they weren't -- they
10 weren't concentrated on, is this going to be consistent with
11 the comp plan?

12 So far, the -- and with regards to like studies,
13 we have not seen the development of a sensitive template for
14 conducting racial equity analyses. Basically, what we've
15 seen coming out of the applicants and the Office of Planning
16 is go and pick every possible element or policy in the comp
17 plan that might have some benefit, tangential or not, and
18 shoehorn it in, which is the way they are used to and have
19 always done their compliance with comp plan analyses.

20 They have not looked at the -- kind of the racial
21 history and traditions of each neighborhood. They put the
22 same analysis for Tacoma Park that they've done for U Street
23 and that they've done for others. And these are very, very
24 different neighborhoods. And the racial history and the
25 racial demographics are very, very different.

1 And no nuance, no nuance at all. Got to have a
2 little more kind of, let's drill down. These are supposed
3 to be granulated studies. This is a longer answer than you
4 wanted so I'm going to leave off now.

5 MS. FESKANICH: No. I appreciate it. Thank you.
6 Thank you, Ms. Richards.

7 I don't have any other questions, Chair Hood.

8 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you. And
9 thank -- I want to thank this panel. We appreciate your
10 providing us your testimony.

11 Ms. Schellin, I understand we have about six more.
12 I would like to finish them tonight.

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. And then we have the
14 undeclared, too.

15 CHAIR HOOD: The undeclared. So seven --

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Let me call Kirby Vining,
17 John Jones, Sandra Reischel -- she is on as the caller,
18 Mr. Young, 202-265 -- Kerry --

19 CHAIR HOOD: Let's bring

20 MS. SCHELLIN: -- Kemp?

21 CHAIR HOOD: Let's bring all six up, Ms. Schellin.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Kerry Kemp? And there is
23 three more I have names. I was told they called in, but
24 they -- I don't see them, but I'll call their names anyway.
25 I've just gotten a message that Charles Ellis will be on in

1 five, but that may be too late. So it's Charles Ellis,
2 Penelope Brown, and Eric Blodnikar.

3 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I think we have everybody up
4 who is here, and we will start with Kirby Vining.

5 MR. VINING: Can you hear me?

6 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, we can.

7 MR. VINING: Thank you. I'm Kirby Vining, active
8 in several community organizations in my stronghold
9 neighborhood of Ward 5, but testifying as a private citizen
10 on matters overlapping with this case that have citywide
11 implications.

12 My points will be brief and center on two issues:
13 notice of such cases and the use of public land. You have
14 my written testimony, but on that first point, the notice,
15 this case first came to my attention with Exhibit 67,
16 exhibit my neighbors directly across the street who said
17 that they had not -- they're within 200 feet and have not
18 received notice.

19 This is -- and why that is important to me, of
20 course it's important within the zoning context, but I'm
21 looking at although the Zoning Commission is an independent
22 agency, I'm watching a pattern that is coming out of the
23 administration of expediting and truncating public comment
24 periods in general. And I was terrified as this creeped
25 into zoning. I'm not going to ask you that, but that's why

1 it brought to my attention.

2 I am very concerned about attempts by the
3 administration to cut down or it looks like headed towards
4 eliminate public comment period in certain -- in certain
5 matters. Directly related, as far as I'm concerned, about
6 transparency and openness with the public there, something
7 that I've heard twice during this hearing earlier nights,
8 and twice during the Council oversight hearings for the
9 Office of Zoning, was I look at all of the zoning cases
10 weekly, and I'm very concerned about the fact that so many
11 of them, not this one, 1617 used to be very clear, but so
12 many of the other cases list the case by square and number.
13 And in my work -- square and lot.

14 And when I'm working with my neighborhood, I'm
15 working with a neighborhood -- I'm sure you're well aware
16 most -- most people are not aware that their house is even
17 zoned, and I'm concerned about notice going out, so someone
18 can recognize instead of a square and a lot just to see
19 2000 block of M Street, Northwest, something that would help
20 them understand where this is.

21 I know my own square and lot, and I'm sure
22 everyone on this call does as well. But how many other
23 people do? I'm talking about the transparency to try to see
24 if we can interest people who find zoning difficult, to see
25 if it affects their -- directly affects their neighborhood.

1 The second point that I had, I -- the public --
2 the use of public land -- and the more that I think about
3 this, any case involving changing of the disposition of
4 land, public or private, really deserves the normal process
5 that I have seen, the sequence and the procedure that the
6 Zoning Commission and the BZA confront, which is a specific
7 project to evaluate. And we don't have that here.

8 I'm very concerned about the massive upFLUMing
9 around the city there and a precedent that this could set
10 there. I think that we would all benefit -- I know that we
11 would all benefit if there were a specific project, because
12 some things about the specifics of individual projects are
13 compelling in a way that it says, well, I'll bend things
14 because this is so beneficial, or we have to see the
15 project.

16 I'll let the -- my written comments stand for the
17 rest of my remarks. And thank you for this opportunity to
18 speak.

19 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. If you hold tight, we may
20 have some questions for you.

21 Ms. Kemp?

22 MS. KEMP: Yes. Can you hear me?

23 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, we can. Go right ahead.

24 MS. KEMP: Okay. Thank you, Chairman Hood, and
25 good evening, Commissioners. My name is Kerry Kemp. I live

1 on 17th Street about four blocks from the proposed
2 development, and I am testifying -- I submitted written
3 testimony in November of 2023, and I'm testifying in
4 opposition to the upzoning of the 1.88 acre of publicly
5 owned land from MU-4 to MU-10.

6 Part of the reason is because the discussion to
7 date has taken place in the absence of any concrete plans,
8 and I feel that that is kind of putting the cart before the
9 horse. Also, I feel, as Maria Gillem said, that this
10 building, this 10-, 11-, or 12-story building at that site
11 would be basically a trojan horse that would lead to
12 gentrification on steroids. And that would mean that
13 existing residents, the prices of everything would be going
14 up and there would be displacement, and that sort of thing.
15 We've seen it time and time again, and it's -- and
16 especially when the -- well, I don't want to get into all
17 those details.

18 I also agree with Shelly Repp, the Chair of the
19 Committee of 100, that the proposed amendment is
20 inconsistent with Chapter 20, the mid-city element of the
21 comprehensive plan, including policy MC 1.1.1 neighborhood
22 conservation, which says retain and reinforce the historic
23 character of mid-city neighborhoods, particularly -- and I
24 won't read it all.

25 MC 1.1-4, which is local services and small

1 businesses, support small businesses and essential local
2 services that serve mid-city. Right now that site is, as
3 you know, the site of the police and fire station. So the
4 idea that we would just be giving this public land away to a
5 private developer when it's currently being used for a very
6 essential public purpose seems kind of crazy to me, and
7 certainly -- and certainly without any kind of plan of
8 what's going to happen with the police and the fire station.

9 I don't oppose all development. I'd like to see a
10 new police station, a new fire station there, or as I think
11 Thomas Farah was saying, something like you could even have
12 the police station with a job training site, but none of
13 those things would necessitate upzoning to MU-10. You could
14 do that all within MU-4.

15 Similarly, affordable housing could be done with
16 affordable -- with MU-4. And I actually also want -- I'd
17 like to see -- it's shocking to me that there haven't been
18 any more community impact studies and community engagement.
19 Other people have discussed this at length. Also, the lack
20 of a racial equity lens has been discussed at length. I
21 agree with -- I'd like to associate myself with all those
22 comments that have been made previously.

23 So, in conclusion, I implore you to reject this
24 map amendment and send it back to the Office of Planning or
25 postpone it at a minimum, because it really -- it really is

1 going to have a devastating impact on our neighborhood.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. thank you.

4 Let's go to the person on the phone, please. I

5 guess the person on the phone, if you can hit star six.

6 There we go.

7 MS. REISCHEL: Okay. Can you hear me?

8 CHAIR HOOD: Yes. We can hear you now.

9 MS. REISCHEL: Okay. Fine. My name is Sandra
10 Reischel. I have lived in Washington for 50-plus years on
11 Columbia Road, so I'm just about four or five blocks north
12 of 1617 U. But I take the 96 bus by there every week, and I
13 have been involved in my own neighborhood of Adams Morgan
14 with several issues.

15 And it seems as though much of what has come up
16 about 1617 U has come up before. And listening -- I mean, I
17 sort of like being at the end here because I've been
18 thinking I've probably heard at least half of the testimony
19 that has been given. It's very good, but it highlights the
20 enormity of the problems with this, from the upFLUMing that
21 our Councilmember Nadeau did two years ago -- two years?
22 three? -- of this site.

23 And I should say I went to the ANC meeting, and
24 there were -- the areas under consideration were
25 highlighted. Most of the area was Columbia Road, a long

1 stretch I believe from 16th down into Mintwood Street (sic).
2 And there was not one peep at that meeting about this small
3 little area at the south end that would be 1617 U of two
4 blocks there. Not one word came up because everyone was
5 focused on the Columbia Road thing.

6 Anyway, the enormity of the problems beginning
7 then, and maybe before, that I don't know about, but in any
8 case, it has been flawed completely, and I believe that the
9 Zoning Commission has been thrust with all of the
10 devastating problems that lead straight back to the Office
11 of Planning.

12 That would "planning," there never was any
13 planning. It's more like the Office of Do What the Mayor
14 Says. And I got a real good instance of that with the Adams
15 Morgan Plaza, just north of there. When the Historic
16 Preservation Review Board violated their own design
17 principles, which by the way could be used by the Office of
18 Planning, just because that area is not an a historic
19 district, doesn't mean that good design, and particularly
20 the issue of scale, which is so out of place -- it's just
21 monstrous.

22 Anyway, I'm thinking -- I'm sort of zooming out
23 and thinking, what does the Commission do in light of all of
24 the serious problems that have to have attention? Should it
25 just reject this outright and make the Mayor really mad,

1 since this is her baby, as it is all over town?

2 Development, at all cost, is what she does, and that is also
3 true of our Ward 1 Councilmember Nadeau.

4 But what do you do with these big things, about
5 surplusing property, about the inappropriateness of the size
6 of it, the issues of parking? None of these things that
7 have been brought up. These are all the things that should
8 have been, but never were, through the Office of Planning.
9 So you can't call that an Office of Planning. That is not
10 city planning. I'm sorry.

11 So it either needs to be rejected outright or sent
12 back to the Office of Planning, and I fear that because of
13 the poor performance to date. I think you'd have to have
14 some -- the community -- of course, this is all volunteer
15 time -- as a watchdog to what they are doing, to see that
16 they are dealing with this.

17 The importance of all of these projects needs to
18 be at the front end, the planning. Questions like, we're
19 getting all of these new buildings, do we have enough park
20 space for all these people? Do we have enough schools? You
21 know, city planning is not just putting up buildings.

22 So that's my overarching view I guess of where
23 this is, and I applaud you people for hanging in there. The
24 failure of the Office of Planning -- complete failure, I
25 would say -- and those issues have been brought up, the lack

1 of outreach, the lack of other possibilities for that site
2 with MU-4, for instance, those are all questions that need
3 to be answered, but that takes time and a lot of thought,
4 from community members of course but experts on this stuff,
5 the Urban Institute reports.

6 And that gets back to one more thought I have,
7 which is William Jordan spelled out much of the displacement
8 there in the numbers that are -- have been lost of black
9 residents. Of course, it's all for white people, too. That
10 never is mentioned, but we need a study that shows by income
11 as well.

12 I know several people who have already moved
13 because they can't afford to live here. Anyway, so this --
14 this needs serious attention, and I think especially the
15 displacement in Ward 1, for example, 25 percent of the
16 population -- black population -- was lost --

17 CHAIR HOOD: Give us your closing thought. Give
18 us --

19 MS. REISCHEL: Pardon me?

20 CHAIR HOOD: -- your closing thought. Give us
21 your closing thought.

22 MS. REISCHEL: Okay. I am totally opposed for
23 many, many reasons, this upzoning, the way it was handled,
24 and it must be rejected. The statement Do No Harm applies
25 equally beyond medicine to editing, to painting restoration,

1 and to neighborhoods.

2 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Thank you very much.

3 Hold tight. We may have some questions for you.

4 MS. REISCHEL: Okay.

5 CHAIR HOOD: John jones.

6 MR. J. JONES: Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

7 CHAIR HOOD: Yes, we can hear you now. Yes, we
8 can hear you.

9 MR. J. JONES: Yes. My name of course is John
10 Jones. I am a long-time Adams Morgan resident. I have the
11 distinction of being an intricate part of making sure Seaton
12 Street, which was an example of neighborhood involvement in
13 housing issues.

14 We -- that was a case where the developer came in
15 and bought out all the houses. Every single one of them
16 were -- had black residents, and the Adams Morgan -- Adams
17 Morgan organization, which was a precursor to the ANCs, we
18 got directly involved in making sure that the people who
19 lived in those houses had a chance to stay there, and they
20 were able to -- they had -- they were afforded that
21 opportunity. We were able to engineer a bank loan for them
22 to buy the apartment, buy the houses, and they lived there
23 as long as they desired to do that.

24 I think that this -- I've been in the
25 neighborhood, as I said. I moved in the neighborhood in

1 1978, and I've seen the radical changes. I don't think --
2 I'm mulling over whether or not the -- it should be -- this
3 case should be postponed or simply thrown in the trash all
4 together, exactly because of the dramatic effect it's going
5 to have on the neighborhood.

6 When I moved to D.C., there was something called
7 urban renewal in southwest. And it was called by, city
8 fathers then, Negro removal, which was exactly what it
9 turned out to be. And you having in Adams -- this building,
10 I agree with those who testified saying that this building
11 is the death nail, for all intents and purposes, for the
12 remainder -- a significant -- the remaining significant part
13 of the African American in the neighborhood and in D.C. in
14 general.

15 Since I've heard, and I have no reason to doubt
16 the testimony that has been given so far, that half --
17 literally half of the African American population has been
18 moved out of Ward 1. That -- I find that extremely
19 disturbing. But this then hopefully will give us a chance
20 to argue for putting this on hold, and until a -- until you
21 can have -- if the development is to occur, there can be
22 guarantees that significant set-asides as it were, or other
23 carve-outs, would make sure that the low and moderate income
24 people can stay in the neighborhood and not be negatively
25 affected by all this.

1 I want to support what Ms. Kemp -- her testimony,
2 which is, I mean, at this point in the testimony, all of --
3 everybody has said what I wanted to say, both from a
4 technical level as well as from the emotional angle. So I
5 don't want to repeat any of that.

6 And if I didn't mention, I am a -- I was then, and
7 I am -- I am now, a Commissioner in Adams Morgan -- a
8 Commissioner in Adams Morgan. My district is 109.

9 So I've had this long history of direct
10 involvement, and I want to bring that to bear in make --
11 making my argument that this, at a very minimum, should be
12 put on hold, so that community involvement can be increased,
13 and that they can -- so that there can be increased
14 likelihood that if there is going to be any development that
15 there be some guarantee of -- that we put in some guarantees
16 so that, you know, low and moderate income people can be
17 looked out for.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you.

19 Ms. Schellin, can we bring up Mr. Ellis? Okay.
20 Mr. Ellis, you can proceed with this panel. You can go
21 right ahead. Okay. Mr. Ellis, if you hit star six, you can
22 unmute yourself, I believe.

23 MR. ELLIS: Oh, okay. Good. I hit the wrong
24 thing. Okay. Yeah. My name is Charles Ellis, and I was
25 born in this city. I have been proud of this city as an

1 American and as a Washingtonian. And I served in the Army
2 in this city because I was lucky enough to be sent to the
3 Pentagon for almost three years.

4 And I want us all, I want our children, and I want
5 -- first, I want to express my appreciation for the comments
6 of several people before me, including the gentleman right
7 before, and Kerry Kemp, and so on, and John Hanrahan for
8 that matter. They are all senior to me and living here,
9 since I came back as an adult in my sixties and lived
10 elsewhere in the interim.

11 But I'm interested in -- I'd like to see planning
12 done such that it guides what we do, and I -- I guess the
13 planning ought to be done by somebody other than the people
14 who are just answerable to big money. You know, the idea
15 that the city is going to use our tax -- the receipts from
16 the people who pay taxes in the city, so that it can
17 basically give a free pass if somebody wants to build a
18 monster apartment and then keep it for 20 years, lighting
19 out the -- or, pardon me, blocking the light that people in
20 neighboring houses can see, and blocking the light that
21 would keep their gardens alive, if they have gardens in the
22 backyard, and so on, doesn't strike me as a very sensible
23 way to plan anything.

24 And it's also -- it sounds corrupt. It's utter
25 silence from the administration and the news media that I

1 use. And the news media that I use includes public
2 television, public radio, and The Washington Post, and,
3 until very recently, the DCist, part of The Washington --
4 part of the public radio. I've learned some valuable things
5 from them, and the administration has been silent on most of
6 this stuff since the time when many of us were collecting
7 signatures last summer at the intersection of 16th and U.
8 Pardon me, 17th. No, 16th and U.

9 And I think the business of giving away public
10 property that has a firehouse and a police station on it is
11 nuts, and the -- both of those buildings may be a little bit
12 worn, although six years for a firehouse doesn't strike me
13 as being especially old. But both of those institutions are
14 genuinely worth having in this neighborhood. They are
15 popular. They serve several neighborhoods, and we all like
16 being near them, although I'm not sure anybody would like
17 being in a third or fourth or fifth story above a police
18 station. You never know what's happening in that case.

19 I am interested in mentioning a couple of
20 principles that some of our group that was passing out the
21 petitions articulated for ourselves last summer. I think
22 they are just as good for anybody else as they would be for
23 me. To wit, one, public land ought to stay public.
24 Otherwise, there is a continuing diminishment of acreage of
25 public land in a city that, notwithstanding some people's

1 optimism of more people make it cheaper, the city is limited
2 in the amount of square miles that it's got in it. You give
3 away public land, you lose that public land because city
4 agencies are going to have a harder time getting it back if
5 in fact they should grow or have their needs grow for some
6 reason.

7 So giving away public land, by any stretch of the
8 imagination, in this city isn't a good idea. And another
9 thing that we agreed upon was that -- so the public land
10 must stay public. The second thing is we need to have in-
11 scale development that preserves and protects environment
12 and public safety.

13 And I should also say, in the way of preserving
14 and protecting the environment, it also -- it should also
15 protect trees, gardens, and a sense of well being that you
16 would not get if you put a great big tower building smack
17 next to somebody's two- or four-story house such that he or
18 she loses their lawn or the light that -- it animates their
19 garden or the trees that make it a pleasant place.

20 And the third item in this is that we should have
21 community-driven planning. I --

22 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Ellis? Mr. Ellis?

23 MR. ELLIS: Yes.

24 CHAIR HOOD: Give me your closing thought. But I
25 would like for you also to just, in your testimony, to help

1 me with this case. I'm not following you. I need you to
2 help me understand why MU-4 -- why we should not go from MU-
3 4 to MU-10. I get it about the garden. I understand about
4 public land. That's not -- none of that is in front of us,
5 but help me understand the MU-4 to MU-10. Help me --

6 MR. ELLIS: Why we should --

7 CHAIR HOOD: -- help me with that, please.

8 MR. ELLIS: -- go from -- okay. There is a reason
9 why it shouldn't go from MU-4 to MU-10, and that reason is
10 it would enable somebody to put monster buildings smack up
11 next to short two- to four-story houses. And I think that
12 that is a perfectly rotten idea.

13 The other thing is, nobody has checked with a
14 number of people who may have an interest in the stability
15 of those couple of blocks, including the police and fire
16 stations.

17 The primo Broadway actors of our past had their
18 taller buildings mostly down to the east at U Street and
19 6th, 7th, 8th, and so on. And if you're going to call
20 attention to their history and the consideration of the
21 city, that ought to be done correctly and in place. And
22 they have nice buildings.

23 CHAIR HOOD: Give us your --

24 MR. ELLIS: They have nice buildings.

25 CHAIR HOOD: Give us your closing thought, please.

1 MR. ELLIS: I'm done.

2 CHAIR HOOD: You're done? Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. ELLIS: My closing thought is, okay, here is
4 the closing thought. Don't raise it to MU-10 for any reason
5 whatever, because there is no excuse to do that.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Thank you,
7 Mr. Ellis. We appreciate it.

8 MR. ELLIS: You're quite welcome.

9 CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Schellin?

10 MR. ELLIS: Thank you.

11 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Hold tight. We may have
12 some questions.

13 MR. ELLIS: I'll take questions if you want then.

14 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

15 Ms. Schellin, do we have anybody else in
16 opposition?

17 MS. SCHELLIN: We have one more caller on. It's
18 caller number 11, Sam -- I think it's Sarate.

19 CHAIR HOOD: Sarate. Okay. So after -- Sam
20 Sarate is the -- Sarate, well, they'll correct us -- is the
21 last person for opposition, correct?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: That is correct.

23 CHAIR HOOD: So --

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Anybody who was called and didn't -
25 - wasn't here, they can submit --

1 CHAIR HOOD: Right.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: -- their testimony --

3 CHAIR HOOD: Moving forward --

4 MS. SCHELLIN: -- in writing. Yes.

5 CHAIR HOOD: So we won't have 12 hearings. Moving
6 forward, if anybody wants to submit something, they can in
7 writing. So we will end with Mr. Sarate. So let's bring
8 him on.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Well, the record is open of course.
10 That --

11 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. They can -- they can submit it
12 in writing, but we will end with --

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

14 CHAIR HOOD: -- public testimony to us.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

16 CHAIR HOOD: So we can move forward to the parties
17 in opposition after we hear from undeclared.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

19 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Mr. Sarate, I believe, or
20 Sarate? You'll straighten us out once you get here. I
21 don't see you.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: He's in the bottom right of my
23 screen. He needs to hit star six, I believe it is, to
24 unmute.

25 CHAIR HOOD: Star six to unmute, right.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

2 CHAIR HOOD: Yeah. I see -- what caller is he?

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Caller 11. He has unmuted now.

4 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I don't see him. Okay.

5 MR. SARATE: Chair Hood, my name is Sam. I live
6 in Single-Member District 1B05. I just want to make a quick
7 statement. Two weeks ago, Commissioner Kensek said it best.
8 When there was a 1B meeting on this matter in April 2023,
9 Commissioner Kensek acknowledged that we have two minutes to
10 talk, and we couldn't ask a follow up. This is
11 unacceptable. Thank you.

12 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I just -- I just -- I feel
13 very compelled to say what I'm going to say, and I'm not
14 making light of your two minutes that you all had. I, too,
15 go to community meetings, and I was the guest speaker at a
16 meeting, and they gave me one minute. And I'll leave it at
17 that. So -- and I'm not making up for the two minutes that
18 you all got, but I had one minute to -- as a guest speaker
19 and was -- and was told to sit down. So we all get some of
20 that.

21 So I don't want you all think that you all are
22 doing something different from the rest of us. We live
23 here, too. Let's see if we have any questions or comments.

24 Commissioner Imamura?

25 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No, sir.

1 CHAIR HOOD: All right. Commissioner Stidham?

2 Okay. And Vice --

3 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I couldn't get off mute.

4 CHAIR HOOD: No problem.

5 Vice Chair Miller?

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 Thank each of you for your thoughtful testimony. I have no
8 questions. Thank you.

9 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I, too, have no questions, but
10 I want to see if there is any cross. But I do, too, want to
11 thank each of you for your testimony, and especially staying
12 at this late hour, even though not later, but at this hour
13 and sticking with us through this whole process. We
14 appreciate your comments.

15 Does the ANC -- I mean, does the Office of
16 Planning have any cross?

17 MR. LAWSON: No, sir. Thank you.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Does Chair Harris have any --
19 Chair Harris, do you have any cross?

20 MS. HARRIS: No, thank you.

21 CHAIR HOOD: ANC 2B? Mr. Jones, Randy Jones, any
22 cross? And Gregory Adams, any cross?

23 MR. ADAMS: I have a question for Mr. Jones.

24 Mr. Jones, you say you're an ANC Commissioner for
25 Adams Morgan?

1 MR. J. JONES: Yes.

2 MR. ADAMS: Okay. Are you the only black
3 Commissioner for the ANC?

4 MR. J. JONES: Yes.

5 MR. ADAMS: Can you tell me how the voting went on
6 this particular issue? Were you in support?

7 MR. J. JONES: As it happened, I -- the ANC seat
8 that I hold was -- it wasn't filled in a normal electoral
9 process. I got on in a special election, and the first
10 meeting I attended was when the vote came up. So I wasn't
11 that familiar with the case except that I understood clearly
12 what the implications -- what the implications were, and I
13 had been in the neighborhood, as I said, since 1978.

14 And I had witnessed, you know, this dramatic
15 decrease in the amount of African Americans in the
16 neighborhood, and I understood -- understood clearly. So
17 what I was voting on then was to put it on hold to give the
18 community -- because I understood the community had not had
19 a chance to actively involve themselves in the
20 considerations of this building.

21 So, yes, we, as a Commission, considered it, and
22 I, along with another Commissioner, voted to abstain. Not
23 abstain, pardon me. To vote to put the consideration on
24 hold for the purpose of getting -- of getting the proper
25 amount of community input.

1 MR. ADAMS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jones.

2 No more questions, Chairman Hood. Thank you.

3 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Mr. Jones, right quick,
4 what is the proper -- what do you believe to be the proper
5 amount of community input?

6 MR. J. JONES: It would -- the proper amount is
7 the -- is not so much the amount of time, but the
8 consideration of making sure that we have -- there are
9 certain assurances that we -- that we've got to be able to
10 get. So if we can -- we want to put it on hold so -- I
11 mean, not solely, but including the purpose, because I think
12 this -- this project maybe we could put on hold at a
13 minimum.

14 And there also would have to be some guarantees
15 that if -- because several people have spoken to developers
16 making promises that they didn't keep, we want to have the
17 opportunity to make sure that we can have assurances and
18 that these assurances are -- have the full weight of making
19 -- have the full weight of guarantees that whatever
20 agreements that are made are kept.

21 So we can't do that now, because we -- you know,
22 the opportunity for participation and the process has been -
23 - has been shorted. I mean, several -- several people,
24 because I listened to the last, what, eight hours of this,
25 and there are several people who brought to the floor that -

1 - that there simply has not been sufficient community
2 outreach. And the purpose, again, of the outreach is to
3 make -- is to include -- give us a chance to include
4 guarantees that whatever -- that the -- guarantees that we
5 can have the proper input to make sure that -- I'm trying to
6 -- what I'm trying to make -- get to is make sure that we
7 have a chance to ensure that the -- whatever agreements, we
8 want to put in agreements, and that these agreements have to
9 be abided by.

10 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I appreciate it, Mr. Jones.

11 MR. J. JONES: I mean, at the -- as it stands now,
12 that's not the case.

13 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I think you've answered my
14 question. So thank you. I appreciate it.

15 Okay. Did I do Mr. Adams? I --

16 MR. ADAMS: Yes, you did. Thank you.

17 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Adams.

18 Ms. Akel, do you have -- Rochelle Apartments, any
19 cross of this panel?

20 MS. AKEL: Yes, Chair. And I'm going to be really
21 -- I could ask a question to all of these wonderful
22 witnesses, but I'm not going to.

23 But I would like to ask Commissioner Jones,
24 because he's a long-time resident, he's a Commissioner, and
25 -- Commissioner Jones, if this becomes an MU-12, what do you

1 see as the future of the rest of U Street corridor in terms
2 of displacement? I'd like to hear your thoughts on that,
3 because you did mention displacement in your testimony.

4 MR. J. JONES: As I -- since I've been here for
5 such a long time, I'm seeing this dramatic reduction of the
6 African Americans in the -- in the neighborhood. And as it
7 has to do with it, if we can stop projects like this, if we
8 can come up with stabilizations for the neighborhood in --
9 for the neighborhood in general, we can have a sense of the
10 future, of people being able to stay in -- stay in the
11 neighborhood.

12 But in projects like this, particularly this one,
13 this 11-story building, we're right down there, and it would
14 be -- and I agree with those who said it would be a front --
15 an affront of the highest order, particularly public
16 property, and give it over to a private developer to -- all
17 they're going to do is accelerate the practice of putting
18 people out of the neighborhood.

19 And this is what has to -- you know, have to put
20 the brakes on that, at least put the brakes on it, if not,
21 you know, get rid of this kind of business altogether.

22 MS. AKEL: Thank you. That's it for me.

23 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you.

24 And Ms. Feskanich?

25 MS. FESKANICH: I have a question for Mr. Vining.

1 You testified about, you know, this being a zoning issue,
2 but we really need some kind of specifics of a project. Do
3 you think that if we had had a project put before us that
4 would have eliminated the amount of hearing time we've had
5 to expend so far on this simple map amendment?

6 MR. VINING: Yes, I do, because a specific
7 project, we'd be able to talk directly with the people who
8 designed the project and who will be arguing for the
9 specifics of their project and how the community would
10 benefit. And some of those things would occur to us, yes,
11 that is a benefit, but also have a specific project
12 applicant be in a position to say, well, I can bend that a
13 little bit, because I appreciate what you're saying.

14 So, yes, the answer to your question is yes.

15 MS. FESKANICH: Thank you. And just a couple of
16 questions for Mr. Jones. Thank you for your service to
17 ANC 1C and Adams Morgan. I just wanted to ask you again, or
18 clarify, that the Office of Planning never offered to your
19 ANC considerations of other alternative zoning approaches to
20 1617 U Street? And you were told that it would be MU-10,
21 nothing else? Is that correct?

22 So ideas, like split zoning or a custom zone or
23 even a special use zone, were never discussed by your ANC.
24 Is that correct?

25 MR. J. JONES: Now let me qualify that. As I

1 mentioned, I came on the Commission at the time that this
2 business came before the ANC for the last time. So the
3 specific details that you're talking about now were no
4 longer -- the issue was no longer discussed because we took
5 the position that we wanted to put a hold on it at least
6 until -- well, no, what we did was that we want to -- to
7 make those decisions that -- that improve the likelihood
8 that people in the neighborhood, African Americans
9 particularly, would be able to stay.

10 So if the project did not speak to that, it should
11 be at least put on hold.

12 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. So you're not familiar with
13 any particular alternative zoning options that --

14 MR. J. JONES: I have seen --

15 MS. FESKANICH: -- might be --

16 MR. J. JONES: -- but not in the Commission as a
17 whole, no.

18 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. And one final question. I
19 know you -- you testified to the need for guarantees. Do
20 you think that these guarantees, you would be able to get
21 these guarantees through a custom zone, which is a
22 possibility in this case, to actually create a custom zone
23 for this area? Would that give you the guarantees you're
24 looking for?

25 MR. J. JONES: It would speak to that directly,

1 I'm sure, but I -- I am not that specific with the -- I am
2 not specifically reading this -- with the opportunity you're
3 talking about, that this would allow.

4 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. Yeah. A special --
5 creation of a special zone for that site.

6 And on racial equity and meeting people where
7 they're at, do you believe Office of Planning's limited
8 public engagement fails the basic racial equity principles?
9 Or even basic levels of respect for the affected community?

10 MR. J. JONES: That is egregiously the case, yes.

11 MS. FESKANICH: And one last thing. Do you have
12 other experiences of displacement concerns or racial equity
13 issues in the Strivers' area or around 17th and Seaton
14 Street perhaps you can elaborate on?

15 MR. J. JONES: Yes. I mentioned that they -- when
16 there was -- I think it was 1978 when the -- when the guy
17 bought up all the houses on Seaton Street. And the housing
18 was in horrible condition, I can guarantee. I mean, I
19 remember walking in somebody's house when we first began to
20 organize the people. They didn't know they didn't have to
21 be forced out because they got the -- the developer gave
22 them 30 days to get out.

23 And some of the houses you walked in, you opened
24 the front door, and you stepped on dirt. And what we were
25 able to do was organize it, and it's usually the right of

1 first refusal, though. And as it happened at that time,
2 Perpetual Bank was coming to 18th and Columbia Road, and we
3 were able to negotiate with them to get to -- to make money
4 available to the tenants, and then the government -- the
5 federal government then came out and bought out those --
6 bought out those loans, so the people were able to stay
7 there.

8 The point was they had -- and I think this is what
9 your question is getting at. The point was that this was an
10 opportunity for people to live in the house. And if they --
11 if they chose to leave, it was on their own accord and not
12 be forced into something. But the opportunity to stay there
13 was there. And while I want to make sure -- I'm concerned
14 that this big building that they are -- that they are
15 talking about will remove that likelihood of people being
16 able to stay in -- you know, go there in the first -- go
17 there initially and then be able to stay there.

18 So I -- I think you asked a question about, what
19 did I see helping along U Street? You said U Street or was
20 it Florida Avenue?

21 MS. FESKANICH: Strivers' area in general, 17th
22 and Seaton in particular.

23 MR. J. JONES: Yeah. The whole point again is to
24 try to make -- give people a reasonable opportunity to have
25 a decent life in the neighborhood like we have. And this

1 building would go far and away to deny the people who live
2 there now the opportunity to do that.

3 MS. FESKANICH: Yeah. I thank you for those --
4 that last part because one of my neighbors, I knocked on her
5 door and I think she spoke of you as helping her stay in her
6 house. She lives on Seaton Street, and she -- she spoke of
7 you, you know, helping her get a loan to stay in her house.
8 And she's still there today. Her family is still there, she
9 and her family.

10 Thank you very much. I don't have any other
11 questions, Chair Hood.

12 MR. J. JONES: Well, let me thank the Commission,
13 Mr. Hood particularly, and the rest of the panel, for giving
14 us the opportunity -- at least this opportunity to speak to
15 this issue, and hopefully we'll be able to take it up and
16 translate it into something that the neighborhood can agree
17 with. I can't hear you. Okay. I see you speaking,
18 Mr. Hood, but I can't hear you.

19 CHAIR HOOD: Because I said all of that -- the
20 only person that heard it was in the room, if my wife --
21 well, she's got the door closed. She don't want to hear no
22 more. But I -- I was saying I want to thank you. I thank
23 this panel for all your testimony and staying with us at
24 this hour. So thank you all. We appreciate your testimony
25 to us.

1 All right. Ms. Schellin, do we have anybody else?

2 And thank you, Commissioner, for letting me know
3 that I was not being heard.

4 Ms. Schellin, do we have any -- so we have
5 finished with opposition?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: We called all of the names on the
7 list.

8 CHAIR HOOD: Anybody that has opposition from this
9 point going forward, you can submit it in writing, because
10 we --

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Right.

12 CHAIR HOOD: -- we're --

13 MS. SCHELLIN: If they were not here at the time
14 they were called, they can submit in writing. So now we
15 move on to the next phase, which is undeclared. So I'll
16 call those names.

17 Mr. Young, just let me know when you get to four.
18 James Brannon, Alan Gambrell, Kerry Bennett -- Benard, sorry
19 -- Omar Hakeem, Vikram Chiruvolu -- I'm sure I messed that
20 one up. It's C-h-i-r-u-v-o-l-u. Do you have four yet?

21 CHAIR HOOD: I only see one, Ms. Schellin.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Harry Butockis, and the last
23 one, Ashleigh Fields. And that will close out all public
24 testimony.

25 CHAIR HOOD: So the only one I see is Ashleigh

1 Fields. So the same thing will apply for undeclared. So I
2 guess the rest of them can submit if they --

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Submit in writing. Yes. The
4 record will be open since we have the parties in opposition
5 still, so the record will at least be open for one more --
6 until one more hearing. So up until 3:00 the day -- or up
7 until the day before. Yes.

8 CHAIR HOOD: All right. It looks like,
9 Commissioner Fields, you are the -- you are the last person
10 for this evening. Commissioner Fields?

11 MS. FIELDS: I just wanted to first say thank you
12 all so much for taking the time to listen to everyone's
13 testimony. I truly appreciate it. And to all the
14 residents who are on the call, I definitely do want to make
15 the case for 1B, that we have done a plethora of community
16 engagement over the course of the past few months, being
17 that we've had several meetings with our Economic
18 Development Committee where we met with members of the
19 community.

20 I know that Arlene and Deborah and I have met
21 personally multiple times. I've spoken to Randy multiple --
22 twice. And there has also been meetings hosted by Arlene
23 and Deborah that were at MPD onsite that myself,
24 Commissioner Hanrahan, Commissioner Tucker Jones, and
25 Commissioner Alan Kensek have attended.

1 As we discussed the zoning for this site, the
2 reason that I stand undeclared today is because I want to
3 ensure that the next zoning case where there is hearing
4 about setbacks on V Street and around the land plot are
5 ensured. And the reason that I voted in favor of this going
6 to MU-10 is because we know what we're going to get with
7 affordable housing, and we know the limits that will be set
8 in place and the density onsite.

9 And I want to make sure that the police station,
10 the fire station, our first responders have the much-needed
11 upgrades to the facility to serve the community in the best
12 way possible.

13 So pretty much that's all that I wanted to share
14 here today. I'm open to hearing and meeting with more
15 residents. And, again, I appreciate everyone for being on
16 the call and testifying, and I do hope that as we decide on
17 the zoning for the site that we will give consideration to
18 the historic district that does surround the property and
19 how potential construction as an MU-10 site might go
20 underway, could potentially affect their homes.

21 It's important that we have, you know, greenspace
22 onsite, important that they have access to sunlight, and
23 that's something I will continue to push for and advocate
24 for. But, at this time, I do believe that it's best that we
25 move to an MU-10 with the setbacks that OP has -- is

1 potentially going to put in place or introduce at the next
2 zoning hearing.

3 So thank you so much for listening, and I
4 appreciate your time again.

5 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Fields, for
6 being so succinct and to the point. I greatly -- we greatly
7 appreciate your testimony. I'm sure you'll hear that from
8 others once I go to them, and I will start with Commissioner
9 Imamura.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 Thank you, Commissioner Fields, for your succinct
12 testimony tonight. I think you ought to win the award for --
13 -- I think you're the last one to testify tonight, so
14 appreciate your patience and your fortitude here, so -- as
15 well as your point of view and your work in the community on
16 behalf of -- behalf of your constituents.

17 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
19 Imamura.

20 Commissioner Stidham?

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No questions or comments.
22 Thank you, Commissioner Fields, for your attendance here
23 tonight, and probably for many nights up until this one. So
24 thank you.

25 CHAIR HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 Thank you, Commissioner Ashleigh Fields, for your
3 thoughtful testimony and your service to your community.

4 CHAIR HOOD: And let me just ask, Commissioner
5 Fields, did you -- did you do a separate testimony?

6 MS. FIELDS: No.

7 CHAIR HOOD: I hate to put work on you, but I --
8 you articulated that so well, that would be good for -- I
9 know you're probably going along -- well, you voted -- you
10 were undeclared. You voted undeclared in the ANC vote,
11 correct?

12 MS. FIELDS: No. In the ANC vote, I voted in
13 favor of MU-10. I just heard back from OP today, which is
14 the only reason that I marked undeclared when I applied to
15 testify.

16 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. So you -- are you undeclared
17 now? Well, would you change your vote? Is that what -- I'm
18 trying to understand where you are now?

19 MS. FIELDS: No, I wouldn't change my vote, but I
20 just want to make sure that those implications for the
21 setback are in place with this site as it goes to MU-10. I
22 know that we would have to do this first, I assume, and then
23 wait for the next hearing for those implications to be put
24 in place. But I would keep my vote in favor of MU-10, and
25 I'd be willing to submit a written testimony further

1 explaining why.

2 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you so much, and thank
3 you for your testimony and stay engaged. And I'm sure you
4 will. And keep pushing for the community in your capacity,
5 and even if you are not a Commissioner. But I think -- I
6 think you are -- that community is well represented with
7 you, and I liked your testimony. Believe me. Thank you.

8 But I would like to get that in writing, too, so I
9 can -- if you don't mind. All right?

10 MS. FIELDS: Yes, I will.

11 CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Ritting, do you have something to
12 add? You're on mute. It's funny. The later we get, we are
13 all on mute.

14 MR. RITTING: I'm sorry. I clicked on my video by
15 mistake. That was an error. I apologize.

16 CHAIR HOOD: Oh. Okay. All right.

17 All right. So let's see if there is any cross on
18 Commissioner Fields. Let's go with Office of Planning?

19 MR. LAWSON: No questions. Thank you.

20 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Give me one minute. My mouse
21 is not working right. Probably the operator's problem.
22 Okay. That's what it was.

23 All right. Okay. Chair Harris?

24 MS. HARRIS: No questions. Thank you,
25 Commissioner Fields.

1 CHAIR HOOD: And ANC 2B? Mr. Jones?

2 MR. R. JONES: Thank you for taking time tonight,
3 Commissioner Fields, and over the last two weeks talking to
4 me, and just thank you I guess. I think your point about
5 incorporating setbacks as part of this is really vital, and
6 I believe that's why you voted to support this with all
7 those conditions that the ANC asked for. And I would just
8 implore the -- implore the Commissioners to review that and
9 see resolution, which adds nuance to this big map amendment.

10 CHAIR HOOD: Is there a question there somewhere?
11 Did I miss it?

12 MR. R. JONES: I'm sorry. No. I just -- thanks,
13 Ashleigh. Have a good one.

14 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Okay. Mr. Adams, Gregory
15 Adams?

16 MR. ADAMS: Commissioner Fields, can you share
17 with those of us listening today what the Office of Planning
18 shared with you that helped you reach the decision to
19 approve or to go along with the upzoning from MU-4 to MU-10?

20 MS. FIELDS: So instead -- what OP shared with me
21 is that they would include a setback of 40 feet above a
22 height of 60 feet of buildings relatively along the narrow
23 V Street, Northwest, and then also a building setback of
24 12 feet, not required under current or typical zoning from
25 the property to the east of the site.

1 And so this would be on zoning text amendment
2 Case 23-26, which has been set down for a hearing before the
3 Commission on March 21st, 2024.

4 MR. ADAMS: And that was sufficient enough for you
5 to make your decision?

6 MS. FIELDS: For me, yes. And this was -- I
7 received this information as of today. But prior to that, I
8 voted in favor of this decision because I do want to see a
9 maximum of affordable housing onsite. I also want to see
10 upgrades to the first responders' station, and we also added
11 other things in our amendments that I mentioned about access
12 to sunlight, greenspace, and other things like that.

13 And I think with those implications it will be the
14 best for our neighbors and best for those who are displaced
15 trying to come back to the area. I think it provides the
16 best opportunity for everyone involved. So that was why I
17 voted in that way.

18 MR. ADAMS: And you believe that MU-10 is the only
19 way to accomplish this?

20 MS. FIELDS: I believe that that's what is before
21 us, and I do think that would be the best path forward at
22 this time. Yes.

23 MR. ADAMS: Thank you. No further questions,
24 Commissioner Hood.

25 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Let's go to Ms. Akel.

1 MS. AKEL: Questions for Commissioner Fields. She
2 is my Commissioner, and I am disappointed in her -- her
3 testimony.

4 Commissioner Fields, you said something just now
5 about people who were displaced will have a chance to come
6 back. What did you mean by that?

7 MS. FIELDS: So as we've heard throughout
8 tonight's call, there were multiple black residents that
9 lived along U Street who were displaced due to
10 gentrification or other new construction onsite. And I do
11 believe if this goes back to an MU-10, with some level or
12 component of affordable housing, those who had to move out
13 over the course of the past 20 years might have an
14 opportunity to apply for affordable housing on this site to
15 be in an area in uptown of northwest D.C. and come back to
16 their neighborhood.

17 So that's my hope. I know that we're going to be
18 losing the Geno Baroni Apartments momentarily as those
19 undergo reconstruction as well, and so I'm hoping that with
20 that project and this project affordable housing will be
21 available to more people to live in a thriving area along
22 U Street.

23 MS. AKEL: Are you aware that IZ is a lottery
24 system?

25 MS. FIELDS: I am.

1 MS. AKEL: Yeah. And are you aware that most
2 people who get displaced don't come back because they're
3 already settled in wherever they went to? The damage was
4 already done? That's kind of magical thinking. You should
5 check that out.

6 I'd like to ask you, did your Commission ever
7 really seriously debate the MU-10 versus what could be
8 accomplished with a lower MU and still provide affordable
9 housing? Or did you ever seriously discuss having it social
10 housing or a similar model like at Project U and O, which is
11 98 percent affordable housing? Did you ever have
12 discussions about that?

13 MS. FIELDS: Yes. So, first, I'll just address
14 your thought that it's magical thinking. You know, every
15 resident makes their own decision about where they live and
16 when they come back. And all we have the opportunity to do
17 as representatives is make these options available to them,
18 and so that's what I meant in regards to that statement.

19 As far as what we discussed as a Commission, I
20 believe numerous times when we met onsite at the first
21 responders' location this was brought up by various
22 residents in attendance. I think Commissioner Alan Kensek
23 brought forth the argument that a lot of you all who are
24 against us upzoning to MU-10 are bringing forth tonight. We
25 discussed social housing, but we recognize that, you know,

1 with -- I believe it was a type of housing introduced by
2 Councilmember Janeese Lewis George. That's still undergoing
3 a vote by the City Council, and so we realized that those
4 options were unlikely to happen or unlikely to be available
5 during the time that we had this vote.

6 And so I do believe that we have thorough
7 discussed those options, and at this time what seems more
8 realistic is an MU-10 and working with that to see what the
9 starting point is with affordable housing. We understand
10 that's the starting point, and it's not the ceiling.

11 And so as we continue throughout this process, I
12 know that I'll advocate for the maximum affordable housing
13 that can be available, and I think a lot of my fellow
14 Commissioners will as well, too.

15 MS. AKEL: If I may, when I said "magical
16 thinking," there is data that shows about returning
17 displaced people. So I'm not just saying that as an
18 opinion.

19 Social housing is many things. We're already --
20 we already did it in Shaw. The Mayor just cut the ribbon in
21 January. It's possible, and it's already being done. So
22 social housing is not something we have to wait --

23 CHAIR HOOD: Is there a question? Is there a
24 question or --

25 MS. AKEL: I'm -- well, I think that Commissioner

1 Fields is mistaken. She is basing --

2 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. You can --

3 MS. AKEL: -- her decision on mistakes.

4 CHAIR HOOD: Right now, you are supposed to ask
5 her questions.

6 MS. AKEL: Yeah. Well --

7 CHAIR HOOD: Her testimony is her testimony. Let
8 me -- let me just straighten something out that I -- I
9 wasn't going to say anything, but her question -- her
10 testimony is her question. Whether you like it or not is
11 not before this Commission or anybody who is listening.
12 Your testimony and your presentation that you're going to do
13 at the next meeting is what you and your party believe.

14 So let's be respectful of everyone. But continue
15 to ask her cross-examination questions, but not everything
16 else about social housing and all this other -- just on her
17 testimony.

18 MS. AKEL: Yeah. I mean, Commissioner Hood, it's
19 not -- it's not what I like or don't like. It's facts.

20 CHAIR HOOD: You said it. You said it. The
21 record quotes -- the record has you talking about you're
22 disappointed in her testimony. That's her testimony. So --

23 MS. AKEL: Right. But --

24 CHAIR HOOD: -- ask her -- cross-examine her, and
25 then you'll call the office tomorrow and complain about me.

1 I'm used to it. I've been doing this for a long time.

2 MS. AKEL: It's -- can we move past that, please?

3 It's --

4 CHAIR HOOD: No. I can't. I can't because I
5 think it's -- this is a deliberate process, the community
6 engagement. I've been doing this a long time, and I listen
7 to the community. I'm very patient, even though you're off
8 key. So I'm asking now, just cross-examine and ask her
9 questions. That's all I'm asking, please. I'm saying
10 please, too. I don't usually say that. Please.

11 MS. AKEL: I've forgotten now what my last
12 question was going to be.

13 CHAIR HOOD: You take your time, and I'll come
14 back to you. See, this is how fair I try -- we try to be.

15 MS. AKEL: Okay. That would be great. Thank you.

16 CHAIR HOOD: I'll come back to you.

17 MS. AKEL: That would be great.

18 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

19 MS. AKEL: Thank you.

20 CHAIR HOOD: Ms. Feskanich? Ms. Feskanich, do you
21 have any cross?

22 MS. FESKANICH: I hadn't unmuted myself. Sorry.

23 Ms. Fields, I wanted to ask you, you qualified
24 your vote on the ANC resolution with an expectation that
25 DMPED would do a displacement study. And have they done

1 that to your awareness?

2 MS. FIELDS: They have not. But I'd just also
3 like to clarify, too, that that request was made in regards
4 to a request before the RFP will come out, which would
5 happen after the Zoning Commission case and other
6 formalities were in place to decide what type of project
7 would be placed on this land plot. So, at this time, that
8 would be premature.

9 MS. FESKANICH: And you also, I believe, voted
10 with the expectation that certain conditions and impact
11 studies be done. How and when do you think these impact
12 studies will be done? And how do you -- how and -- how do
13 you think they will be guaranteed?

14 MS. FIELDS: That's not relevant to my testimony
15 tonight. I'd be happy to further discuss it another time
16 with meetings with the community.

17 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. You did testify this
18 evening about affordable housing, and we will get affordable
19 housing on this -- on this site. What do you believe we
20 will get in terms of affordable housing with this remapping
21 to an MU-10 zone?

22 MS. FIELDS: I can't guarantee. I can only go
23 with the regulations that are within the MU-10 zoning site.
24 I don't have that in front of me now, but whatever MU-10,
25 you know, regulates as affordable housing as a base. I

1 think somewhere around 40 percent, 30 percent, is the floor.

2 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. And isn't it the case that
3 DC's definition of "affordable housing" is largely
4 unaffordable for anyone making a living wage and due to the
5 racial wealth gaps in D.C.? I believe that was brought up
6 in prior testimony.

7 MS. FIELDS: I don't think it's relevant to my
8 testimony at this time.

9 MS. FESKANICH: One last question. Were any of
10 the options that you testified were presented to you at the
11 ANC, were any of those options ever presented during
12 community discussions?

13 MS. FIELDS: I do believe that OP attended a
14 meeting with us in conjunction with the Economic Development
15 Committee where the representative did put in place, you
16 know, that just because it does go up to an MU-10 doesn't
17 mean that, you know, the entire land plot would be built to
18 maximum capacity. So I would say yes, that was presented to
19 the community at those meetings.

20 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. But that -- you know, that
21 -- if it is upzoned, it would be a by-right MU-10
22 construction. But that wasn't really whether the options
23 were presented, any other options besides MU-10 were
24 presented to the community. That was -- that was what I was
25 asking.

1 MS. FIELDS: I mean, I know that, you know, as a
2 Commission, what we discussed was, you know, MU-10 as that
3 was what was before us. And, you know, that's what we voted
4 in favor to do.

5 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. And one last question.
6 Couldn't a special use zone be applied at this site to
7 guarantee 70 percent of the units are affordable, such as
8 with a social housing model?

9 MS. FIELDS: I'm not sure. That would be a
10 question for OP and the Zoning Commission.

11 MS. FESKANICH: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
12 Fields.

13 I have no other questions, Chair Hood. Thank you.

14 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much.

15 Ms. Akel, do you remember your last question?

16 MS. AKEL: I do. And I promise this is going to
17 be my last question for the evening. And it does apply to
18 Commissioner Fields' testimony just now. She said that she
19 voted in favor of this because of the conditions and the
20 promises that OP made, and, you know, she is relying on
21 affordable housing as it is stated, blah, blah, blah.

22 So what I'm saying is, Commissioner Fields, a) did
23 you hear Shelly Repp's testimony -- he's the head of the
24 Committee of 100 -- where he testified in the last hearing
25 that there is no ironclad guarantee of any affordable

1 housing in this project, regardless of what you may believe
2 is a guarantee?

3 And I apologize, I don't mean to sound like I'm a
4 know-it-all, but I've been here a long time and I've seen
5 personally a lot of development where they came to us and
6 promised us stuff and it never came to be.

7 How are you so sure that the guarantees that you
8 are basing your vote on are actually going to happen once
9 the Zoning Commission makes its decision? There is really -
10 - according to track record, that doesn't usually happen.
11 How are you so sure?

12 MS. FIELDS: Thank you for that question. First,
13 I'd like to say that I think a lot of people who are
14 passionate about this project have been promoting their own
15 narrative and their own information about what would happen
16 on this land mass for the site and this project, which has
17 sparked a lot of fear among neighbors, and a lot of support
18 for things that people don't necessarily understand.

19 But from my knowledge, and from my time working on
20 the Commission, and working alongside the Zoning Commission,
21 OP, and going through the process with the Reeves Center
22 where an RFP was issued and affordable housing was
23 guaranteed and actually solidified, that has not been my
24 experience.

25 And to my knowledge, they have upheld everything

1 that, you know, they had -- the residents and that the ANC
2 has requested. And that's something that I believe that
3 they will continue to do, and all I can go based off is my
4 experience. And so I do believe that that will be the best
5 option at this time for affordable housing, and it's better
6 than what we would get if we went with something else where
7 an outcome was not solidified. So that's why I voted in
8 favor of this MU-10 upzoning at this site.

9 MS. AKEL: The Reeves Center has not been built
10 yet. There is still plenty of time for change orders.

11 Thank you very much, Commission. I'm sorry this
12 has gone so long. That's it for me.

13 CHAIR HOOD: Thank you to everyone. And,
14 Commissioner Fields, thank you very much and keep up
15 whatever you're doing with ANC 1B. You had a lot of
16 questions from community members, and you handled yourself
17 well. You sound like a young person. If not, you sound
18 young, and I always like to encourage young people because
19 I, too, was young at one time, believe it or not.

20 All right. So with that, I want to thank everyone
21 tonight, whether you're pro or con. You know, I know
22 sometimes it gets a little strenuous, but I want to thank
23 each and every one of you when you participate in these
24 hearings.

25 We're going to start on -- let me just, before I

1 lose my thought, Mr. Ritting. We're going to start on
2 March 18th, Ms. Schellin, at 4:00 p.m. And we're going to
3 be starting with the parties in opposition. And we will --
4 I guess you all have supplied what order you're going in, so
5 let this be known, that we're going to start with the
6 parties in opposition. Okay?

7 Mr. Ritting?

8 MR. RITTING: Yeah. I wanted the record to
9 reflect that the Dupont Circle Citizens Association, the
10 motion asking for a continuance is now moot, because we
11 didn't get to the parties in opposition. So there is no
12 longer a need to rule on that motion.

13 Number two, I wanted to tell the parties in
14 opposition that the Commission is going to ask you at the
15 hearing to state whether you've submitted a written report
16 in the record already listing your arguments. And if you
17 could please come prepared to state what the exhibit number
18 is, so the Commissioners could follow along, that would be
19 very helpful, given that there is I guess about 700 exhibits
20 in the record.

21 Related to that, I believe the Commission asked
22 the parties to submit in writing their arguments with a
23 listing of the comprehensive plan policies they believe are
24 inconsistent with the map amendment. I looked through the
25 record during the hearing, and I saw that there were two

1 such submissions that have been made already, one by Randall
2 Jones, the other by the Black Neighbors group. But the
3 other three parties have not made such a submission, and I
4 believe it would be very helpful to the Commission in its
5 consideration of the case if you would make one.

6 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I would ask all of the parties
7 in opposition to take note of what our legal counsel has
8 mentioned, and we will be looking for that as soon as
9 possible or prior to the -- either prior or during the
10 hearing before you start your testimony.

11 Is that right, Mr. Ritting, before they start
12 you'd like to have -- we'd like to have it?

13 MR. RITTING: Ideally, yes. However, I mean,
14 that's not required.

15 CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

16 MR. RITTING: And I understand, in addition, that
17 the Commission, instead of closing arguments is going to ask
18 for the parties to submit their closing arguments in
19 writing, and that's another opportunity for you to make that
20 written submission.

21 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Correct.

22 All right. Let me ask my colleagues, any
23 questions or comments, anybody? Okay. I know we're ready
24 to -- kind of tired, exhausted.

25 So, again, let me thank each and every one of you.

1 Ms. Schellin, again, what's that date, so -- just so I won't
2 get it wrong, cause a problem.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: It is going to be Monday,
4 March 18th, at 4:00 p.m.

5 CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Again, I want to thank my
6 colleagues and everyone who stuck with us tonight.

7 The Zoning Commission will meet again on
8 February 29th. It will be our regular meeting. We have a
9 few agenda items. It won't be as long as this, but we have
10 a few agenda items.

11 And with that, I want to thank everyone, and we'll
12 see you all on the next date that Ms. Schellin just
13 mentioned.

14 So with that, this -- we will continue this on the
15 date that Ms. Schellin mentioned.

16 Good night, everyone.

17 (Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 9:14
18 p.m.)

19 * * * * *

20

21

22

23

24

25

