

## Cochran, Patricia (DCOZ)

---

**From:** Bardin, Sara (DCOZ)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2017 9:56 AM  
**To:** DCOZ - BZA Submissions (DCOZ)  
**Subject:** FW: Application 19450 -correction

### Sara Bardin

Director

**Office of Zoning | District of Columbia Government**  
441 4th Street, NW | Suite 200-S | Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 727-5372 (office) | (202) 727-6072 (fax)  
[www.dcoz.dc.gov](http://www.dcoz.dc.gov) | [sara.bardin@dc.gov](mailto:sara.bardin@dc.gov)

---

**From:** Jules Muis [mailto:[julesmuis@verizon.net](mailto:julesmuis@verizon.net)]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 26, 2017 11:33 AM  
**To:** ATD DCOZ <[dcoz@dc.gov](mailto:dcoz@dc.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Application 19450 -correction

L.S.

My local preacher pointed out to me that the term 're-zoning' used in my letter below does not quite fit legal scripture, and the decision of the Bureau, technically, is a decision on a "requests for zoning variances and special exceptions".

As a flatfooted accountant, I will take his word for it, and please consider my letter below corrected conform. All other observations stand.

Sincerely,

Jules Muis

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Jules Muis <[julesmuis@verizon.net](mailto:julesmuis@verizon.net)>  
**Subject: Application 19450**  
**Date:** February 26, 2017 10:25:13 AM EST  
**To:** [dcoz@dc.gov](mailto:dcoz@dc.gov)

*Jules(Julius) W Muis  
3235 38th St NW  
Washington DC 20016*  
tel 202 2378902

Board of Zoning Adjustment  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO.19450  
EXHIBIT NO.200

*E-mail [julesmuis@verizon.net](mailto:julesmuis@verizon.net)*

February 24, 2017

**To Bureau of Zoning Adjustments (BZA)  
Washington DC**

Lectori Salutem,

**Ref : Application 19450**

This is to let you know that I strongly oppose at this in-flux stage for the Bureau to approve above application 19450; a decision which, I understand, will be on your agenda March 1, 2017.

Since much of the arguments for and against have/will be made clear - or, intentionally not so clear as the case may be - by various parties involved, and be couched in legal and procedural terms far beyond my pay grade, I will try to keep my opposition for approval at this stage simple: It is my considered opinion that this Idaho shelter project, by railroading and sidelining regulatory communication/consultation requirements, given its ever changing premises annex seat of the pants concretizations, simply lacks the base professionalism in concept and execution and communication for any responsible re-zoning approval decision. Especially so for a project of this invasive nature - human, social, esthetic and financial. As well as considering its also embracing nature: by aiming at giving fellow citizens in dire straits an interim shot at a new license to domestic life.

If worked out as presented, it will seriously risk, 5 - 10 years from now, to be seen as an early example of 'deconstruction by DC government of DC Government', railroading half baked solutions and mortgaging the future for many stakeholders in the process; as a typical case of 'management by exasperation', not management by quiet competence design.

I am borrowing from my own experience, decades, having seen many pendulum swing decentralization/centralization decisions, and vice versa, of organizations challenged by intractable problems. The root cause of these mood swings from one end of the spectrum, centralization, to the other, decentralization, was often based on a structural lack of management savvy, or because of the difficulties inherent to the nature of the business or challenges at hand; or a combination of the two.

In any such situation the temptation to look at centralization or decentralization as a miracle drug, without properly charting&analyzing the core social and business model at hand, from beginning to end, is self-evident. It creates a smokescreen for management ineptitude, raises hope that change is at hand, and true leadership is at work. Leading to rush measures which do little or nothing to address the fundamentals. Mortgaging future generations, conveniently buying (political) time, railroading interested parties, in the process ('under pressure everything becomes fluid'); and possibly victimizing many involved by creating 'faits accomplis' difficult to reverse.

The present **re-zoning** decision is at this stage on same shaky grounds unless better clarity is achieved about the base location analyses considerations; including insightful DC ward comparators. As it stands, it risks having to be rolled back at one point of time and its flimsy ever changing premises cannot deal with reality; more in particular since the location choice also goes against the advise of the relevant DC Government agency; and possibly only leads to decentralizing extant shelter management problems, without solving its core managerial and facility problems, including a sustainable credible business plan.

Finally, any alternative to the complex status quo situation as is - this one or others - better gets things right at entry level. I note that this decentralization decision is predicated on the simplistic premise that ( historical, culturally, economically and socially diverse) ward borders are an ideal

key to decentralization of the City's homeless shelters over 7 wards. It is a decision more worthy of flatfooted accountants than a City Management that should look beyond such arbitrary decentralization criteria.

If a mature plan, properly and civilly coordinated/communicated, with neighborhood input, were to lead to the conclusion that we better have 3 shelters in DC, with enough critical mass to assure mature management support services and care, and 'Idaho Ave' is one of them, despite its militarized environment, I'd be the first hang out the flag and see how we can resolve/reconcile it with present zoning requirements; and help to make it work beyond. And so, I am sure, will be many in my hood.

Re-zoning decisions, it looks to me, have to factor in the soundness of any proposal for change. This decision Application 19450 is as Wild West, in substance, form and process, as it gets in the East.

Reason why I oppose it at this stage.

As should the Bureau.

Cordially,

Jules Muis