Schellin, Sharon (DCOZ)

From: Bardin, Sara Jo (DCOZ)
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2005 10 48 AM
To: Schellin, Sharon (DCOZ)
Subject: FW This email is intended for Sara, to whom I spoke yesterday re zoning follow up promised
Attachments: zoning board final record doc, article on indoor centers and walking doc; Addendum 2.doc, plat receipt dcra.jpg; cert of occupancy old jpg, cert of occupancy new.jpg

Sharon, this is from the lady who had the accident yesterday

Sara

#05-21

Sara Benjamin Bardin
Special Assistant
(Budget/Performance/Information/ANC Contact)
Office of Zoning
441 4th Street, NW, Ste. 210-S
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 727-5372
(202) 727-6072 - fax
www.dcoz.dc.gov
sara.bardin@dc.gov

From: Rebecca Bisgyer [mailto:r.bisgyer@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2005 7:42 AM
To: dcoz@dc.gov
Subject: This email is intended for Sara, to whom I spoke yesterday re.zoning follow up promised

I spoke with Sara (Bardin?) yesterday as I was having difficulty getting there yesterday to provide my response to the Dog Boarding regulations pending approval. The record closed yesterday and I called after my car was rear-ended on the way there Sara suggested I fax my information in the interim before hand delivering it as a follow up.

I seem to be having very bad luck this week, since my efforts last night (most of the night) to fax have proved futile, and then the fax stopped working entirely Then my printer also stopped working (I am not making this up). Anyway, I found an email address on the website, and being my only remaining method of communication, I thought this might serve until I can get everything to you later today, I am attaching all the documents I can that don't require additional intervention or are already on my computer It will not, unfortunately, including everything I wanted to send, but hopefully my response will be duly recorded until I can reach you another way. You should receive the main letter entitled Zoning board final record, two addendums, a scanned copy of my old and my new Certificate of Occupancy and a site plan I can also provide a scanned copy of a receipt for a plat but no actual plat until I drop it off in person, nor can I provide some other backup documents until I drop them off later

Hopefully I won't have kidney failure or lose my hearing or some other calamity before I get there ,) If Sara could call me to say she received the documents appended to this email, I would be forever relieved and grateful at 202 986 3850 or 202 486 4383 This email address is also direct to me

I appreciate your help very much!

[redacted]
[redacted] 05-21
[redacted] 17

Rebecca Bisgyer
Owner
Dog-ma Daycare and Boarding for Dogs

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.05-21
EXHIBIT NO.17

December 5, 2005

The Honorable Carol J. Mitten
Chair, DC Zoning Commission
441 4th Street, Suite 210
Washington DC 20001

Dear Chairman Mitten:

Thank you for allowing me to follow up regarding Dog-ma's continuing ability to operate legally and successfully in DC. I want to do anything possible to comply with all laws and still provide our excellent, highly sought-after service to the 2500 Districts residents that are clients of Dog-ma. I am not sure how much information you need and realize you are busy, but wanted to give you all information pertinent to our case...forgive me if this proves excessive.

I've been extremely worried about this situation and feel like I've spent half a year repeatedly defending my circumstances despite both a perfect record and a consistently responsible business attitude—an attitude that proved somewhat prescient when it came to site selection. Hopefully, this information will help you to make the decision to prevent what might amount to a real injustice against my business (or even its demise), and a decision in Dog-ma's favor would also in no way contradict the spirit of any sound zoning policy for the District. Let me say that I support the implementation of responsible and fair zoning guidelines for my industry, and have spent six months working with the Q Street Association helping to define what that policy should entail.

When I opened Dog-ma, the site--I believe the entire block--was zoned light industrial (C2? I can't remember the classification, but I suspect you do.) The site had been home to a plumbing company warehouse and previously must have been a garage and body shop, based on the items that still leach up constantly through the soil at Dog-ma. There are four rentable properties on the block; the first is another garage/body shop, the second has been, at various times, a nightclub, restaurant, etc, but generally vacant over 8 years, and then Dog-ma has the two last pieces. We have a smallish concrete block main building, and in the adjacent site, another small building that serves as my office and caretaker quarters for the whomever is watching the property at night. The remainder is the play yards and some shipping containers used as storage by the landlord. The entire block, save for the middle nightclub/restaurant property, is owned by my landlord, who resides in Italy.

Sometime during the past few years my site or the block was apparently re-zoned and I was not informed or aware of it until learning, by chance, of a plan to prevent DC dog boarding one week before emergency regs were to be submitted. To give you some background, at that time, I and

two other owners of dog boarding facilities contacted the Office of Planning to ask what was happening and why; and it was also at that time I was made aware that my zoning classification had changed. Based on the OP's suggestion, we immediately contacted the Q Street Association, and determined we would work together to suggest a framework for reasonable and responsible zoning guidelines. At this time, let me preface that, in all areas except the external yard issue, I agree with the Q Street Association's suggestions, as we worked very closely together over many hours to identify and address potential issues affecting and inherent in operating a responsible dog care facility.

In 1998 when I opened Dog-ma, I was the only business on the block. Vacant for at least 15 years, it was a repository for human waste from squatters living in all the vacant buildings (including, unfortunately, mine.) The site was completely remote, fronted 10 yards away from our entrance by a freeway overpass which ran the entire length of Virginia Avenue; another freeway entrance bordered the corner and part of the east side of Dog-ma. That side also was primarily comprised of a park. Dog-ma is essentially sandwiched between the Marine Barracks and the Navy Yard, so there's very little chance for development for blocks in specific directions, and the closest residential district is across multiple lanes of freeway traffic and hundreds of yards to the NE. Dog-ma is located on the end of a one way, dead-end street that also ends, along with our facility, at the park. Although conveniently located when driving, with ample street parking, I knew I would have to forever overcome the lack of visibility, since there was absolutely no foot traffic and our street led nowhere. The only people I saw were the military men and the crack addicts dealing and using in the park—a park we ultimately helped clean up to create a community garden, where the Marines now have drill practice. (Incidentally...no barking can compare with the noise level of those drills, but we are very happy for their presence.)

Crime was rampant. Our block seemed to be known for its privacy—it had a reputation as a good drive-to spot to park and shoot up drugs or complete transactions with prostitutes. Cars were routinely stolen from the block and/or dumped there. From time to time, to this day, squatters set up large tent cities directly in front of Dog-ma under the overpass. (The police are unable to help in these instances, but Barracks Row Association, whom we support heavily, seems to quickly resolve these matters) At night, the site was downright frightening and, since I routinely worked until the wee hours of the morning, when not actually sleeping there with the dogs, I had some terrifying close calls outside my car. (Fortunately, these incidents were immediately defused when my dogs made their presence known from inside the vehicle--despite the fact they were ancient, friendly, and weighed 30 lbs.) Now that I think of it, no one has ever attempted to enter the yard or break into the property, either, and when our clients were coming and going with their dogs they were never bothered or approached. In fact, in 8 years, no client or employee has ever been personally accosted for any reason.

Despite the obstacles, when developing the Dog-ma concept, I knew I needed to provide the definitive blueprint for excellent group-focused dog care, and in my opinion that meant having outdoor, as well as indoor, space for all dogs, regardless of size and activity level, to exercise and play. In creating this business, not only did I have to introduce the concept and establish the basic need, I had to create business viability by convincing the market to pay more for something unfamiliar; specifically local dog-owning residents of the Hill (since convenience is the primary reason someone chooses a provider initially) and win the trust of the community at large, as I could not risk jeopardizing the concept with angry neighbors. Capitol Hill seemed to have a very tight-knit and vocal community. This was paramount to me as I had seen and researched enough

battles between neighborhoods attempting to establish dog parks to understand just how polarizing animal-related issues can be.

I have been a NW DC resident for 26 years. I would have loved to open in my area—the demographic certainly seemed better from a business perspective, and I knew much more about the neighborhoods—but I could not find any site I deemed appropriate for my concept in terms of space and outdoor/indoor play. I did find several sites that would have allowed me to open, but I was worried about the dense population of the community and couldn't afford any battles (except the financial ones that inevitably lay ahead while waiting to become, hopefully, profitable). I found indoor-only sites, too, but I had already decided to create an indoor/outdoor concept for my facility, for a variety of reasons. If you would like additional information on this, I would be happy to send you an essay I've written for publication on one particular factor that helped solidify the indoor/outdoor decision. I can also share other factors and benefits with you if necessary.

I was very lucky that Dog-ma made it through its first years. I worked 20 hours a day, sleeping at the property when I housed boarding dogs. I had to then, as now, find every customer through marketing or word of mouth, and my growth was slow but consistent. Eventually, dog owners started to realize that, for many of their dogs, our type of care was not a faddish luxury, but a real requirement for their particular dog. Luckily, we were also widely covered in the national and local media for our interesting business story, unusual concept, and enthusiastic response.

In terms of our current facility, Dog-ma's perimeter is fenced with 6-foot fences outside and four-foot fences within. The external fences are covered in opaque tarps so that people/dogs cannot see in/out and this greatly limits the dog's awareness of the street, although it is generally deserted anyway. We just spent $12,000 for new fencing to reconfigure our yards and create more segmented areas. We have redundant gates and doors at every entrance to ensure security and our record of safety is highly lauded. Dogs never leave the property once there for security reasons, but can run the equivalent of miles in the yards on 7,000 square feet of land. Our clients will tell you that this level of exercise in an outside setting is absolutely necessary for many of their dogs and the primary reason they selected Dog-ma originally. This is particularly true for many of the breeds that DC residents commonly have: labs, goldens, pointers, weimaraners, and many others who are often members of the very energetic working, hunting, terrier, or hound breeds.

The site is quite clean. We pick up waste constantly from the pea gravel yards and use a company dumpster who then removes the waste regularly. We bleach the yard daily and clean the block on both front and back streets regularly, since the area outside Dog-ma is still far from pristine, and trash is abundant on the streets. I would venture our site is, in fact, much more sanitary than many of the non-animal related businesses around us. We created protocols for sanitation and cleaning I have seen in few other animal care operations, including veterinary offices, and we spend close to $1,000 per month on bleach and cleaning products as a result.

We have made the neighborhood cleaner, safer, brighter, and better lit. There is always someone on property—as I said, we have never had a break-in. We have an alarm system. We never affect traffic on the block, (there isn't any as it's a dead end street), and Dog-ma has a driveway if needed. The dogs are only outside between the hours of 7:00am and 7:00pm, and are inside for a two-hour nap from 12 noon to 2pm. The dogs are kenneled, inside, all night long. Our building is concrete block so you cannot hear much if dogs are inside, even standing directly outside the

building. We also are careful about controlling barking outside by training the dogs on acceptable behavior, while at Dog-ma, with positive reinforcement. You'd be surprised how well behaved they are! We also are extremely careful about the dogs we accept; we require a 10-page application, personal dog evaluation, and any dog that is boarding must first come for a test day of daycare to ensure their suitability in the group. We do not cut corners, and have a remarkable safety record as a result, which is why customers are so vocal in their support for Dog-ma. In turn, I pride my staff and myself on our close relationship with all the clients, as we provide their dogs' a second home. We love their dogs, and they know it.

Even though we are now established, Dog-ma can never rest on its laurels, since we have no street presence or visibility. I meet longtime Hill residents—dog owners! —to this day that have no idea we exist on the hill. That says I could be more effective in my marketing, but we cannot afford to advertise extensively and instead, rely on word of mouth. In contrast, my competitors in more visible areas probably ramped up faster than Dog-ma and undoubtedly get frequent walk-in customers. We will never have that flow of prospective business due to location, but our reputation is flawless, and that is how we stay in business: by doing things well, understanding every detail about our dogs, loving them, and being responsible. It infuriates me to think that other businesses opening on the sweat of our efforts may operate cavalierly or irresponsibly, particularly because they now reap the benefits of the business need I personally worked so hard to create. I also blanche when I observe businesses operating illegally, particularly when we are spending so much valuable time defending ourselves, have never taken the path of least resistance, and complied with the law.

Now, because of possible ramifications from/or the establishment of new zoning regulations preventing outdoor areas (not to mention the resulting threat of illegal businesses siphoning clients), my business is in danger. Without an outdoor yard, I would lack the capacity to operate, since our building is small, and close very quickly as a result. Indeed, my business model would be eradicated for any future sites, as well, if Dog-ma needed to move, as we might when our lease is up in eight years, given that the property has been for sale for 10 years. As Dog-ma has proved, there ARE sites that are appropriate for outdoor/indoor dog care facilities; we have not had one complaint or negative interaction in eight years, and we helped transform a neighborhood. I have personally witnessed that, when a business like Dog-ma comes in, crime goes out—the site becomes very active with customers coming going with dogs, who are also on the property at all times, as well as people, if the business operates 24 hour staffing. Criminals tend to avoid dogs, as canines tend to have an unusual ability to gauge character and identify potential threats. They are the keenest observers of human behavior in the animal kingdom.

If dog boarding business sites will be approved only by special exception in the future, that process, as I understand it, will vet sites as appropriate or inappropriate for outdoor use. If this is true, I urge you to let this process determine the possibility of appropriate outdoor yards in a case-by-case fashion by not prohibiting them across the board. In the zoning meeting, cities were mentioned that prohibited outdoor yards, but none that permit them were discussed. It seems logical that approving outdoor yards should be a process based on the specific location and its variables, and not predetermined as inappropriate by banning the function over an entire metropolis. I can assure you that there is a real need for this service option if it is properly situated, and it can help transform sites with entrenched problems. Dog facilities can be a perfect tenant for sites, like Dog-ma's, that have inherent development limitations or unappealing—even unsafe—aspects inappropriate to other kinds of uses.

Finally, as far as Dog-ma's future is concerned, we appreciate your interest in learning more about us. We made the responsible choice to permanently trade some ongoing revenue and growth by specifically selecting a remote, oddly configured site, precisely to avoid any impact to area residents and create positive standing in the community. This allowed us to then focus primarily on our stated business, as opposed to dealing with ongoing problems. **Please make a decision on our behalf that avoids further hardship, valuable time, and expense for Dog-ma and prevents us from continuing to defend ourselves in order to go through the special exception process.** In the best of circumstances, we would spend approximately $25,000 obtaining a zoning attorney and preparing a case for the BZA, waiting what is currently a 6- th delay in getting onto the BZA's agenda, with all the uncertainty that my business would face in the meantime. And, if I could not operate the yard until the exception was granted, I could not operate at all, which would destroy the business. Of course, if the exception wasn't granted, we'd have to close immediately, as well.

Instead, please consider grandfathering Dog-ma's outdoor yard. I realize you may be concerned about a future operator, but please understand the realities of the site and situation as I've described them, and understand that I will most certainly lose my lease before this could ever happen (even if I could imagine selling it, which I cannot, since it's essentially my life). **If you choose not to grandfather our yard, then please use your power to act as the BZA and grant us a special exception for it now.** The bottom line is that we cannot survive without one or the other.

Thank you so much for your time, consideration, and, particularly, your patience with this tome.

Sincerely,

RBisgyer

Rebecca Bisgyer
Owner
Dog-ma Daycare and Boarding for Dogs

Addendum 1: An Essay

One Factor Influencing My Choice For Indoor/Outdoor Dog Care Services

Rebecca Bisgyer, Dog-ma Daycare and Boarding for Dogs

I thought I'd discuss a little-known realization that helped me decide that indoor/outdoor service would be at the center of my urban dog care concept. There are many others reasons, not the least of which is that outdoor areas provide an unparallel play setting for many breeds that may be too rambunctious indoors, or need more room to run and play (not to mention the fact that the pool and water is a big part of the summer fun at Dog-ma, as evidenced by the following photo titled "Swim Team".)

Prior to opening Dog-ma, I researched the concept once I found out group play dog care centers existed. (Boy, did I hate learning others had had "my" idea first.) However, there were none in our area. I traveled to several cities to visit centers, see the real story, and try to learn as much as possible about the business in addition to other research. What I found was very limited information regarding how indoor facilities plan to vs. actually control how and where dogs can and will relieve themselves. This was in sharp contrast to the constant debates and info sharing on related topics like general removal of waste and issues of sanitation after waste is removed.

I found that urban, indoor facilities with no outdoor areas, especially in the early stages of operation, generally planned to walk the dogs twice a day so that they could relieve themselves. This was promoted as part of the standard service discussed in marketing materials and in response to client queries. It seemed like it didn't take long before they met with an undeniable truth: this was simply not likely under the best of circumstances. Even without getting much information on this subject from tight-lipped owners during my travels to various cities, I had suspected a potential conundrum when I was creating initial business projections and budgets. I couldn't see, based on the occupancy of most centers, how it could work with the number of dogs, the number of walks, and the staff required to walk them. Even with what appeared to be an average of 40 dogs per day, two walks per dog --even if the dogs were walked three at a time and very difficult with dogs not accustomed to it --would result in 26 separate walks of at about 15-20 minutes apiece, including the time it took to collar and leash each dog, walk, and then uncollar the dogs again. Any group play facility knows collars are a potential hazard given dogs' play habits; many dogs will latch onto anything and pull, and it can result in strangled dogs and broken jaws. I found that most responsible operator allows them, unless they use a type of "breakaway collar"… which still needs to be removed for walks.

When looking at the numbers, it became clear that, in the best circumstances with no problems, you'd need one staff person continually walking and preparing for walks for well over 8 hours daily. Since most facilities cannot possibly employ one person just to walk dogs, especially given that this function drives no revenue whatsoever as it is a part of the standard service, it could not be financially feasible. As I know now, these

businesses are already extremely labor intensive. Now, 8 years later, my initial suspicions are even more relevant given that I know the numbers and possibilities intimately.

But that's not the only reason the "walk" model goal is eventually abandoned. Dogs that come to a group facility are an unknown quantity on leashes. They may be very difficult to walk, especially with a stranger. However, the larger problem is that any dog, if sufficiently motivated, can break away from a human handler—especially a handler that is not part of its family and designated as a leader. The risk of escape is unacceptably high once a dog leaves a secure facility under these circumstances, and exposure for the operator too great. According to every owner that has shared information on this topic, as well as several incidents that occurred in DC with indoor operators over the last few years, there is the potential for frequent mishaps. These situations are what every operator fears most, and even with happy endings, they are always terribly unnerving events with potentially major customer satisfaction ramifications.

There's still more. Even a dedicated, well-funded outfit committed to and intent on walking the dogs to avoid widespread indoor accidents soon realizes it's impossible. I can personally attest that the excitement created on a dog's arrival to a play facility, and see how high energy interactions within the dog group inevitably seems to cause, perhaps through an adrenaline rush (I'm not a doctor), rapid peristalsis, meaning the dogs immediately defecate soon after arriving into the site and more frequently than usual during periods of group play. In addition, many male dogs will mark territory inside of *any* place that smells of many other male dogs. They can distinguish that, even if it IS inside, it's not their home and it seems to be a pack environment, so...bingo! Then, like dominos, other dogs that detect the smell of repeated urination and/or feces on a surface (even if we don't) decide that place definitely IS the bathroom. Once that happens, it is, indeed, from that point forward, the bathroom; de facto maybe, but bathroom nonetheless. Soon the entire group is urinating and defecating all over the play area and any other choice spot. Unfortunately, at this point, nothing will change that; no newly committed attempts to walk the dogs constantly or clean the areas repeatedly, since dogs have scenting abilities thousands of times that of humans. Your only option is to remove the actual flooring and wall surfaces involved, and start all over. Oh, there's one more thing. This time, you'll need to provide an outside place for the dogs to go to the bathroom.

Please note I am not saying these dogs revert their housebroken habits back at home. Many dogs can easily make the distinction that "this is here, and there is different". I would like to know the statistics if there is indeed a percentage that revert, but I have never heard anything on the subject and suspect it isn't too much of an issue or the owners would not have embraced the concept of group play in indoor-only facilities.

The concept of group dog care, indoors or out, is absolutely still relevant and undeniably valuable despite this or other issues that make me **personally** committed to an indoor/outdoor model. Any waste sites indoors can be sanitized completely and odor/germ free, **if** done effectively, regularly and with appropriate products, and humans need not detect any offensive odor. (The dogs, as I mentioned, will always smell it regardless of what you do.)

This, however, was simply one of the many reasons that I, personally, decided to have a dual facility with lots of room outside to run, and why I searched for an appropriate facility that would allow me to provide the many benefits my brand of dog care offers...to both the dogs, the clients, and, just as importantly, to me!

Addendum 2: **A Plea for Assistance and Support of Responsible, Cooperative Operators of Dog Boarding Businesses**

During the Zoning Commission hearing, I mentioned 3 businesses—pet stores-- as examples of potentially illegal boarding businesses that the new regulations seemed to exclude. However, I've since learned there is a difference between pet shops, which are governed by separate regulations, and retail pet product establishments; the businesses I referred to are the latter. As mentioned during the hearing, no business other than the three original legal entities, myself included, applied for a C of O during the interim period, which means any other entity operating is now doing so illegally. Will these businesses be allowed to continue to operate? Will pet product retailers be governed by the new zoning regulations adopted, or will this be the loophole that spawns additional illegal boarding businesses? Perhaps it's too early to be asking these questions, but since we are being held to scrutiny, it's fair to understand what to expect for operators already proven to be non compliant, and when we can expect it.

While my letter is not an appropriate forum to be a whistleblower, my business has the potential to be negatively affected by this zoning process, although I hope this does not occur. Therefore, I want to go on record asking for assistance in dealing with illegal operators. I realize that enforcement of businesses deemed non-compliant is a separate process governed by a separate area, but the issue is extremely relevant given that new zoning laws and the processes designed to create them have already been ignored and flouted, while the operators attempting to cooperate are being publicly slandered and accused of various offenses by these same illegal operators. The potential for continued loss of revenue to current and future illegal operators is significant, as is the distinct possibility of damage to the reputation of our industry by bad practices that are most often perpetrated by illegal operators, as evidenced by the facts behind the complaint that started this process.

One of the businesses to which I referred is Pet Dreams, on 8th and H Streets NE in Capitol Hill. After learning of the pending regulations and determining Pet Dreams had a C of O only for a retail store and not for dog boarding, we called Kim Coates, the owner. She assured us she no longer did boarding or daycare. After the owners of City Dogs, Dogs by Day, and I applied for and received our new Certificates of Occupancy according to the procedure outlined in the emergency regulations, we made an unannounced visit to her shop. There was a large sign saying DAYCARE AND BOARDING on her building, and inside, she was indeed housing dogs in a basement room, which we asked to see over her protestations. Ms. Coates then denied ever saying she didn't offer these services when I asked her about the telephone call we had made.

Also currently operating is Companions, a pet products retailer doing overnight sequestered (not group oriented) kenneling on U Street at 17th Street in NW. Will the District be formally notifying these business alerting them they are not in compliance with the law, when will this happen, and will they be told to cease operating dog day/night boarding services?

The third business, as I'm sure you are aware, is Wag Time, which now operates two facilities in NW. It is ironic to me that Wag Time, based on my understanding, under the guise of agreeing to move its boarding function to a new location based on an offer from the District, now has TWO facilities. While Q Street is supposed to be a pickup and drop off point, both facilities are accommodating boarding and daycare clients, according to eyewitnesses.

Meanwhile, the district residents that use dog care facilities have no way of knowing what entities are legal or illegal, since these illegal businesses are currently promoting themselves as legal entities, emphatically deny any information to the contrary, and, as I mentioned, in some cases slandering any legal business if attempts are made to ask about legal vs. non-compliant operators.

I realize this may seem petty and annoying, but we are being held up to District government scrutiny, despite never causing any problems, and we are willing to make every effort to cooperate completely. In addition, we are actively assisting in the process of creating sound policy, spending valuable time providing information and feedback necessary to identify and define every relevant issue to help construct effective, comprehensive zoning guidelines. We recognize its importance to our city and our industry, and know our participation will help avoid pitfalls based on lack of industry knowledge. Therefore, it is untenable that others—including the specific operator that caused this entire issue to erupt through irresponsible business practices—be permitted to flout the law and create mischief for compliant operators, with no negative result.

On behalf of DC's responsible and legally compliant pet care community, please help me understand if, how, and when notices and information regarding specific operators that are not in compliance with the law can be made available or accessible to any interested community residents, such as dog owners attempting to find responsible care for their beloved pet, relevant businesses, or even the media. People have a right to know who is or isn't legally operating, particularly if being told inaccurate information, and we have a right to make others aware of the facts and to distance ourselves from illegal operators.

Frankly, when my customers, industry related businesses, and other people learn of what is transpiring in the District regarding the establishment of zoning law for dog boarding, how and why it began, and what it potentially may mean for Dog-ma specifically, they are very concerned and surprised. Inevitably, when they ask about the other operators that fail to cooperate with the process, have caused the problems, or are now operating illegally, and they learn that little or nothing has been done in the past, they are shocked at the lack of ramifications for problem operators in light of the attention being paid to responsible ones. Personally, I feel a tremendous sense of pride and responsibility given that I created the group play model in DC, and know that others routinely operate based on my general business model. Therefore, I want to ensure all operators perform this service with the dedication required to keep our reputation as care providers beyond reproach, and I hope that operators that have been identified as irresponsible or non-compliant are prevented from operating, and that this information is made public (which will assist in the enforcement effort organically as the market learns of it). Conversely, I hope those of us who do take the business seriously, and are responsible and dedicated, are not adversely affected by new District law or regulatory requirements. The city will benefit as a result.

B00181927

BLRA-17
(Rev. 12/95)

District of Columbia Government
Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs
Building and Land Regulation Administration Zoning Division
P.O. BOX 37200 — Washington, D.C. 20013-7200

CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY

SEPTEMBER 11, 1998
(date)

Permission is hereby granted to DOG- MA, INC.
for use suite(s) _____ on the FIRST floor(s)
of the building located on lot(s) 0801 square 0929
known as premises 821 VIRGINA AVE. S.E for the following
purpose(s) DOG DAYCARE CENTER
NOT SEXUALLY ORIENTED [su]

BZA #: _____ EXPIRATION DATE: _____

THIS CERTIFICATE SHALL BE POSTED CONSPICUOUSLY ON THE ABOVE PREMISES AT ALL TIMES. IT IS VALID INDEFINITELY, unless an expiration date is stated, ONLY for the premises, or part thereof, and for the purpose(s), indicated above, and IS NOT TRANSFERABLE to another person or premises under ANY conditions. ANY CHANGE in the type of business, ownership of business, or part of premises used therefor, will render this Certificate VOID and a NEW Certificate must be obtained.

ZONE CM1 FEE $32.00

Hampton Cross, Director

By _____
Designee

Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs
Building and Land Regulation Administration
941 North Capitol Street N.E. room 2100
Washington D.C. 20002
Tel. (202) 442 - 4470 Fax (202) 442 - 4862

Government of the District of Columbia D.L.R.A 94A

C of O

CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY

PERMIT NO.
CO 101295

THIS PERMIT IS VALID ONLY FOR THE PREMISES OF THE PROJECT ADDRESS

DATE : 7/18/2005

ADDRESS	FLOOR(S)	PRCL ID : 929 (square)	ES/C3A	6 (lot)
821 VIRGINIA AVE SE	1ST FL.	WARD :	ZONE :	

PERMISSION IS HEREBY GRANTED TO :
CORPORATION : DOG-MA INC
ID No.: 981879

TRADING AS:
DOG-MA DAYCARE & BOARDING FOR DOGS

APPROVED USES :
OTHER - SEE DESCRIPTION

PREVIOUS USES :
OTHER - SEE DESCRIPTION

TYPE	BZA NO	OCCUPIED SQ. FOOTAGE	OCCUP. LOAD:	EXPIRATION DATE:
LOAD CHANGE		1,350		NONE

DESCRIPTION OF USE:
24 HOUR DOG BOARDING & DAY CARE CENTER

FEE :
$75.00

THIS CERTIFICATE SHALL BE POSTED CONSPICUOUSLY ON THE ABOVE PREMISES AT ALL TIMES. IT IS VALID INDEFINITELY unless an expiration date is stated, VALID ONLY for the premise at the above address or part thereof, and for the purpose(s), indicated above, and IS NOT TRANSFERABLE to another person or premises under ANY conditions. ANY CHANGE in the type of business, ownership of business, or part of premises used therefor, will render this Certificate VOID and a NEW Certificate must be obtained.

David A. Clark
DIRECTOR

PERMIT CLERK:
JOSEPH BEMBRY

Department of Consumer & Regulatory Affairs
District of Columbia
DCRA

3479 ←
or 3481

C/O

D.C. GOVERNMENT
OTR/DCRA CASHIER OFFICE
941 N. CAPITOL ST. NE
WASHINGTON, DC 20002
202-727-1000

ore # 0001 Receipt # 187660
g. # 3 07/18/05 at 09:15
sh In Clk# 04 Sale Clk# 04

23001211	OTHER BUS. LIC. PERMITS	
1 @ $	75.00	$ 75.00
	Sub-Total $	75.00
	Tax $	0.00
	Total Sale $	75.00
	Check Amount $	75.00
	Change Due $	0.00

THANK YOU AND HAVE A NICE DAY

application for Platt

D.C. GOVERNMENT
OTR/DCRA CASHIER OFFICE
941 N. CAPITOL ST. NE
WASHINGTON, DC 20002
202-727-1000

Store # 0001 Receipt # 187149
Reg. # 0 07/14/05 at 16:07
Cash In Clk# 11 Sale Clk# 11

EB23001211	OTHER BUS. LIC. PERMITS	
D 1 @ $	30.00	$ 30.00
	Sub-Total $	30.00
	Tax $	0.00
	Total Sale $	30.00
	Check Amount $	30.00
	Change Due $	0.00

3478
7/14

THANK YOU AND HAVE A NICE DAY

$30