

RE: ZC Case 19-04 – Proposed Text Amendment to Subtitles B, C, H, K, and U of Title 11 DCMR, ZONING REGULATIONS OF 2016 – Defining Community Solar Facility (CSF0, Locating Zones in which a CSF is a Permitted or Special Exception Use, and Establishing Development Standards for a CSF

Dear Mr. Hood and Members of the DC Zoning Commission:

I am a DC resident, a DC voter, a tax payer and I strongly oppose the amendment in the above referenced matter for the following reasons:

- **Voices of DC residents should not be silenced.** The amendment is still overly broad and allows for massive solar arrays/farms to be built directly adjacent to the homes of DC residents without their input or the input of their representatives. For many residents, their homes are the only major financial investment they have that they can pass on to future generations, yet they will not have an opportunity to weigh in on massive projects that might not only decrease property value but also affect the composition of their neighborhood and reduce the tree cover and green space that future generations will have to play under. **The scale of projects that would be allowed to go forward is too large not let citizens and their ANC representatives to have a voice.**
- **Neighbors Might Get the Short End of the Stick and No Benefit from the Solar Farms in their Communities:** Why allow solar developers to cut down trees, use pesticides in mass quantities in residential neighborhoods to install thousands of solar panels when the panels may only benefit a few. It is foolhardy to believe that every solar project that is created in this city, and would proceed as a matter of right if this amendment is approved, would benefit the residents in the neighborhoods that surround the project. For example, there is a case before the BZA sponsored by Catholic Charities in which a solar farm with 5,000 10-17-foot solar panels that would be erected in the Woodridge area and none of the residents in the community would reap a benefit from their placement in the quiet, tree covered neighborhood.
- **Why would DC cut off its nose to spite its face when there are significant environmental tradeoffs that should be considered with each project:** In general, solar power is beneficial and can reduce the effects of climate change but when other environmental tradeoffs are made to accommodate solar farms in our communities (i.e. degradation of the soil quality which can lead to runoff issues, removal of healthy trees, increase of pesticide run off into waterways, noise pollution from the generators, disrupting the local ecosystem of native plants and animals, etc.), it is not necessarily beneficial for citizens of DC. Therefore, these projects should not be allowed to proceed as a matter of right without knowing what trade-offs are being made that will impact the community.
- **There has not been a Pilot Project or comprehensive research on the short- and long-term impact of large-scale solar projects in DC Residential Neighborhoods.** There has not been a city-wide pilot done of large-scale solar projects in residential neighborhoods so the Commission can't access the full environmental, health or economic impact that allowing these types of projects to take place in a single swoop, as a matter of right, would have. However, once these solar farms are in place, it will be nearly impossible to tear them down-- no matter the detriment that has been discovered after they have appeared in green spaces all over our city.

- **There should not be a rush.** This amendment should have not been heard under emergency procedures. The primary reason that was provided when it was proposed for using these procedures is that a solar for all project (that will be located on a brownfield with no neighbors in a close radius) might lose matching funds or funds from the city at the end of the fiscal year if it does not have to deal with the current red tape. However, if solar is a big priority of this city's Administration, why would this city's Administration not continue making funding available in future years or work with investors throughout the process? Additionally, the transcript of the initial hearing on the emergency hearing reveals that a Commissioner flagged concerns about moving this forward under emergency procedures if there would be strong concern from neighbors and the community. The Commission was informed that there wouldn't be. Clearly, this is untrue.

Based on the reasons above, and those previously stated by others who oppose this amendment, I ask the Commission to decline to move forward with approving this amendment.

Sincerely,

Youshea Berry Rollins

2872 Perry Street, NE

Washington DC 20018