

**My name is Ronald Kahn, I live in ANC 3/4G**

I speak as a resident of the District of Columbia, with 3-minute standing in front of the Zoning Commission. I live within 300 feet of the business designated area. I also participated in prior testimony related to Case 23-25. At that time, I detailed problems of substance and lack of diligence. These problems, to the best of my knowledge, were not addressed, causing the set down document to remain substantially inaccurate. To me the rule making determination was a by-product of that process.

The set down goes to excessive length to portray a sense of fairness to what were one sided negotiations. The set down mischaracterized the extent of community participation, with a long list of related community events – not outcomes. This gives the reader a sense that they were partnering, a sense of listening / support of the community. This, in reality mode, consisted of the Office Of Planning staking out initial ridiculous non start positions related to height, and green space only to depict how flexible they were by agreeing to less though still very objectionable and ill-defined so-called compromises. Also note a complete lack of accounting related to naturally affordable housing which occurs in significant numbers along adjacent areas. To that end, the set down contains over 100 references to affordable and not one reference to naturally affordable housing. Bottom line - the set down is painting of a picture with OP's own brush. ZC took the set down at face value. That bears out in that the single response to my previous testimony from the Zoning Commission was that I mispronounced DMPED.

That response was a learning moment that taught me that the zoning commission accepted the set down as a fact-based document without question. I mistakenly believed that the Zoning Commission would have already fact checked the basic assumptions and related accuracy of the set down document - not accepting it as gospel. At this point what has changed? Is the Zoning Commission at the same point of accepting the set down as gospel? Nonetheless, as an impacted and concerned citizen, I persevere. To that end, my written testimony adds additional information that might have direct bearing upon this hearing's outcome.

Thank you for listening.

The following verbal testimony, per the reason below, is to be added to verbal testimony.

The significance of a newly documented failure of process can nullify a key related legislative matter changing the basic content of the set down document. This matter is to be fully assessed. It's best to give this process some additional time to resolve, assuming your process allows. It's best not to provide greater detail, to include confidentially, other than to note its status and potential importance.