

**\*APPLICANT'S DRAFT ORDER\***

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
Zoning Commission**



**ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**Z.C. ORDER NO. 25-17**

**Z.C. Case No. 25-17**

**Living Classrooms Foundation on behalf of the United States General Services  
Administration and the District of Columbia  
(Southeast Federal Center Zone Design Review @ Square 771, portion of Lot 816)  
January 29, 2026**

Pursuant to notice, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (the “**Commission**”) held a public hearing on December 8, 2025 to consider the application (the “**Application**”) of Living Classrooms Foundation (the “**Applicant**”) requesting the following relief under the Zoning Regulations (Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (“**DCMR**”), Zoning Regulations of 2016, to which all references are made unless otherwise specified):

- Design Review approval for approval for new construction and for education, institutional, and eating and drinking establishment uses in the SEFC-4 Zone District, as well as design review flexibility from the ground level floor-to-ceiling height, lot occupancy, side yard, court, and waterfront setback requirements, pursuant to Subtitle K, Chapter 2 and Subtitle Z, Chapter 6;
- Special exception approval to permit education use within a 100-year floodplain pursuant to Subtitle C § 1102.4, Subtitle K § 242.1, and Subtitle X §§ 603.4 and 901.2; and
- Variance relief from the rules of measurement for building height under Subtitle B § 307.2 to permit height to be measured from finished grade pursuant to Subtitle K § 242.1 and Subtitle X §§ 603.4 and 1000.1.

The above relief is granted for a portion of Lot 816 in Square 771 to allow construction of a new three-story headquarters for Living Classrooms in The Yards development in the SEFC-4 Zone. The Commission reviewed the Application pursuant to the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedures, which are codified in Subtitle Z of the Zoning Regulations. For the reasons below, the Commission hereby **APPROVES** the application.

**SUMMARY ORDER**

**The Property**

1. The property that is the subject of the application consists of a portion of Lot 816 in Square 771 that includes a 9,196 square foot parcel that is known as Parcel P3 (“**Parcel P3**”) as well as the surrounding environs that are part of Yards Park (together, “**Property**”). The

Property is an unimproved area located at the southeasternmost edge of Yards Park. (Exhibit [“Ex.”] 3; Ex. 3J.)

2. The Property is located within the boundaries of the Southeast Federal Center Master Plan (“**SEFC Master Plan**”) and within the SEFC-4 Zone District. Pursuant to a recent text amendment approved by the Zoning Commission in Z.C. Case No. 24-18, Parcel P3 is part of the SEFC-4 Development Area. 11-K DCMR § 200.8(a). The balance of the Property is in the SEFC-4 Open Space Area. 11-K DCMR § 200.8(b).

### **Notice**

3. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 301.6, on March 18, 2025, the Applicant mailed a Notice of Intent to file a Design Review application (the “**NOI**”) to all property owners within 200 feet of the Property and to Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“**ANC**”) 8F, the ANC within which the Property is located and the “affected ANC” per Subtitle Z § 101.8. The Applicant engaged with ANC 8F prior to filing the Application. (Ex. 3D.)
4. On September 12, 2025, the Applicant filed the Application with required and supportive documentation and plans. (Ex. 3.)
5. By letter dated September 23, 2025, the Office of Zoning (“**OZ**”) referred the Application to the National Capital Planning Commission (“**NCPC**”) for review and comment. (Ex. 5.)
6. By letter dated December 4, 2025, OZ referred the Application for review and comment and gave notice of the December 8, 2025, virtual public hearing to:
  - D.C. Department of Energy and Environment (“**DOEE**”);
  - D.C. Metropolitan Police Department (“**MPD**”);
  - D.C. Fire & Emergency Medical Services (“**FEMS**”); and
  - D.C. Homeland Security & Emergency Management Agency (“**HSEMA**”).(Ex. 19.) The Commission kept the record open until January 12, 2026 to provide the above agencies with additional time to provide feedback.
7. Pursuant to Subtitle Z §§ 402.1-402.2 and 402.6, on October 15, 2025, OZ sent notice of the December 8, 2025 public hearing concerning the Modification to:
  - (a) The Applicant;
  - (b) ANC 8F;
  - (c) The ANC 8F02 Member District Commissioner, whose district includes the Property;
  - (d) The ANC 8F01 Single Member District Commissioner;
  - (e) The Office of the ANCs;
  - (f) The Ward 6 Councilmember;<sup>1</sup>
  - (g) The Chair and At-Large Members of the D.C. Council;
  - (h) The Office of Planning (“**OP**”);
  - (i) The District Department of Transportation (“**DDOT**”);
  - (j) The Department of Buildings (“**DOB**”);

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time of the notice of public hearing, the Ward 8 Councilmember seat was vacant.

- (k) The Department of Energy and Environment (“**DOEE**”);
  - (l) The Office of Zoning Legal Division; and
  - (m) The owners of property within 200 feet of the Property.  
(Ex. 10.)
8. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 402.1(a), OZ published the Notice of Public Hearing in the October 24, 2025, issue of the *D.C. Register* (72 DCR 011784-011786). (Ex. 8-9.)
  9. The Applicant posted notice of the hearing on the Property on October 29, 2025, and maintained such notice in accordance with Subtitle Z §§ 402.3 and 402.10. (Ex. 13, 18.)

### **Parties**

10. Apart from the Applicant and ANC 8F, there were no parties to the proceedings and no requests for party status.

### **The Application**

11. On September 12, 2025, the Applicant submitted an application requesting:
  - Design review approval of new construction as well as education, institutional, and eating and drinking uses in the SEFC-4 Zone Development Area pursuant to Subtitle K §§ 239.1 and 239.5;
  - Flexibility from the rules of measurement for building height, ground level floor-to-ceiling height, lot occupancy, side yard, court, and waterfront setback requirements pursuant to Subtitle X § 603.1; and
  - Special exception approval for education use within a 100-year floodplain pursuant to Subtitle C § 1102.4.

The approval and relief were requested to authorize the construction of a new three-story facility for the Applicant with approximately 17,000 square feet of education, workforce training, culinary training/eating and drinking establishment, marina support, and administrative uses on Parcel P3 as well as surrounding landscape improvements to complete the development of Yards Park (“**Project**”). The Application included a detailed narrative setting forth the Application’s compliance with the general Design Review standards in Subtitle X §§ 603 and 604, the SEFC Zone Design Review standards under Subtitle K §§ 241 and 242, the standards for design review flexibility under Subtitle X § 603, the waterfront special exception criteria under Subtitle C §§ 1102.1(g) and 1102.5, and the general special exception criteria in Subtitle X, Section 901.2. (Ex. 3.)

12. On October 8, 2025, the Applicant submitted a certified site plan in support of the special exception for education use within a floodplain. (Ex. 7.)
13. On November 6, 2025, the Applicant submitted additional information regarding concurrent federal reviews and approvals of the Project by NCPC and the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (“**CFA**”) as well as other information in support of the Application. (Ex. 14.)

14. On December 7, 2025, the Applicant submitted its presentation in support of its Application. (Ex. 20.)
15. On December 8, 2025, the Applicant submitted a motion to amend the Application to withdraw its request for design flexibility from the rules of measurement for building height in Subtitle B § 307.2 and instead request variance relief from the same provision, in order to allow the Project's height to be measured from its finished grade. The Applicant provided a detailed analysis of the satisfaction of the burden of proof for variance relief under Subtitle X § 1000.1. The Application demonstrated good cause to permit the amendment of the Application pursuant to Subtitle Z § 101.9 because the requested height relief had been present in the Application from initial filing, there was no opposition to the Application, and the specific issue was raised in the December 1, 2025 OP Report. (Ex. 22.)
16. On January 16, 2026, the Applicant submitted additional information in support of the special exception for education use within a floodplain, including a flood emergency action plan and confirmation that the Project will be elevated to the regulatory design flood elevation and otherwise comply with the flood hazard rules of Title 20, Chapter 31 of the D.C. Municipal Regulations ("**Flood Hazard Rules**"). (Ex. 27.)

#### **Responses to the Application**

17. By report dated December 1, 2025, OP submitted a report in support of the Application ("**OP Report**").
  - OP supported approval of the building, its proposed uses, its design flexibility, and the special exception to allow education use in a 100-year floodplain. OP provided a detailed analysis confirming that all required SEFC Zone Design Review standards under Subtitle K § 241, general Design Review standards under Subtitle X §§ 603 and 604, and special exception standards under Subtitle C, Chapter 11 and Subtitle X, Chapter 9 were met. OP also concluded that, on balance, the Application would not be inconsistent with the District of Columbia Comprehensive Plan, including when viewed through a racial equity lens, as well as other applicable planning documents, including the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative Plan and SEFC Master Plan.
  - In its report, OP did not support the use of Subtitle X § 603.1 to grant flexibility from the rules of measurement for building height but otherwise supported flexibility from the 40-foot height limit to allow for the height of the building. At the public hearing, OP affirmed that it was in support of a variance from the rules of measurement for building height to allow the Project's height.(Ex. 17; Tr. Dec. 8, 2025 at 43-44.)
18. By report dated November 26, 2025, DDOT submitted a report indicating no objection to approval of the Application, provided the Applicant implement its proposed Transportation Demand Management Plan for the life of the Project. (Ex. 16.)

19. By report submitted December 8, 2025, DOEE submitted comments detailing certain requirements of the District’s Flood Hazard Rules and requesting that the Applicant prepare an evacuation plan in support of its special exception for education use in a floodplain. (Ex. 21.)
20. By report dated December 8, 2025, HSEMA submitted a report in support of the Application, contingent on submission of an evacuation plan. (Ex. 24.)
21. By letter dated November 19, 2025, the United States General Services Administration (“GSA”) submitted a letter affirming that the Project was consistent with the SEFC Master Plan and related historic preservation guidelines and had completed the required 35% design review under the SEFC Master Plan. (Ex. 23.)
22. By report dated July 14, 2025, NCPC submitted a copy of its report in support of the Project, concluding that it was consistent with the approved SEFC Master Plan. NCPC recommended removal of certain non-native species from the landscape plan and noted in its report that the Applicant made the requested changes. (Ex. 6.)
23. By report dated October 21, 2025, ANC 8F submitted a report indicating that, at a regularly-scheduled and duly-noticed public meeting on October 21, 2025, with a quorum present, ANC 8F voted in support of the Application, including the requested design review approval, design review flexibility, and special exception approval (“**ANC Report**”). (Ex. 15.)

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. Pursuant to the authority granted by the Zoning Act, approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 797, as amended; D.C. Official Code § 6-641.01 (2018 Rep1.)), the Commission may approve a design review application consistent with the requirements of Subtitle K, Chapter 2; Subtitle X, Chapter 6; and Subtitle Z § 301.
2. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 600.1, the purpose of the design review process is to:
  - (a) *Allow for special projects to be approved by the Zoning Commission after a public hearing and a finding of no adverse impact;*
  - (b) *Recognize that some areas of the District of Columbia warrant special attention due to particular or unique characteristics of an area or project;*
  - (c) *Permit some projects to voluntarily submit themselves for design review under this chapter in exchange for flexibility because the project is superior in design but does not need extra density;*
  - (d) *Promote high-quality, contextual design; and*
  - (e) *Provide for flexibility in building bulk control, design and site placement without an increase in density or a map amendment.*
3. Pursuant to Subtitle K §§ 239.1 and 239.5, the Project requires design review approval under Subtitle K §§ 241 and 242 and Subtitle X §§ 603 and 604 to allow education, institutional, and eating and drinking establishments in the SEFC-4 Zone Development

Area and a new structure in the SEFC-4 Zone as well as to authorize flexibility from the ground level floor-to-ceiling height, lot occupancy, side yard, court, and waterfront setback requirements.

4. Subtitle K § 241 provides specific SEFC design review criteria in addition to the general design review criteria of Subtitle X § 604.
5. Subtitle X § 603 authorizes the Commission to grant relief from development standards for height, setbacks, lot occupancy, courts, and building transitions and other zone-specific design standards as well as to hear simultaneously an application for special exception or variance relief. See also Subtitle K § 242.1 (authorizing the Commission to hear and decide additional requests for zoning relief in connection with SEFC design review applications).
6. The Application requires special exception approval under Subtitle C § 1102.4 to allow education use within a 100-year floodplain. Section 8 of the Zoning Act (see also Subtitle X § 901.2) establishes that the Commission may grant a special exception upon its determination that the special exception:
  - *Will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Map;*
  - *Will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Map; and*
  - *Complies with the special conditions specified in the Zoning Regulations.*

Relief granted through a special exception is presumed appropriate, reasonable, and compatible with other uses in the same zoning classification, provided the specific regulatory requirements for the relief requested are met. In reviewing an application for special exception relief, the Commission's discretion is limited to determining whether the proposed exception satisfies the requirements of the regulations and "if the applicant meets its burden, the [Commission] ordinarily must grant the application." (*First Washington Baptist Church v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 423 A.2d 695, 701 (D.C. 1981) (*quoting Stewart v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 305 A.2d 516, 518 (D.C. 1973)).)

7. For the relief requested in the Application, the "specific conditions" are those of Subtitle C § 1102.5.<sup>2</sup>
8. The Application requires variance relief from the rules of measurement for building height in Subtitle B, Section 307.2. Section 8 of the Zoning Act (see also Subtitle X § 1000.1) establishes that the Commission may grant variance relief where:

*"By reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property at the time of the original adoption of the regulations or by reason of exceptional topographical conditions or other extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition of a specific piece of property," the strict application of the*

---

<sup>2</sup> The Commission agrees with the Applicant that the waterfront setback special exception requirements of Subtitle C § 1102.1(g) do not strictly apply because Subtitle X § 603.1 permits design review flexibility from "setbacks" but notes that both the Applicant and OP concluded that the Application met these standards.

*Zoning Regulations would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to or exceptional and undue hardship upon the owner of the property, provided that relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.*

(D.C. Official Code §6-641.07(g)(3); 11 DCMR § 3103.2.) The District of Columbia Court of Appeals has held that “an exceptional or extraordinary situation or condition” may encompass the buildings on a property, not merely the land itself, and may arise due to a “confluence of factors.” (*See Clerics of St. Viator v. District of Columbia Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 320 A.2d 291 (D.C. 1974); *Gilmartin v. District of Columbia Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 579 A.2d 1164, 1168 (D.C. 1990).)

9. Based on the record before the Commission, the Commission concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof for the following:
  - Design review approval of the Project, including education, institutional, and eating and drinking establishment uses and including flexibility from the ground floor clear height, lot occupancy, side yard, court, and waterfront setback requirements pursuant to Subtitle K §§ 241 and 242, Subtitle X §§ 603 and 604, and Subtitle Z § 301,
  - Special exception for relief from the penthouse setback requirements, which will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations, will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Map, pursuant to Subtitle X §§ 604 and § 901, and complies with the special conditions specified in Subtitle C § 1102.5; and
  - Variance relief from the rules of measurement for building height to permit the Project’s height to be measured from its finished grade, because the unique and exceptional requirements to elevate the Property out of the floodplain in accordance with the Flood Hazard Rules creates a practical difficulty in complying with the requirement to measure height from the lower of the natural or finished grade, and the relief will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the integrity of the zone plan, pursuant to Subtitle X § 1001.1.

### **OP Report**

10. The Commission is required to give “great weight” to the recommendation of OP pursuant to Section 5 of the Office of Zoning Independence Act of 1990, effective September 20, 1990 (D.C. Law 8-163; D.C. Official Code § 6-623.04 (2018 Repl.) and Subtitle Z § 405.9. *See Metropole Condo. Ass’n v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 141 A.3d 1079, 1087 (D.C. 2016).
11. The Commission finds OP’s detailed analysis of the Application against the applicable design review and special exception standards as well as its conclusion that the Application is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan when viewed through a racial equity lens, and its ultimate recommendation to approve the Application persuasive and concurs with

OP's recommendation. The Commission notes that the Applicant amended the Application to request variance relief from the rules of measurement for building height, thus addressing OP's concern regarding whether relief from the rules was available under design review flexibility.

### **ANC 8F Report**

12. The Commission must give "great weight" to the issues and concerns raised in the written report of the affected ANCs pursuant to Section 13(d) of the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Act of 1975, effective March 26, 1976 (D.C. Law 1-21; D.C. Official Code § 1-309.10(d) (2012 Repl.) and Subtitle Z § 406.2. To satisfy the great weight requirement, the Commission must articulate with particularity and precision the reasons why an affected ANC does or does not offer persuasive advice under the circumstances. *Metropole Condo. Ass'n*, 141 A.3d at 1087. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals has interpreted the phrase "issues and concerns" to "encompass only legally relevant issues and concerns." *Wheeler v. District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 395 A.2d 85, 91 n.10 (1978) (citation omitted).
13. The Commission acknowledges ANC 8F's Report and support for the Application.

### **Summary Order**

14. Since no persons or parties appeared in opposition to the Application, a decision by the Commission to grant this Application would not be averse to any party. ANC 8F, the only party to the Application, supported the Application. Therefore, pursuant to Subtitle Z § 604.7, the Commission authorized a Summary Order in this case and determined it may waive the requirement that findings of fact and conclusions of law accompany the Order because such waiver will not prejudice the rights of any party.

### **DECISION**

In consideration of the record and the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law herein, the Commission concludes that the Applicant has satisfied the burden of proof and therefore APPROVES the Application subject to the following conditions (whenever compliance is required prior to, on, or during a certain time, the timing of the obligation is noted in **bold and underlined text**):

### **Project Development**

1. The Project shall be built in accordance with the plans and elevations dated September 2025 (Ex. 3J) (collectively, the "**Final Plans**"), and with zoning flexibility from the ground level floor-to-ceiling height, lot occupancy, side yard, court, and waterfront setback requirements, as well as variance relief from the rules of measurement for building height, subject to the following areas of flexibility:
  - a. To vary the location and design of all interior components, including partitions, structural slabs, doors, hallways, columns, stairways, mechanical rooms, and toilet



rooms, provided that the variations do not change the exterior configuration or appearance of the structure;

- b. To vary the colors of the exterior materials based on availability at the time of construction, provided such colors are within the color ranges proposed in the Final Plans;
  - c. To make minor refinements to the locations and dimensions of exterior details that do not substantially alter the exterior design shown on the Final Plans. Examples of exterior details would include, but are not limited to, doorways, canopies, railings, and skylights;
  - d. To vary the final streetscaping and landscaping materials as shown on the Final Plans based on availability and suitability at the time of construction, to incorporate materials consistent with adjacent Yards Park, or otherwise in order to satisfy any permitting requirements of the Capitol Riverfront Business Improvement District as well as DC Water, DDOT, DOEE, DOB, or other applicable regulatory bodies;
  - e. To add or vary the amount, location/orientation and type of green roof, solar panels, landscaped areas, and paver areas to meet stormwater requirements and sustainability goals or otherwise satisfy permitting requirements;
  - f. To modify the final building designs to the extent necessary in order to achieve compliance with applicable floodplain regulations;
  - g. To modify the final building location and designs to the extent necessary to address requirements of WMATA's Office of Joint Development and Adjacent Construction;
  - h. To vary the final design and layout of the mechanical penthouse and other mechanical equipment to accommodate changes to comply with Construction Codes or address the structural, mechanical, or operational needs of the building uses or systems, so long as such changes do not substantially alter the exterior dimensions shown on the Final Plans and remain compliant with all applicable penthouse requirements;
  - i. To vary the final design and layout of the outdoor spaces (including the location of guardrails on lower terraces) to reflect their final design and programming; and
  - j. To vary the final design of the ground floor frontage, including the number, size, design, and location of windows and entrances, signage, awnings, canopies, and similar storefront design features, to accommodate the needs of the Applicant.
2. **For the life of the Project**, the Applicant shall maintain a flood emergency action plan ("EAP"). The Applicant shall be permitted to update the draft EAP included as Exhibit 27 of the Record in consultation with DOEE to maintain compliance with applicable floodplain regulations and accommodate changes in the operational needs of the Project.

## **Transportation Demand Management Measures**

2. **For the life of the Project**, the Applicant shall adhere to the following TDM plan measures:
- a. Identify Transportation Coordinators for the planning, construction, and operations phases of development. The Transportation Coordinators will act as points of contact with DDOT, goDCgo, and Zoning Enforcement and will provide their contact information to goDCgo
  - b. Require the Project's Transportation Coordinator to conduct an annual commuter survey of employees on-site, and report TDM activities and data collection efforts to goDCgo once per year;
  - c. Require the Project's Transportation Coordinators to develop, distribute, and market various transportation alternatives and options to the employees, including promoting transportation events (i.e., Bike to Work Day, National Walking Day, Car Free Day) on the Project's website and in any internal building newsletters or communications;
  - d. Provide for the Project's Transportation Coordinators to receive TDM training from goDCgo to learn about the transportation conditions for the Project and available options for implementing the TDM plan;
  - e. Require the Transportation Coordinator to post "getting here" information in a visible and prominent location on the Project's website with a focus on non-automotive travel modes. Also, links will be provided to goDCgo.com, CommuterConnections.com, transit agencies around the metropolitan area, and instructions for students and patrons discouraging parking on-street in Residential Permit Parking (RPP) zones;
  - f. Require the Transportation Coordinator to distribute information on the "Commuter Connections Guaranteed Ride Home" program, which provides commuters who regularly carpool, vanpool, bike, walk, or take transit to work with a free and reliable ride home in an emergency;
  - g. Require the Transportation Coordinator to demonstrate to goDCgo that, to the extent applicable, the Property is in compliance with the DC Commuter Benefits Law and other applicable laws providing commuter benefits;
  - h. Provide employees who wish to carpool with detailed carpooling information and/or referrals to other carpool matching services sponsored by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments ("MWCOG") or other comparable service if MWCOG does not offer this in the future;
  - i. Provide at least 10 short-term and 2 long-term bicycle parking spaces;

3. **Following the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the Project**, the Project's Transportation Coordinator shall submit documentation summarizing compliance with the transportation and following TDM conditions of this Order to the Office of Zoning for inclusion in the IZIS case record of Z.C. Case No. 25-17.
4. **Five years after the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the Project**, if the Transportation Coordinator has not established a relationship with DDOT or goDCgo, the Transportation Coordinator will submit a letter to the Zoning Administrator, DDOT, and goDCgo summarizing continued substantial compliance with the transportation and following TDM conditions in the Order, unless no longer applicable as confirmed by DDOT; provided, that if such letter is not submitted on a timely basis, the Applicant shall have sixty (60) days from date of notice from the Zoning Administrator, DDOT, or goDCgo to prepare and submit such letter.

### **General**

5. This Application approval shall be valid for a period of two years from the effective date of this Order. Within such time, an application for building permit must be filed as specified in 11-Z DCMR §702.2. Construction must begin within three years after the effective date of this Order. (11-Z DCMR §702.3.)
6. In accordance with the D.C. Human Rights Act of 1977, as amended, D.C. Official Code §§ 2-1401.01 et seq. (Act), the District of Columbia does not discriminate on the basis of actual or perceived: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, personal appearance, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, familial status, family responsibilities, matriculation, political affiliation, genetic information, disability, source of income, or place of residence or business. Sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination which is prohibited by the Act. In addition, harassment based on any of the above protected categories is prohibited by the Act. Discrimination in violation of the Act will not be tolerated. Violators will be subject to disciplinary action.

Vote (January 29, 2026): 5-0-0 (Anthony J. Hood, Robert E. Miller, Gwen Wright, Tammy Stidum, and Joseph Imamura to APPROVE)

In accordance with the provisions of Subtitle Z § 604.9, this Order No. 25-17 shall become final and effective upon publication in the *D.C. Register*; that is, on  .