CASE NO.: Motion of:	ing this form, please rev 13-14 Applicant PL -open the record in		ins on the reverse ion must be com	pletely filled o		n unless othe	erwise i	ndicate	d. All
Motion of:	Applicant PL		Appellant			1000/2000 A B 1001/100	CONSIDERATION.		
	PL		Appellant	1					
Motion to re-		EASE TAKE NOTICI		D Party	Intervenor	Other	Party i	n oppo	sition
Motion to re-	open the record in		E, that the unders	igned will bri	ng a motion to:				
	A N (38: 10 )/ ]}	order to perm	it Friends of M	1cMillan Pa	ark (FOMP) to fi	le the atta	ched	objec	tion
			Points and Auth	orities:					
including relevant requesting the re	h and every reason why nt references to the Zon ecord be reopened, the No substantive informa	ing Regulations or document(s) that	Map and where you are requestir	appropriate a g the record	concise statement of	of material fa	acts. If	you are	ły
FOMP her	reby files the at	tached obje	ection to the	e Commi	ssion's state	d intenti	on,		
suggested	by the Chairm	an just prio	r to at the c	lose of t	ne record in t	his proc	eedi	ng	
on May 27	7, 2014, to allow	Applicants	s' witnesses	s to supp	ly additional	testimo	ny	016	
in the form	n of answers to	questions	from the Co	ommissio	on on July 28	, 2014,	the		
date this c	ase is set for a	decision.							
44) 	BOUNDS PON	वर्षः सः वृष्ठः श	91/196/104,444	W colle	phi president	sole of the	(09)	0.85	
	Press and the ended	7			-	4.15.24.55			
					in many particular 17 of	ani hoin			
5.1	J. MC Late Dials	nž <sub>d</sub> oznatiji	abato (), qe	Nothuon	heer gan	<del>nu an</del> i	iaiz h	i	
	hill Sinn andreffen	fatto Bostar	STATES OF BUIL			Marine State Cardon State			
		G	ERTIFICATE OF S	EDVICE				Tes A	
		M. th		JERVICE.					
I hereby certify tl		May of	June, 2014	MOND!		, 10	10	10	10
I served a copy of	f the foregoing Motion t	o each Applicant,	Petitioner, Appel	ant, Party, an	d/or Intervenor, and	d the Office	of Plann	ning	
in the above-refe	erenced ZC or BZA case v	ia:	] Mailed letter	🗍 Hand del	very 🔳 E-Mail	Other			
Signature:	Ce	- la							
Print Name:	Andrea Ferst	er	1		sin finding	gilli ge	an ti	98	
	2121 Ward Court NW 5th Floor, Washington, DC 20037								
Phone No.: 2	202-974-5142 E-Mail: aferster@railstotrails.org ZONING COMMIS								MISSIO

EXHIBIT NO.830

ANDREA C. FERSTER LAW OFFICES 2121 Ward Court, N.W., 5th Floor. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037

TEL.(202) 974-5142 FAX (202) 223-9257 <u>AFERSTER@RAILSTOTRAILS.ORG</u> <u>WWW.ANDREAFERSTERLAW.COM</u>

June 11, 2014

Mr. Anthony J. Hood, Chairman D.C. Zoning Commission One Judicial Square 441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W 2<sup>nd</sup> Fl Washington, D.C. 20001

Re: ZC Case No. 13-14 – Objection to Allowing Applicants' Witnesses to Testify on July 28, 2014

Dear Mr. Hood:

Friends of McMillan Park ("FOMP"), a party in opposition to the abovereferenced application for re-zoning and a Planned Unit Development ("PUD"), hereby objects to the Commission's stated intention to request additional testimony, comments, and/or answers to questions posed by the Commission from the Applicants' witnesses on July 28, 2014, the day that this case is set for a decision.

At the end of the final hearing in this proceeding on May 27, 2014, this Commission closed the record in this case, established deadlines for limited post-hearing submissions, and set this matter down for a final decision at the Commission's public meeting on July 28, 2014. The Chairman then requested that the Applicants make their witnesses available at the public meeting set for July 28, 2014, in the event that Commissioners had additional questions for any of Applicants' witnesses.

FOMP appreciates the Chairman's desire to ensure that the Commission thoroughly understands this unusually complex and important matter that is before it. Nonetheless, this manner of proceeding is a concern. This matter is a contested case proceeding, in which the parties are entitled to the due process right to cross-examine all witnesses who testify in the proceeding. *Capitol Hill Restoration Society v. Zoning Commission*, 287 A.2d 101 (D.C. 1972). Testimony in a contested case proceeding that is not subject to cross-examination is not considered reliable, probative, or substantial evidence. *Selk v. D.C. Dept. of Employment Services*, 497 A.2d 1056 (D.C. 1985).

Allowing Applicant's witnesses to testify in a context in which other parties are not permitted to cross-examine these witnesses, and where there is no opportunity to address additional testimony in the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law or other scheduled post-hearing written submissions, meets neither the Chairman's goal of creating a complete record nor the legal requirements of a contested matter before the Commission.

To avoid these legal problems, if the Commission believes that the Applicants have not satisfied their burden of proof in this proceeding based on the five hearings already held, the Commission should deny the zoning request. Or alternatively, to both avoid these problems and ensure that the record in this case fully reflects the array of information that this Commissions will need to make the best decision on behalf of District residents, the Commission may re-open the record and schedule an additional hearing prior to the decision date, so that all parties can participate through crossexamination and address any such additional testimony through appropriate post-hearing written submissions.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea C Ferster Attorney at Law 2121 Ward Court, NW, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Washington, DC 20037 (202)974-5142 (phone) (202)233-9257 (fax) aferster@railstotrails.org (e-mail)

cc: Carolyn Brown, Esq.