Holland & Knight

800 17th Street, NW, Suite 1100 | Washington, DC 20006 | T 202.955.3000 | F 202.955.5564 Holland & Knight LLP | www.hklaw.com

Norman M Glasgow, Jr. (202) 419-2460 norman.glasgowjr@hklaw.com

May 1, 2017

VIA EMAIL

Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia 441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 200S Washington, D.C. 20001

> Re: Z.C. Case No. 13-14 – McMillan Sand Filtration Site Applicant's Response to Friends of McMillan Park's Motion in Limine

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of Vision McMillan Partners, LLC and the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development ('DEMPED") (collectively, "Applicant"), this letter is sent in response to the Motion in Limine ("Motion") filed this morning by Friends of McMillan Park, ("FOMP") a party in opposition to the above-referenced PUD Application. For the reasons discussed below, FOMP's Motion should be denied.

FOMP's Motion rests on the sole assertion that under 11 DCMR Subtitle Z §408.9 the Applicant was required to provide a list of rebuttal witness and a written summary of their rebuttal testimony in advance of tonight's hearing. Motion at page 3, *see* also e-mail exchange between Andrea Ferster and undersigned attached as Exhibit A to the Motion. 11 DCMR Subtitle Z §408.9 contains no such disclosure requirement, and Ms. Ferster failed to identify any pertinent authority in support of her initial request or in response to my request that she identify same. To wait until the morning of the continued hearing is nothing more than a delaying tactic.

More to the point, Applicant only intends to present rebuttal testimony this evening from witnesses – fact and expert – who have already testified in this limited remand proceeding. While FOMP asserts surprise and requests relief under 11 DCMR Subtitle Z §408.10, there is simply no surprise as FOMP has already heard from each witness expected to testify this evening, and, in the case of experts, already have the resumes in hand as per Applicant's Prehearing Submission.¹

¹ In turn, not only did FOMP fail to make any advance disclosure of its fact and expert witnesses, but it also tried to introduce written testimony from two witnesses – Claudia Barragan and Anne Sellin – who would not be available for cross-examination (11 DCMR Subtitle Z §§408.5, 6) or to testify under oath or affirmation examination (11

Anchorage | Atlanta | Austin | Boston | Charlotte | Chicago | Dallas | Denver | Fort Lauderdale | Houston | Jacksonville | Lakeland Los Angeles | Miami | New York | Orlando | Portland | San Francisco | Stamford | Tallahassee | Tampa | Tysons ZONING COMMISSION Washington, D.C. | West Palm Beach CASE NO.13-14

Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia May 1, 2017 Page 2

FOMP also challenges the submission of rebuttal testimony by DOEE, claiming that DOEE cannot testify on rebuttal since it was not part of Applicant's case. DOEE has testified in this case and its testimony this evening was discussed at the conclusion of the last public hearing. As the Commission is well aware, 11 DCMR Subtitle Z §§408.1, 4 and 5 gives the presiding officer great flexibility in how the proceedings are conducted, and allowing DOEE to testify this evening causes no undue prejudice to FOMP.

Lastly, FOMP seeks to introduce 3 additional documents in the record for this proceeding. Applicant does not object to the proposed introduction, except it reserves the right to supplement the record with a complete, and final, versions of each document so identified.

We appreciate your attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Holland & Knight LLP

By: Norman M. Glasgow, Jr.

cc. Jennifer Steingasser, D.C. Office of Planning (via email) Maxine Brown-Roberts, D.C. Office of Planning (via email) Anna Chamberlin, District Department of Transportation (via email) Jonathan Rogers, District Department of Transportation (via email) Kimberly Johnson, DC Office of the Attorney General (via email) Matthew Lane, DC Office of the Attorney General (via email) Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1B (via email) Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5A (via email) Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5E (via email) Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5E (via email) Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5E (via email)

DCMR Subtitle Z §408.13). While FOMP may believe it is bound by a different set of procedural rules, that is simply not the case.

Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia May 1, 2017 Page 3

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the Applicant's Response to Friends of McMillan Park's Motion in Limine Filing was sent on <u>May 1, 2017</u>, electronically to the parties/persons below:

Bradley Thomas, Chair Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5E 107 P Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20001 Email: 5E05@anc.dc.gov

C. Dianne Barnes, Vice Chair / SMD 5E09 Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5E 41 Adams Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 Email: 5E09@anc.dc.gov

Nicole Cacozza / SMD 1B10 Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1B 644 Columbia Road NW Washington, DC 20001 Email: 1b10@anc.dc.gov Ronnie Edwards, Chair / SMD 5A05 Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5A 122 Michigan Avenue, NE #L24 Washington, D.C. 20017 Email: 5A05@anc.dc.gov

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1B 2000 14th Street, NW Suite 100B Washington, D.C. 20009 Email: 1b@anc.dc.gov

Andrea Ferster, Esq. Law Offices of Andrea Ferster 2121 Ward Court, N.W., 5th Floor Washington, D.C. 20037 Email: aferster@railstotrails.org

Counsel for Friends of McMillan Park

Norman M. Glasgow

Holland & Knight LLP

.

#51032331_v1