GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

MAY 14th, 2012

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 6:30 p.m., Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman
MARCIE COHEN, Commissioner
PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS)
KONRAD W. SCHLATER, Vice Chairman
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA,
Commissioner (OAC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.Transcript
EXHIBIT NO.null

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

PAUL GOLDSTEIN

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director,
Development Review & Historic
Preservation

ARTHUR JACKSON

JOEL LAWSON

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ. JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular meeting held on May 14th, 2012.

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
CALL	TO ORDER, CHAIRMAN ANTHONY HOOD	5
FINAL	ACTION	
Α.	Z.C. Case No. 07-13C (Trustees of Corcoran Gallery of Art Two-Year Pt Time Extension at Square 644S)	
	Vote to Approve	16
В.	Z.C. Case No. 07-18B (Jemal's Up Against the Wall Two-Year PUD Time Extension at Square 347)	16
	Vote to Approve	20
CONSE	INT CALENDAR	
Α.	Z.C. Case No. 07-18C (Jemal's Up Against the Wall Minor Modification to PUD at Square 347)	
	Vote to Approve	23
PROPC	SED ACTION	
	Z.C. Case No. 06-11F/06-12F (George Washington University 2nd Stage PUI Square 102) Further Processing will) at
be	considered at final action	24
	Vote to Approve	30
HEARI	NG ACTION	
Α.	Z.C. Case No. 09-5A (United House of Prayer PUD Modification at Square 4	
	Vote to Approve	38
	NEAL R. GROSS	

HEARING ACTION (CONT.) В. Z.C. Case No. 12-03 (Asmara, LLC Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment at Square 5113. Vote to Deny Setdown. 48 C. Z.C. Case No. 12-04 (Office of Planning Map Amendment at Square 5749 & Reservation 412). 49 Vote to Approve Setdown 64 OTHER BUSINESS Α. DOES Representative (Lewis Brown) Presentation on New First Source Law. . 66 Relaxed Dress Code. 93 CORRESPONDENCE Z.C. Case No. 08-06 (Letter from Council Member Michael Brown re: ZRR) . 94 ADJOURN . . .

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

District of Columbia.

6:36 p.m.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: This meeting will please come to order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the May 14, 2012 public meeting of the Zoning Commission of the

My name is Anthony Hood. Joining
me is Vice Chairman Schlater, Commissioner
Cohen, Commissioner May, and Commissioner
Turnbull. We are also joined by the Office of
Zoning Staff Ms. Sharon Schellin. Also the
Office of the Attorney General Ms. Nagelhout
and Mr. Ritting.

Also the Office of Planning.

Okay, the Office of Planning will be joining us shortly but right now we have Ms. Brown-Roberts and Mr. Jackson. I'm sure Ms.

Steingasser and Mr. Lawson will be joining us very shortly.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to you and are located in the

1	bin near the door. We do not take any public
2	testimony at our meetings unless the
3	Commission request someone to come forward.
4	Please be advised this proceeding
5	is being recorded by a court reporter and is
6	also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask
7	you to refrain from any disruptive noises or
8	actions in the hearing room. Please turn off
9	all beepers and cell phones.
10	Does the staff have any
11	preliminary matters?
12	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I've been
14	granted permission to make an announcement.
15	It's kind of a bittersweet meeting. One of
16	the Commissioners is going to be leaving. We
17	were just informed. He's done a lot for the
18	city.
19	I think he has really exemplified
20	himself well. I think he is well respected.
21	I talk to people all the time who say, "I like
22	that person." That person is a great person.

He's a great guy, a nice guy.

I have personally as the Chairman, or even as the Vice Chairman, enjoyed working

-- I'm not sure if I was the Vice Chairman

with this person but I have enjoyed working

with Konrad Schlater who is going to be

leaving. Tonight is his last night. He's

going to be leaving to do bigger and better

things. I'll let him say a few words, however

much he wants to say.

I can tell you from my standpoint
Commissioner Schlater, Vice Chairman, I'm
going to miss you. One of the things I really
enjoyed with you was disagreeing with you so
I'm going to miss that part of it. I'll open
the floor up to you.

VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: We didn't disagree that much, Mr. Chairman, when it came down to it.

Thank you very much for the kind words. It has been a true honor and pleasure to work on this Commission. It's a lot of

1	work but it is good work to be doing. I feel
2	like as a Commission, the five of us here,
3	we've been doing a pretty good job,
4	particularly with the addition of Commissioner
5	Cohen most recently.
6	One of the hardest parts about
7	taking a new position out of state in Chicago
8	is that I have to leave this Commission and
9	will not have the same opportunities to help
10	shape my city. It has been a pleasure to do
11	so. It's been a pleasure to work with you
12	all. I'm sorry I have to cut short my term
13	like this, but thank you very much for this
14	opportunity.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anybody else?
16	Commissioner May.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I would
18	just like to say it's been a pleasure serving
19	with the Vice Chairman. If the Chairman would
20	like, the rest of us could try to disagree
21	with you more.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I was just saying

1	that to try to get a laugh. Actually, he's
2	right. We didn't disagree that much.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm just
4	following your example. Anyway, it was a
5	pleasure working with Vice Chairman Schlater
6	both here and the minimal interaction we had
7	I think even before you joined the Commission.
8	It was a pleasure working with you and I think
9	it's a loss for the city but it's a gain for
10	the city of Chicago, I'm sure. Thanks.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
12	Cohen.
12 13	Cohen. COMMISSIONER COHEN: Yes,
13	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Yes,
13 14	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Yes, Chairman. Thank you. It's been short and
13 14 15	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Yes, Chairman. Thank you. It's been short and sweet but I know that you're committed to some
13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Yes, Chairman. Thank you. It's been short and sweet but I know that you're committed to some of the values that we share including the
13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Yes, Chairman. Thank you. It's been short and sweet but I know that you're committed to some of the values that we share including the development and preservation of affordable
13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Yes, Chairman. Thank you. It's been short and sweet but I know that you're committed to some of the values that we share including the development and preservation of affordable housing so I wish you the very best in your
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Yes, Chairman. Thank you. It's been short and sweet but I know that you're committed to some of the values that we share including the development and preservation of affordable housing so I wish you the very best in your new position in Chicago.

1	to you. We'll miss you. We really will miss
2	you. We've got to break in a rookie now.
3	We've got to have someone else.
4	You're going to a great city,
5	great food, great neighborhood. Baseball's
6	got a problem. You're leaving just when the
7	Nationals are on the rise. No, it's been a
8	pleasure working with you and good luck.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. As we've
10	done in the past, I would like for all of us
11	just to give our colleague who is leaving a
12	round of applause. Again, thank you and it's
13	been a pleasure working with you.
14	Okay. Let's move right into our
15	agenda tonight. What I'm going to do,
16	Commissioners, if it's not a problem, that we
17	move the Consent Calendar item after we take
18	the Final Action item under B under Final
19	Action.
20	Mr. Ritting, I think that's okay
21	to do it in that fashion because we have to
22	deal with the Final Action items before we

1	deal with the Consent Calendar item.
2	Let's go right to Final Action on
3	Zoning Commission Case No. 07-13C. This is
4	Trustees of Corcoran Gallery of Art Two-
5	Year PUD Time Extension at Square 644S.
6	Ms. Schellin.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. If the
8	Commission will recall back to the February
9	13th agenda, the Zoning Commission voted to
10	hold the request this request at abeyance
11	for up to four months.
12	At Exhibit 8 you have an ANC-6D
13	report which rescinded their earlier
14	opposition. This report shows that they voted
15	in support. Then at Exhibit 10 you have a
16	supplemental submittal from the Applicant.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay,
18	Commissioners. You've heard the submissions
19	that we have in front of us. We have a
20	request in front of us. The ANC, I think, as
21	Ms. Schellin already mentioned, that we did
22	hold off because they needed an opportunity to

1	be able to hear from the Applicant in which
2	Exhibit 8 they actually did that.
3	They approved and, additionally,
4	the Commission voted five to zero to one to
5	support the extension not exceeding the two-
6	year time period.
7	Let me open it up for discussion.
8	Any discussion?
9	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Mr. Chairman,
10	it appears that the Applicant made a great
11	effort to meet with the ANC and work with
12	them. I think that is very positive. The
13	only other observation that I have is this
14	particular neighborhood has often come out,
15	and people I know within the neighborhood,
16	they are often complaining about the kids in
17	the neighborhood around the school, public
18	housing projects.
19	So I would just hope the Corcoran
20	would give special attention to maybe reaching
21	out to these kids appear to create problems

for neighbors. I think there are

1	opportunities for this particular project to
2	make the kids more inclusive in their own
3	neighborhood. I just hope that will be taken
4	into consideration during future negotiations
5	with the community.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
7	comments?
8	Commissioner May.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I'm a bit
10	puzzled by this. We have three letters from
11	the ANC. The first was the opposition letter.
12	Then we had the letter in support five to zero
13	to one. Then we have the letter requesting
14	that the record be reopened so that the
15	Commission may properly voice its comments
16	regarding the case.
17	I'm not sure what we would do with
18	that. I would think if we wanted I mean,
19	if the record was open for the ANC to submit
20	their comments now. I mean, we are reading
21	their comments right now and there is really

no substitute. I mean, the only way we could

1	do this would be to defer again considering
2	this and allow the ANC to send us another
3	letter. I mean, am I missing something here?
4	COMMISSIONER COHEN: I guess, Mr.
5	Chairman and colleagues, I interpreted it, and
6	maybe I'm wrong, is that they felt that the
7	record had been closed and they are asking to
8	reopen it to allow this March 16th letter to
9	be considered.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, is that all
11	it is?
12	COMMISSIONER COHEN: That's the
13	way I interpreted it.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
15	COMMISSIONER COHEN: I thought it
16	was just, you know, dotting the i's and
17	crossing the t's.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: We haven't
19	taken it out.
20	COMMISSIONER COHEN: We did
21	earlier. What happened was I think we allowed
22	them an opportunity. I'm not sure if we did

1	it earlier or when we did it but we did allow
2	them an opportune time to respond. That is
3	the second letter.
4	I think what they did, and I don't
5	know if staff informed me if the record was
6	closed, or whatever they did they made sure to
7	request to leave the record open so we can, I
8	guess, deal with Exhibit 8. That is the way
9	I read it.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. The fact
11	that it came after made me think that maybe
12	they were trying to say something more that
13	they hadn't said in their letter. I apologize
14	for any confusion.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: At least that is
16	the way I saw it and I would agree with
17	Commissioner Cohen.
18	Any other comments? Okay. I
19	would move that we grant the request of Zoning
20	Commission Case 0 which one is this? 07-
21	13C. Okay. I'm looking at A. and B. 07-13C
22	which we grant the two-year PUD time extension

1	in Square 644S.
2	I ask for a second.
3	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been
5	moved and properly seconded. Any further
6	discussion? Are you ready for the question?
7	All those in favor aye.
8	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
10	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you please
11	record the vote.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: The staff would
13	record the vote five to zero to zero to
14	approve final action in Zoning Commission Case
15	No. 07-13C. Commissioner Hood moving,
16	Commissioner Cohen seconding, Commissioners
17	May, Schlater, and Turnbull in support.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay,
19	Commissioners. Next is Zoning Commission Case
20	No after we do Zoning Commission Case No.
21	07-18B under Final Action, I then would like
22	to move the Consent Calendar item Zoning

1	Commission Case No. 07-18C right after we do
2	07-18B.
3	Okay. Zoning Commission Case No.
4	07-18B, Jemal's Up Against the Wall two-year
5	PUD time extension at Square 347.
6	Ms. Schellin.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. This is,
8	as you said, a request for a two-year
9	extension to May 14, 2014. At Exhibit 4 there
10	is an OP report that supports this request.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
12	Ms. Schellin. That is Exhibit No. 4. Office
13	of Planning makes that recommendation. It
14	basically says the extension request was
15	served on all parties by the Applicant and all
16	parties are allowed 30 days. It goes on to
17	talk about the different issues. They are
18	recommending that we approve the time
19	extension.
20	Also we have something from the
21	Applicant.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,

1	I was going to say that in their Exhibit 1,
2	Tab D, they talk about the financial
3	implications of the economic turndown. I
4	think that meets the burden of proof after
5	going through it.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
7	Commissioner Cohen.
8	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Thank you,
9	Chairman. I guess my questions or concerns
10	are related to not that I don't believe
11	that they met the burden of proof but when you
12	indicate that you go to certain banks and
13	these banks are banks that may have legal
14	lending limits that don't suit the particular
15	project or may have some credit issues related
16	to the current owner, I mean, I just don't
17	it's a very modest threshold that they have to
18	address.
19	This is the second extension and I
20	just want to say that I would be concerned if
21	this doesn't move ahead in a more timely

manner. If it's not complete in two years, I

1	just don't understand why it can't be because
2	of its location and we are supposedly a very
3	active market. As I said, it's just a
4	question that I have and a concern.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chairman.
6	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: Mr.
7	Chairman, I think we all know that the market,
8	and particularly the office market in the last
9	couple of years has been under great strain.
10	Not too many buildings have gotten going
11	without tenants in place. I think the
12	extension is justified at this time.
13	However, I do agree with
14	Commissioner Cohen that projects do get stale
15	and can only justify so many extensions.
16	Usually we give this speech when we are giving
17	the second extension to a PUD. I'm in
18	concurrence with Commissioner Cohen.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I would
20	agree with all the comments that I've heard.
21	What is significant for me is the second part
22	of this if we get there. I would agree with

1	the comments I've heard from both of my
2	colleagues all of my colleagues.
3	Any other comments or questions?
4	Would someone like to make a motion?
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
6	I would move that we approve Zoning Case No.
7	07-18B, Jemal's Up Against the Wall two-year
8	PUD extension at Square 347 and ask for a
9	second.
10	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: Second.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been
12	moved and properly seconded. Any further
13	discussion? All those in favor aye.
14	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition?
16	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would you
17	please record the vote.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: The staff records
19	the vote five to zero to zero to approve final
20	action in Zoning Commission Case No. 08-18B.
21	Commissioner Turnbull moving, Commissioner
22	Schlater seconding, Commissioners Cohen, Hood,

1	and May in support.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to
3	the Consent Calendar now which is the second
4	part of the request. I think let me do
5	this. Zoning Commission Case No. 07-18C,
6	Jemal's Up Against the Wall minor modification
7	to PUD at Square 347.
8	Ms. Schellin.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The
10	Applicant is requesting to change condition 4
11	which requires the relocation of the Waffle
12	Shop from the PUD site to Square 45 by May 16,
13	2013. They are basically asking that date be
14	changed to May 14, 2014 to coincide with the
15	time extension just granted. There is an OP
16	report at Exhibit 4 that supports the request.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I might have some
18	confusion. I thought they were asking to May
19	16, 2014. I may have it wrong.
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Maybe I wrote it
21	down wrong. Let me check.

MR. RITTING: I believe that's

1	correct. The current deadline is May 16, 2013
2	so it would be another year to 2014.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Which would put
4	them in tandem with the time extension.
5	MR. RITTING: Correct.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we are looking
7	at May 16, 2014.
8	MR. RITTING: Correct.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
10	Commissioners, I'll open it up for discussion.
11	Any discussion?
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
13	I think it's a reasonable request in light of
14	
	the time extension.
15	the time extension. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Especially when
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Especially when
15 16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Especially when you put things together that makes it a lot
15 16 17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Especially when you put things together that makes it a lot easier for those of us well, for those of
15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Especially when you put things together that makes it a lot easier for those of us well, for those of you who may be around whatever date this is.
15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Especially when you put things together that makes it a lot easier for those of us well, for those of you who may be around whatever date this is. Let's go ahead and obtain a motion.

1	requested by the Applicant for the minor
2	modification in 07-18C and ask for a second.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It has been moved
5	and properly seconded. Any further
6	discussion? All those in favor aye.
7	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
9	objections, Ms. Schellin, would you please
10	record the vote. Actually, I meant to mention
11	the correction on the extension of condition
12	No. 4. Hopefully that can be included.
13	Okay. Ms. Schellin, could you
14	please record the vote.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. The staff
16	records the vote five to zero to zero to
17	approve final actions in Zoning Commission
18	Case No. 07-18C, Commissioner Hood moving,
19	Commissioner Cohen seconding, Commissioners
20	May, Schlater and Turnbull in support.
21	I'm sorry, I read the wrong one.
22	Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner

1	Turnbull seconding, Commissioners Cohen, May,
2	and Schlater in support.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
4	Let's go to Proposed Action.
5	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-11F/06-12F,
6	George Washington University 2nd Stage PUD
7	at Square 102. Further Processing will be
8	considered at final action.
9	Ms. Schellin.
10	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. At
11	Exhibits 36 through 39, those are post-hearing
12	submissions from the parties. Exhibit 37 is
13	a response from FEMS regarding who has
14	authority to speak.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's start right
16	off with the authority to speak, as soon as I
17	find it. Okay, Exhibit I have it now. It
18	would be nice when I read it if I would put
19	stuff back in order.
20	Ms. Schellin, should I be reading
21	the first email?
22	MS. SCHELLIN: The first email is

1	the actual response that I received from the
2	chief which was in response to my email to him
3	asking who had the authority to speak on
4	behalf of FEMS since it came up at the
5	hearing.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The captain does
7	not have the authority to offer official
8	comments on behalf of the agency. I just want
9	to make sure. This comes from the chief and
10	I asked for that because we had conflicting
11	reports.
12	The captain I mean, I'm sorry,
13	the Chief Ellerbe has made it clear who I
14	don't know what happens internally but he has
15	made it clear who speaks for the Department.
16	That's at Exhibit 37.
17	Commissioners, as stated, we have
18	a number of items that were submitted,
19	Exhibit 39. I have a draft order in front of
20	us also, some of the requests that we had.
21	I'm looking for one other document. Here it

22

is. Exhibit 36.

And response to some of the actions that we asked for. I guess we can just look at that or if you have anything else that is outstanding, I'll just go ahead an deliberate and talk about that at this point.

I'll open it up. Anyone? Everybody is happy?

No comments? I should really save my breath then. I have a few but I will -- I didn't know how far we wanted to go.

Commissioner Cohen.

COMMISSIONER COHEN: Yes. I have just one observation, one comment. The ANC had made some suggestions earlier about the number of buses from schools as well as senior centers. They actually had a specific number.

I do believe that the museum said they are probably get even fewer buses so I would recommend that we not be specific if there is going to be fewer buses than even the ANC had thought would come to the site. I don't know if anybody else has that recollection.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Can you
2	tell me exactly where you are? Where is that?
3	COMMISSIONER COHEN: "Based on
4	current patterns of the existing location"
5	This is under Exhibit 36 from the Goulston &
6	Storrs. "there are 26 school visits per
7	year and approximately 15 visits from adult
8	senior groups per year." Actually, I think it
9	does match what the ANC had mentioned so I'm
10	actually okay with this. I'm sorry. I may
11	have lent some confusion there.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Actually, what I
13	would like to do, I always I appreciate you
14	bringing that up like to bring up the
15	communities' concerns. We also have a letter
16	from West End Citizen's Association which is
17	Exhibit 38. The first part about the chief
18	has already been addressed.
19	The only other thing I saw that I
20	would address they mention, unfortunately, the
21	Applicant's post-hearing response did not

address BCD. It says, "Trash trucks do not

operate during evening rush hour.

Continuous request for restrictions 1B and C deliveries, especially those with any delivery from right-side doors during the evening rush from 4:00 to 7:00.

During this period of the week we believe the Applicant should require all deliveries to be made on G Street."

I saw that and after I looked at what was requested, recommending alternative bus loading and all that on the G Street side of the museum, I think the plan that we have here in Exhibit 36 from the Applicant at least satisfied me.

I do have a check mark by the Campus Plan Advisory Committee which, Mr. Barber, if you recall, came forward at the hearing and mentioned to me how that was working or what people thought and the ideas about the five five. I don't know if I want to rehash that right now but I do want it to work.

1	I don't know if this is the time
2	to do that but they also say here in what they
3	submitted that, "The University and the ANC
4	are engaged in dialogue regarding the advisory
5	committee and both parties are committed to
6	maintaining the advisory committee as a form
7	for collaborative discussions of campus plan
8	and development issues."
9	I guess from that I can live with
10	that, but if it's not working in the next
11	case if I hear it's not working, then I'm
12	going to start looking at some other measures
13	that need to be done because this is very key
14	to me. This is important.
15	From my standpoint it would make
16	campus plan hearings a lot quicker. Not that
17	I'm trying to get through it but it would make
18	it a lot easier and quicker on all parties
19	involved.
20	Everything else actually what I
21	see in the submission of 36 I'm fine with.

I'll open it up to any more comments. Again,

1	the fire department spoke for themselves.
2	Okay. Anybody like to make a motion?
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
4	I would move that we approve Zoning Case No.
5	06-11F/06-12F, George Washington University
6	2nd Stage PUD at Square 102. Look for a
7	second.
8	COMMISSIONER COHEN: I'll second
9	that.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved
11	and properly seconded. Any further
12	discussion? Are you ready for the question?
13	All those in favor aye.
14	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
16	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you please
17	record the vote.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: I believe
19	Commissioner Schlater did not participate in
20	this case so staff would record the vote four
21	to zero to one to approve proposed action in
22	Zoning Commission Case 06-11F/06-12F.

1	Commissioner Turnbull moving,
2	Commissioner Cohen seconding, Commissioners
3	Hood and May in support. Commissioner
4	Schlater not voting having not participated.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do we no. I
6	was going to ask let's go to Hearing
7	Action. Zoning Commission Case No. 09-05A,
8	United House of Prayer PUD Modification at
9	Square 442.
10	Ms. Brown-Roberts.
11	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes. Good
12	evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the
13	Commission. For the record, I'm Maxine Brown-
14	Roberts representing the Office of Planning.
15	The United House of Prayer request
16	modification to Condition No. 5 of Zoning
17	Commission Order 09-05 which will require the
18	provision of eight affordable units in the
19	development.
20	The Applicant owns a number of
21	buildings within the square that provide
22	housing for seniors and families and state

that following the approval of the PUD the owner took further review of the housing stock and determined that there's a demand for affordable senior and family housing in the neighborhood.

To address the demand, the

Applicant proposes to reduce the number of

affordable units within the PUD from eight to

two units and locate the other six units

within two other of their buildings which are

shown and identified in our report.

In addition, they propose to dedicate an additional 10 affordable units within these buildings thereby increasing the number of affordable units to 18. The application will continue to meet the IZ requirements on the PUD site, conform to all the standards and requirements of the PUD, and will not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Office of Planning has been advised by OAG that the proposed revision to

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Condition No. 5 needs further modification and
2	we will work with the Applicant and OAG to
3	make the necessary changes prior to the public
4	hearing notice.
5	The development will continue
6	sorry. The Office of Planning therefore
7	recommends that the requested modification be
8	set down for public hearing. Thank you, Mr.
9	Chairman.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms.
11	Brown-Roberts.
12	Commissioners, any questions of
13	the Office of Planning?
14	Commissioner Cohen.
15	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Thank you,
16	Chairman.
17	Ms. Brown, are they the units
18	that are being moved to different sites, are
19	those sites currently vacant, those units, or
20	are they just substituted?
21	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Those are
22	properties that are developed, already being

1	developed. They were matter-of-right
2	projects.
3	COMMISSIONER COHEN: So it's not
4	new units that are affordable?
5	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Those units
6	the current units I don't think are designated
7	as affordable.
8	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
10	questions?
11	Vice Chairman Schlater.
12	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: I think
13	that's an important question whether or not
14	they are designated as affordable. There is
15	designated for affordable in the zoning sense.
16	There is matter of right and clearly they are
17	all eligible to be market rate from the zoning
18	standpoint. But if they were financed with
19	tax credits or other affordable housing
20	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No, they were
21	not.
22	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: They

1	weren't?
2	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I specifically
3	asked that question of the Applicant and, no,
4	they were not.
5	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: Okay. Well,
6	in that case, well, the question is will the
7	rents be reduced from what is being currently
8	offered now?
9	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I will have to
10	follow up on that.
11	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: That is
12	basically what will be asked during the
13	hearing and the focus of it. I don't think
14	anybody has any problems with spreading out
15	the affordable units but you want to be making
16	sure that they are actually adding to the
17	affordable housing of the city.
18	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: That's
19	correct.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
21	questions?
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Mr.

1	Chair. I just have one question.
2	Ms. Brown-Roberts, the units that
3	are being moved to the other buildings, are
4	the units being refurbished within those
5	buildings or just providing units, the
6	existing units, or are they being refurbished
7	at all?
8	MS. STEINGASSER: They will be
9	refurbished as part of the shift. They are
10	looking they own several buildings within
11	that block so they are looking at how they can
12	use their proffer and commitment under the PUD
13	in combination with their own mission of the
14	existing buildings to create a more active
15	senior community as well as larger housing for
16	families.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I was just
18	curious whether they are moving into existing
19	units without doing anything.
20	MS. STEINGASSER: They are looking
21	at all three buildings.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

1	Thank you.
2	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: Is this
3	building almost complete? It's under
4	construction?
5	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: It's under
6	construction, yes.
7	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: I think it
8	looks pretty good. I'm happy with it.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner May?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just want to
11	comment that I'm glad to see this coming
12	before us as a modification and not a minor
13	modification because very often the first time
14	we see these things it's a minor modification
15	Then we look at it and say the
16	unit mix is changing or something about the
17	units is changing and we want to see it as a
18	modification. I don't think it's going to be
19	a very contentious issue but I'm just glad to
20	see it come through the right way first time
21	around.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anybody

1	else? I would move that we set down Zoning
2	Commission Case No. 09-05A and ask for a
3	second.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been
6	moved and properly seconded. Any further
7	discussion? All those in favor aye.
8	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
10	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you please
11	record the vote.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: The staff records
13	the vote five to zero to zero to set down
14	Zoning Commission Case No. 09-05A as a
15	contested case. Commissioner Hood moving,
16	Commissioner May seconding, Commissioners
17	Cohen, Schlater, and Turnbull in support.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next is
19	Zoning Commission Case No. 12-03, Asmara, LLC,
20	Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment at
21	Square 5113.

Mr. Jackson.

1	MR. JACKSON: Good evening, Mr.
2	Chairman, and members of the Commission. My
3	name is Arthur Jackson. I'm a development use
4	specialist in the D.C. Office of Planning
5	representing the D.C. Office of Planning's
6	report on this application.
7	While I do my summary, you might
8	reference Exhibit No. 1 in your packet. It
9	shows a lot and it will identify a lot of
10	issues that were raised by this proposal.
11	I'm sorry. Exhibit 1 in the
12	Office of Planning report will actually
13	identify a lot of the issues related to this
14	proposal on that map. The proposed tax lot
15	encompasses nearly 2.5 acres of undeveloped
16	wooded property with no frontage on any public
17	right-of-way.
18	LLC filed an application
19	requesting Zoning Commission approval of a
20	consolidated PUD on this lot on Square 5113
21	with a related zoning map amendment to change

the current zoning from R-5-A to C-2-A.

22

The

proposed development would consist of 100,000 square feet of four-story garage row dwellings, approximately 30,000 square feet of office space, and 15,000 square feet of retail pharmacy.

It's a large proposal and raises several issues besides the lack of public access to public right-of-way. There is existing zoning relief that is requested but not clear what it actually would be for this proposal.

The proposed parking area and vehicular access would be located on properties outside the PUD boundaries on properties that don't appear to be under the control of the Applicant.

The proposal is inconsistent with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan future land use designation of moderate density residential for Square 5113 and inconsistent with the policy map designation of the square but labeled it enhancement area.

NEAL R. GROSS

The current R-5-A zone in the subject property actually is not inconsistent with the moderate density residential designation. In the Office of Planning's report we indicate that the residential component of this proposal could be allowed as a special exception but that was an error. The residential component of this proposal could be allowed as a PUD under the current zoning. The rezoning of properties at C-2-A would be inconsistent with the current land use designation and would not allow commercial uses -- it would allow commercial uses that are inconsistent with the established community character and would create competition for the established commercial corridors along Kenilworth Avenue.

Section 6-641.02 of the District of Columbia official code states that zoning amendments should not be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. Accordingly, the Office of Planning does not support setting

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	down this rezoning petition and PUD
2	application for public hearing.
3	That concludes the Office of
4	Planning's brief summary of our report and we
5	are available to answer questions.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
7	much, Mr. Jackson.
8	First, is the Applicant present?
9	The Applicant in this case?
10	Okay, Commissioners. Any
11	discussion?
12	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Mr. Jackson,
13	you did indicate that you attempted to reach
14	out and meet with them but they have been
15	unresponsive and unavailable?
16	MR. JACKSON: Yes. There was a
17	telephone call, brief conversation, emails.
18	They indicated they wanted to come in and
19	talk. We set a date and a time. They never
20	showed up and we haven't heard anything from
21	them.
22	They just have been the lack of

communication has been -- it's one of the principal reasons we have to make this recommendation because we don't have enough information. It's incomplete. Although some of those issues could be resolved with some communication, the ownership issue really is a principal one.

COMMISSIONER COHEN: I understand that. Plus, I think there are quite a few issues as you mention in your report which I thought was very good. I would agree with the Office of Planning that this is really not right for consideration.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other

comments? I was just wondering if we move

forward with the recommendation, do we deny or

do we dismiss? Okay. I know if we deny, I

think it's so many months or years they have

to come back. I wanted to give them an

opportunity if they wanted to come back.

Maybe they wanted to take Mr. Jackson up on

his open invitation.

1	MR. RITTING: I'm sorry. I missed
2	your question.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just remember
4	sometime before when we had something like
5	this and the issue was whether we deny or
6	dismiss. If, one, we deny I think it's a long
7	period of time that they have to come back.
8	MR. RITTING: Yeah, that I'm
9	sure of the exact wording that you're thinking
10	of but there is language that says deny in the
11	portion of the Zoning Regulations that deal
12	with denial without setting it down and they
13	use the word deny in that section.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank
15	you, Mr. Ritting.
16	Okay, Commissioners. Any other
17	comments?
18	Mr. May.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just had a
20	couple of quick questions. Did I miss
21	something they are not showing in the
22	drawings? Are they not showing the office

1	space that is proposed? Okay. So it's not
2	shown at all.
3	Then the last question I have is
4	there by any chance any paper streets that are
5	existing in the area that somehow they thought
6	might be realized?
7	MR. JACKSON: Not to our
8	understanding. We contacted the Department of
9	Transportation to get clarification about the
10	plans for roads around here but nothing at
11	this point. Although it has been suggested
12	because there is some in attempt to extend
13	Anacostia to intersect Kenilworth but nothing
14	is being worked on that right now.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, okay. I
16	agree with the Office of Planning and
17	Commissioner Cohen. I mean, this is really
18	not a very well developed submission at all.
19	There's really I mean, it needs so much
20	work in so many areas. It's inconsistent with
21	the Comp Plan.

The thinking is not very clear on

1	it. The drawings are so far below the minimum
2	we can't even begin to understand what's
3	intended here. And the fact that there's no
4	ownership of the property, or it's not
5	demonstrated. I mean, it's absolutely
6	astounding.
7	The only question I have is, I
8	mean, we are required to afford them an
9	opportunity to explain why they think this
10	should be set down is simply calling for them
11	to speak tonight if they are not available.
12	Is that sufficient?
13	MR. RITTING: Well, the rule says
14	to give them a reasonable opportunity. I
15	think you've definitely they've had an
16	opportunity to appear tonight and they've had
17	previous opportunities to communicate with the
18	Office of Planning so I think it is sufficient
19	and you can go forward tonight.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: And do we know
21	that they received notice of this meeting

tonight?

1	MS. SCHELLIN: There was an email
2	sent to them through ISIS because this was the
3	first electronically filed case. When I put
4	in the setdown date, an email shot off to them
5	saying, "The case has been scheduled for
6	setdown. You can check the day of to make
7	sure it's still on the agenda." Staff has not
8	heard anything from them.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. For the
10	purposes of completeness of this record, you
11	may want to have a copy of that email that was
12	sent out to them in the record so that we know
13	that, in fact, they received it. Of course,
14	this transcript, too, would be part of that
15	record as well.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Would somebody
17	like to make a motion?
18	Commissioner Cohen.
19	COMMISSIONER COHEN: I move that
20	we dismiss deny Zoning Case No. 12-03,
21	Asmara, LLC Consolidated PUD & Related Map
22	Amendment at Square 5113.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'll second it.
2	It has been moved and properly seconded. Any
3	further discussion? I would just add they did
4	call for the Applicant. I think the
5	Government has done its part. I think the
6	Commission has done their part and I'm
7	definitely going to vote in favor of denying
8	this setdown.
9	It's been moved and properly
10	seconded. Any further discussion? All those
11	in favor.
12	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition of
14	denying the setdown?
15	Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin,
16	would you record the vote?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
18	the vote five to zero to zero to deny setdown
19	in Zoning Commission Case No. 12-03.
20	Commissioner Cohen moving, Commissioner Hood
21	seconding, Commissioners May, Schlater, and
22	Turnbull in support of denial.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next Zoning Commission Case No. 12-04, Office of Planning 2 Map Amendment at Square 5749 & Reservation 3 412. 4 5 Mr. Lawson. 6 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Office of Planning submitted this case on 7 behalf of OPEFM and DPR. This is a case for 8 initial zoning on a piece of land dedicated 9 10 for a re-built Fort Stanton Recreation Center. There is an existing facility on the site 11 The plan is to replace it with a 12 right now. 13 new and improved one. The Applicant has already 14 submitted building permit applications. 15 16 was only at this stage that it was discovered that the land is actually not zoned and that, 17 of course, zoning is required because District 18 19 projects, even if they are on federal land, do require zoning for a building permit to be 20

The project is fully funded and it

reviewed.

21

1	has been reviewed by CFA and HPO already. The
2	project is not inconsistent with the
3	Comprehensive Plan and, in fact, there is
4	specific language in the Comprehensive Plan to
5	upgrade these specific facilities.
6	I should note that in the Office
7	of Planning Report we provided the description
8	of the property. The description of the
9	property actually should include a portion of
10	one more square, that portion of Square 5818
11	that was part of the transferring as part
12	of the site. It includes Square 5749, that
13	portion of the reservation 412, as well as
14	that portion of Square 5818.
15	With that, I'll be happy to answer
16	any questions. Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
18	much, Mr. Lawson.
19	Commissioners, any questions of
20	the Office of Planning? I think it's pretty
21	straightforward. Let me just say this,
22	though. Any objections to waive the rules for

1	late submissions? We have a request in front
2	of us. No objections. Any questions of the
3	Office of Planning?
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just have
5	one. Do you know whether OPEFM or the Office
6	of Planning I guess maybe you might have
7	have had any what kind of discussions
8	they've had with National Capital Parks East
9	and their staff? That is the land that
10	surrounds this site.
11	MR. LAWSON: Absolutely. That's a
12	question we hope to get resolved before the
13	hearing. This all came fairly quickly and I
14	didn't have a chance for a lot of conversation
15	but that's a good question. We'll make sure
16	to answer that at the hearing.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Just to know.
18	I can't imagine there are any issues because
19	this has been happening in multiple sites
20	across the city. It's always good to know
21	that it's been discussed and that there are no

22

complications.

1	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: How about
2	the community? Have they been involved in the
3	planning process for the new facility?
4	MR. LAWSON: That's also a
5	question that I will have to get resolved with
6	the Applicant. I'll have to find out what
7	level of discussions have happened.
8	As I said, it has gone through the
9	Historic Preservation and CFA processes so
10	there may have been some consultations as part
11	of that. Typically with the recreation center
12	there is some level of discussion. I just
13	have to find out exactly what level that was.
14	We can get that to you certainly before the
15	hearing.
16	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: It's not for
17	me to say anymore but if the community hasn't
18	been properly consulted through the process,
19	the Applicant shouldn't be surprised if they
20	get stopped in their tracks.
21	MR. LAWSON: Right. Of course, in
22	this case they weren't stopped in their tracks

1	by the community. They were stopped in their
2	tracks by DCRA.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
4	comments? I would agree with Vice Chairman
5	Schlater. It's going to be a very unfriendly
6	hearing, I can tell you that now. Okay. Any
7	other comments? Okay.
8	We also, Mr. Lawson, have a
9	request for emergency action. Did you want to
10	comment on that?
11	MR. LAWSON: Yes. They are hoping
12	to move forward with this facility as soon as
13	possible. They have submitted building permit
14	applications. Those applications have
15	actually already been partially reviewed.
16	They are getting down to the level of dealing
17	with zoning and code issues right now.
18	They would like to be able to
19	proceed with those reviews and establishing
20	the emergency zoning would assist in DCRA
21	being able to move forward with their review.

It's not an enormous recreation

1	facility but it is obviously pretty complex
2	and it will take some time to go through the
3	DCRA review process. This would facilitate
4	that review. As far as I know there is no
5	plan to start construction or anything before
6	a hearing has happened.
7	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: What would
8	happen if we approved on emergency this map
9	amendment which gave them the zoning
10	necessary? If the building permit were
11	approved and then we went through the process
12	for the permanent map amendment and we found
13	there were problems with the building, would
14	they have the rights with that building permit
15	to move forward?
16	MR. LAWSON: We have already
17	fairly much determined that there aren't
18	problems with the building because the
19	building
20	VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: We don't
21	know if the community has weighed in on that
22	MS. STEINGASSER: In order to

appear before the Historic Preservation Review
Board, ANC notice is required under the ANC
act so we do know at least that level of
community involvement has happened and notice.
VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: Okay. I
guess I would just be concerned. You'll have
to take it from our perspective; we know
nothing about this project. We are being
asked to change the zoning on a parcel so that
the project can move forward. With this
action we are going to approve the granting of
a building permit that cannot be then
rescinded.
MS. STEINGASSER: If the building
permit is not consistent with the zoning, then
they would have to come back and request
variances simultaneously with the
VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: Presumably
they are only asking for the map amendment
because that is all they need to get their
II

MS. STEINGASSER: But there is

nothing to imply that your action on an emergency basis would grant them anything beyond matter-of-right so no variances or anything like that.

VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: I think I

understand that. I'm just saying if we were
to be surprised at the hearing with some
opposition to the project, there is nothing we
could do to take back that building permit.
Correct?

MR. LAWSON: Again, I would just note that this is a direct -- the action to replace the facility is a direct action from the Comprehensive Plan which was also a very public process. This recreation center was identified for replacement through that process.

This is really just fulfilling the direction that came from the community through the Comprehensive Plan as well. I don't think there are any surprises this facility is being replaced.

tend to agree. I mean, I think the notice about replacing recreation centers is a very well discussed topic within any individual neighborhood. It's unfortunate that this one got missed because I recall when this first started happening a long time ago, it was probably eight or 10 years ago, when there was an emergency amendment to allow the first rec. centers to get rebuilt.

In this circumstance it's actually the kinds of concerns you might have because of the physical circumstance I don't think are likely to exist. It's surrounded by other park land so it's not like it's going to be a case of over-building on a constrained city block which is one of the concerns that we had in that original case so many years ago.

I think this is a fairly safe move in this circumstance. I think I would be very surprised if had significant objection to the fact of redoing the rec. center. There may be

1 concerns about does it have all the right stuff. Those are the sort of questions we 2 might wind up hearing and not being able to 3 4 answer. 5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: One of those rec. 6 centers was Turkey Thicket. I know a lot of 7 people had issues with that lot occupancy. It's unfortunate that it was a missed 8 opportunity because it still should have had 9 some more coverage from the lot. 10 Be that as it may, it's working. 11 The neighborhood was very happy. Some of the 12 13 folks who complained were some of the main users of the rec. center. I know because I'm 14 down there. I don't have a problem moving 15 16 forward with this and also granting the emergency. Any other discussion? 17 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 18 Yes, Mr. 19 Chair. I have a point of clarification. the map that we received it shows the site as 20 olive green and then you had a little piece of 21

Does the other part that's olive green

418.

1	also going to become R5 or has that remained
2	unzoned?
3	MR. LAWSON: The rest of the land
4	is all MPS land but the lighter color green
5	would all remain unzoned.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, but
7	there's a part of the you've got the thing
8	marked "site" and there's a line but the piece
9	on the other side of the line is that not part
10	of the site?
11	MR. LAWSON: If I'm understanding
12	the question, that is actually the additional
13	land that I mentioned in Square 5818 that
14	would be part of that is part of the site
15	and would be part of the action.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I
17	understand. I'm sorry. Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay,
19	Commissioners. Any other discussion? Then I
20	would move that we setdown Zoning Commission
21	Case No. 12-04 and also grant the emergency
22	action as requested and waive the rules. I

1	would ask for a second.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second. Mr.
3	Chairman, can I ask one question before we
4	vote?
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It's been
б	moved and properly seconded. Any further
7	discussion? Mr. May.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. Ms.
9	Schellin, do you have any idea when this case
10	will be heard? How quickly?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: At the very
12	earliest September.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do we have a
14	Wednesday when we can do this?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: We always have
16	Wednesdays.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, but are
18	there other hearings that we're having that
19	are going to be short that we could double up?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: If we can find one
21	in September we will.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Is there time

1	to do it in July?
2	MS. SCHELLIN: I don't think we
3	have anything in July that can be doubled up.
4	It's mainly the Southwest Waterfront case.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would not
6	object to doing a hearing on a different
7	night. Wednesdays are wide open in the
8	summer. Tuesdays are the problem.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Tuesdays? Do we
10	have a Tuesday?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: We need lots of
12	Tuesdays.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would be find
15	with doing a short hearing on a Wednesday in
16	July just because we don't want if we need
17	to consider this quickly, we should act
18	quickly rather than waiting three months.
19	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Mr. Chairman,
20	I also agree with Commissioner May. How long
21	will it take to actually do the improvements
22	because, again, they want to get it ready for

the summer as well.

MR. LAWSON: I'm not sure exactly what their construction phasing is. Again, we can get a bit more information on that for the hearing. We do anticipate that this hearing will be fairly short and concise. We are perfectly comfortable with this case being doubled up with another case.

Potentially even one of the

Southeast Federal Center ones, although -
Southwest Waterfront, sorry. I'm getting my

waterfronts mixed up. We would be comfortable

with doubling them up. We could also work

with the Office of Zoning.

We can get a bit more information from -- we can have more discussions with the Applicant to find out the level of community involvement in the planning so that we can have a better sense of what we might expect at the hearing and if it's determined that this could be a very short hearing doubling this up we'd be comfortable with.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. If we
2	could, let's just leave it up to staff to see
3	whether it would be a Wednesday night. I
4	think they've heard it loud and clear with
5	Office of Planning to try to move this as fast
6	as possible.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Is the Commission
8	willing to double up with one of the Southwest
9	Waterfront cases?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: I would prefer
11	that we not.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: That's what I
13	thought.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Just because I
15	think we're going to need every minute for
16	those.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm worried
19	about getting all of them in. I would rather
20	do a Wednesday.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: All right. We'll
22	work it out.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, I
2	really think it's going to be a short short
3	hearing.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Wednesday or
5	Tuesday, either one of those days works well.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think it
7	would be short enough that even a Tuesday
8	wouldn't be a problem. Do you want to start
9	at 8:30 or 9:00?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: On a Tuesday?
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. That
12	won't interfere with my volley ball game.
13	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Why don't we
14	start it when it gets dark like at 9:30.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Why don't we start
16	it tonight and then we can go ahead and finish
17	it.
18	Okay. We'll go ahead and leave it
19	up to staff to come up with a Wednesday. I
20	was just joking about Tuesday. I'm just
21	trying to get a Peter. It's been moved and
22	properly seconded. No more discussion I don't

1	believe. All those in favor aye.
2	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any objections?
4	No objections, so ordered.
5	Ms. Schellin, would you record the
6	vote.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff would
8	record the vote five to zero to zero to set
9	down Zoning Commission Case No. 12-04
10	including taking emergency action.
11	Commissioner Hood moving,
12	Commission May seconding, Commissioners Cohen,
13	Schlater, and Turnbull in support. Staff is
14	unsure whether this is going to be considered
15	a rulemaking or a contested case since it's
16	one property. I don't know. It's up to the
17	Commission.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Whether it's a
19	rulemaking or contested case, Mr. Ritting, how
20	should we
21	MR. RITTING: I think given that
22	you are taking emergency action and the

1	established process for doing that is to issue
2	a notice of emergency rulemaking so this
3	should be a rulemaking case.
4	Your rules authorize to hear map
5	amendment cases as rulemakings when they are
6	initiated by public agencies such as this one
7	so I think that is the course of action that
8	I would recommend.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We've heard
10	the recommendation, Commissioners. Any
11	objections?
12	Okay. We will accept that
	onay. We will decept that
13	recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Ritting.
13	recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Ritting.
13 14	recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Ritting. Okay. I'm going to move the
13 14 15	recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Ritting. Okay. I'm going to move the agenda around just a little bit. I'm going to
13 14 15 16	recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Ritting. Okay. I'm going to move the agenda around just a little bit. I'm going to do the ZRR, the letter from Council Member
13 14 15 16 17	recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Ritting. Okay. I'm going to move the agenda around just a little bit. I'm going to do the ZRR, the letter from Council Member Brown, the ZRR last, the update of the
13 14 15 16 17	recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Ritting. Okay. I'm going to move the agenda around just a little bit. I'm going to do the ZRR, the letter from Council Member Brown, the ZRR last, the update of the process. We'll do all that last.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Ritting. Okay. I'm going to move the agenda around just a little bit. I'm going to do the ZRR, the letter from Council Member Brown, the ZRR last, the update of the process. We'll do all that last. I'm going to ask Mr. Lewis Brown,

1	thank him for coming down this evening to give
2	us a presentation on the new First Source Law
3	here in the District of Columbia.
4	Any chair you want. Thank you,
5	again, Mr. Brown, for coming down and giving
6	us a brief presentation on First Source.
7	MR. BROWN: Okay. All right.
8	Good evening. My name is Lewis Brown. I'm
9	the Associate Director of the D.C. Office of
10	Apprenticeship. Recently I was given
11	responsibility to oversee the Office of First
12	Source. I appreciate being asked to come down
13	to go over the new First Source Law.
14	The new First Source Law is on
15	Bill 19-50 which is known as the Work Force
16	Intermediary Establishment and Reform of the
17	First Source Amendment Act of 2011 which was
18	signed December 2011 by the Mayor. The law
19	took effect February 24, 2012. It is
20	currently in effect.
21	The initial First Source Law was
22	established in 1984. There have been there

are some significant changes. The initial law had a dollar amount of \$100,000 or more where contractors would have to hire 51 percent of new hires -- D.C. residents as new hires.

The First Source Law has been an issue in terms of how people wanted to look at it and as far as District residents being employed or having employment opportunities on projects, particularly construction and renovation projects that are being financed by or receiving District government assistance, financial or otherwise.

In the new law the dollar amount will change from \$100,000 to \$300,000 and above. It still will have 51 percent new hires from the dollar amount of \$300,000 until it reaches contracts that are \$5 million or more.

Contracts or projects for construction that receive \$5 million or more will require contractors, prime contractors and subcontractors, to employee 20 percent of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	journey workers employed journey worker
2	hours performed, I should say, shall be D.C.
3	residents.
4	Sixty percent of apprenticeship
5	hours will require the employment of District
6	residents. Fifty-one percent of skilled
7	laborer hours must be D.C. resident. Seventy
8	percent of common labor hours employed on
9	those projects must be D.C. residents.
10	That is what is very significant
11	because you are looking at real actual
12	percentage of District residents across the
13	board in all of the classification of workers.
14	As far as apprenticeship, there
15	is, or has been, a mandatory requirement for
16	apprenticeship. That was a law that was
17	passed in 1978 that required prime contractors
18	or subcontractors whose contract amount is
19	\$500,000 or more will be required to register
20	in an apprenticeship program.
21	From 1978 until 2004 there was no
22	there was no requirement or nothing stated

in that law requiring District residents. It was the assumption or the intent that apprenticeship opportunities will be available for District residents.

In many cases it did provide apprenticeship opportunities for District residents but there are a number of contractors who pushed back and looked at the law literally and said, "Well, there is nothing in the law that says you have to have D.C. residents.

We are complying. We do have a registered apprenticeship program we want to give our initial workers, or existing workers, apprenticeship opportunities, but when we get more work we will eventually hire a District resident.

While I was enraged by the pushback or those contracts circumventing the law,
I knew what the game was. Fortunately,
Council Member David Catania amended the
mandatory apprenticeship law that required 35

percent of apprenticeship hours performed -35 percent of apprenticeship hours must be
performed by a District resident on a tradeby-trade basis.

I have to say virtually overnight that law worked. Not only did that law meet the 35 percent but it exceeded it. There has been a range of anywhere between 48 to 92 percent of District residents employed as apprentices on these projects. But it did leave a gap in the other classification of workers such as skilled laborers, common laborers, and journey workers.

I was particularly troubled by skilled laborers and common laborers where there were so few District residents. I would see as many -- my staff and I would see as many as 30 skilled laborers or 20 common laborers, or unskilled laborers, and maybe one and, in some cases, no District residents in those classifications.

I think Council Member Michael

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Brown looked at this law. He decided we are going to cover all of the classifications of workers. That is why this law is in effect.

I think you'll see a significant number of District residents in all the classifications of workers in the construction trade employed on these projects.

Also with the apprenticeship law there was a five percent penalty fine for those contractors who failed to comply with employing 35 percent or more of district residents. I'm happy to say that my office collected over \$100,000 in those monetary fines for those contracts.

It applied to both union and nonunion contractors who did not comply with the law. The unions aren't exempt with their signatory contracts. They by no means are exempt from complying with the law. There is no finger pointing where the union is saying, "Well, the contractor bid on the work."

The contractor said, "Well, the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

unions are the ones whose supply us with our workers including D.C. residents." My position is you both are at fault. The contractor -- you know, if you can't convince your unions, who you are signatory to, to provide you with more District residents, you have to ask yourself a couple of questions.

asset or liability because you're going to pay that fine. Well, you know, the unions have worked very, very well with us across the board and we are seeing significant headway in the number of District residents being accepted as apprentices with the unions. As well as non-unions hiring District residents as apprentices.

The new first law also includes a monetary fine of 5 percent, but it also includes debarment of contracts who have failed to comply. I have no problems with the employers being debarred from District government assisted projects if they fail to

NEAL R. GROSS

comply with hiring of District residents as apprentices or any of the other classification of workers.

During the bidding process the contractors will have to submit an employment plan that outlines a strategy of meeting local hiring requirements which will be evaluated by the agencies that are overseeing the bids or reviewing the bids. It could be worth up to 10 percent of the overall bid score.

The bid will -- the law will also require the bidders to submit a prior practices of hiring District residents for the past three projects or meeting those goals.

What could be beneficial of the contractor's bidding there is a rollover of hours.

If contractors exceeded the percentages on prior projects, they will receive another 10 percent of credit on the next projects. Those are some of the significant changes.

There is also a change where

NEAL R. GROSS

contractors can receive double count of hours percentages if they hire to employ residents who are ex-offenders or residents who have been on some public assistance that can be verified by the District government including DOES. They can receive a 15 percent credit for employing hard-to-employ residents.

When the contractors are submitting bids, they also must submit not only their past hiring practice but also status of any Davis-Bacon issues that they've had. District Government projects that receive District monies of \$2,000 or more are subject to federal Davis-Bacon law.

If they have any pending -- if any contracts have any pending Davis-Bacon issues on prior projects whether they are federal projects or projects in other jurisdictions under the federal Davis-Bacon law could be problematic for those contractors.

My office, the apprenticeship office, myself and my staff, we do have the

NEAL R. GROSS

expertise in reviewing certified payroll records. We also have the authority by the U.S. Department of Labor-Wage and Hour to enforce the Davis-Bacon law and to request the withholding of fines -- I'm sorry, not withholding of fines -- withhold of payments to those contractors until those Davis-Bacon issues are resolved.

If they are not resolved we will simply submit that issue to the Department of Labor. They will take a much harsh course than we would. That would be automatic debarment from any federal Davis-Bacon project for those contractors so they would rather work with my office than for us to submit to turn that issue over to the Department of Labor.

Contractors will have to provide us with an ongoing report of the projects of new positions that are created through attrition. They would have to provide a projection of workers when they submit their

NEAL R. GROSS

1	bids, projection of the number of hours that
2	would be performed by journey workers and the
3	number of hours that would be performed by
4	District residents along with the other
5	classification of workers. That is pretty
6	much it.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Brown, I want
8	to first of all thank you for coming down.
9	I'm sure we have a few questions but we won't
10	hold you long.
11	MR. BROWN: No problem.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have a few
13	questions.
14	Would you like to start off,
15	Commissioner Cohen?
16	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Thank you. I
17	do have a few questions. Your definition for
18	new hires, it sounds to me like these
19	positions could be just one-off positions. In
20	other words, when the job is complete, then
21	that person has to look for another position.
22	However, are these positions

sustainable? In other words, your new hires and District residents, do they get employed job after job?

MR. BROWN: Well, as far as new hires, the way the First Source Law was created when employers are hiring new workers, whatever number of new workers they plan to hire, 51 percent of that must be D.C. residents.

We are required to also monitor the training activity. Not only just the job site but also the school as far as the required related instruction. We also conduct compliance reviews. Compliance reviews are a procedure that is like an audit where companies have five or more apprentices registered. They are conducted once a year for each apprenticeship sponsor that has five or more apprentices registered. We are almost at 40 percent of the apprentices registered are D.C. residents.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: How about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	women in apprenticeships?
2	MR. BROWN: That's a tough one.
3	Not a very good percentage.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I've
5	walked job sites and I'll see some women
6	painters. I'll see a few electricians. Then
7	it kind of peters out.
8	COMMISSIONER COHEN: The painter's
9	union likes women because they are very neat.
10	Seriously. That's what I've been told.
11	MR. BROWN: Women who pursue
12	apprenticeship in the trade areas, that is a
13	group that really are on a mission. That's
14	what they want to do. As much as we do
15	outreach through women organizations,
16	opportunity for women and women in trades,
17	most of the women are looking for areas that
18	are traditionally in the woman area as far as
19	construction.
20	The women who chose construction
21	they thought through on this and this is what
22	they want to do and succeed in it. I would

1	say the percentage of women may be around 10
2	percent or so, something like that.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
4	Thank you.
5	MR. BROWN: If that.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Brown, let me
7	change the subject a little bit and you can
8	help me if I'm not understanding the
9	apprenticeship. I understand that Tom Blanton
10	and all the guys do. I know all about what
11	they do.
12	My issue for the First Source is
13	something I brought up some years ago on the
14	Commission. On the Commission we have what is
15	called a Planned Unit Development. I was
16	raising the issue from the dias, and this was
17	under the former Chairman Cropp, the
18	chairperson of the council.
19	That was one of the things we were
20	really driving, Chairperson Mitten and myself,
21	and other Commissioners at the time. One of

the things that it seems as though, we got the

1	report sometime back, I guess in the early
2	2000's, that the first source agreement was a
3	joke.
4	Developers would come into DOES
5	and getting that agreement signed. I don't
6	know if you've seen one yet but getting an
7	agreement signed with the PUD, Planned Unit
8	Development, and it wasn't happening.
9	At that time I asked the Office of
10	Planning to give me a report. What we had as
11	far as the First Source was we had three
12	percent of qualified employees that are
13	District residents so we started trying to
14	work on that and we started trying to hold
15	these developers and applicants' feet to the
16	fire.
17	I guess the question is what are
18	we doing to enforce it? We've had meetings
19	with your predecessors. You said you just got
20	First Source.
21	MR. BROWN: My leg and my arm and
22	everything was twisted. It's not something I

1	jumped up in the air and said I wanted to do
2	it. The director asked me to do it and I
3	agreed. I will support her efforts with DOES.
4	After being asked several times I agreed.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: My issue is
6	important. I know it's going to take you time
7	but it's important. When people come down and
8	proffer and make offers to us about their
9	interest and agreement, more happens than just
10	what happened in the past. I think DOES at
11	the time I can't thin of the former
12	director's name, a lady.
13	MR. BROWN: Susan Gilbert.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Gilbert. Is
15	she still here?
16	MR. BROWN: No, she retired a
17	couple of years ago.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just because she
19	retired I want the program to retire because
20	we need to move that thing forward. We need
21	to move that piece forward because this is
22	very important to the residents who are

looking for jobs in the city.

When applicant's come down -- I
will follow up and do whatever we need to do
-- when applicant's come down and present us
with the DOES signed agreement of First
Source.

More needs to happen when they leave out the room and that is the end of it.

I'm going to tell you, the word out there is that it's a joke.

Here's what we need to do and I'm going to ask the Office of Zoning and the Office of Planning, and I'm also gong to talk to the Deputy Mayor myself personally. I'm going to ask because here is the thing. I don't know how my colleagues feel but we accept these proffers.

We give people some credit, I guess is the word I want to use, so when they come down before us and as soon as they walk out the door nothing ever happens. So what needs to happen is a coordinated effort.

NEAL R. GROSS

Mr. Brown, you just got on board with the First Source. You definitely know the apprenticeship piece of it but with the new law our office will explain the Planned Unit Developments, how that whole process is done along with Ms. Steingasser and others so we can make sure that something is actually happening once they leave out the door.

MR. BROWN: Absolutely. What I liked about the agencies that I mentioned,
OPEFM, now a lot of those officials are under the umbrella of the Department of General
Services, they worked hand-and-glove with my office on the apprenticeship side to withhold money, to take action.

There were issues of noncompliance or hiring compliance. The prime contract along with their subs, those contractors that were subject to any violations or had issues, all had to come before the agencies that oversaw that project and the issues were spelled out.

NEAL R. GROSS

They were put on notice, "You're not getting anymore money until the Apprenticeship Office gives us the okay that they are satisfied with taking corrective action."

Whether it's restitution or you're hiring additional residents in this case would apply to the other classification of workers whether they are skilled laborers, common laborers, or what have you. I was frustrated prior to this new law seeing the apprenticeship numbers being met or exceeded, but that was the only thing that was really riding or carrying the number of residents.

That's because something had to be put in place to penalize these contractors.

Now with this new law it's \$5 million for a project. Now, this doesn't mean \$5 million for each contract. This is for the entire project so every subcontractor for that \$5 million project, or more, have to conform or comply with those percentages in those

NEAL R. GROSS

1	classifications of workers.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Here's what we're
3	going to do.
4	MR. BROWN: Not to cut you off,
5	but if we see just like we worked with
6	those other agencies to force those contracts
7	to come into compliance. I don't tell Office
8	of Planning what ammunition you all have to
9	withhold money or to cut them off for any
10	zoning
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me say this,
12	Mr. Brown. Not to cut you all but I've been
13	doing this awhile. We're going to get to the
14	bare bones and we're going to get it done.
15	That's the whole thing. Like with your
16	predecessors I told them let's just get it
17	done.
18	MR. BROWN: Sure.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: There is a
20	mechanism where we can explain what our
21	process is. I think it's very beneficial. I
22	think this administration deserves it and it's

1	out there to be done so we need to find out
2	what the process is from our standpoint, work
3	with your office and make sure those
4	agreements when they come down here and flash
5	them in front of us that something is being
6	done once they walk out the door.
7	MR. BROWN: Absolutely.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: A few more
9	questions and then we're going to cut it off.
10	COMMISSIONER COHEN: I'm sorry.
11	I'm just being the contrary in here. I
12	believe the reason why First Source does not
13	work happens to be that the District of
14	Columbia has had a very inferior education
15	program and it hasn't had the technical
16	schools. Now Phillips, I believe, has come
17	back online.
18	We have a population of people who
19	are unprepared for the first hires program.
20	I think to make this a more successful
21	venture, not only do we need to have Mr. Brown
22	but we need to have the people who are working

1 on pre-apprenticeship, pre-training programs, addiction programs, Show Up To Work programs. 2 I don't think it's the 3 4 contractors. They want the workers. want good workers. The problem is we don't 5 6 necessarily have many workers who show up who 7 are prepared for their jobs and that is a big problem that I think we all face. 8 I've been in this business for 40 9 10 years and that still isn't being corrected. The mayor has realized it and he wants 11 technical training introduced into the city so 12 that we can get people ready for jobs. 13 is an important step that we should not 14 overlook. 15 16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just say I prefaced my comments, Commissioner 17 this. Cohen, with 3 percent qualified. I know there 18 19 are other tools in the tool box that need to take place. What I'm saying is when we sit 20 here until 11:30 and quarter to 12:00 at night 21

and people come down here and make all these

1	offers to us and we sit here and say, "Oh,
2	okay. Accepted." And that's the end of it.
3	All I'm just saying is I want some
4	action after it's all done. That's what wrong
5	with us now. We sit down here and once it
6	goes out the door we done with it. I will
7	tell you I've done it. Ten years ago I did
8	the same thing and I'm bringing the issue back
9	up again. I know there are some other issues.
10	I'm discounting that. What I'm
11	saying is if everybody just does a little
12	piece of it, then maybe we can try to all get
13	together and work it out. I'm doing the piece
14	from the Zoning Commission.
15	I can't go out there and have a
16	class on Come To Work. I have enough of that
17	on my own job. I can't go out and do all
18	these other things but I can do the piece that
19	I took the oath to do and that's from the
20	Zoning Commission standpoint.
21	Now, Mr. Brown. Sorry to cut you
22	off.

1	MR. BROWN: I disagree with you
2	where you said District residents aren't
3	qualified or contractors are not at fault. I
4	have to disagree with you on that. Yes, you
5	do have some residents who if given an
6	opportunity they don't follow through. So
7	does Maryland and so does Virginia but
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So does the
9	federal government and everybody.
10	MR. BROWN: Absolutely. Listening
11	to you it's across the board that our kids
12	aren't properly educated or
13	COMMISSIONER COHEN: Excuse me. I
14	have to say you're misinterpreting what I'm
15	saying because I do not disrespect the people.
16	I disrespect the government that hasn't served
17	them.
18	MR. BROWN: Also I disagree.
19	There are contractors who I've had to really
20	lock horns and bump heads to force them to
21	hire D.C. residents. I've been out there by
22	myself toe-to-toe with some of the largest

1	contractors in the city
2	COMMISSIONER COHEN: And I respect
3	you.
4	MR. BROWN: and brought them to
5	the table. That's one of the reasons Council
6	Member David Catania changed the law because
7	of the actions that I took by myself.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm glad to hear
9	that. I think we're on the same page.
10	MR. BROWN: Sure.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think from our
12	standpoint you learn what we're doing and we
13	learn what you're doing and then that
14	connection because I'm going to be asking the
15	Office of Planning in a couple of months, six
16	or eight months. I don't want to have the
17	number and this predates you. I don't want to
18	have 3 percent qualified. I want us to work
19	on it. I've asked DOES I've asked
20	applicants to come down and say, "Look, are
21	you working with DOES to make sure that we

NEAL R. GROSS

have a qualified pool?" Do that up front.

1	Anyway, I'm going to leave that up
2	to Ms. Schellin, the Office of Planning, and
3	yourself, Mr. Brown. I really appreciate it.
4	It sounds like we're well on the way. We just
5	need to make it happen.
6	MR. BROWN: Right. I just need
7	support. If I see something that is non-
8	compliant, I don't want to see the same
9	contracts get another project. I want to see
10	contracts debarred and I want to see them
11	fined if they don't comply with the law.
1.0	
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We can't fine them
13	but I can tell you when they come back down
13	but I can tell you when they come back down
13 14	but I can tell you when they come back down here for another project and they proffer
13 14 15	but I can tell you when they come back down here for another project and they proffer that
13 14 15 16	but I can tell you when they come back down here for another project and they proffer that MR. BROWN: Whatever needs to be
13 14 15 16 17	but I can tell you when they come back down here for another project and they proffer that MR. BROWN: Whatever needs to be done. That's good.
13 14 15 16 17	but I can tell you when they come back down here for another project and they proffer that MR. BROWN: Whatever needs to be done. That's good. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I really
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	but I can tell you when they come back down here for another project and they proffer that MR. BROWN: Whatever needs to be done. That's good. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I really want to thank you. It sounds like we are well

1 what our process is and what goes over to DOES 2 and we'll go from that point. Maybe Alan and others and Ms. Steingasser can work with you 3 4 on that. 5 MR. BROWN: No problem. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Mr. Brown. 6 7 Thank you very much. We appreciate you coming down. 8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Is that it? 9 10 Just joking. We are going to go to the ZRR. Let's go to the correspondence first. 11 dress code will be real easy. From this point 12 13 on let me just do that. Marcie wants to talk about the dress code. The dress code from 14 this point on is relaxed. 15 16 Gentlemen, you can take your ties off if you want to. Come in with your short-17 sleeve shirts. We're not looking for any 18 19 ties. I guess if we can get the word out hopefully. We just come in relaxed in shorts 20 because when it gets 90 degrees it's kind of 21

hot sitting up here with a tie on and your

shirt all tight and sweating.

That goes for not just the Zoning
Commission members but the Office of Planning
and Office of Zoning, as well as the Office of
the Attorney General, and as well to people
who come down and present in front of us.
Hopefully they are watching this. I'm sure
they don't have anything to do tonight but to
watch the Zoning Commission meeting.

We're not going to be much longer.

Let's talk about this correspondence letter

from Council Member Brown.

Ms. Schellin.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. The letter that was addressed to Chairman Hood was received in the office on April 30th. That was the last meeting we had but it didn't allow time for the Commission to read and be able to prepare a response or for OP if they needed to weigh in either. Staff put it on tonight's agenda for the Commission to consider.

1	Behind that from Greater Greater
2	Washington David Alpert actually provided a
3	response also because of the letter that was
4	written.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I
6	appreciate everyone responding including Mr.
7	Alpert but we are capable of responding
8	ourselves, which we did. I'll just read
9	excerpts.
10	"Dear Council Member Brown, I am
11	in receipt of your letter dated April 25,
12	2012, regarding the above-referenced matter.
13	The Zoning Commission will take your concerns
14	into consideration as it moves forward with
15	this docket.
16	We are well aware of the community
17	concerns and will ensure that the public
18	hearing process will provide a forum for all
19	members of the public to share their issues
20	with the Zoning Commission.
21	Unfortunately, I cannot address
22	the specific zoning issues cited in your

letter since the Commission has not publicly deliberated on any of these issues other than to provide general guidance to the Office of Planning.

I would, therefore, suggest that you contact the Office of Planning concerning these questions. If you have any questions that require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. Sincerely, Anthony J. Hood."

That was the response. I will tell you there is a buzz going around and I'm hearing it from all sides, everyone. I heard it at the D.C. Value dinner the other night. I'm hearing a lot of the way we move forward with the ZRR.

It's not just from the community
but from the people that use this took all the
way around, or that's in this process all the
way around. I have a few questions that I
want to ask the Office of Planning to get this
started, this discussion. I'm getting older

1	so I have to write things down and email them
2	and everything else.
3	Ms. Steingasser, what were the
4	guidelines when the task force was first
5	established?
6	MS. STEINGASSER: Well, the task
7	force was established to create an interface
8	between the Office of Planning as we work
9	forward with certain proposals and stakeholder
10	groups.
11	Every ward had a council. Several
12	interest groups including DCBIA who, by the
13	way, is one of our most involved
14	representatives on the task force. I would
15	say he is probably one of the top three
16	individuals who participates.
17	We've also spoken directly with
18	DCBIA on several occasions with relevant
19	issues. We've also had the American Institute
20	of Architects, the Federation of Citizen's
21	Association, Committee of 100. There is the

Federation of Citizen's Association and the

Association of Civic Groups. Both of those have had representatives.

We tried to do a broad base of stakeholder representation. On average we have about a 30 percent representation at the meetings. We have also had, of course, the work groups which the task force also served on. Our expectation of them was that they would take the different ideas back to their stakeholders and then bring their representative comments back.

With these other two questions. You can answer these at the same time. What is the mechanism to allow nonmembers to speak at task force meetings and how is the attendance at the task force meetings been? I know we did an update some months back, or maybe some years back.

I can't remember now but I know then we did -- I think all of us went to a meeting to try to engage and bring back the

NEAL R. GROSS

spirit of what the task force was created to do.

Apparently, from what I've been advised by a number of people, the attendance is back where it was prior to us having that meeting. What has the attendance been like and how are people who are not on the task force or who want to be a part, how are they being allowed to be engaged?

MS. STEINGASSER: Let's step back a second and recognize we have not released an official draft document. We are trying very hard to get that draft document done while we are interfacing with the public. The interface mechanisms are very straight forward. They are very, very public.

We take phone calls directly. We have a website that is interactive. When that website went down for six weeks we had the staff names with emails and phone numbers posted so they could still interact with us directly.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	We take phone calls. We take
2	emails. There are notices sent from the
3	Office of Zoning on behalf of the Zoning
4	Commission to every single ANC in the city
5	for, I think, over a dozen different hearings.
6	We've gotten written correspondence.
7	Of course, we have made multiple
8	presentations to the community this year alone
9	since 2012 we have been to eight separate
10	community meetings outside of the six task
11	force meetings and then, of course, the
12	updates that we give here to the Zoning
13	Commission.
14	There is a sense that people are
15	getting the word about certain policy issues
16	that are upsetting them because of the way
17	they are being presented, but it's not because
18	the ability to engage is not there. It is
19	there.
20	We have a spreadsheet of over 400
21	public comments that we've gotten this year.

We keep that spreadsheet and put the name of

who sent it to us. We put whether we reacted to it already, whether it's been incorporated into the drafts.

Right now we are drafting text.

We don't have a text that is loose out there

that we haven't educated anybody. As you know, when the Zoning Commission came to the task force, we all agreed at that point that it was the desire that the Office of Planning

stop going out with individuals and write a full document.

That is basically what we've done. We've been focusing on that. I would like to talk to you this evening about possibly bringing some items to you in isolation. Some items that we are discovering through our work with the task force and through the work with community groups are important enough that they need a more focused discussion.

We are finding that the formatting of the new text in combination with some of these new policy shifts is very confusing and

NEAL R. GROSS

1	it's creating a whole lot of misinformation.
2	All the blogospheres grab it, seize it, and it
3	just spins immediately out of control.
4	Some of them we would like to
5	bring forward to you separately in the

language of the current code so that people understand it. We would like to discuss the policy shift. We don't think there are that many but we think they are critical and there are some that have made the communities very uncomfortable.

There are some that other communities find very, very desirable. also want to have certain things in place. We are seeing the market start to warm up and projects are coming lose. There are a lot of these things we would like to have in place.

If we continue with the full rewrite and then wait for the mapping and then wait for the effective date, it can be another two years before some of our more major policy initiatives that the Commission gave us

NEAL R. GROSS

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	guidance on two years ago could come into
2	effect. That would be the parking, the
3	loading, the Bike Share, the GAR. We would
4	like to bring some of those forward to you.
5	As far as attendance at the task
6	force, it fluctuates. I'm not going to say
7	it's fabulous but we have 22 members. The
8	smallest meeting we ever had was Ms. Gates by
9	herself got a tutorial on the industrial zones
10	but it was not a controversial particular
11	chapter. On average we have about five to
12	seven members which is about 30 percent.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just
14	I'm going to hold your last comment in the
15	parking lot.
16	MS. STEINGASSER: Okay.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I can tell you
18	when I start getting phone calls and people
19	start hanging up on me and every time I go
20	somewhere I get the same and I'm getting a lot
21	of it.
22	First of all, I haven't been going

around -- Ms. Schellin and I have tried to go around to a couple of ANCs and say, "Look, get involved." I've been doing that for a long time now.

I want to go back and I've asked staff to help me go back to some of the things that we talked about early on in the process in 2007. It goes back to Commissioner Parsons.

A lot of times I sit up here and I think that was a wise guy. I should never have disagreed with anything he ever said because a lot of stuff has come back to show me the opposite way. I will tell you that one of them is in my neighborhood.

Anyway, Commissioner Parsons says,
"I'm concerned with a sentence in your report
that says, `All of this leads us to the
conclusion that regardless of whether the
policies found in the document change at all,
a fundamental reorganization or rewrite is
necessary because I did not hear that from our

round table.'"

Then he goes on to say, "I would agree with you that the word `rewrite' is misleading. I think what you did here at the round table was a lack of clarity. Everyone says they have a hard time finding what they need to find and understand what they need to find.

That's what that is intended to convey that we need to look at how things are organized and try and address single issues in single places." Maybe that's where we're going. "That sounds like a major edit to me rather than the word `rewrite.'"

This is from Mr. Parker,

"Absolutely it may have been a mistake with

the word `rewrite.'" Commissioner Parsons:

"Then I must offer that I'm -- I don't know if

you are going this way but I would caution

that I think you shouldn't. This current fad

of form base codes to me is not right for this

city." And he goes on.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Here is another thing, Ms.
2	Steingasser, where you commented. "I would
3	like to add just to put everyone's mind at
4	ease because we have gotten a lot of startled
5	reaction to the phrase `comprehensive
6	rewrite.'
7	We do plan to have a comprehensive
8	review. We don't plan to rewrite every single
9	word but it will be a comprehensive review and
10	we have made notes to ourselves to us the word
11	`review' instead of `rewrite.' I couldn't
12	agree with you more, Ms. Mitten." It goes on.
13	Here is what really struck me, and
14	this is a comment by Mr. George Clark, June
15	21, 2007. "I'm not sure I'm going to contract
16	with what the Chairman has said here but
17	updating the regulations doesn't mean throwing
18	them out in their entirety and starting from
19	scratch with a totally different concept.
20	I'm not saying that a lot of
21	things don't need to be thrown out but the

NEAL R. GROSS

question is we have a built-up city. We have

many hundreds of thousands of people who have made significant investments in their property based on certain sets of assumptions about what happened.

Zoning can always change but fundamentally changing the approach to zoning risk the property values and destroying what I call the goose that has laid the golden eggs for the resurgence of property values in the city."

When I went back and revisited some of the things that were said in 2007, I know it's been a lot of time since then. Some of the same things that were said in this transcript are some of the same things that are now coming to light.

I will tell you -- let me just finish. I will tell you that we lead the final way and here's the thing. People have jumped on me. I have not gotten an attitude with them. What I try to do is try to find a way to resolve their issues because at the end

NEAL R. GROSS

1	of the day they are the ones that's going to
2	have to endure.
3	We are the ones who's going to
4	have to live here and deal with whatever code.
5	I'm going to tell you the truth. Anthony Hood
6	does not want to go down being one of the
7	worst Zoning Commission members in the city.
8	I would rather do like my Vice
9	Chairman and find a job somewhere else and
10	move on. On a serious note, we need to make
11	sure Office of Planning I know they have
12	done a lot of work. I'm not discounting that.
13	I think we the Zoning Commission
14	members we've done a lot of work. I'm hearing
15	from developers. I'm hearing from the public.
16	I really think, though, at some point in time
17	we've got to find a way. The catcher was when
18	I got the call from Ward 7.
19	We've got to find a way and I
20	think, Ms. Steingasser, you may have that way
21	that we do a little piece, let it run its

course. Run a piece of it out. Maybe that's

1	what we need to do. We need to give a piece
2	of it a chance and run it out. Four or five
3	members or eight members, or whatever it is on
4	the task force, I will honestly admit I'm one
5	of the members that is not there.
6	MS. STEINGASSER: Well, Mr.
7	Chairman, before you go on record in a
8	position on the Zoning Regulations that we
9	have not yet released
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me correct
11	you. I have not went on a position. What I
12	am trying to do is get input from whoever. At
13	the end of the day I'm not going to get upset
14	with whoever it is.
15	MS. STEINGASSER: If I could
16	
	respond.
17	respond. CHAIRMAN HOOD: If somebody has a
17 18	
	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If somebody has a
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If somebody has a concern, I'm not going to be upset with them.
18 19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If somebody has a concern, I'm not going to be upset with them. MS. STEINGASSER: Okay.

1	MS. STEINGASSER: I would
2	appreciate the opportunity to be listened to
3	here this evening. That is true from 2007
4	when we had that round table, but the Office
5	of Planning has made no major moves I
6	repeat, no major moves without the sanctioning
7	of this Zoning Commission.
8	We came through with our first
9	reports. We came back with public hearings
LO	and then we came back with guidance reports
l1	from the Zoning Commission. If the Commission
12	is now unhappy, I would point out that the
L3	voices you hear that were unhappy in 2007 are
L4	the same people. The fact that they
L5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Correction.
L6	Correction.
L7	MS. STEINGASSER: are
L8	consistent.
L9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I heard from
20	somebody just last week. But here is the
21	thing. Let me say this.
22	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir. She

1	was upset that we couldn't make a meeting
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me say this to
3	you.
4	MS. STEINGASSER: that was held
5	this evening.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, no. Let me
7	say this to you, Ms. Steingasser. That
8	meeting is tomorrow night but I've got that
9	taken care of. You and I are going to attend
10	that meeting June 19th.
11	What I'm saying is, and I said
12	this just last week, whoever got this email
13	that I have never seen that is going around
14	about the ZRR, obviously that's what it took
15	to get people engaged. I have been to many
16	meetings trying to get people engaged.
17	Whatever mechanism it took to get
18	other people who are not the same people that
19	we talk about, George Clark and whoever you
20	want to name, the other people, there are
21	different people now who are trying to get

engaged.

1	MS. STEINGASSER: Sir, I would
2	rather not have a public this kind of
3	public discord with the Zoning Commission. I
4	have nothing but great respect for this
5	Commission and our work with the Commission on
6	the ZRR.
7	While it may not be the same exact
8	people, it is the same community and it is the
9	same voice of people who want very little, if
10	any, change. That is why I'm proposing that
11	we bring forward these hot button issues, this
12	hysteria that has been created.
13	We have not publicly released
14	we made a commitment to the Zoning Commission
15	and at the request of the Zoning Commission
16	that the task force have the first feedback on
17	all zoning text.
18	That is where we are. We have not
19	gone through our public education program that
20	the Commission asked us and that we committed
21	to and that the Zoning Commission publicly

committed to.

That will start once the task

force completes its review of the text. Then

the Zoning Commission ask that you have the

next bite of that text. Then we would set the

case down and then we would go public with a

large education campaign.

We've hired an education specialist to help us formulate the message to get it out but there are certain things that represent a bit of change. Some of that change is significant and some communities are very frightened by it whether it applies to them or not.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well --

MS. STEINGASSER: Things like corner stores do not apply to the single-family-detached areas, yet those are some of our most ferocious opponents so we would like to bring some of those particular issues to the Zoning Commission and have hearings on those in the context of the current zoning language so people understand it, so there is

1	a familiar context, and so that we don't spend
2	all this time and lose the momentum and miss
3	the market when the real estate comes back up
4	and we have an opportunity to start
5	implementing some things.
6	The Zoning Regs are not about
7	taking people's cars away. It's about choice.
8	It's about creating the city that we want in
9	the future and how we want to get there.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think my point
11	I hear you loud and clear and, again, I'm
12	not dismissing the work that we've done
13	because my first response when I got the
14	letter we've been doing this since 2006.
15	That's when the discussion, as far as I
16	remember, started. But what I am concerned
17	about, and I hear we are saying the same
18	people.
19	I'm not let me just say it like
20	this. I'm not concerned about any given group
21	of people who have been engaged. I'm more

concerned about the group that I heard from $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right)$

last week that has not been engaged.

Again, I don't know what kind of email this is that went out but whatever it did, we need to take note from it because we are starting to get attention from people who were not engaged. I'm more concerned about the people who know absolutely nothing.

In many meetings -- I think Ms.

Schellin can verify that many of the ANC

meetings that I have attended I have asked

them to get involved with the ZRR process. I

think we talked about -- I think you all are

doing -- go to the ward and do one. It may

take more than that because everybody is not

up on zoning.

MS. STEINGASSER: We committed to a minimum of one to make sure that every ward gets representation. We did a series of these three or four years ago on just the PUDs, how does the PUD process work. We got very little outcome but we want to commit.

As I said, we have already done

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

eight this year and we haven't even released
the text officially. To represent that the
Office of Planning is not available for
information or that the Office of Zoning is
not available for information, that's a
failure to communicate. There is also these
things that come out that are fear based. We
are not out to destroy anybody's neighborhood.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't think the

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't think the citizens will let that happen honestly. I'm not going to record to defend any of it. What I'm going on record to do is make sure the process, which I think it has but, again, it's about getting people engaged.

I don't know, again, what this email is. I keep referring to this email because this email seems to have triggered a letter from Council Member Brown, a call from Ward 7, a call from my own Ward 5. These are people that have not been at those work force meetings.

There is one person, and I can

NEAL R. GROSS

tell you the one name that was at the work
force meetings early on in Ward 5. Not only
one person was there. I have pleaded with
people to come and get involved with the
process.

Here is another thing and then I want to hear from my colleagues. The reason why I'm doing it like this is because if I go to a community meeting about another issue, I hear about this issue and I'm there for something else.

I think it's important that we at least -- I'm not being disrespectful to the Office of Planning. I'm not upset with the Office of Planning. Ms. Steingasser, I am definitely not upset with you. You and I have had a great working relationship. But I want to make sure that at the end of the day we have exhausted all our resources.

I think you've heard me say this. From this dias we have done all we can to listen. Not just so the people are engaged

NEAL R. GROSS

1 but get it out to the folks that are not 2 engaged. I do like the piece about taking a piece of it and let it run its course. 3 4 I think once that piece gets 5 through, then we can come back with the other 6 piece and do more and more and more. Then it 7 will give those who may be engaged a comfort level, and it will also give those who are not 8 engaged a way of understanding what exactly is 9 10 taking place instead of going at them all at once in one gamut. 11 I think that may be a win/win for 12 13 those engaged and those not engaged. I'm not going to keep talking but I wanted us to try 14 to go back to what we started off to do and 15 16 make sure we get back on track. I'll open it up now. My colleagues may not agree with me 17 but that is the fashion, I think. 18 Those are 19 my comments. That is this Commissioner's 20 comments. Commissioner Cohen. 21 22 COMMISSIONER COHEN: Thank you,

Chairman. Again, you have the long-term experience on the Commission and I'm just going into my six months, but I have to tell you that when I sat down with those huge books before I was even -- when I was told by the Mayor that he was going to appoint me, I sat down and read the Zoning Regulations.

I am a highly educated woman.

I've been in the business for 40 years of housing community development and planning but I had a hard time with that. As I see at the BZA meetings and I see at the PUDs, there is an industry of lawyers, planners, and architects that work on this and make their living off of this.

Then there are a lot of people, including the person who may have sent that email, that are totally misinformed. I do believe since, again, I'm the newest member here so I'm sort of open to everybody's information, that we need to, again, maybe look at one particular area that is

NEAL R. GROSS

controversial, work it through.

I know there are many cities in this country who have done rewrites, that have made it into more plain English, that have done some very unique thinking. These cities have experienced as much input as we have at public hearings.

They have gone through it successfully so I think we need to give the Office of Planning a chance. Again, I respect you a great deal, Chairman. I know that you are -- you know, I'm walking down the street and nobody recognizes me thank goodness.

I really do believe that we are doing the right thing. I support the Office of Planning because this needs to change.

It's too dense. It's too complicated. People do not need to make their livings off of other people coming forward.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I want you to hold that point because the way I understand it, and this may be a question, is exactly what

NEAL R. GROSS

1	you're saying. We started off that we wanted
2	to make this easy to read, layman's terms.
3	Ms. Steingasser, do you find I
4	know you haven't finished the text. Do you
5	find that the book is getting thicker or
6	thinner?
7	MS. STEINGASSER: We don't do
8	zoning by the pound so I would say that there
9	is some repetition in it but I think the
10	useability is much easier.
11	Again, it's the useability that we
12	went over with the Zoning Commission in a
13	format over two years ago that had tables so
14	that rather than have things be topically
15	separated, they are consistent with the zone
16	so that you would go to your zone and all your
17	information, or as much as possible, would be
18	there.
19	We found that to be a desirable
20	way. The Zoning Commission sanctioned that
21	through a guidance hearing and we proceeded

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that way.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I want to correct
2	my good friend here to my right. It's not
3	that I support the Office of Planning. I
4	support the Office of Planning just like I
5	support the Office of Zoning, just like I
6	support the community, just like I support the
7	developers, just like I try to find balance
8	all the way across. That's where my support
9	is.
10	Any other questions,
11	Commissioners? Commissioner Turnbull.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,
13	Mr. Chair. I think when we started this, I
14	think we knew it was going to be a complicated
15	and difficult process. It's not easy.
16	There's a lot of different interest at play
17	here.
18	I would like to say the Office of
19	Planning lost a key staff member who had been
20	leading it, but I think they have regrouped
21	and, again, they have been doing trying to
22	keep that job going. I think I would like to

let Ms. Steingasser and the Office of Planning come back with a proposal -- I mean, as Ms. Steingasser was saying, they would like to come back to us with some increments of this.

Maybe she could come back with a better layout of what that actually means, a timeline of some sort how we can get back into this. If the Zoning Commission needs to go to some more meetings or whatever, maybe we do that. I don't know.

Whatever it takes, let's get this thing jumpstarted again. It could be, and maybe I'm misreading Ms. Steingasser, but I don't think she feels that it is exactly as some of the comments that we are getting in the email. I think she is feeling that it's still going forward.

Oftentimes there are emails out there that are from a certain point of view and they can become infectious and maybe not really -- I'm not saying there is not a concern out there but I think what we need to

NEAL R. GROSS

do is have maybe --

I would like to hear from the Office of Planning who is really into this come back with us and maybe give us their feeling of the pulse of where the process is and what they think they need to do in response to maybe your concern about the emails on this.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, these were brought to my attention. Unfortunately, my other four colleagues up here, I don't know if I'll call you up but I'm going to get a list of you all's numbers and stuff so some of the stuff that happens to me, I'm going to share the love.

I can tell you that this stems from -- again, it's not just from the people who have been involved, the George Clarks and people that have been involved, Ms. Gates and others who have been involved. It's not just from the applicants who come down here.

It's from everybody. I'm hearing

NEAL R. GROSS

1	from everybody. I'm not diminishing the
2	Office of Planning. All I've ever said is I
3	want to do what we can do and I try to do my
4	part on nights when we don't have hearings.
5	I'll tell you, Thursday before
6	last we didn't have a hearing. I tried to go
7	out to an ANC meeting and do my part and say,
8	"Look, get in touch. Go to the Office of
9	Planning." I've been to Ward 8. I've been to
10	Ward 7. I've been to Ward 4. I've been to
11	Ward 5. I've been across the city to Ward 1.
12	Go to the Office of Planning's website.
13	I'm doing the same thing. Even
14	though I don't speak at the Office of
15	Planning, I'm saying get involved, get
16	engaged, get involved with the process.
17	Whatever this email was that went out from the
18	Federation of the Citizens Association, which
19	I have not seen, seemed to trigger.
20	I don't know what was in it. I
21	have not seen it. I've been told about it but
22	it's gotten a response. Even to the point

that Council Member we have a letter
tonight from Council Member Brown. What I'm
saying is I'm taking all of that and I'm not
getting upset with nobody.
I'm not upset with any of my

I'm not upset with any of my colleagues. I'm trying to figure out how can we balance all that out. Yeah, we're going to be all unhappy. Some people are going to be unhappy. First of all, some of it is change and some is different. I accept all that.

All I'm saying is moving forward I have to, at least from my standpoint, feel as comfortable as possible knowing that I have given everybody a fair shot and an opportunity to be able to comment or weigh in, whoever wanted to. Those who don't want to I still would like to hear them weigh in and get involved and get engaged. No more or no less.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: My only thought was let's ask Ms. Steingasser and her staff to shake up the barrel and see what ideas are out there, or what they feel they

NEAL R. GROSS

1	need to do at this point in time to get the
2	program at a point where we can put some of
3	these measures or some of these issues to
4	rest.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm done
6	with that. I think Ms. Steingasser is getting
7	ready to lay out a plan so I'm going to allow
8	her time to do it. I think we may be ready
9	tonight for a plan that she's going to roll
10	out.
11	MS. STEINGASSER: No, sir. As
12	with all cases, before we made such a drastic
13	move, we wanted to get the Zoning Commission's
14	input on whether that was the direction you
15	were interested in. We believe it would be
16	very helpful. We think it would help in the
17	overall speed of the document being completed.
18	We think it would provide great input both to
19	the community and the Commission.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I actually think
21	that's an excellent idea. Right now with all
l	

the comments I've received -- Commissioner

1	Cohen gave me her phone number. She better
2	watch it. I will give it out now. I think
3	that is an excellent idea to move forward.
4	Was that related to the task force? I think
5	you had a meeting last week? Or you came to
6	use first?
7	MS. STEINGASSER: We did briefly
8	talk about it with the task force at the end
9	of the meeting. Those present at that time
10	didn't seem to have any objection to this
11	approach.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Steingasser,
13	let me ask this. I know we've been through
14	this and I know sometime it gets rather
15	frustrating to be redundant. What would it
16	take for us to get either the members to come
17	back or new members? Do we need to come to
18	those meetings?
19	MS. STEINGASSER: Well, I think we
20	are too far into the system to have new
21	members come on board unless we are going to
22	abandon and just start over. I don't think we

1	want to reboot. I know I don't want to
2	reboot.
3	People come as the topic interest
4	them. Like I said, on average we have almost
5	always a minimum of five. We have up to six
6	to eight depending on the evening.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The night that we
8	came we had a nice crowd there that night.
9	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes. When the
10	Zoning Commission shows up you have almost 100
11	percent participation.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. You know
13	what? I think we need to show up again.
14	Commissioners, I know you have busy schedules
15	but I think for the sake of if we're the
16	draw, we need to show up. Even though we're
17	going to hear it again, I think we need to
18	show up at another task force meeting. When
19	is the next one?
20	MS. STEINGASSER: It would be in
21	two weeks. At this point, though, what we're
22	doing is we are going through the draft text.

1	When the Commission came the first time you
2	had a reason.
3	You wanted to talk to them about
4	going forward, to hear from them about whether
5	we needed to do a complete document and the
6	education thing. We would love to have you
7	there but it really is just working through
8	the sausage.
9	MR. LAWSON: Actually, I would
10	just add to that. The task force meetings
11	we're having actually are really really
12	productive. I think there was a really great
13	discussion with the members who were there and
14	the staff. I know we have learned a lot.
15	We've heard some of the task force
16	members say that they have heard they have
17	learned a lot as well. That is not the only
18	opportunity for a task force member to
19	participate. Community information is sent to
20	the task force members.
21	Their comments are invited. Any
22	task force member who has an interest in a

particular topic or has a particular issue to raise with us, they are certainly welcome to do so.

Now, we obviously encourage the task force members to come to the meeting because there is this synergy of sitting around the table and having that discussion.

As Ms. Steingasser said, at this point we really are going through the nitty gritty of this draft.

Again, I want to really stress this is just a draft that we are bringing out for discussion at this point. We are going through that nitty gritty and if a task force member is not really interested in spending the time to kind of go through that nitty gritty discussion, then, you know, we can't force a task member to come.

It really is important that a task force member comes who is really interested in that topic and really wants to get into that level of discussion.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.

I really appreciate that. I just think that
the task force meetings should be reflective
of the city and we need to try to get people
other than one side of the city or one corner,
or whatever, actively engaged and I don't know
how to do that. If we have to come, then
that's what we do.

Mr. May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, if we decide that it's appropriate and help for us to all attend the task force meeting, certainly I would be interested in doing that. I just want to say I'm rather puzzled about a lot of this whole discussion and a lot of it, I think, is just because I haven't heard what Chairman Hood has heard from folks about the Zoning Regulation rewrite.

I have been comfortable with the process. It doesn't mean that I have been comfortable with every aspect of it or that I feel like we are satisfying everybody during

NEAL R. GROSS

the course of it. This is not a radical reinvention of the Zoning Regulations.

There are a few areas where there are some changes in policy and those have been discussed quite exhaustively. I don't think they have been resolved completely. We have been consulted at an early stage to be able to give direction, to be able to hear comment from people.

It's been an arduous task from the very beginning and it has been made worse by the challenges of communicating something that most people never have to deal with until that moment when they want to do something to their property and they are held back by the zoning or they see a neighbor doing something that concerns them. It's difficult to make sure that all of the casual users of zoning are educated about it.

I just want to say up to this
point I think OP has done some great work in
getting us to the point where we are. I think

NEAL R. GROSS

that all the members of the task force and the working groups have also done that.

The ANC's who have sounded off, the citizens' groups, all the people who come and testify, it has all been very useful so far and we have made great progress. This Commission, I think, has done a lot of good hard work in advancing us to the point where we are.

It is unfortunate that there had to be sort of a restart when there was a kind of change in direction on how we would complete the process. When things stalled like that, I think it was, as they say, nature abhors a vacuum. Even if it's not a real vacuum, it just felt that way perhaps to some. People will tend to imagine the worst.

I am totally confident that we will get through to the other side of this and that we will get good public comment and that the document in the end will be better, easier to use, and will enhance the value of people's

NEAL R. GROSS

1	property and not reduce it. I look forward to
2	hearing what else the Office of Planning has
3	to show us and tell us on this. If we decide
4	to attend a task force meeting, I will gladly
5	be there.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What I would
7	suggest I will tell you I've got most of my
8	comments out. What I would suggest is that we
9	take the recommendation or the guidance that
10	Mrs. Steingasser has talked about as far as
11	moving forward about doing a piece of it.
12	Let's let it run its course.
13	Ms. Steingasser, I don't want to
14	put any words in your mouth but I think if we
15	do a piece of it, let's let it run its course.
16	Then that way we will have a track record to
17	see exactly how the rest of the pieces will
18	follow. Maybe that will take care of some of
19	the concerns I've heard.
20	Again, I'm going to do my part
21	personally until I am otherwise told not to

because I was told I could go to ZRR meetings

1	so I have been telling people to get involved
2	with the process and to come and testify in
3	front of us and do whatever you need to do to
4	get educated, follow it, get on top of it.
5	When it comes out, that is not going to be the
6	time to come down and tell us in what I call
7	an after-the-fact meeting.
8	I think, Ms. Schellin, you heard
9	me mention that at the ANC meeting. Let's not
10	keep having these after-the-fact meetings.
11	That's kind of where I am. I think that piece
12	might be the resolve. I think the Office of
13	Planning will go back to the task force.
14	Then we continue to try to get
15	other wards and other people involved because,
16	I can tell you, east of the river feels like
17	they haven't been involved and they probably
18	have. They just didn't pay that much
19	attention to it because they are not the
20	zoning people.
21	They don't follow the zoning. We
22	wait in my community also. We wait until

after the fact and then get involved. It's going to be an arduous task and is incumbent upon all of us to push and try to get people involved. That is part of the job in this case is the way I see it.

Okay. Anyone else? Vice Chairman Schlater.

VICE CHAIR SCHLATER: Mr.

Chairman, I am sorry that I won't be here for the final result of this process but I have taken part in many, many hearings and heard a lot of testimony and read a lot of information on this. I'm just going to put in my two cents as the last order of business.

I think the Office of Planning is doing an outstanding job on this. I agree with Council Member Michael Brown that our planning staff are superb professionals. This is a huge undertaking and a necessary undertaking. The zoning code that we have today isn't adequate to help guide the future growth of our city.

NEAL R. GROSS

We need a better tool and we are getting there. I think we are giving people an enormous amount of opportunities to have their input into the process. I think for those who say we are moving too fast I think just the fact that the number of hearings that we have had over the past five years, the number of community outreach meetings that we have had belies that fact.

I would just say -- I would encourage everybody to keep pushing, keep reaching out to the community, keep educating the community. I have seen some of the things that have been going around about the zoning rewrite and it's full of untruths and misinformation.

The only way that can be pushed back against is with information and getting the right information out there and answering those questions and having public hearings.

This should not be decided on email listservs.

It should not be decided on blog posts.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	It should be decided right there
2	on the dias where people can come up here and
3	give their public testimony and tell us what
4	they like or they don't like about the
5	proposed changes. Then we can based on the
6	testimony on the record make a decision. Good
7	luck. I'm rooting for you and I'll be
8	tracking it from Chicago. Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. I just
10	want to say this, though, Vice Chairman. I
11	don't want to say this on your way out but one
12	thing I was taught when I was young is always
13	read the whole letter.
14	When I read this letter and had to
15	digest it days before you guys got it, when it
16	got down to this point, since you brought up
17	Council Member Brown's letter, he says, "We
18	cannot consider this outreach to be public.
19	Educating the public on the nature
20	and range of issues at play is challenging.
21	Many aspects are complicated and obscure but

that should not deter us from making the case.

The code has to make sense."

That's also part of his letter.

While he calls us professionals, the Office of Planning professionals, he still demands us and calls us back to make sure we do outreach. Apparently from his view, or whoever he's talking to, we cannot consider this outreach to be public.

That's in his letter. I didn't write this letter. The letter was addressed to me and I've been grappling with this letter. I don't know how many times you guys have read it but I've probably read it about 15 times. That's why I had to figure out some type of response.

Anyway, that's where we are. I'm looking forward to hearing from Ms.

Steingasser as soon as possible so we can at least get that little piece going. Maybe it will give everyone a comfort level. These issues were raised and I would agree with you this much, Vice Chairman, it should be decided

1	here but we have to start somewhere.
2	The Office of Planning's
3	recommendation is a start. I'm sure if anyone
4	from the Office of Zoning is watching, the
5	telephone number is 727-6311, not Anthony
6	Hood.
7	Okay. Do we have anything else?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry. Nothing
9	else.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Steingasser,
11	you want to close anything on that note?
12	Okay. All right. With that this
13	meeting again, we want to wish the Vice
14	Chairman well as he moves on to bigger and
15	better things. Best of luck to you.
16	With that, this meeting is
17	adjourned.
18	(Whereupon, at 8:55 p.m. the
19	meeting was adjourned.)
20	
21	