GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2009

+ + + + +

The Special Public Meeting convened in Room 220 South, 441 $4^{\rm th}$ Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Marc D. Loud, Chairman, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARC D. LOUD Chairman

SHANE L. DETTMAN Vice Chair (NCPC)

MEREDITH MOLDENHAUER Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD Chairman

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY Secretary

BEVERLEY BAILEY Sr. Zoning Spec.

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Special Public Meeting held on November 10, 2009.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME: Marc Loud
EUCLID OF VIRGINIA APPLICATION NO. 17963:
LEON AND PEGGY ROBBINS APPLICATION NO. 17620-A:
INNOVATIVE RECYCLERS, INC. APPLICATION NO. 17676-A:
MID-ATLANTIC REALTY PARTNERS, LLC APPLICATION NO. 17684-A:
EUCLID OF VIRGINIA APPLICATION NO. 17963:
ADJOURN: Marc Loud

NEAL R. GROSS

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

9:51 a.m.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Good morning, everyone. Let me apologize for our starting a few moments late this morning. It is our goal to come out here every Tuesday at 9:30 a.m., so we do apologize.

This meeting will officially come to order. This is the November $10^{\rm th}$ Public Meeting of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia.

My name is Marc Loud, Chairperson.

And joining me today is Chairman Anthony Hood

from the National -- I'm sorry, from the

Zoning Commission to my right and to my left

is Ms. Meredith Moldenhauer, BZA Mayoral

Appointee, to her left Mr. Clifford Moy,

Secretary of the BZA, and on the far end Ms.

Beverley Bailey, Zoning Specialist in the

Office of Zoning.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

	Telt in the wall bin hear the door.
2	We do not take any public testimony
3	at our meetings, unless the Board asks someone
4	to come forward.
5	Please, be advised this proceeding
6	is being recorded by a Court Reporter and is
7	also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask
8	you to refrain from any disruptive noises or
9	actions in the hearing room. Please, turn off
10	all beepers and cell phones.
11	Does the staff have any preliminary
12	matters?
13	MR. MOY: No, Mr. Chairman.
14	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.
15	Then why don't we proceed with this morning's
16	agenda.
17	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Good morning,
18	Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. My
19	understanding is that the first case the Board
20	is going to deliberate on is Application No.
21	17963 of Euclid of Virginia. This case is
22	pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for a special

exception to allow a new self-service gasoline station and convenience store under section 706 in the C-1 District at premises 4975 South Dakota Avenue, N.E. This is in Square 3899, Lot 76.

I do believe that the one of the voting Members on this case is not going to be able to join us this morning and so what I'm suggesting we do is put the Euclid decision off until 1:00 this afternoon when Board Member Dettman will be able to be with us.

MR. MOY: Okay. Very good. In that case, the next case before the Board, Mr. Chairman, is a Motion to Extend the Validity of the Order to Application No. 17620-A of Leon and Peggy Robbins, pursuant to section 3130 of the Zoning Regulations.

If the Board will recall, the original application was approved on January 15, 2008. And that application was pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2, for a variance from the lot

NEAL R. GROSS

occupancy requirement under section 772, and a variance from the off-street parking requirements under subsection 2101.1, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, а special exception from the rear yard requirements under section 774, and floor area ratio requirements under section 1323, to allow the construction of three-story mixed-use а building HS, the Η Street in the Commercial Overlay, Neighborhood District at premises 1383 through 85 H Street, N.E., Square 1027, Lot 846.

November 3, 2009, On the Board convened Application 17620-A. After deliberation, the Board on its own motion rescheduled this decision on November 2009. The record will be kept open to allow the applicant to submit additional information or substantial evidence attendant to provision of section 3130.6 of the Regulations.

Mr. Chairman, there are two filings

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in the record dated November 6, 2009 and they are Exhibits 44 and 45. These filings are from the applicant. The Board is to act on the merits of the request pursuant to the provisions of 3130. And that completes the staff's briefing, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.

I believe the file is full on this case. As you indicated, the case was continued from last week because the applicant had not made the showing on the 3130, particularly 3130.6.

Subsequent to that, applicant filed Exhibits 45, Exhibit 44.

Exhibit 44 is a summary of the total cost of the project putting it at \$1.05 million. Exhibit 45 is the available financing the applicant has gotten to date, which is half a million dollars, showing a gap of about a half a million dollars.

So I think the applicant has made - has met its burden regarding an extension
under Rule 3130.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	With that said, I would like to
2	rest on the record before us and recommend
3	that we do approve the extension request.
4	Is there further discussion?
5	All right. Hearing none, then I
6	would like to move approval of Application No.
7	17620-A for a 2 year extension under Rule
8	3130. Is there a second?
9	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I second.
10	CHAIRMAN LOUD: The motion has been
11	made and seconded. Is there further
12	deliberation, discussion?
13	Hearing none, all those in favor
14	say aye.
15	ALL: Aye.
16	CHAIRMAN LOUD: All those who
17	oppose? Are there any abstentions? And, Mr.
18	Moy, can you read I'm sorry, can you let us
19	know if there are any additional votes?
20	MR. MOY: Yes, sir, absolutely, Mr.
21	Chairman. Before I give the final vote, there
22	are two other Members who participated on this

application and they both submitted absentee 1 ballots. 2 The first is from Mr. Michael 3 Turnbull and his absentee vote is to approve 4 the motion with such condition as the Board 5 may impose. We also have second 6 а participating Member that is the Vice Chair, 7 Mr. Shane Dettman, and his absentee ballot is 8 to -- also to approve or to grant the motion 9 10 to extend. So that would give a total vote of 11 4-0-1 on the motion of the Chair, Mr. Loud, to 12 13 approve the Motion to Extend the Validity of the Order to Application No. 17620-A of Leon 14 15 and Peggy Robbins, seconding the motion Ms. 16 Moldenhauer and one other Board Member participating. 17 So again, the final vote is 4-0-1. 18 19 CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy. MR. MOY: Waive the requirements 20 for a summary order, Mr. Chairman? 21 Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN LOUD:

MR. MOY: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN LOUD: And we can move on to the next case when you are ready.

MR. MOY: The next case also is a Motion to Extend the Validity of the Order, but this is to Application No. 17676-A of Innovative Recyclers, Inc., pursuant to section 3130 of the Zoning Regulations.

original application The was 23, approved on October 2007 and application was pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2, variance from the building height requirements under subsection 840.1, DCMR 3104.1, for a special pursuant to 11 exception to establish a solid waste handling facility under subsection 802.4 in the LO/CM-1 District at premises 2225 Lawrence Avenue, This property is in Square 4106, Lot N.E. 820.

Also on November 3, 2009, the Board convened this application and after deliberation, the Board on its own motion

NEAL R. GROSS

rescheduled its decision on November 10, 2009. 1 2 The record was kept open to allow the applicant submit additional information to 3 the provisions of subsection 4 attendant to 3130.6 of the Zoning Regulations. 5 Mr. Chairman, the applicant made 6 7 his filing dated Thursday, November 5, 2009, though it was received in the office on 8 November 6, 2009. That filing is identified 9 10 in your case folders as Exhibit 39. And the Board is to act on the merits of the request, 11 pursuant to provisions of 3130. 12 13 That completes the staff's briefing, Mr. Chairman. 14 15 CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy. 16 Similar to the previous case, the Robbins case, this was a matter heard originally last 17 week, continued over for one week two days 18 19 after the hearing, it looks like.

record the supporting documentation to meet its burden under section 3130, particularly

entered

applicant

The

NEAL R. GROSS

20

21

22

into

1	3130.6, and that is now our Exhibit No. 39.
2	In light of that, I don't think we
3	need to belabor the point. I would like to
4	rest on the record and suggest that we grant
5	this motion. Is there further deliberation or
6	discussion?
7	Hearing none, I would like to make
8	a motion then. I would like to move approval
9	of Application No. 17676-A of the Innovative
10	Recyclers for an extension under Rule 3130, a
11	2 year extension.
12	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I second.
13	CHAIRMAN LOUD: The motion has been
14	made and seconded. Further discussion?
15	Hearing none, all those in favor
16	say aye.
17	ALL: Aye.
18	CHAIRMAN LOUD: All those who
19	oppose? Are there any absentees? Mr. Moy?
20	MR. MOY: Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman,
21	before I give the final vote, we have two
22	absentee ballots from two participating

Members.

The first is from Mr. Michael Turnbull and his absentee vote is to approve with such conditions the Board may impose. The other absentee ballot is from the Vice Chair, Mr. Shane Dettman, and his absentee vote is to also approve or to grant the motion to extend.

So that would give a final vote of 4-0-1 on the motion of the Chair, Mr. Loud, to grant the Motion to Extend the Validity of the Order to Application No. 17676-A of Innovative Recyclers, Inc., seconding the motion is Ms. Moldenhauer. And the final vote is 4-0-1.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy. Let's waive the requirement and do a summary.

MR. MOY: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: All righty. And I believe we have one more case for this morning.

MR. MOY: Again, we also have our last and final Motion to Extend the Validity

NEAL R. GROSS

of the Order. This is to Application No. 17684-A of Mid-Atlantic Realty Partners, LLC, pursuant to section 3130 of the Zoning Regulations.

Board will recall, As the the original application was approved on November 20, 2007. That application was pursuant to DCMR 3104.1 and 3103.2, for variances from the rear yard requirements under section 774, the limitation on compact parking space requirements under subsection 2115.2, and the off-street loading facility requirements under section 2201, and a special exception from the required number of off-street parking spaces under section 2108, to permit the development of an office building with retail space on the ground floor in the DD/C-2-C District at the southeast corner of the intersection of 6th and K Streets, N.W. The property is in Square 484, Lots 23, 811 through 813 and 826.

On September 30, 2009, the applicant filed their request. This filing is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

identified in the case folders as Exhibit 38. 1 2 And to be brief, the Board is to act on the merits of this request to extend the validity 3 4 of the order, pursuant to the provision under section 3130.6. 5 And that completes the staff's 6 7 briefing, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy. 8 I just wanted to note for the record that our 9 10 dream team is complete this morning. been joined by Vice Chair Shane Dettman, who 11 National Capital 12 represents the Planning 13 Commission and who always tries to steal my camera, so I did have a bit of the camera to 14 15 myself this morning. Good morning, Vice Chair 16 Dettman. VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Good morning. 17 We are -- we have CHAIRMAN LOUD: 18 19 just started the Mid-Atlantic case 17684-A and it's another case like the previous two were. 20 I believe we can rest on the record. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

brought

applicant

The

22

case

the

1	before us last week. Subsequent to the
2	hearing, the Board decided to continue because
3	he had not met the burden under 3130.
4	Subsequent to last week's hearing, he did
5	submit Exhibit 38 and attachments, all of
6	which help him to meet his burden as regards
7	not being able to identify adequate financing
8	for the project.
9	In light of that, I'm going to rest
10	on the record. I'm going to recommend that we
11	approve this application. Is there any
12	further discussion or deliberation?
13	All right. In that case, then I
14	would like to move approval of Application No.
15	17684-A of Mid-Atlantic for a 2 year extension
16	under Rule 3130. Is there a second?
17	VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN LOUD: The motion has been
19	made and seconded. Is there further
20	deliberation?
21	Hearing none, all those in favor

say aye.

1	ALL: Aye.
2	CHAIRMAN LOUD: All those who
3	oppose? And are there any abstentions?
4	MR. MOY: Yes, sir, the staff would
5	record the vote as 3-0-2. This is the motion
6	of the Chair, Mr. Loud, to grant the Motion to
7	Extend the Validity of the Order to
8	Application No. 17684-A of Mid-Atlantic Realty
9	Partners, LLC, seconding the motion Mr.
10	Dettman, in support of the motion Ms.
11	Moldenhauer. No other Board or Zoning
12	Commission Members participating.
13	Again, the final vote is 3-0-2.
14	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.
15	Summary order
16	MR. MOY: Yes, thank you, sir.
17	CHAIRMAN LOUD: will be
18	appropriate.
19	MR. MOY: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you. Is
21	there anything further for the morning's
22	decision calendar, Public Meeting calendar?

1	MR. MOY: That's it for
2	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay.
3	MR. MOY: this morning.
4	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you. Then
5	the morning calendar is adjourned.
6	(Whereupon, the Special Public
7	Meeting was recessed at 10:06 a.m. to
8	reconvene at 1:14 p.m. this same day.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
1 8	

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

1:14 p.m.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the continuation of the November 10th Public Decision Meeting of the Board of Zoning Adjustment. We started our decision meeting earlier this morning at 9:30 and we continued one of our cases until this afternoon, which is the Euclid case. And so that's going to be the matter that we are taking up first this afternoon is the Euclid decision.

For those of you that are here for the afternoon hearing calendar, which starts at 1:00 p.m., following our deliberation on Euclid, we will move immediately into the hearing calendar and I suspect that we will not have anyone here beyond 4:00 or 3:00 perhaps today at all.

So with that, let me ask for, Mr. Moy, if you could call our first case? If there are any preliminary matters?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. MOY: Yes, there are, but it's only attendant to this one case for decision.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay.

MR. MOY: Good afternoon, Mr. Members Board. Chairman, of the That. Application is No. 17963 of Euclid of Virginia, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for a special exception to allow a new self-service gasoline station and convenience store under section 706 in the C-1 District at premises 4975 South Dakota Avenue, N.E. The property is in Square 3899, Lot 76.

As the Board will recall on September 22, 2009, the Board completed public testimony, closed the record and scheduled its decision on November 10th of this year. The Board requested additional information to supplement the record both from DDOT and allowing responses.

The DDOT report, which was filed-is dated October 16, 2009 and that is in your
case folders, Mr. Chairman, identified as

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Exhibit 31.

We have two other filings. One is a response which was allowed into the record with a deadline of November 2, 2009. The first is from ANC-5A dated November 4th, but it was received in the Office of Zoning November 9, 2009. That filing is identified as Exhibit 32.

The second filing is an individual letter in opposition from a Ms. Patricia Love and Percy Love and Fannie Love. That document is identified as Exhibit 30 and that's dated September 23, 2009, which was a day after the Public Hearing of September 22nd.

These last two filings should be treated as preliminary matters, Mr. Chairman. Other than that, the Board should act on the merits of the requested special exception relief from section 706. And staff will leave it at that for today. That completes the staff's briefing, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Moy.

NEAL R. GROSS

Before we get started, why don't I introduce the fellow Members who are up here on the dias.

indicated, I'm As Marc Loud, Chairperson. To my right is Shane Mr. Dettman, Vice Chairperson, also representing the National Capital Planning Commission. my left is Mrs. Meredith Moldenhauer of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, Mayoral Appointee, Mr. Clifford Moy, Secretary of BZA, and to my far left Beverley Bailey, Zoning Ms. Specialist here in the Office of Zoning.

As indicated, this is a continuation of this morning's hearing and I just wanted to note again for the record at this morning's decision meeting that public testimony is not allowed at a decision meeting, unless a Member of the Board asks someone to come forward.

So, please, bear that in mind as we move forward. I think we have got a couple of preliminary matters. And what I'm going to do

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is ask Mr. Dettman if you could start us off with respect to the matters.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. I think we have maybe two
preliminary matters before we get into
discussing the actual merits of the case.

Exhibit No. 30, which Mr. Moy mentioned is a letter from the community. The preliminary matter is whether the Board wants to waive our rules and allow this into the record, which again, as has been stated, was closed at the end of the Public Hearing with the exception of the information that the Board specifically requested.

I think that the Board was very specific in terms of the type of information that they wanted at the conclusion of the Public hearing. And it would be my recommendation that we not waive our rules and not allow this particular letter, again our Exhibit No. 30, into the record.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Mr. Dettman. I would agree with that. I think that the submission is untimely. I think we closed the record November 2nd. And in order to comply with our rules, I would not be in favor of allowing it in.

In addition, a lot of what is contained in the letter is contained in the submission by the North Michigan Park Civic Association as well as the ANC's report. So I support your direction on that.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Great. Okay.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I concur with both of you in regards to the timeliness. And I think that it's a new effort of this Board to make sure that, you know, we are staying consistent and not permitting additional documentation after a specific date. And you know, we specifically actually articulated October 28th for the ANC and other community to respond back and then November 2nd for the close of the record. So this was untimely and

NEAL R. GROSS

I agree not to let it into the record.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Moldenhauer. The second preliminary matter, colleagues, is our Exhibit, I believe, No. 32, which is the letter that we received from ANC-5A dated November 4, 2009.

As Ms. Moldenhauer had just stated, we left the record open for an ANC response to the information that we requested from DDOT. I believe the deadline was October 28th. And again, this was received by the Office of Zoning on November 9th.

Just quickly reviewing the letter, it looks like the ANC has been very busy with respect to this case and has addressed the information that is contained in the DDOT report and that articulates the community output and the meetings that have occurred since the Public Meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I actually would be in favor of waiving our rules and allowing the ANC letter from Ms. Alston into the record.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, I believe that our Rule 3100.5 does Dettman. allow us to waive the timeliness issue in this And I think for all the reasons you cased. articulated, I think it would pretty much make good sense to do that, so Ι would be supportive of that.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: I believe that it is important to have the letters in timely. I think that based on some additional discussions that we will be having later, I think that it would be relevant to permit the letter into the record.

VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Thank you. Specific to the information that the Board requested from DDOT to close the Public Hearing and then just to kind of briefly touch upon some of the topics of discussion, the main topics of discussion from the Public did receive, again Hearing, we Mr. Моу articulated this already, Exhibit No. 31 from DDOT dated October 16, 2009.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Essentially, DDOT kind of lays out in this three page memo that they provided us their rationale for supporting. They essentially just reiterate their support for this project stating at the top of page 2 that the applicant has provided DDOT а transportation study supporting redevelopment of the property located at 4975 South Dakota Avenue, N.E., with a three pump gas station and convenience market.

Further down the page, DDOT notes the applicant reviewed the potential impact for cut through traffic on the North Michigan Park community and the response is credible.

Those were the two main items that I thought went directly to some of the questions that the Board had at the Public Hearing. However, if you will remember, colleagues, at the Public Hearing, DDOT had mentioned that in order to adequately assess the impacts of additional traffic generated by this use on the surrounding community, they

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

had actually relied upon a transportation study that was conducted for a site along Minnesota Avenue. It was a recent BZA case for a gasoline service station, which I believe was by the same applicant, Mr. Koo Yuen.

So DDOT felt that it was adequate to utilize that transportation study and the findings and the type of traffic that surrounded the Minnesota Avenue site and the number of trips that would be generated by that gasoline service station.

They felt comfortable relying upon that study in order to come to a conclusion as to whether to support or not support this particular application. We had requested that DDOT provide a little bit more thorough of a rationale on how they actually got to their support for this project in reliance upon that previous study.

We had asked for the rationale. We had actually also asked for the -- that

NEAL R. GROSS

particular transportation study to be served on us, as well as the ANC. And we were very clear that we wanted to make sure that the ANC and the community had an adequate amount of time to work with the applicant, to work with DDOT and meet with the community, so that they could adequately analyze whatever information was submitted with respect to the impacts to transportation and traffic and whatnot.

Mr. Chairman, I feel, at this time, the record is not full enough. I think that the special exception criteria, the standard that needs to be met under 706 and Chapter 23, this is a special exception. I think that this is a use that is presumed to be appropriate for this particular Zone District.

And I think that the standard for special exception is that if the relevant provisions are met, the Board must ordinarily grant the relief. However, at this point, especially with respect to 706.4 that states "The operation of the use shall not create

NEAL R. GROSS

dangerous or other objectionable traffic conditions," I don't think we have enough information in the record for us to adequately come to a conclusion on how this use is actually going to impact the surrounding transportation network.

That's not to say that I disagree with DDOT. I just think that they have provided us with support for a project, based upon a methodology, I'll say, that is different than the way we typically see it.

We usually have a transportation study that is generated for a particular site.

And in this case we don't.

So I think that if DDOT wants to continue to rely upon the Minnesota Avenue Study, we need kind of a rationale on how they got there. And from a transportation engineering perspective how that is appropriate in order to measure one site based off the study of another.

I also think that it is important

NEAL R. GROSS

that the community be served with this information. I did notice in our Exhibit No. 32 the ANC states that "In addition to the traffic study that DDOT relied upon, they also requested a complete email list of the dates in which DDOT meetings took place and a record of correspondence." And it appears as if the ANC has not received any of that information as yet.

So I think a little extra time for this case would allow the ANC to get the information that they think that they need.

I will say that the applicant having not met their burden yet is not off the hook. I think that they need to be engaged with the community. And it is really their burden to meet. It's not DDOT's. It's the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate to the Board that they meet the provision of 706.4.

And so whether that is working with the community and DDOT in order to come

NEAL R. GROSS

together and discuss the existing transportation study for Minnesota Avenue or taking the initiative to create a Traffic Impact Study for this specific location, which is actually my preference.

But I'm willing to entertain kind of both ways of going about measuring transportation impacts. So I think that the applicant still has some work to do here as well.

said, That being Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that you can gather already that I'm in favor of putting our decision off with the stipulation that our focus be on making sure that the ANC and the community gets enough time to analyze whatever information is generated, getting their heads around this somewhat complicated matter of measuring transportation impact and that we keep that in mind when we are scheduling and finding a date.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Mr. Dettman, I

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

think that you provided a very full summary and I do agree with your conclusion. I just wanted to add a couple of different points.

I think that the applicant may potentially have detrimentally relied on DDOT's approval and so because of that, I would not want to burden them any more with a long time frame for them to have to wait.

I do though think that it is their burden to submit an application that under 706.4, there has been plenty of testimony that the traffic conditions would be objectionable and thus, they have to then -- the burden goes back to them to show that there is no objectionable conditions, that there is sufficient analysis so that we can rely on a Minnesota Study or that there is another study that may be presented as you suggested.

I think that in addition to that, you know, it's their responsibility to make sure if DDOT is not being responsive to the ANC's request that, you know, they encourage

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that communication, such as, you know, making sure that the ANC has a copy of the survey and that they have a copy of whatever dates the meetings occurred, since, obviously, they were both in attendance at the meetings.

You know, the applicant does not have to just sit back and wait for DDOT to respond. They can contact the ANC themselves and make sure that they are communicating and obtaining all the different information that is needed, so we can make an adequate decision at the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you, Ms. Moldenhauer and Mr. Dettman. I, too, agree with both of you with respect to your analysis of where we are. And I'm a little troubled as well, and it may or may not be the applicant, it may be the Department of Transportation, it may just be everybody's work load, but what comes across as a lack of transparency in articulating the basis for the conclusions around traffic impacts.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We had a very long exchange at the initial hearing about articulating the basis for the conclusions for the traffic impacts and being transparent. Just being straight up about what the conclusion is based on.

I'm going to read a little bit from the transcript. This is at page 185. I'll be very brief, but it talks about sort of where we are right now. And this is Chairman Loud saying "We would like to see a report from DDOT. It's too bad that they are not still here, but a report from DDOT that addresses the section 706 requirements and the 2303, the grounds for relief particularly as relates to the traffic and transportation elements of the requirements.

I think we would also like to see an articulation in the DDOT report of the basis of their utilizing 3710 Minnesota Avenue as the study. There was testimony to that regard by Mr. Jennings today, but I think a written articulation of the basis for why they

NEAL R. GROSS

did that and then I would like to see the 3710 report as appended to the DDOT report and made a part of our record."

So I think we were clear that we wanted to see why the Department tied the 3710 report to this application, essentially, giving this applicant a privilege to not have a study for this site.

And I think where we were at the hearing was that okay, if that is the direction that the professionals at DDOT want to go in, we will allow that, but let's have an articulation of why that should be the case and let's see a copy of this report and the analysis appended to the report.

We don't have that. We just have, as Mr. Dettman mentioned and Mrs. Moldenhauer mentioned, the two page, I think, from DDOT which is very conclusory and it just suggests again a lack of transparency.

I went on the record at the hearing and said I thought this was a great project,

NEAL R. GROSS

really exciting elements, fresh fruit, no bulletproof glass, not selling any rolling papers, not going for an alcohol license, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, but we were also clear that, like Mrs. Moldenhauer said, there is a standard that has to be met.

There is a standard that has to be met. It's the applicant's burden to meet that standard. Hopefully they are able to work with and don't run into any obstacles from Government agencies like DDOT. But at the end of the day, it's the applicant's burden to meet that standard.

And so I agree with you, Mr.

Dettman. I agree with you, Mrs. Moldenhauer.

And let me open it back up. I'm going to review something and let me open it back up.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: It appears potentially that there actually was a specific South Dakota Transportation Study done. And if that is the case though, we still don't have that in our record. And I think that

NEAL R. GROSS

some of the discussion that we are having right now in the Board is because of the potential, maybe the lack of clarity in the DDOT report.

Obviously, just simply referred to on the second page, you know, a supporting survey when we were not sure whether that supporting study was a new one or was the old one. Even if it is the case that a new one has been then done, completed, the question is from the Exhibit 32, it doesn't appear as though the ANC has ever received a copy of it from their letter.

And at the same time while we do not have a copy of that report and we would want at least either to have a DDOT report or something from the applicant that we can understand the clarification, that that is what the final DDOT report and decision was based on.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yeah, it appears again we're sort of trying to fill in the

NEAL R. GROSS

gaps, not typically taking testimony at a decision meeting, but having received some information that apparently there was a study done. Presumably, it was done by the applicant.

Part of the gap we're trying to fill in that the study that was done by the applicant was provided to DDOT, it was also provided to the ANC. No, it was provided to DDOT. And DDOT submitted a report to us that not only did it not reference the study, but did not attach it.

I think the DDOT report, if I'm correct -- well, you know what, it is vaguely worded. However, it could be interpreted, I'm looking at the DDOT exhibit, as meaning that the DDOT staff did review a transportation report for South Dakota.

The way it is worded, it's not clear whether they were talking about a study at 3710 or 4975 South Dakota. So it looks like we are able to clear that up. So perhaps

NEAL R. GROSS

what we are looking at now really is making sure that the Board gets a copy of this study that DDOT is referencing, so that we have an opportunity to review traffic and transportation impacts that are in the study.

I don't think it changes necessarily the outcome that, Mr. Dettman, you had suggested we aim for today, but it may change exactly what we are looking for. And I think both the actual 4975 study and then a time line that allows the ANC to look at this study and offer some comments.

So with that, is there further discussion on this point? Okay. So I think what we need to do now is come up with a reasonable time line to get this study in the hands of the Board with a copy to the ANC with an opportunity for the ANC to respond.

Kind of all of what we did the first time, I think, but to do it all over again with an opportunity for the ANC to respond in this 4975 South Dakota study. And

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I believe the first time around we gave the
2	applicant an opportunity to respond to the ANC
3	and so we should do that again as well.
4	We're going to take the
5	extraordinary step of asking the ANC leader to
6	come up, the person that is authorized to
7	speak on behalf of the ANC. And it's just for
8	the specific purpose of trying to get a
9	reasonable time line before us. Not any of
10	the merits of the case.
11	Good afternoon, Commissioner
12	Alston, correct?
13	MS. ALSTON: Yes, sir.
14	CHAIRMAN LOUD: All right. How are
15	you this afternoon?
16	MS. ALSTON: Fine and yourself?
17	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Very good. So you
18	have heard some of our deliberation regarding
19	the follow-up study and the confusion about
20	whether it was or was not completed.
21	I think what we are looking for now
22	is to make sure that gets in your hands, in

	your commission's hands, you have an adequate
2	reasonable time to review it and then to
3	submit something back into our record.
4	MS. ALSTON: Okay.
5	CHAIRMAN LOUD: So with that as the
6	backdrop, is there a time frame that you would
7	be looking at to both have this and that you
8	could get something to us?
9	MS. ALSTON: The ANC meets the
10	fourth Wednesday at every month.
11	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes.
12	MS. ALSTON: Because the fourth
13	Wednesday of this month is the day before
14	Thanksgiving, we meet the 18 th of November,
15	which is next Wednesday.
16	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes.
17	MS. ALSTON: After that, we don't
18	meet again until the fourth Wednesday in
19	January.
20	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes.
21	MS. ALSTON: Because we are out in
22	December. So at this point, it's no way we

1	can get this on the November 18 th deadline, our
2	November 18 th . So the next date for
3	consideration would be like the fourth
4	Wednesday in January for us to even hear it at
5	a monthly meeting and then get a response back
6	to you would be the beginning of February.
7	CHAIRMAN LOUD: So you're saying
8	you don't meet at all in December?
9	MS. ALSTON: No, sir.
10	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. And notice
11	has already gone out for the November 18
12	meeting?
13	MS. ALSTON: Yes, sir.
14	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay.
15	MS. ALSTON: And we have to allot 7
16	days, but prior to it, it has to be taken to
17	the affected Commission, the area.
18	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes.
19	MS. ALSTON: And the area has to
20	have a Single Member District meeting and then
21	once that is decided, it goes before the
22	Commission as a whole for their support and

1	what the community wants.
2	CHAIRMAN LOUD: All right. So
3	we're looking at the end of January for your
4	internal process.
5	MS. ALSTON: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Noticed quorum
7	meeting.
8	MS. ALSTON: Yes, sir.
9	CHAIRMAN LOUD: All right. And so
10	you would have reviewed everything by that
11	point?
12	MS. ALSTON: Yes, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. And then
14	after that, how long would it take you to
15	submit a report to the BZA?
16	MS. ALSTON: Not even a week,
17	probably less than a week.
18	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay.
19	MS. ALSTON: Just a couple of days.
20	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. All right.
21	And again, give me the exact date in January
22	that we are talking about. Ms. Bailey, I'm

1	going to ask for your help in a second.
2	MS. ALSTON: The 27 th .
3	CHAIRMAN LOUD: The?
4	MS. ALSTON: 27 th .
5	MS. BAILEY: The 27 th , the fourth
6	Wednesday.
7	MS. ALSTON: The fourth Wednesday.
8	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. And then
9	after, presumably, you would close it out or
10	the 27 th , the Commission would take a position
11	with respect to the contents of the study.
12	MS. ALSTON: On the 27 th .
13	CHAIRMAN LOUD: On the 27 th .
14	MS. ALSTON: And then it will just
15	be us getting something to you in writing.
16	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. And the
17	calendar I'm looking at, Ms. Bailey, doesn't
18	even go that far, so I need a little help.
19	MR. MOY: If I can intervene, Mr.
20	Chair, if I can help?
21	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes, sir.
22	MR. MOY: The 27 th , which is the

1	last Wednesday of January, the 31 st , the last
2	day of January is a Sunday, so the following
3	Monday is February the 1 st , would be February
4	the 1 st .
5	MS. ALSTON: Right.
6	CHAIRMAN LOUD: All right. And I'm
7	assuming that all right. So you could get
8	something to us by that
9	MS. ALSTON: By February 1 st .
10	CHAIRMAN LOUD: February 1 st .
11	MS. ALSTON: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN LOUD: And then I'm
13	assuming that the applicant would want an
14	opportunity to respond to whatever the ANC
15	submitted. Yes, why don't you join us at the
16	table and just introduce yourself for the
17	record?
18	MS. FULLER: Good afternoon.
19	Carlynn Fuller, attorney for the applicant.
20	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Good afternoon, Ms.
21	
	Fuller.

1	Are there special provisions for an emergency
2	meeting of the ANC? I mean, I understand your
3	normal process, but isn't there a process when
4	there is an exceptional circumstance that
5	allows you to call an emergency meeting?
6	Because the applicant is going to
7	endure an undue hardship. I mean, they did
8	provide the report to DDOT and we, again,
9	relied on that DDOT would do what they were
10	supposed to do in their report to the Board
11	and to the applicant.
12	Now, we have to, you know,
13	conceivably we are going to, wait three more
14	months.
15	CHAIRMAN LOUD: I do want to
16	commend the applicant for following up with
17	the study.
18	MS. FULLER: And the applicant paid
19	for that study.
20	CHAIRMAN LOUD: No, I understand.
21	MS. FULLER: So I mean
22	CHAIRMAN LOUD: But now, there is

1 also a requirement that you serve all parties 2 and the ANC is a party. MS. FULLER: And I guess we figured 3 that since DDOT had to submit their report, 4 that their findings with the traffic study 5 that was submitted would be included in that 6 7 report. And you know, unfortunately, that was our error in relying on DDOT, but that's what 8 we did, since DDOT was charged with submitting 9 10 the report, not the applicant at the last hearing. 11 CHAIRMAN LOUD: No, I understand. 12 13 MS. FULLER: So I mean --It is a mistake to CHAIRMAN LOUD: 14 15 But again, the rule is that you serve make. all parties. Let's ask for your specific 16 question to see if we can close this out and 17 try to get a date that will work. 18

I think her question is can you have an expedited meeting, an emergency meeting some way that would allow this to get back on BZA calendar before February $\mathbf{1}^{\text{st}}$ or

19

20

21

February 8th?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. ALSTON: We can call emergency meeting in December. Again, the fourth Wednesday is like the day before Christmas, which you won't have a quorum, I'm sure you won't. And the ANC Guidelines state that you only have to have nine meetings a I have capped that nine meetings a month. month this year, so stretching to have November meeting was a fight.

If we call for a December meeting and there is no quorum, it's a waste of time, because people aren't going to come out, unfortunately, the week before Christmas. So I don't see that -- I really don't see that happening.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Can I ask a question? You said earlier you need 7 days to give notice and right now we're on the $10^{\rm th}$.

MS. ALSTON: Okay.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: And the next meeting isn't until the $18^{\rm th}$ of November. What

would stop you from being able to provide notice for the meeting on November 18th? I mean, obviously, I also see a very active, you know, constituents, individuals, citizens in the audience right now. I think that most people that would be interested in responding or at least contributing have notice currently of potentially having that issue on the calendar.

MS. ALSTON: Unfortunately, that's not the way it works, because it's a Single Member District issue in my Single Member District, which is 5A03. I have to serve my community 7 days in advance to have a meeting for SMD 5A03. And so at the earliest that meeting would probably be Tuesday. If I sent it, it would be the 18th.

At that meeting, I would give the consensus of my community. We would sit down and go over the traffic study. Then I have to present it to the Commission as a whole and say hey, let's look at this traffic study, but

NEAL R. GROSS

take in mind this is what the community wants. Then at the next meeting, which would be the $18^{\rm th}$, that's where we would discuss it as a Commission, give findings and then take a stance from there.

It's no way to have two meetings before the November the 18th meeting and give 7 day notice. So it's not 7 day notice for the 18th meeting. It's 7 day notice for a community meeting in which then I take to the Commission.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: So I'm trying to work with this. So if you gave 7 days notice today.

MS. ALSTON: Yes.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: For a meeting for your Single Member District and then you, at the same time, talked with the Commission as a whole and told them that you were going to try to address this issue on the 18th, you would then be already able to have potentially a meeting on the 17th within the 7 days and

NEAL R. GROSS

then go to the Commission on the 18th.

MS. ALSTON: Which is good, but I can't have a meeting on the 17th. I have prior — I have obligations on Tuesdays and Thursdays. So I can't do that. And it's unfair to push this on our community, when we have had a month and a half and nothing happened. So for me to stress that on them is not fair either.

MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: As to the Board, I mean, I don't like the idea of having to stretch this out. The last time we heard this case was, you know, a couple of months ago when we waited and we had a long time frame to then, you know, stretch this out all the way into mid-February, I would just try to see if there is a way. I would be happy to see if there was a way to work it out to have an earlier time frame to resolve this. That's my encouragement.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: I agree with the spirit of where you're going with it, just

getting close to the holidays and the ANC normally only meeting once per month and their decision to -- you're not going to meet in December at all?

MS. ALSTON: Not in December.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: They don't meet in December. It just creates a very difficult situation for everybody and I'm not certain that our -- trying to encourage the ANC, I know, is what we should be doing and we're really trying to encourage you, but I just don't think the way the statutory scheme is set up that we can force the ANC to meet any earlier than the statute requires and what their internal bylaws require them.

I mean, it would really serve everyone's interest to have a prompt resolution of this. And to Mrs. Moldenhauer's point, the community has been and is very engaged on the issue. You know, I'm not trying to force a December meeting on you.

I agree with you, I think November

NEAL R. GROSS

1	is just, you know, inconvenient.
2	MS. ALSTON: But then, you know,
3	it's like we're just meeting with the
4	applicant. We are going through a traffic
5	study that takes some time to digest to a
6	community and then to a Commission whose
7	agenda was set at the beginning of this month
8	for the October's meeting.
9	It is not going to be small. This
10	is a detailed traffic study
11	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes.
12	MS. ALSTON: that you are asking
13	us to consider.
14	CHAIRMAN LOUD: This is
15	unfortunately, because, I mean, this applicant
16	has done what it was supposed to do by getting
17	the study, and as Ms. Fuller indicated, at
18	some considerable expense to them. So it's
19	not anything, I think, that they have done
20	wrong, other than not serve you as a party.
21	MS. ALSTON: Well, how long will it
22	take us to get a copy of the traffic study?

1	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Did you bring any
2	with you right now?
3	MS. FULLER: We can have it to them
4	this afternoon.
5	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay.
6	MS. FULLER: I mean, that's not an
7	issue.
8	CHAIRMAN LOUD: You didn't bring
9	any with you today?
10	MS. FULLER: No. We have it
11	electronic.
12	CHAIRMAN LOUD: I see.
13	MS. FULLER: So we can email it or
14	print it out.
15	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Well, she said
16	today, I mean.
17	MS. FULLER: Yeah, we can have it
18	to you today.
19	CHAIRMAN LOUD: As early as today.
20	Sorry, Commissioner Alston, I think you were
21	getting ready to
22	MS. ALSTON: I am trying to see if

I can --

CHAIRMAN LOUD: -- respond.

MS. ALSTON: -- find a date in December. I'll work to call a special meeting in December and I'll encourage them to come out. That meeting would probably be the 16th. I'll work to have it on the 16th of December.

MR. MOY: And that's your meeting with the SMD?

MS. ALSTON: No, that would be the meeting with the ANC as a whole. So if today is the 10th, if we could get the traffic study soon, I can call a Single Member District meeting and then hear reports from that and then take it to the Committee as a whole at an ANC meeting and then that way we will call it the third week in December. Then we can schedule something and I can get something back to you maybe that Friday.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: I think Mr. Dettman may have had a couple of thoughts. I mean, I'm looking at that as maybe saving a couple

1 of weeks. 2 MS. ALSTON: Yes. CHAIRMAN LOUD: And if we are able 3 to deliberate at the end of December versus 4 deliberating the end of January. You had a 5 6 couple of suggestions. I don't want to stand 7 in front of you. VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: Well, if the 8 ANC could make that work, I think the Board 9 10 could accommodate that. I'm just looking at our calendar. And you had said December 16th? 11 MS. ALSTON: Yes. 12 13 VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: That gives us our last meeting before the holidays, December 14 22nd. 15 And if for whatever reason the ANC can't, you know --16 CHAIRMAN LOUD: Right. 17 VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: 18 get 19 organized, then we're automatically So I was wondering if this would 20 January. If the SMD could have a special meeting work? 21

NEAL R. GROSS

in the beginning of December?

1 MS. ALSTON: Yes. VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: So that you 2 can look at the study with your constituents. 3 And the ANC could hold a special meeting 4 right after the New Year holiday, like --5 MS. ALSTON: So we're going back to 6 7 January? VICE CHAIR DETTMAN: So the first 8 January. If you could hold your 9 week of 10 special SMD meeting in December, so that gives you from today until the beginning of December 11 yourself, to look 12 for you, at this 13 transportation study and then present it to your SMD in the beginning of December. 14 15 Then you can take it to your ANC in the very beginning of January. 16 MS. ALSTON: The only thing about 17 that is we have to have elections in January. 18 19 So they are not -- we're not going to have a community meeting the first week, an executive 20 committee meeting and then another 21

meeting all in the month of January.

would be too much on the Commission.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

What I will do is in December we have an executive committee meeting the first Monday, which would be December the 7th is what is normally scheduled for, but because we're not having a meeting in December, I would see could see if the Commission would entertain having a special meeting that day to address this issue, which means that we would have to get the traffic study from applicant today, so that I could have 7 day notice to give it to my constituents maybe the Tuesday or Monday before Thanksgiving and then follow-up.

Give the Commissioners a week to review and then have a special meeting the first Monday in December. That's if the deadlines are met. Then that way in December, you all can hear the first, second, third Tuesday of the month, whichever was more convenient for you.

MS. FULLER: We can definitely give

1	her that report today, so we can meet that
2	deadline.
3	CHAIRMAN LOUD: So then let me just
4	go back over those dates, because there would
5	be some filing requirements to BZA for that.
6	So applicant would get the ANC the study
7	today.
8	MS. FULLER: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN LOUD: And also provide
10	the BZA with a copy of the study as well,
11	obviously.
12	MS. FULLER: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Then the ANC would
14	notice a Single Member District meeting?
15	MS. ALSTON: Yes, sir.
16	CHAIRMAN LOUD: On the 18 th you
17	said? You said a week before Thanksgiving.
18	Okay. I'm sorry, go ahead.
19	MS. ALSTON: We have to work with
20	the facility to see what is available, too,
21	and then with the holiday approaching, we
22	would have a Single Member District in a

1	timely manner.
2	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay.
3	MS. ALSTON: Then that way I could
4	take it to the Commission the first week in
5	December.
6	CHAIRMAN LOUD: All right. And
7	your meetings are still going to be on
8	Wednesdays or since it's a special meeting
9	there is no
LO	MS. ALSTON: Right.
11	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. But you
12	think that would be the first week in
L3	December? You just don't know what date right
L4	now?
L5	MS. ALSTON: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
L6	CHAIRMAN LOUD: And then would it
L7	be safe to say one week after that?
L8	MS. ALSTON: That's fine.
L9	CHAIRMAN LOUD: When would you know
20	what date the meeting was going to be?
21	MS. ALSTON: I mean, I can schedule
22	the meeting the 2^{nd} . Probably the 1^{st} . No. We

have a meeting that day. See, this again is provided we can get a quorum. So I would have to see who is going to respond, because it was pulling teeth to get a meeting in November, the nine because met meeting a we requirements by the District Government. So they were pulling tooth and nail to get a November meeting. Provided we can get а quorum,

Provided we can get a quorum, because we're trying to accommodate the applicant, I would say the first week in December and then that way I could get the response back to you by the 7th.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: Is that a Monday?

MS. ALSTON: That's a Monday.

CHAIRMAN LOUD: All right. So you got it back to us by December 7th. That would be your report. And then we allow the applicant a week after that to respond to the ANC's report. Counsel?

MS. FULLER: We can have it by that $\label{eq:final_point} \text{Friday, the } 11^{\text{th}}.$

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 CHAIRMAN LOUD: December 11, which 2 means we would be able to place it on the calendar for, was that, December 15? So it 3 looks like we would be able to have a decision 4 deliberation on December 15th. Does that work, 5 Commissioner? 6 MS. ALSTON: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN LOUD: Ms. Fuller? 8 MS. FULLER: Yes, thank you. 9 10 CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. Thank you both and, again, appreciate both of you for 11 your follow-up, obviously. A lot of work has 12 13 been done since we last met on it. And for the things that fell in the gaps, 14 we do 15 apologize. 16 MS. FULLER: Thank you. CHAIRMAN LOUD: 17 Okay. MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: And, 18 19 Commissioner Alston, I appreciate all the hard work that your community and you are doing in 20 regards to working with, you know, us and our 21

support of having that fast meeting.

1	you.
2	MS. ALSTON: Could I be very can
3	I make a
4	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes.
5	MS. ALSTON: I have a comment for
6	clarity.
7	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Yes.
8	MS. ALSTON: The traffic study that
9	I will receive today is for 4975 South Dakota
10	Avenue?
11	MS. FULLER: That's correct.
12	MS. ALSTON: Okay. Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Thank you both.
14	Ms. Bailey, did you want to read back those
15	dates or did you have any questions for
16	clarification?
17	MS. BAILEY: I can read back the
18	dates, Mr. Chair.
19	CHAIRMAN LOUD: I'm sorry, I'm
20	sorry. Mr. Moy.
21	MS. BAILEY: Sorry.
22	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. I forgot

1	we're in decision.
2	MR. MOY: Oh, that's all right.
3	Ms. Bailey can back me up.
4	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay.
5	MR. MOY: The way I understand it
6	from my notes, if I can still read my notes,
7	the ANC would file their report or their
8	letter by Monday, December 7 th .
9	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Well, let's start
10	with this. The applicant is going to give the
11	ANC the report
12	MR. MOY: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN LOUD: today, November
14	10 th .
15	MR. MOY: That's fine. Well,
16	that's good. Then the applicant will provide
17	the transportation study.
18	CHAIRMAN LOUD: And Mrs.
19	Moldenhauer has reminded me and the BZA would
20	get that as well.
21	MR. MOY: That's right. Would
22	serve the ANC and would serve all the parties,

1	including the ANC and the BZA
2	MS. FULLER: Yes.
3	MR. MOY: today, November 10 th ,
4	close of business November 10 th .
5	MS. FULLER: Yes.
6	MR. MOY: Then the ANC would meet,
7	the full ANC would meet sometime during the
8	first week of December, depending on which
9	date they would be able to hold a quorum. And
10	then would file a resolution or a letter to
11	the Board, to the BZA Monday, December 7^{th} ,
12	correct? And responses?
13	MS. ALSTON: December 7 th .
14	MR. MOY: The applicant's response
15	by December the 11 th .
16	MS. FULLER: Yes.
17	MR. MOY: Which is a Friday, I
18	believe.
19	MS. FULLER: Yes.
20	MR. MOY: Okay. And the Board
21	would hold a Special Public Meeting on this
22	application on Tuesday, December the 15 th .

1	MEMBER MOLDENHAUER: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Okay. Again, thank
3	you both. We look forward to your following
4	and sticking to the schedule. We are not
5	inclined for any more postponements. I think
6	once we get this report, we will have a full
7	record and can move forward to deliberation
8	and on December 15 we will deliberate the
9	case.
10	MS. FULLER: Thank you.
11	MS. ALSTON: Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Anything further on
13	the decision?
14	MR. MOY: That should do it, Mr.
15	Chairman.
16	CHAIRMAN LOUD: What?
17	MR. MOY: That should do it.
18	CHAIRMAN LOUD: Finally.
19	(Whereupon, the Special Public
20	Meeting was concluded at 1:59 p.m.)