## GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

TEXT AMENDMENTS TEMPORARY BALLPARK
ACCESSORY SURFACE
PARKING LOTS

Case No. 07-08A

Thursday February 21, 2008

The Public Hearing of Case No. 07-08A by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in Room 220 South, 441 4<sup>th</sup> 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 GREGORY N. JEFFRIES, Vice Chairman CURTIS L. ETHERLY, JR., Commissioner MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (OAC)

PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary DONNA HANOUSEK, Zoning Specialist

## OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS JOEL LAWSON

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the public hearing held on February 21, 2008.

## A-G-E-N-D-A

Report of the Office of Planning	
Mr. Lawson	4
Report of ANC-6D Mr. Roger Moffett	30
Parties in Opposition Ms. Carolyn Mitchell	52
Mr. Roger McBee	55
Ms. Nancy Masterson	69

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	7:10 p.m.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go
4	now to our first case. We disposed of the
5	second case first and now the first case
6	will be second. Anyway, again we have
7	Zoning Commission Case No. 07-08A, Text
8	Amendment to the Ballpark Parking. Ms.
9	Schellin, I don't think we have any
10	preliminary matters?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We'll go
13	straight to the Office of Planning. Mr.
14	Lawson?
15	MR. LAWSON: Good evening Mr.
16	Chair and members of the Commission. My
17	name is Joel Lawson with the Office of
18	Planning. Back in July of 2007 you gave
19	approval to a case which would permit
20	temporary parking lots on 11 specified
21	squares and portions of squares in proximity
22	to the ballpark. The current case before

you for which you took emergency action in
October 2007 and again this month, earlier
this month, is for the extension of that
permission to eight additional sites in the
Capitol Gateway CR District. That's Squares
603, 605, 657, 661, 662, 662 East and 664 as
well as Lot 7 in Square 658, as well as to
one additional square in the Capitol Gateway
W2 District, Square 664 East. If this is
approved, any temporary parking lot in any
of these squares would also be subject to
all of the conditions established in the
original order for the original 11 squares.
That includes the cap of 3,775 spaces in
total, so for the ones that you approved in
July as well as for these that area under
consideration tonight the cap of 3,775 would
apply to all those sites. This proposal is
not to add additional parking; it's to
provide additional flexibility in terms of
the location of where those temporary
parking spaces could go.

The other conditions that would apply to these include the expiration date of April 1, 2013. These are temporary lots and the 5-year limit is what was established in the first approval. It would request DDOT approval of the traffic routing plan. It would require that the temporary parking lots be available for ballpark, ballpark attendees for 1.5 hours prior to the start time to 3 hours after the start time, and it would establish other parking size and drive aisle requirements as well as surface treatment, landscaping and lighting requirements. All of those conditions would apply to these new lots as well.

The new lots would also be of course, just like the existing approval, in fact any surface parking space in the District, it would be subject to review at the building permit stage by the Department of the Environment for stormwater issues and other environmental issues, and they would

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of course also be under - the building permit would receive review by the District Department of Transportation and that would be for lot design, access issues, issues related to how ballpark patrons would get from those parking lots to the ballpark. That would all be addressed at the building permit stage.

I've said this many times in the past, but for the record I've got to say it again, that normally OP is not supportive of surface parking lots and that's for all the reasons that we noted in our report.

However, the current proposal would not increase the number of parking spaces beyond what's already approved by the Commission.

It would provide additional flexibility in their siting and at the same time it would provide additional certainty over the longer term over where these parking spaces could go. There's no guarantee that parking lots will go on any of these sites frankly, but

2.

the Nationals have requested this

flexibility so that they could work with

owners and then work with their patrons, the

ballpark patrons, to adequately publicize

where those spots are well in advance of

when they're actually available to help ease

issues of how those lots would be accessed.

All the proposed sites are relatively flat. They're all currently paved over. None of them are green space right now. The sites are all within easy and convenient walking distance of the ballpark and per the access limitations already placed in the existing order they will not be accessed through existing lowdensity residential areas. As such we recommend that the Zoning Commission adopt these amendments as outlined in the OP I'm available report and that's it for me. for questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you Mr. Lawson. Colleagues, I'm going to open

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	it up for questions. Commissioner Turnbull?
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr.
3	Lawson, you mentioned flexibility as one of
4	the issues. Is there a problem with the
5	availability of the existing sites?
6	MR. LAWSON: There are some sites
7	that are currently used right now. In fact,
8	some of them are actually used for parking.
9	But the thought is that over time some of
10	those spots may be available. They're not
11	available right now, but at some point
12	during that 5-year period they may become
13	available. It's basically to allow a bit of
14	a phased approach to how parking will be
15	approached related to the ballpark. One
16	year the sites may be on these particular
17	sites. Those parking spots may go away
18	because the owner of that site decides to
19	develop it for some other use and so the
20	Nationals would hopefully be able to provide
21	spots in some other location on one of the
22	other sites that's under consideration by

the Commission, or frankly be able to 1 provide those sites in for example maybe an 2. 3 office building that gets built and they'd be able to use the basement parking, you 4 know, that kind of stuff. So it's going to 5 be a flexible approach over probably a 6 7 number of years of where that parking is going to be located. What the Nationals 8 9 want is some certainty of where they could at least discuss where the sites could go 10 with the owners so that they can you know 11 12 enter that into the overall traffic 13 management plan. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: There is 14 15 no agreement as of yet, the Nationals, with 16 anyone? Not on the sites 17 MR. LAWSON: 18 that are under consideration tonight. 19 have formed some agreements with some of the 20 other sites that are already approved. There's already - also the Commission has 21 22 approved some ballpark sites, ballpark-

associated sites on the Southeast Federal 1 2 Center site. 3 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right. MR. LAWSON: But on the sites 4 5 that are under consideration now, they've reached, at least the last time they talked 6 7 to me there were no agreements with owners to provide parking on those sites yet. 8 9 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Now, the cap for the existing sites, these new 10 11 proposed sites and the Southeast Federal 12 site is still at 37? MR. LAWSON: Almost. 13 There is a cap of 3,775. That's for the sites that are 14 15 under consideration tonight as well as the ones that were approved in 07-08. 16 17 Southeast Federal Center site has a separate 18 approval process where temporary parking is 19 permitted on those sites separately. 20 I'm trying to remember how many parking spots are being proposed for that site, but 21 22 I believe it's somewhere in the neighborhood

1	of a thousand.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: There was
3	like four? I'm trying to remember if there
4	was four sites?
5	MR. LAWSON: It's either three or
6	four locations on the Southeast Federal
7	Center site, yes.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay,
9	thank you.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Mr.
11	Lawson, refresh my memory. What's the long-
12	term plan for parking in this baseball
13	district? Because these sites, I mean some
14	of these sites are going to be developed by
15	you know private sector developers at some
16	point. So what happens on a rolling basis?
17	Do they just go find other parking to make
18	up for the parking that's lost? I mean just
19	long-term.
20	MR. LAWSON: Well, I think you
21	know the crux of everybody's plan first of
22	all is that people won't drive at all; that
ļ	

people will take transit, that they'll walk,
they'll bike, they'll carpool as much as
possible to reduce the number of cars, and
that's certainly what DDOT and the Nationals
are stressing right now. They're trying to
really strongly, strongly encourage people
to not drive at all. But to say that
nobody's going to drive is also not a
reasonable expectation. So the plan is that
over time as new development comes onstream
that that development will include parking
and that that parking can be made available
to patrons of the ballpark kind of the same
way that people use MCI Park right now.
With MCI, you know again most people arrive
by Metro, most people don't even try to
drive, but for the people who do drive they
don't park on the MCI site because there is
no parking. Instead they park in existing
office buildings, in other parking
structures associated with other buildings
where there's parking available.

With the Southeast/Southwest area we're starting to see this development come onstream really quickly. There's a lot of cranes down there right now. There's a lot of development happening and a lot more is going to happen, but those parking spaces in those buildings just aren't ready yet because the buildings aren't ready. time these - and certainly by five years from now when the approval for these surface parking lots goes away the Nationals will have to enter into agreements with other building owners to allow ballpark patrons to make use of those parking sites, or those parking sites will have to be - will be made available through those other developments. VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: So the

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: So the thought is that over time there's going to be some sort of educational program to get people who were previously, the first few years, driving, I mean they see all the congestion and so forth, they're like you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

know listen, I can't do that anymore. 1 you're assuming that there will be a certain 2 3 percentage of people who will after the first two or three years won't be driving 4 and they'll be taking the Metro. 5 Some of these lots will be developed and most of 6 7 them you're assuming will be office developments, so there will be a temporary 8 9 period where that parking will not be available, but it'll be you know re-10 11 inventoried once the development is up. 12 What about residential development? I mean, are you seeing that 13 there might be a lot of residential 14 15 development on some of these lots that are 16 currently in place? You're not going to 17 replace those. 18 MR. LAWSON: Yes, we actually 19 don't have development proposals for any of 20 the lots that are under consideration 21 tonight, at least none that have come to the There certainly may be 22 Office of Planning.

sites that owners have started to prepare some plans for, but not that I've seen.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But kind of more generally in the area we are seeing a nice mix of residential and office being proposed, and you're absolutely right. I mean, it's much more difficult, I would say pretty close to impossible that residential parking lots, underground parking lots for a residential building could be made available to ballpark patrons. I don't think that's the expectation of DDOT. But there will be a good representation of office buildings and the anticipation is that in many cases the parking associated with those office buildings will be available.

But you know again, I want to stress that the education component is actually happening now. It's not waiting for two years from now, or five years from now. DDOT and the Nationals particularly are very heavily out there now stressing to

people who are going to be coming to this game, whether they're season ticket owners or whether they're the more occasional ball game person you know like myself, that you just shouldn't even consider bringing your car down here because Metro is going to be faster, it's going to be cheaper, it's going to be more convenient.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: So someone has sat down and done like a 10-year projection and made some assumptions about you know the amount of parking over the next five years, and then an assumption that in Year 7 you might lose so many spaces, then this is - I mean, has that - that has occurred? That kind of projection has occurred?

MR. LAWSON: In very general terms only because again none of us know exactly when particular buildings are going to be coming onstream. We see buildings coming up out of the ground and we certainly

hear from the owners of many of these properties that they're interested in developing when it fits their timetable. So certainly the expectation is that there will be other opportunities in the area for parking. You know again, the hope being that most people don't drive anyway.

But DDOT is very honest in saying that it needs to be a flexible approach here because on a year-to-year basis pretty much they need to reassess what's available, what's possible and then come up with their traffic management plan accordingly. are some parts of that plan that are set. For example, the initiatives to protect the neighborhoods, the existing lower-density areas from people parking on their streets. That's being set right now and that's going to continue. So there are parts of it that have already been worked out. But in terms of exactly where everybody is going to park every year, that's going to be a bit of a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

moving target. One of the things that we want to do is at least provide some certainty as to where those parking spots can go and by inference where those parking lots then can't go.

WICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes, I mean because obviously - I mean you know the housing market starts to turn around and rates stay low. I mean, that's a recipe for there to be pressure for residential development to start to pick up again and then as long as this plan is somewhat flexible and sort of addresses those types of upswings you know, because right now I mean I would imagine for a lot of the residential developers, I mean they might just want to lay low anyway.

But also I see that you guys are going to be coming to this Commission you know in another few years, I mean regularly anyway, right? With these - with more parking lot.

1	MR. LAWSON: I actually certainly
2	hope not. I'm hoping that the lots that are
3	already approved and are under consideration
4	are the extent of the lots that are going to
5	be under consideration. There aren't a lot
6	of additional alternatives, quite frankly.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But in
9	five years if the Nationals still have a
10	problem, are we looking at an extension?
11	MR. LAWSON: If the Nationals
12	wish to maintain some of the surface parking
13	lots, they would have to come back to the
14	Zoning Commission and tell the Zoning
15	Commission why those parking lots are still
16	needed. In other words, there's no
17	automatic rollover of their occupancy
18	permits or anything like that. On April 1,
19	2013, all those lots go away unless the
20	Zoning Commission says otherwise.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I for
22	one, I mean I won't be on the Zoning

1	Commission at that point, but I you know, I
2	hope that this Commission is going to be
3	somewhat thoughtful about this whole notion
4	of surface parking lots. I mean that has to
5	be a temporary thing. It's just not an
6	acceptable long-term solution period. I
7	mean, there's no way - this is just not the
8	District of Columbia. I mean, we - the
9	infrastructure is not set up. So as long as
10	this is always temporary because surface
11	parking lots is just, you know, just so
12	unacceptable long-term. So.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anybody else?
14	All right. Yes, Mr. May.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just had a
16	couple of follow-ups. You mentioned that
17	there were measures being taken to protect
18	the adjacent residential neighborhoods from
19	parking during games. Can you elaborate on
20	what that actually is?
21	MR. LAWSON: I can only elaborate
22	very roughly. I see that there's a
	I .

representative of the ANC who probably actually has more knowledge of this than I do at this point. But I think the plan is that there will be parking permit areas.

There will be restrictions to prevent people from driving down certain streets in the area so that people won't be parking in that area. But I think the main one is the restrictions on parking that will be I assume somewhat similar to what's existed around RFK for you know in the Capitol Hill area in terms of restrictions. So I assume that's kind of the basis of it, but they're taking it much further.

MPD, the Police Department's special events unit I think they're called have already started to plan out where they need to station people to make sure that they can control the traffic and guide the traffic for what streets they're supposed to be on and what streets they're not supposed to be on. DDOT is looking at the

signalization at intersections to see where it's appropriate to allow people to turn off the major streets and where it's not. a multi - kind of multi-tiered approach that they're taking in looking at every aspect of how people kind of get around the area, education frankly I think being the most important one. And the Nationals have indicated they've already or will be sending out maps to all of the ballpark patrons who are going to be bringing their cars to show them not only where their parking lot is, but how to get there and how not to get So it's just like a multi tiered approach and I think everybody realizes that nobody gains by it being confusing.

Having said that, there's going to be a lot of confusion at the beginning.

It's going to take awhile for this to 
probably a few games at least for this to really sort itself out. But hopefully we can get over that hump and I think my own

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

hope is that even all the commuters out there will hear how difficult traffic is going to be and even the commuters will take some other route on ballpark night, so maybe traffic will actually go down on game nights in the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't know that this is necessarily the right spot to voice this concern, but I would point out that the situation with RFK and the parking there was not quite analogous because people who were trying to park in the neighborhood were people who - they were doing it because they just didn't want to pay for the lot, or they didn't want to park as far away in the lot, felt they could park closer. This is a I mean, if there isn't different thing. parking that's available for them you may find that people are much more aggressive about trying to park in the neighborhood and so I would hope that the efforts to control that would be similarly aggressive.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The question I have, the only other question I have I think is that you mentioned that the Nationals have been working to establish some of these parking lots in the sites that were already approved and I'm just curious about how overall they're doing in terms of hitting that mark of 3,775, whether they are close to that mark or have a long way to go given that we're you know what, five weeks away from starting to have events there.

MR. LAWSON: Well, there's no magic number for the number of parking spaces. It's certainly not that if they have 3,775 spaces all problems would go away. I actually don't know an exact number at this point. And I know that they have a number of lots that they're actively working on. I'm not even sure if all of those will be available on opening day. I assume that's certainly their goal, to have them all available on opening day. If you wish I

could certainly get some additional information to you on where the Nationals are on their parking goals.

COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, I don't know that it necessarily will have much bearing on the decision-making, but I think it would be appropriate and helpful to have a status report on the overall parking picture for the stadium before we make any decisions on this. But I'll leave it up to the Commission to decide exactly what we would request by the end of the hearing. So that's it for me.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other questions? Let me just ask Mr. Lawson, we received some submittals and I believe a lot of questions are being asked of my colleagues. Something that stuck out in one of the submittals, it came from the ANC commissions, one of the community activists, and it was consistent in all letters.

Anyway, Page 2 of this particular piece says

Nationals - that these additional parking spaces - areas are not needed. So apparently from the way I'm gathering, I'm waiting to hear the testimony, but apparently the Nationals when they met with the community and DDOT - over half of those meetings took place with a Council member apparently it was stated that these were not needed. But then I heard you state that all they were trying to do was just get the flexibility. They may use them, they may I quess it depends upon simply the need.

MR. LAWSON: I didn't hear that from the Nationals, but that could very well be the case that they feel they have with these other spots they have their parking needs wrapped up for this year, or at least any parking lot that's going to be available you know they can already make available. But you're exactly right, I think what they're looking at is well, what happens

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

next year and what happens the year after that, and how do we start to plan for that this year so that we're not - so that we as a city frankly, you know the Police Department, DDOT, as well as the Nationals aren't scrambling you know every spring to try to come up with an overall traffic management program because hopefully in the future we'll have a clear idea of where all the parking lots will go you know further in advance, or well in advance. It's to allow for that planning to happen you know over the course of this 5-year period. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. there's an overall discussion - I want to make sure because I briefly looked at what we got tonight - between I guess DDOT, the community about, and you mentioned this in your testimony, about not going down certain streets and one-way streets. So all that dialogue is continuing?

There certainly is

MR. LAWSON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I attended a meeting last night dialoque. with some community representatives and I believe with DDOT, Police, Deputy Mayor's Office, OP, the Nationals, and I thought it was a productive meeting, to talk about overall traffic and parking management. I certainly assume that those conversations will continue and I certainly got a sense that DDOT was committing to have those, not just until when the ballpark opens, but even beyond that so that we can monitor how the system is working and make changes over time to make it work as well as it possibly can. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. We may have some questions. Any other questions? All right. Thank you, Mr. Does the ANC Chairman Moffett have any cross examination? Oh, they don't do cross? Okay, you're right. Well, we don't do it anyway. You know, depends on the One that I want to do I don't do it case. when I'm supposed to do it and I do do it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	when I'm not supposed to do it, so anyway,
2	that's the way life goes.
3	MS. SCHELLIN: They're next.
4	You're right.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, maybe that's
6	why I called him.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Try to cover up
9	the mistake, it's too late. Anyway,
10	Chairman Moffett, if you could come. Thank
11	you, Ms. Schellin. You always keep me
12	honest.
13	MR. MOFFETT: Good evening
14	Chairman Hood, Commissioners and other
15	interested parties. Thank you for allowing
16	me to address the body on behalf of ANC 6D -
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Excuse me. Would
18	you speak up just a little bit so we can
19	hear?
20	MR. MOFFETT: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well actually
22	they probably can hear you there. We want

to be able to hear you.

MR. MOFFETT: Okay. At a regularly scheduled public business meeting of ANC 6D on February 11, 2008, ANC 6D voted 7-0 to oppose the application of the Office of Planning to zone eight additional sites for temporary baseball stadium parking. It is a rare thing to find unanimity on votes in ANC 6D, but this instance demonstrates the resolve of our community.

In its earlier application for baseball stadium parking, OP included several lots in the Buzzard Point area. ANC 6D opposed all of those lots south of Potomac Avenue. In October, your order in Case 07-08 specifically prohibited either the Washington Nationals or the District Department of Transportation from directing baseball patrons to approved temporary parking spaces lots via 4<sup>th</sup> Street or P Street SW. All the squares in the current application are south of Potomac Avenue.

Encouraging access via the prohibited streets and no traffic plan has been put in place by DDOT or the Nationals to effectively prevent baseball patrons from using those streets. Now at the eleventh hour OP has returned with a request for additional spaces, all in the same Buzzard Point area, albeit on different squares. Additionally, nothing has changed relating to the infrastructure in this area. All of the squares under consideration are currently primarily industrial in use and lack sidewalks and curbs. The ANC believes that Department of Transportation of the District could far better use - find far better uses for its limited funds other than upgrading a streetscape that would be used only for a few months out of the year. The primary concern for ANC 6D continues to be the potential impact that up to 2,950 additional cars would have on health and safety, especially of children

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

who use streets in the hot summer weather
during arrival and departure times of the
stadium crowds. While we believe the
Nationals are acting in good faith when they
say that they will use their best marketing
and promotional materials to direct traffic
away from residential streets we believe
that it is the District that has shut the
near-Southeast and Southwest out of the
process. Sure there were PowerPoint
presentations to fill a quota for community
meetings, but the decisions that really
count were made without citizen comment.
This was brought home again last evening at
a DDOT update on the parking plan for the
stadium. There we learned that the
scheduled starting time for the great
majority of night home games is to be 7:10
p.m., making peak arrival time occur in the
heart of rush hour. It was not the
Nationals who wanted this, but rather WMATA
who believes that their logistics will be

better served by having the game end That decision was also based on earlier. the erroneous belief that most arrivals will be against the rush hour flow. Not only was the decision a bad one, but it was made behind closed doors. No community input was ANC 6D believes that bringing these sought. requests at the last minute is a ploy to gain approval without due diligence and without adequate input. We trust the Commission will remain steadfast in its previous pronouncement and findings, thus will deny this application. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you Chairman Moffett. Colleagues, any questions? Okay. Let me just state, and we've looked at what we did previously I quess would be the first order, Chairman Moffett. And basically we share your concerns and as you notice from our first But what we're asking, we ask the order. traffic routing plan described in - shall

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

not direct traffic through Eye Street SW, P
Street SW and $4^{\text{th}}$ Street SW. Basically that
is a DDOT issue. It's only been so much -
we put in the order this is what we want to
see from a Zoning Commission standpoint, but
the overall authority on that is DDOT. And
while we have it - this is still our
request, but from what I heard from your
testimony, and that's why I asked Mr. Lawson
was that still going on by - he was
mentioning about the one-way street or what
the traffic plan, is DDOT still working with
the MPD. I have been in those meetings, but
this was the request and intent of the
Commission to try to help to relieve some
congestion in dealing with traffic in that
area, but the overall authority is DDOT, not
us. This is what we requested and hopefully
DDOT looks at what our request is, but
they're going to be the ones who have the
final say on it.

Okay.

MR. MOFFETT:

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I know - but 1 2 we too share the concerns. But like I said, 3 they have the final authority. And I just wanted to bring that out because I noticed 4 5 you pointed back to our order which you're exactly right. 6 7 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: MΥ. Chair? I wonder if I may ask. 8 9 mentioned in your testimony that the Nationals are asking for another 2,950 cars 10 11 or potential, but I don't think that's -12 there's no request for additional cars being asked by the Nationals. It's simply a 13 request for the option to use different lots 14 15 to get up to the 3,750 or whatever, 3,775. So they're not asking for another 2,950 16 17 The cap is still what it is. I don't 18 know if you understood that, or you're - I

21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, you can

mean, you say it's a potential, but they

can't get more cars according to what we've.

19

20

22

respond.

1	MR. MOFFETT: All right. Yes, I
2	agree with you, but what we were saying is
3	that those cars, by placing these particular
4	squares in play again, will be forcing cars
5	to come through the neighborhood because
6	there's no other access. That's the reason
7	I pointed to Potomac Avenue as a way of
8	ingress and egress from there. Keeps it out
9	of the neighborhood. And currently DDOT
10	intends to have a no left turn off of
11	Potomac, which would mean preclude people
12	from actually going into it without going
13	through neighborhood.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay, no
15	I understand your point. I just wanted to
16	clarify that.
17	MR. MOFFETT: Oh yes.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The
19	request is not for additional cars, but
20	flexibility in lots.
21	MR. MOFFETT: Yes. I apologize,
22	it wasn't clear, fully stated. That's what

1	the intent was.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I
3	understand.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
5	questions, comments of Chairman Moffett?
6	Commissioner May?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: So I
8	understand exactly your point of view, I'm
9	looking at a plan that the Office of
10	Planning provided which shows the proposed
11	new sites all being in Southwest as opposed
12	to Southeast. And it's your concern that
13	the only way in or out of those spots is
14	going to be through the neighborhood, down P
15	Street, Eye Street, 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, those sorts
16	of streets, is that right?
17	MR. MOFFETT: Unless they can
18	find some way to cause them to come down
19	Potomac Avenue.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Potomac
21	Avenue.
22	MR. MOFFETT: Which would be a

1	left turn - well, it wouldn't necessarily be
2	left, depending on which direction they're
3	coming it would be off of South Capitol.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Off South
5	Capitol to make a left, right. A left
6	coming over the bridge.
7	MR. MOFFETT: Coming across the
8	bridge, yes.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: As you're
10	going north on South Capitol, making a left,
11	and so they have to make a left onto P
12	Street because they can't get onto Potomac.
13	MR. MOFFETT: Well, actually DDOT
14	I think is intending to make no left turns
15	on every street up through there.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: So they can't
17	get to the parking spaces -
18	MR. MOFFETT: But the only way
19	they would have to do it if they're coming
20	that way is to go somewhere and somehow to
21	come across.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Got it.
ļ	I

1	MR. MOFFETT: But come back down
2	through the neighborhood.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So
4	they'd be - maybe the southbound ones would
5	be able to get out. But they could be
6	coming southbound on South Capitol and if
7	they were coming by the freeway that is the
8	logical thing for them to do, right? So
9	they could come down and then make a right
10	onto Potomac to get to these lots.
11	MR. MOFFETT: Right, if they have
12	exited from anywhere from Maine Avenue out,
13	taking any of those exits. If they came to
14	South Capitol exit, yes.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, right.
16	If they stayed on the freeway, which we know
17	during rush hour never fills up, right?
18	MR. MOFFETT: No, and neither
19	does M Street.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm saying
21	that facetiously because the
22	Southeast/Southwest Freeway is a very slow-

moving road in both directions during rush hour. It's moving though, just slow-moving.

All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, any other questions?

COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much Chairman Moffett for your work and that of the ANC which of course has been very actively engaged in this issue for a long time. Ι wanted to follow up on a question that my colleague Mr. May raised, and I'm going to again come back to the map that he was referencing. You may not have it in front of you. It's a map that's appended to the end of the Office of Planning's report, and it perhaps is a slight point, but I wanted to make sure I'm very clear on the ANC's position regarding it. With respect to the lots that are the subject of tonight's proposed rulemaking there are five that I count that are south of Potomac Avenue and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

three that are north of Potomac Avenue. Is
it the ANC's concern that just by the very
nature of where those locations are, the
impact upon the residential inventory there,
the impact upon members of the community is
simply going to be too great from a
vehicular standpoint regardless of how those
vehicles are routed, or is it the ANC's
concern that these lots could work, but the
absence of a transportation routing plan at
this point is of such concern that you just
can't simply support it without knowing how
the patrons are going to get to those lots.
In a way I'm kind of asking - let me ask it
in the messy way. Regardless of how you get
people to these lots, is the ANC opposed, or
is it a matter of as long as the ANC is
comfortable with how vehicles are being
routed in such a way that they're not going
through residential streets there would be a
comfort level with these locations.
MR. MOFFETT: Well. there were

reasons that we mentioned that - for those not being good places. There are no curbs, there are no sidewalks, it's going to require a lot of infrastructure investment for those to be truly useable unless you want people walking in the streets.

## COMMISSIONER ETHERLY:

Understood.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. MOFFETT: But our main concern, our main main concern is people going through the neighborhood to get there when we have children out. It's dangerous and there's - you can't put blocks out there to stop everybody. I mean, you can have police or you can have signs up saying No Stadium Parking this way and that, but people are going to ignore it as you well know, especially if it's blocked up you know. If this road is blocked and there's an empty one here, someone will try to go So that is our major concern with that way. it, but there are reasons for not doing it

1 even if they were there, but even if they did a plan in place, but they don't have a 2 3 plan in place that addresses coming through the neighborhood. I don't know - I think as 4 Mr. Lawson said, they are working toward 5 that, but this is - we're almost at start 6 7 time here. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: 8 Okay. 9 Okay, I appreciate it. That answers my 10 question. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. 11 Chairman. 12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Chairman Moffett, let me ask you, are you in those discussions 13 with DDOT, OP and the Police Department, all 14 those entities, involving you? Are the ANC 15 in dialoque, a participant? 16 MR. MOFFETT: Well, we talk with 17 them a lot, yes. Actually Andy Litsky is 18 19 the one who's spearheading this, but he 20 can't be here so I needed to come in and 21 testify tonight instead. But yes, there's a

dialogue.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You're looking
2	for -
3	MR. MOFFETT: It's the plan, yes.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I've got you.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: One last
6	question, and I think this is tied to
7	Commissioner's May question. So the concern
8	is really for traffic that's traveling south
9	on South Capitol getting to these new
10	proposed sites, that is of most concern
11	because you can't make a left turn going
12	north on South Capitol, right?
13	MR. MOFFETT: Well, if - the fact
14	that you couldn't make a left turn onto
15	Potomac Avenue would exacerbate the problem
16	of making it drive through the neighborhood
17	to get back to it.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: So
19	you're going to - okay.
20	MR. MOFFETT: And the ones coming
21	from the north may well come that way
22	anyway. There's nothing to keep them from
ļ	

turning off. If you're coming from Virginia or Northwest, you might come down 12<sup>th</sup>

Street and come that way rather than follow

South Capitol. And if you come down, say

you get to the 4<sup>th</sup> Street or Delaware Avenue

and you just cut down into the neighborhood.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: But Chairman, but you know this could be the situation no matter where you are really in this ballpark area. I mean, in terms of - I mean, first of all we're dealing with availability of lots. I mean lots that are available for - to become surface parking I quess my question is this could be, whether these lots were all above - north of Potomac Avenue or wherever they might be in this area, there's going to still be a I mean, is the concern about the problem. concentration of them, or you think they should be more spread out? I mean.

MR. MOFFETT: The main concern is keeping traffic from going through the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	neighborhood to get to those lots. If -
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I don't
3	know how you're going to achieve that. I
4	guess that's - I don't know how you really
5	fully achieve that. I mean, obviously with
6	some of the -
7	MR. MOFFETT: You can't - I'm
8	sorry.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: - that
10	we're talking about.
11	MR. MOFFETT: You can't stop it
12	completely, no. There's no way as I said
13	earlier. You cannot put a road block up
14	there and stop people. If you do, you stop
15	everybody. I mean, you can put a cement
16	thing up and stop all traffic, but what good
17	does that do? But our main concern is that
18	very one thing. Initially we had voted
19	against the ones that were south of Potomac,
20	but then they come back with more at the
21	eleventh hour in the same area.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

1	Because that's what I was trying to draw you
2	to. I mean, is there a more optimal
3	location for these proposed lots than what's
4	been proposed? And quite frankly, from what
5	I'm understanding from the Office of
6	Planning they are where they're available.
7	I mean, you know it's not like there's lots
8	of choices. So I just wanted to understand
9	you know if this is a problem with the
10	concentration in terms of where the proposed
11	- or, this would probably be a problem no
12	matter where you are near the site, near the
13	baseball stadium.
14	MR. MOFFETT: Well, would it - I
15	can't -
16	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: That's
17	fine. I was just trying to understand
18	whether it was a problem with the
19	concentration around Potomac Avenue, or
20	whether you could say that you know there
21	might be more optimal locations for these
22	proposed surface lots that would not be
I	I and the second of the second

1	detrimental to the residential zone and
2	people traveling and so forth.
3	MR. MOFFETT: Well, I can't point
4	to specific ones. If I could I'm sure OP
5	would have found them already and made them
6	available to them. But these, as I've
7	stated previously, are going to require a
8	lot of infrastructure investment, and that -
9	is that going to be the District that makes
10	this investment? That's another thing too.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.
12	MR. MOFFETT: But, again, our
13	main concern is the safety of the people,
14	and children especially, who live in that
15	neighborhood. And as you've said, as I've
16	said, there is no way to guarantee that
17	nothing will ever happen, but there should
18	be some plan in place that will make it look
19	like they're at least working in that
20	direction.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay,
22	thank you.
ļ	

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
2	questions for Chairman Moffett? Okay, thank
3	you very much for coming in and testifying.
4	MR. MOFFETT: Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Other
6	government reports? We don't have any. We
7	had the report of ANC 6D, okay. I notice we
8	have a lot of - this has nothing to do with
9	the case, but I notice we have a lot of
10	laptops. Either we're going high-tech or
11	something's happening, and I was just
12	curious if somebody wanted to come and tell
13	me what was going on. This has nothing to
14	do with the hearing, but I'm like that so I
15	want to know what's happening. Somebody,
16	would somebody come to the mic so we can
17	know what's going on?
18	THE WITNESS: Well, I'll talk
19	loudly. We're first-years at American
20	University Law School for our Property
21	class.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What class is it?

THE WITNESS: Property. 1 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Property. Okay, 3 well good. Welcome. Hope you find this interesting. Should've came when we did the 4 American University campus plan. That would 5 have been real interesting. Okay, thank 6 7 Welcome to you all and good luck. Okay now, let's move on with our 8 9 agenda. Ms. Carolyn Mitchell, Southwest Neighborhood Assembly, Commissioner Ron 10 11 McBee, ANC 6D-03 and Nancy Masterson - and 12 forgive me for saying that because I have a cold so it's kind of rough - who's a 13 Nancy, are you testifying? 14 resident. 15 that's right, you know what I did? I called 16 all three. Okay, well you two can share, you can come up after one of them moves. 17 Okay. Okay, we're going to - Ms. Mitchell 18 19 from the Southwest Neighborhood Assembly, 20 you may begin. VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: 21 And try 22 to really speak up.

I will. MS. MITCHELL: 1 2 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes, 3 thank you. MS. MITCHELL: Thank you. 4 Μv name is Carolyn Mitchell and I am vice 5 president of the Southwest Neighborhood 6 7 Assembly and I am here in support of the ANC 6D resolution opposing eight additional 8 9 Nationals parking lots that would accommodate 2,950 cars located directly 10 11 adjacent to residential Southwest. Mv12 organization's mission is to improve the quality of life for all residents of 13 Southwest. Our actions are quided by five 14 15 goals: to access, record and monitor the quality of life as related to the issues of 16 17 concern; to evaluate existing programs, 18 public and private, that are related to 19 those subjects of concern and that affects the quality of life in Southwest; to support 20 improvements in those programs; to 21 22 facilitate the creation of new programs,

public or private, to meet unfulfilled needs; to work to overcome social, racial and economic barriers in Southwest.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

There has been numerous meetings with the Nationals, the Transportation Department, Councilman Wells and various other organizations regarding parking and it has been stated by the Nationals that these additional parking areas are not needed. to hear that the Text Amendment Temporary Ballpark Accessory Surface Parking Lots Z.C. Case No. 07-08A has been submitted and it's not only alarming to me, but to all residents of Southwest. Parking, already too few spots. Traffic backup at rush hour prolonging arrival time at home and now a request to add 2,950 cars to the equation. I ask what type of quality of life is this for the residents of Southwest that already have to park sometimes up to two blocks away from their home? How long will they have to ride around looking for parking in order to

acquire a spot if the temporary lots are Safety is also a concern if approved? required to park more than two blocks from How much later will residents one's home. arrive at home due to added cars in their neighborhood? How much later will residents that utilize public transportation arrive at home due to added cars in their neighborhood? What's the quarantee that if the temporary parking lots are approved that visitors to the lot would not scout out the neighborhood at their next visit looking for street parking now that they are aware of the area?

Temporary parking lots? In my short time in the District I've learned that "temporary" often means 10 years or longer. For six months out of the twelve months per year the Nationals will host 13 to 16 games a month, some running as long as two weeks at a time. While baseball, the all-American game, is being played, many residents are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

either being held hostage in their homes 1 scared to leave due to the risk of not 2 3 having a place to park upon returning, unable to return home after a long day of 4 work due to no place to park. 5 Finally, what will this do to the 6 7 weekend family gatherings in Southwest? Will they become non-existent due to nowhere 8 9 to park? And I conclude with this question. Is this the quality of life you would like 10 11 for your family? The Southwest Neighborhood 12 Assembly stands strong and solid in support of the ANC 6D resolution in opposing any 13 additional parking lots in Southwest. 14 you for this wonderful opportunity to 15 participate in this inspiring process. 16 We look forward to working again to create a 17 brighter future for our community. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very 20 If you can just hold your seat. much. Commissioner McBee? 21 22 MR. MCBEE: Thank you very much.

1 My name is Ron McBee. I'm Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner for 6D-03. 2 Τ 3 appreciate the opportunity to address the Zoning Commission this evening on the 4 additional temporary ballpark surface 5 parking lots proposed under Case No. 07-08A. 6 7 At ANC 6D's recent February business meeting, ANC 6D voted 7-0 to support a 8 9 resolution against this proposed text amendment for additional temporary parking 10 I'm here to 11 ballpark surface parking. 12 testify on the behalf of my single-member district that includes part of South Capitol 13 Street directly across from the stadium and 14 support the testimony of Roger Moffett, 15 Chair, ANC 6D against the text amendment at 16 this time. 17 18 At stake here are not only safety 19 and traffic concerns, but the very character 20 of our near-Southwest residential community which we are working to preserve and 21 22 maintain during this nearly unprecedented

transitional change in our community from the stadium and adjacent developments in the near-Southeast/Southwest community. community is very different than the community around RFK Stadium where the Nationals have resided during these past Also, the infrastructure three years. resources at RFK Stadium to support patrons using private vehicles does not exist with the new Nationals stadium. I want the patrons of the Nationals to be able to attend a game without great hardship and the residents of our community not be unduly burdened, or their safety threatened by the flight of cars, SUVs and vans coming to or leaving the Nationals stadium.

The new stadium was placed in the shadow of the Capitol and it deserves to be a model for traffic and pedestrian egress.

The plan for additional temporary parking does not move towards smart growth in the handling of vehicular traffic. I have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

bulleted below several concerns and reasons for not supporting this text amendment. We have not seen any environmental impact statements, especially on traffic and pedestrian safety issues, or the impact on the residential community itself which I think you have talked about today.

The Nationals have stated at public meetings and hearings that these additional parking areas are not needed for this current year. The Nationals to their credit are offering free parking and free shuttle service with restrooms to and from the Nationals stadium for baseball events. Additional surface parking lots will only encourage private vehicular use and increase traffic as well as impact pedestrian safety, especially for children and seniors. Traffic heading north on South Capitol Street cannot turn left onto Potomac Avenue to access these parking areas, meaning access will primarily be off our residential

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

streets.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

These temporary lots, if they could be acceptable should be located south of Potomac Avenue SW where parking exists with the U.S. Coast Guard headquarters and Homeland Security. This area has been ruled unacceptable to DDOT due to a lack of infrastructure, meaning sidewalks, lighting and curbs I think as was addressed earlier here by Commissioner Moffett. Albeit stated these parking structures are temporary, we in Washington understand "temporary" does not mean temporary in terms of time as we have many temporary buildings constructed for World War II that still are used today.

The Nationals have indicated they have been working with Metro to have

SmartCard users exiting the Navy Metro

Station charged the minimum fare to increase public transportation Metro ridership for patrons attending stadium events.

Unfortunately, this would take programming

1	to implement and no schedule has been given.
2	The Nationals have published a brochure on
3	how to get to the stadium via Metro, further
4	reducing the need for these parking spaces.
5	I request that you deny this current
6	application for temporary surface parking
7	lots, allow the stadium traffic plan to work
8	for the coming year and evaluate the need
9	for temporary parking lots at this time next
10	year. Also, current construction of office
11	and commercial buildings which will have
12	underground and off-street commercial
13	parking will be complete and operational in
14	the very near future. This will increase
15	the number of available parking spaces for
16	stadium attendees using private vehicles.
17	Thank you very much.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.
19	Colleagues, any questions at this point?
20	Any questions?
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just want to
22	clarify, you said that if there were to be

parking lots in this area that they should be south of Potomac Avenue, did I understand that right?

MR. MCBEE: Correct. We're trying to - I mean if that would be acceptable which it's not acceptable from ANC, but for me it would be acceptable to have those parking lots south of Potomac Avenue because then you could limit egress so that you could take the traffic that would be coming off the Douglas Bridge, create a lefthand turn although there's not a lefthand turn available now so that that traffic could be directed in or directed from coming over from Virginia which is the main users for - that are the main patrons for the stadium are going to be coming. think it's about 60/40 if you just look at Maryland and Virginia in terms of their usership of the stadium.

So we're just concerned and what we're trying to do - this is a very low-

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

wealth community that we are talking about
here. We're talking about Tel-Court
Cooperative, we're talking about St. James
Cooperative, we're talking about Syphax
Gardens, we're talking about James Creek and
we're talking about a number of other small,
4-unit, 5-unit, 6-unit apartments that are
in there that are very susceptible. And we
have a lot of children in that community and
areas so they're out on the streets at
night, they're out playing, coming back from
the King-Greenleaf rec center which is
located at 1st and N Street. So we're very
concerned about this additional traffic
going through the residential area and we'd
like to be able to figure out a way to
deflect that parking so it's away from that
part of our community and put into some
areas which there is already parking going
on now. As I said with the U.S. Coast
Guard, their headquarters are located there
and Homeland Security which is also located

1	there as well.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm a little
3	confused because on the map that we got from
4	the Office of Planning it indicates which
5	squares would be used for these temporary
6	parking lots and of the eight new squares
7	that are proposed, five of them are south of
8	Potomac Avenue and three are north of
9	Potomac Avenue.
10	MR. MCBEE: Yes, and - but -
L1	COMMISSIONER MAY: You're saying
L2	-
13	MR. MCBEE: - part of the issue
L4	is they won't use those. They're saying
L5	they will not use those south of - I'm
L6	trying to explain to you they will not use
L7	them because the infrastructure is not
18	there. And we're concerned -
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: So DDOT has
20	said they won't recommend using them? They
21	won't permit them?
22	MR. MCBEE: Exactly. I mean

1	that's what I understand.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I think
3	we'll need to get some clarification on
4	that.
5	MR. MCBEE: Yes. And the main
6	part of that is, my understanding is from
7	talking to Kathleen Penny is because the
8	issue is no curbs, cannot put sidewalks -
9	they'd have to put sidewalks in because of
10	parking, I mean because of walking with the
11	parking. People would be walking out in the
12	streets because there is no -
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think we
14	understand what the potential issues are. I
15	just want to get that clarified, whether -
16	MR. MCBEE: That's correct.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: - there is
18	something that would prevent the use of
19	these lots because there are a whole lot of
20	them that are south of Potomac Avenue.
21	MR. MCBEE: And actually -
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: And if DDOT

1	doesn't think that they're going to work
2	then I would want to know. That's all.
3	MR. MCBEE: And what I'm saying
4	is they're currently being used by the U.S.
5	Coast Guard headquarters.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand
7	that. I just want to get clarification.
8	MR. MCBEE: I would be happy to,
9	for myself, to have those lots be used in
10	some way that we could direct that traffic
11	to those lots.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Okay.
13	That's it.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, any other
15	discussion? Any other questions?
16	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: So
17	Commissioner McBee, so the three lots that
18	are north of Potomac - because you're
19	thinking that they're going to have
20	difficulty getting permits for surface
21	parking south, but they'll use those three
22	that are above and then that will then force

1 ||

MR. MCBEE: Right, particularly
the one at Q Street which is where the
Southwest Community House is located which
is one of the more sacrosanct buildings in
our community because it's well over use of
100 years of service in our community
providing social services. So it's based or
one of the volunteers of the community come
and staff it so it's been going on for a
number of years. We're afraid that that
kind of impetus suddenly here for parking
will push the clearance of those lots, you
know land for those lots, and that's one of
the major things we're concerned about.
We're just trying - for me, I could see how
I could or how it could be maintained with
Potomac Avenue that you could actually
prevent. But we have not been in support of
any parking down there because of the fact
that we were told initially many years ago
that there would not be any lots in

Southwest and now we've been confronted with this parking.

I think also the Nationals have been more than forthright coming forward and using RFK parking. They're going to be having buses. They're going to be very nice buses they're going to use so they have actually adequate parking. There's not an issue here I think and I understand from talking to Gregory McCarthy is that we're set for this year. We're not worried about this parking. And my suggestion to the Zoning Commission is let's come back next year, let's see how this goes. lot of parking, particularly the building that's going in over the Navy Yard Metro Station is going to have something like 1,100 parking spaces in it for vehicular parking which is a little troublesome because it's right in the shadow of the stadium so you really - but there will be additional buildings, commercial buildings

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	that are going to be going in where there
2	will be parking.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Eleven
4	hundred?
5	MR. MCBEE: Lots. It's massive.
6	It's a huge building. That building is
7	massive. It must be 90 feet down. It's
8	quite an impressive construction.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I have
10	one other question for Ms. Mitchell. A lot
11	of your testimony seemed to indicate that a
12	lot of the residents are very car-dependent.
13	They use their cars to get in and out of the
14	neighborhood and so forth. Do you see a
15	time that people are going to be a little
16	less dependent on cars in this neighborhood
17	and walking and using the Metro and biking
18	and so forth?
19	MS. MITCHELL: I do all of that.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay,
21	good.
22	MS. MITCHELL: I use the bus and
ļ	

1	the Metro to work and home. So I already
2	know the stop and go between - on M Street
3	between 6 <sup>th</sup> and trying to get to Delaware.
4	I drive my car sometimes. On weekends I
5	always drive my car. The games are mainly
6	on weekends. How do I get in and how do I
7	get out? Those parking lots, you cannot get
8	to those places unless you go through our
9	neighborhood.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Thank
11	you.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
13	questions at this time? Okay, I thank you
14	both. Appreciate you coming out and your
15	testimony. Okay, Nancy?
16	MS. MASTERSON: Yes, Nancy
17	Masterson. I'm a resident.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me do this.
19	Is there anyone else who would like to
20	testify tonight? Okay. Ms. Masterson,
21	you're the last witness.
22	MS. MASTERSON: Good, good,
	I

because I don't appreciate being here. I
think having something like this at the last
ANC meeting and Mr. Lawson couldn't answer
our lovely little map. What's there right
now is the new, what is it, the Army Corps
of Engineer, the flood plain, the new flood
plain that the District is going to fight
against? Includes all of Southwest and part
of Federal Center. There is no answer from
Mr. Lawson as to what does this do to the
river. We have pollution galore. I'm going
to hype up the environment for the kids too.
So get this all down. It's all about what
we're doing to this area, not only for the
people that live there, but for the
environment that we've got. We're right on
the river. You're planning on putting
parking lots right on the river, okay?
Okay, well I'm just getting to the point as
far as getting an environmental oversight to
this and that would be absolutely necessary
in order to make this go.

Chicago has green alleyways. I
mean there's all sorts of things that can be
done, and yet I go to an ANC meeting and I'm
looking at this map and thinking what are
they doing? They're not even showing on the
map where the Coast Guard is. You've got
the Coast Guard going down one - there's a
one-way street going down 1 <sup>st</sup> and then go
back up. You're going to have to have a
whole new traffic pattern for that. You've
got the Homeland Security, you've got PEPCO,
you've got the Environmental Conservation
Corps. They've got one of their sites down
there. They're going to be running a bike
path. You know, there's all this
environmental stuff that's going on. Where
do parking lots fit in and where does all
this additional traffic fit in to those
plans that are already put in - or well,
hopefully, maybe put in place?
So I agree with ANC's opposition
and everybody else's opposition to any

1	parking in Southwest. We have high-rises in
2	Southwest, okay? There's just - there's no
3	place to park. And well, I'm not going to
4	get into that. So, any questions?
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, do we have
6	any questions? Any questions of Ms.
7	Masterson?
8	(No response)
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, thank
10	you for coming down. We appreciate your
11	testimony.
12	MS. MASTERSON: Okay. Did it
13	make sense?
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh no, absolutely
15	it did, especially for somebody who works in
16	the Environmental Protection Agency.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: You've
18	got some green people up here too.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And when you
20	mentioned Chicago, I thought we - okay,
21	thank you very much. Okay. We have some
22	requests. I think Ms. Schellin, I don't
I	

know if you recorded some things that was 1 2 asked for? Let's wrap up. Any questions 3 for OP? VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: 4 have a question. 5 And Mr. Lawson, I know you brought this up before, but why are we 6 7 approving eight new lots when there's not they've already stated, Nationals have 8 9 stated they don't need them? MR. LAWSON: I've never heard the 10 11 Nationals say they don't need the lots. 12 may be the Nationals have said they don't need them right now. Again, I think that 13 the anticipation is that over time lots will 14 15 essentially come and go. Some of the lots that they may have right now won't be 16 17 available a year from now, or two years from 18 now, or six months from now, I don't know. 19 So I believe what they're asking for is they 20 want to know kind of what's their ballpark 21 in terms of where the parking can go. 22 And again, by seeing where the

parking can go you're de facto saying where
the parking can't go as well because we're
saying these are the lots where you can
consider, other lots you can't kind of
thing. And it lets them know that and they
have that certainty of which owners they can
start discussions with now for maybe having
parking on that lot you know two years from
now if it's needed. There's certainly no -
it's not for sure that the parking will ever
go on any of these lots, you know. If the
transportation management program works as
well as I think everybody would like it to
work the lots won't be needed, people will
take Metro, they'll carpool, they'll walk,
they'll bike, they'll take the ferry,
they'll do whatever they can possibly do not
to drive. But I think that the Nationals
and we feel that we need to have that plan
in place for what the boundaries of the
possibilities are.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES:

Okay,

1	the universe.
2	MR. LAWSON: So that we know.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And the
4	other question, Mr. Commissioner McBee said
5	something about 1,100 parking spaces at
6	Southeast Federal? Does that sound accurate
7	to you?
8	MR. LAWSON: I think he was
9	talking about -
10	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES:
11	Monument, I'm sorry. The Monument.
12	MR. LAWSON: I could certainly
13	look. That sounds like a very high number
14	and I would anticipate that a lot of those
15	spots would actually be for the residential
16	and the hotel component of that development
17	so the number of spots that would actually
18	be available for use, and I'm hoping it's as
19	many as possible because if they're building
20	them I'd rather the ballpark patrons park
21	there than having to build additional

surface parking lots for them. But I

suspect the number - 1,100 sounds very high, but even if that's true, and it is a big site. It could be there are a lot of spots there. But a lot of those spots will be dedicated for other uses and wouldn't be available.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Well, I just thought it was alarming because again, I mean you know how I mean surface parking lots are just, you know, are problematic. And I just - so what you're telling me is that the Office of Planning is very clear about the universe of potential parking spaces in this area for overflow parking and you're comfortable that these eight additional lots are needed. I understand the universe and the Nationals are planning, they don't want to be running back and forth to the Commission asking for more sites and I understand that, but I just want to be clear that you've checked the entire universe of potential parking options for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

overflow and you're comfortable with eight here.

MR. LAWSON: We're comfortable with the ones that the Nationals brought I think that they're forward to us. weighing a number of conflicting kind of issues here. First of all of course they want the lots that are within walkable distance. They don't want the spaces to be on the outer side of the residential neighborhood because that means people would have to walk through the neighborhood with the noise and the litter and stuff that could associate that to get to the parking So I think that they're looking for areas that are not within the neighborhood, but are close enough that people won't have to go through the neighborhood either walking or driving to get to them. So these seem like logical sites to me. I think DDOT has indicated that they will look at the Potomac Avenue intersection and the

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

signalization there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And I think the last point I would make is I would again remind everybody that these are not pristine lots. These are lots that are currently paved over, they're used for parking, there is no environmental remediation of them at all. One of the requirements if they are used for parking is that they'll have to do that. They'll have to work with DDOE. It won't be a perfect solution, it won't be a good long-term solution, but it will be a better solution than what's on there right now in that we can start to look at these issues that can provide some landscaping on the site compared to what's there now. None of these are park sites.

Do we want to see parking lots adjacent to the river? Of course we don't, nobody does, nut I think we have to recognize the reality of the situation we're dealing with and weighing the issues that

frankly we heard tonight about the risk of people parking in a neighborhood that's already short on parking. Do we provide an opportunity for them - do we provide an appropriate place for them to park, or do we say no, there will be none so it's going to be a free-for-all? I think that we're just saying that we need some time to work this through to truly educate the ballpark-going public that driving isn't the appropriate way to go, but to deal with the situation in the meantime. Otherwise it will be chaos. VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And there's also going to be education for the residents as well. MR. LAWSON: Absolutely. I'm certainly hoping that the Nationals and DDOT and the District in general will continue the discussions with the neighborhood. meeting I went to there was the commitment

to continue that well beyond when the

ballpark opens to make sure that we're

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

constantly monitoring this situation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr.

Lawson, what about Commissioner McBee's comment about lots south of Potomac being basically non-starters even though you said that there would be remediation?

I would be happy to MR. LAWSON: get a comment from DDOT on that. I've heard no indication from DDOT that they would not allow parking. Frankly again already there's parking on those lots so I'm not sure why - why DDOT would not allow it. again, if it developed as an apartment building or as an office building, that use would have parking as well and probably a lot more parking than what would be possible as a surface parking lot. So it would be more cars and potentially more people using those sites. I absolutely agree that the issue of how people get from the lots to the ballpark needs to be addressed, but I haven't heard from DDOT. I haven't heard

yet from DDOT that they would not allow a 1 2 parking lot in that area. If that's the 3 case I would certainly want to hear that as well. 4 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What's 5 your thought on if the three lots north of 6 7 Potomac were taken off the table? MR. LAWSON: Well you know 8 9 ultimately it's the Zoning Commission's decision which lots would be appropriate. 10 Т 11 think that the lots north of Potomac could 12 be as easily managed in terms of routing the traffic from Potomac to those lots as the 13 ones south of Potomac. In other words, I 14 15 think it could be - they could be managed as 16 easily as the lots south of Potomac. That's not what I would recommend, but -17 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: T'm 18 19 trying to grapple with how we - how we try 20 to balance the neighborhood concerns and your concerns obviously about cars coming 21 22 here anyway, but how do we balance the

neighborhood concerns with these lots and give some kind of modicum that their needs are being addressed? I just - I feel very tentative about how to go forward on this.

I understand and I MR. LAWSON: think we all, including the neighborhood, have been grappling with how do we deal with this issue of conflicting priorities and conflicting wishes. There's - well first of all, we have to keep in mind that there needs to also be a long-long-term solution because eventually all these properties are going to develop and they're going to develop with real big buildings with lots of people whether they're office-goers or residences, and those people are going to bring cars, and those cars are going to come get there somehow. So whether they're surface parking lots for a short-term or not, eventually there's going to be a lot of activity on those sites and a lot of people using them and they're going to get there

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

somehow.

So I think that the neighborhood which is being very consistent in really demanding, rightly so, an effective traffic management program. I honestly think that's the only way to address it adequately, to address how people access these sites, where they can go, where they can't go and the means that are put in place to make sure that that's carried out. And that would include you know - it would have to include real effective and strong enforcement measures.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, and I guess that's part of the issue is how does this body, the Zoning Commission, have the authority to actually set up what streets can and cannot be used? DDOT is going to decide what they're going to do. We can't control that.

MR. LAWSON: DDOT and the Police Department are working in conjunction

actually to come up with that plan and from what I'm hearing tonight there have been many discussions with the community on what that plan should incorporate. You know again, acknowledging that that plan itself has to be flexible over time because the situation on the ground is going to change over time, where buildings are, where parking lots are, all those kinds of things are also going to change over time. So I think you're right that it's to some extent outside the purview of this Zoning Commission to really effectively address. You did address through the approval of the ballpark itself that there

would be a traffic management program put in place which is what DDOT as I said is working on and finalizing now with the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, and I understand that, I appreciate that. quess I'm just concerned that this body is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

going to pass on something and our good intentions may not be followed. I mean, we may have the best intentions of the world to work with the neighborhood, but in the final run if the traffic management plan says they can do this, we're handicapped. Our hands are tied at a certain point and I don't know how to come to grips with some of these lots that are very closer to residential areas than others.

MR. LAWSON: I guess all I can say is that we do have an agency which is well-experienced at dealing with these kinds of issues and that is DDOT and the special events element of the Police Department.

It's not in their interest to upset the neighborhood. It's in everybody's best interest, even the Nationals' best interest to make sure that the situation about parking and traffic is as efficient and as simple and as non-obtrusive as possible. So I guess knowing that these agencies who do

2.

1	have experience at doing this are there and
2	at least in every meeting I've been in has
3	expressed exactly the same goals and
4	objectives as the Zoning Commission is
5	expressing tonight gives me some comfort.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I have
7	a couple of follow-ups. We don't have any
8	kind of report from DDOT for this hearing,
9	is that right?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Actually no we
11	don't, but when we finish up I was going to
12	ask for some things from DDOT.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I just
14	find it very disappointing that we don't
15	have a report from them and that they were
16	not present at this hearing because there
17	are a lot of issues that we could get better
18	answers to if they were here today.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: They're
20	experts.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: So I just -
22	this is very disappointing. I don't know
I	l

that I would have known it on the face of it 1 just reading the materials that it was 2 3 really that critical for them to be here, but it does all turn on the transportation 4 issues and it's just disappointing that 5 they're not here and that we can't answer 6 these questions directly. Let me just 7 clarify, is it possible that the Nationals 8 9 may be saying at this moment that these additional lots will not be needed before 10 11 this season? 12 MR. LAWSON: That is possible. only know one of the lots - this is what the 13 Nationals indicated to me. There's one lot 14 15 that they're in conversation on. becomes available, they're not quite sure. 16 17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. 18 that's another reason why I'm really 19 interested in getting an update on what the 20 whole parking situation is there. Because if it's conceivable that we don't have to 21 22 act on this in order to address the opening

of the stadium in a few weeks, then we may want to defer making any decisions on this, particularly since - I mean the door is still open with the temporary or the emergency action that was taken, right? I mean, this is a matter of finalizing that emergency action, is that right?

MR. LAWSON: Yes, the Commission has taken emergency action. I'm not quite sure when the second emergency action expires.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well in any case, you know if the need isn't urgent and this is something where we could look and see how it goes for a couple of months and then make a decision about it, maybe that's the way that we can try to see whether the community's concerns are being adequately addressed. Maybe we'd even go so far as scheduling a second hearing on this a couple of months into it. Well and at that follow-up hearing I think some representative from

the Nationals and DDOT ought to be here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Here's the way I see it. I'm just waiting. Here's the way I see it and I think my colleagues have expressed, we have a number of ways we can What I do think though, we need to proceed. have a second hearing. My only issue is Because I would like to hear from - I when. would like the Nationals to come down and tell me that they don't need these lots and also I think DDOT needs to come in front of They're the experts. We're not the us. experts and they're going to have the final authority. But one thing that we do have in our jurisdiction is we uphold the safety of the residents of the District of Columbia so that is part of what we needed to be doing. Some of this other stuff is you know, what street you're going to have, come off this street, make that one-way, I know some of that is not within our jurisdiction but what is within our jurisdiction for those legalminded folks is to uphold the safety and protect the safety of the residents of the District of Columbia. And I think - I forgot who mentioned safety issues, Ms. Mitchell or whomever mentioned it.

So what we can do, because it's obviously not needed for opening day this particular season, so as fast as we can do it and Ms. Schellin, maybe we can look at another date? I don't think it should be no more than maybe an hour, but we need to try to ask the Office of Planning to assist us to get DDOT and the Office of Planning - and one of the things I would like for DDOT to come back with is a progression of this the traffic mitigation, which they're doing for the people who live in the neighborhood. That's what I would like to see. T mean it's all fine for everybody from Maryland, Virginia, even folks from my neighborhood to come over there, but how are we going to respect those who live in that neighborhood?

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I know this issue is not going to be solved here. I know they've had a lot of hearings in the community, you all have been to many I haven't been there, but I think meetings. what we can do is do it from our part. we're looking to see the Nationals. ask for somebody, a representative from the Nationals, and we'll ask OP to help us. Ι don't think we're under any time I don't think anything is constraints. going to blow up if we take our time and proceed with caution. So that's how I see Any of my colleagues want we need to move. to add to that?

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: No. I mean Chairman, I certainly appreciate your comments and I think that this is the way to proceed. I'm in full agreement. Anytime you see the ANC voting 7-0 against you know a text amendment like this I really do think that this Commission needs to pause a bit and give it a lot more serious care about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

what we're doing. So I would very much 1 fully concur with how we should proceed. 2 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anybody else? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would 4 concur with the vice chairman. 5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okav. 6 7 me ask the Office of Planning, can you help us with that? With getting a 8 9 representative, maybe the same person who goes to the meetings? I don't know who that 10 11 And also DDOT. And let's try to put 12 this together and proceed maybe in a month 13 or so. MR. LAWSON: I'd certainly be 14 15 happy to help coordinate that. I'm sure the Nationals would be anxious to have that 16 17 second hearing as soon as possible. 18 said, they're in negotiations with one 19 owner, at least one, and their hands are 20 tied at this point because there is no long-21 term approval for them. So I'm sure that 22 they'll want to have that data as soon as

1	possible. I believe that they're prepared
2	to have that at any time you'd like it.
3	They have the information prepared now.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin,
5	what kind of dates do we have?
6	MS. SCHELLIN: If we announce a
7	date this evening then we will not have to
8	re-advertise, but if we don't pick a date
9	and announce it in the public hearing then
10	we're going to have to re-advertise and
11	that's not going to be in a month because we
12	have to -
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can we pick a
14	date now?
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Lawson, do you
16	think that March 24 would work?
17	MR. LAWSON: I'm sure that they
18	could make that work.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. The Monday?
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have to have
21	DDOT here.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Nothing else that

1	evening.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, we have the
3	day off. Okay, let's move in that fashion.
4	March 24.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Or wait a second.
6	That is the day after Easter. Is that going
7	to be an issue for anyone? No?
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's fine.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So March
10	24.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And
12	we're asking for DDOT to have a
13	representative there and that this body is
14	not going to make any decisions unless we
15	hear from them.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I do want to
17	see something about the traffic mitigation
18	progression plan that - of what they're
19	doing. I want to see that.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman,
21	I would just ask the question are there
22	other dates available that would be sooner

1	than that? I mean we don't really need to
2	take a month for them to develop information
3	or anything like that. If there's an
4	urgency in hearing the matter I'd just as
5	soon get it over with, particularly before I
6	forget anything.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's the first
8	day?
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: That's the
10	first day?
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We don't have
12	anything where we can double up?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: No.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I mean, we can
15	always double up.
16	MS. SCHELLIN: To be honest I
17	wouldn't recommend it based on our March
18	schedule.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, we had
20	planned to double this up with the other
21	hearing that had been scheduled for tonight.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: That was when we

1	thought this one was going to take 15
2	minutes, so.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: That was why.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well now we
6	think it's going to take an hour.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Right. So.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Students are
9	laughing at us. We try to figure things
10	out.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I just
12	wanted to suggest the possibility that it
13	might happen sooner.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: Well, emergency
15	action is effective for 120 days from the
16	date the action was taken which was February
17	11. So March 24 is not -
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well they have
19	120 days, but they're not going to be able
20	to seal the deal with this other parking
21	lot. If it really is critical to them
22	they're not going to be able to seal the

1	deal because who's going to make - I mean,
2	the deal is made -
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The emergency
4	action is still in effect.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. They
6	can make that deal and then it'll be good
7	for - I mean you were saying they were
8	hesitant to do this under the emergency
9	action.
10	MR. LAWSON: I believe that the
11	problem for them is that - and I'd really
12	prefer it if they were answering this
13	question, but I believe the problem is that
14	the lot itself won't be available and they
15	can't negotiate with the owner for the
16	availability of that lot if the lot's not
17	available within the time period of the
18	emergency -
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: What lot?
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, well what
21	about Wednesday? Since everybody - we want
22	to move this. What about Wednesday? It's

1	just like the set-down the way I see it, but
2	I'm not - if it's an emergency and it
3	happens during the emergency, but I
4	understand the concern. I think -
5	MR. LAWSON: Well, I'll just
6	raise another option and I don't normally do
7	this so with respect, possibly another
8	option could be an approval of that one lot
9	and then them coming back for a hearing for
10	the remainder of the lots. That would give
11	them that sense of certainty for that one
12	property.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: What
14	lot?
15	MR. LAWSON: The lot on Square
16	661.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Is that
18	north or south of Potomac?
19	MR. LAWSON: It's south of
20	Potomac.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Are you
22	suggesting that we would actually take

1	action to approve that lot tonight?
2	MR. LAWSON: I'm saying that
3	that's an option that's available to you.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But we
5	could also - if we could do that tonight, we
6	could conceivably do that at our next
7	monthly meeting if a compelling case is made
8	to do so.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: What
10	information are we going to get? I mean,
11	today -
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: First of all, let
13	me back up. I guess I'm the only one who
14	can't find 661. You know what? I'm color-
15	blind. I'm looking at the wrong color.
16	Okay. All right. So what are we saying?
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, if we
18	were going to take action tonight to approve
19	one lot we could easily take that action at
20	the next hearing. Okay, I'm not comfortable
21	with that idea either.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: No, I'm

just not -1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think if we're 2 3 getting to the bottom line and we're having all these issues about traffic, whether the 4 lot is needed, I think we're really - if 5 that's the case, if we're going to do that 6 7 we might as well just wait till the next meeting and just hear the whole thing. 8 9 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes, I don't want to do this a la carte. 10 I mean, 11 take this -12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're going to have a further hearing on the 24<sup>th</sup> and 13 unfortunately I think that's just - unless -14 15 the only other option, the only other 16 option, if we feel that strong about it we can meet on Wednesday night. Other than the 17 class, is anyone for that? 18 19 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I mean, 20 if we met on a Wednesday, I mean how much time are we talking about here? 21 I mean you

said March what date? March 24? A month.

So I mean, is this critical like this needs to happen in the next week or two, or you know the sky will fall? I mean what are we talking about here?

MR. LAWSON: I honestly can't speak for the Nationals so I would assume not because the emergency action is in place. I'm hoping that because March 24 is a week before the first - I believe it's a week before the first game that that's not going to present some conflicting problems, but I believe this is an important enough issue to them that they'll find a way to make the time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.

March 24 at 6:30. We're going to have Part

2 of Zoning Commission Case No. 07-08A and

there are specific things which we are

looking for for the record. Office of

Planning will be helping us facilitate the

Nationals and also the DDOT requests which

we asked for and basically the Commission,

1	we will be asking the Office of Planning - I
2	mean DDOT and the Nationals questions and
3	we'll proceed in that fashion. Okay. Thank
4	everyone for their patience tonight and to
5	the students, I hope this was very
6	interesting. Thank you. This hearing is
7	adjourned.
8	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
9	went off the record at 8:40 p.m.)
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
l	