

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION
CASE NO. 24-21

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

MARCH 17, 2025

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 4:00 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson
ROBERT E. MILLER, Vice Chair
JOSEPH IMAMURA, Commissioner
GWEN WRIGHT, Commissioner
TAMMY STIDHAM, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist
SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

DENNIS LIU, Esquire

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

ALSO PRESENT:

PRESTON JUTTE, D.C. Department of Transportation
MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS, D.C. Office of Planning
MERIDITH H. MOLDENHAUER, ESQUIRE, Cozen O'Connor
THOMAS FAUST, Director, D.C. Department of Corrections
MICHELLE WILSON, Deputy Director of Administration,
D.C. Department of Corrections
ERWIN ANDRES, Gorove/Slade Associates
DAVID CHENEY, CORE Architecture + Design
TAMARA A. CLARKE, CGL Companies
AGYEI HARGROVE, Department of General Services

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the
Regular Public Hearing held on March 17, 2025.

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Case No. 24-21

D.C. Department of General Services on behalf
of D.C. Department of Corrections

Introduction - Chairman Hood	4
Preliminary Matters	6
Applicant's Presentation	
Ms. Moldenhauer	12
Mr. Faust	13
Ms. Wilson	16
Mr. Hargrove	18
Ms. Clarke	19
Mr. Cheney	21
Ms. Clarke	28
Mr. Andres	30
Ms. Moldenhauer	32
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	
Commissioner Imamura	38
Commissioner Wright	47
Commissioner Stidham	54
Vice Chair Miller	56
Chairman Hood	61
Department of Transportation Report - Mr. Jutte	66
Office of Planning Report - Ms. Brown-Roberts	69
Summary of ANC Reports - Vice Chair Miller	73
Applicant's Closing Remarks - Ms. Moldenhauer	75

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

2 (4:00 p.m.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and
4 gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing
5 by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. I'm joined by
6 Vice Chair Miller, Commissioners Wright, Imamura, and Stidham.
7 We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon
8 Schellin, as well as Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of
9 our virtual operations; also, our Office of Zoning Legal
10 Division, we're joined this evening -- this afternoon by Mr.
11 Dennis Liu. We will ask all others to introduce themselves at
12 the appropriate time.

13 The virtual public hearing notice is available on the
14 Office of Zoning's website. This proceeding is being recorded
15 by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube
16 Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's
17 website after the hearing. Accordingly, all those listening on
18 Webex or by phone will be muted during the hearing, and only
19 those who have signed up to testify will be unmuted at the
20 appropriate time.

21 When called, please state your name before providing
22 your testimony. When you are finished speaking, please mute your
23 audio. If you experience difficulty accessing Webex or with your
24 telephone call-in, then please call our OZ Hotline number at 202-
25 727-0789 to receive Webex log-in or call-in instructions or if

1 you have not signed up to testify. All persons planning to
2 testify must have signed up in advance and will be -- one day
3 I'm going to read all that to myself and see how it sounds --
4 and will be called by name at the appropriate time. At the time
5 of sign-up, all participants will complete the oath or
6 affirmation required by Subtitle Z-408.7. If you wish to file
7 written testimony or additional supporting documents during the
8 hearing, then please be prepared to describe and discuss it at
9 the time of your request when submitting.

10 This evening's Zoning Commission case is Zoning
11 Commission Case Number 24-21, D.C. Department of General Services
12 on behalf of D.C. Department of Corrections. This is a design
13 review in the Hill East Zone District at Square 1112E, Lot 826,
14 again, 1900 Massachusetts Avenue Southeast. And, again, today's
15 date is March 17th, 2024 (sic).

16 The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the
17 provisions of 11-Z DCMR, Chapter 4, as follows: Preliminary
18 matters; applicant's case -- I don't know if the applicant needs
19 60 minutes, but I would ask that you hit the highlights, hit the
20 important points, and take us around the whole facility -- report
21 of the Office of Planning and the Department of Transportation;
22 report of other government agencies; and report of the ANC;
23 testimony of organizations and individuals. Organizations will
24 have five minutes; individuals will have three minutes,
25 respectively. And we'll hear from those in support, opposition,

1 and undeclared. Then we'll have rebuttal and closing by the
2 applicant. At this time, the Commission will consider any
3 preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary
4 matters? I do have one, but does the staff have any?

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. There were two filings --
6 motions that were filed that you want to bring up first, and that
7 is a late filing. So there's a waiver request by the applicant
8 at Exhibit 11B. They submitted this request to update the CFA
9 and the NCPC's review of the project after CFA and NCPC's review
10 of the project, so it was less than 30 days before the hearing,
11 so they are asking for a waiver for that late submission being
12 less than 30 days before the hearing. So if you want to rule on
13 that either by consensus or however you want to handle that.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Any
15 objections to the first request from the applicant?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Certainly, we have no
18 objections. Let's go to the next request.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So the next one is at Exhibit 14.
20 It's a request from OP. Their filing was late. It's supposed
21 to be filed ten days prior to the hearing, and it was less than
22 ten, and so we just ask -- they're asking for a waiver for the
23 late filing.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. Any
25 objections?

1 | (No response.)

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm not seeing any. Okay. So we'll
3 accept that as well.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Proffered expert witnesses
5 of the applicant. Of course, Erwin Andres, previously accepted.
6 I would assume the Commission will accept him in this case. And
7 then there are two new ones, previously accepted. The Commission
8 is good with that one for this case, in transportation.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, for Mr. Andres, any
10 objections?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's continue that status. We'll
13 continue with Mr. Andrews.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I guess we can go to Mr. Cheney and
16 then Ms. Clarke.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Okay. So David Cheney, as you
18 said, in architecture. His resume's at Exhibit 10C, page one.
19 And Tamara Clarke in also architecture, and that is in it looks
20 like LEED, Exhibit 10C, pages four to five. I'll turn that over
21 to you, Chairman Hood.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin. I
23 do see a distinction, but let me hear from my colleagues. One
24 of them is in architecture and one of them is in -- I think the
25 LEED expert, but I will turn it over to my colleagues. Any

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

1 questions or comments, Commissioner Imamura?

2 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. In order to be
3 consistent, Mr. Chairman, as we have in the past, I think only
4 one architecture expert witness is needed here. It looks like
5 both Ms. Clarke and Mr. Cheney have been proffered in the field.
6 I'm comfortable with either one, so that's up to the applicant,
7 but either one should suffice, but we only need one.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. I was thinking
9 one was in architecture and one was a LEED expert, but let's --
10 I would agree, if they're both in architecture. And let's hear --
11 yeah, but let's hear from them. If not, I would like to move --
12 as Commissioner Imamura said, let's be consistent, and we'll let
13 them, when they come up, decide which one, and then we will
14 revisit that at the time, unless I hear from others.

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So we'll wait until they come
17 up, and I think we only need one in that case. Anything else,
18 Ms. Schellin? You're on mute, Ms. Schellin.

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Just briefly, at Exhibit --
20 responses to the application, there were three ANCs. We have not
21 heard as of now from ANC 7F, but ANC 6B, there's a report there,
22 the adjacent ANC, Exhibit 12. They voted to support it nine to
23 zero to zero. Exhibit -- I'm sorry. Then at Exhibit 17, ANC
24 7D, another adjacent ANC, they voted six to zero to one to support
25 the application. Then the OP report at Exhibit 14A has voted to

1 support the application. DDOT, at Exhibit 13, they have no
2 objection, with some conditions. And then other government
3 agencies, there's a DOEE statement or report that's included
4 within the OP report at pages 38 and 39 at Exhibit 14A. Other
5 than that, I will turn that over to the Commission. As far as
6 the presentation, the applicant is looking at 45 to 50 minutes.
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let me -- while
9 they're coming up -- let me get them up, and then I'm going to
10 ask Commissioner Imamura to do his advance disclosure that he
11 has, but let me ask first, let's bring everyone up. And before
12 we do -- go to Commissioner Imamura, I want to -- let's resolve
13 the architect issue, once everybody gets up. Ms. Moldenhauer,
14 good afternoon. Whenever you all are ready, I believe that you
15 are taking the lead, so, first of all, good afternoon. You've --
16 I guess you've heard our discussion about the architect. Let's
17 talk about that first, and then we have a disclosure on our end.

18 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Good afternoon, Chairman Hood,
19 members of the Commission. My name is Meridith Moldenhauer, and
20 use counsel from Cozen O'Connor, on behalf of the Department of
21 General Services in connection with the Department of Corrections
22 for the Correctional Treatment Facility Annex Project. To answer
23 your question, Commissioner Hood, we do have two different
24 architects. One is Ms. Clarke, who is not local counsel, but is
25 actually special counsel -- or special architectural services.

1 Her firm, CGL, focuses on institutional and correctional
2 facilities, and I believe that she would be able to provide that
3 narrow focus of expert testimony. And then we have David Cheney,
4 who is local with CORE and has been working with CFA and we
5 believe would be able to answer architectural design questions
6 and expertise. So I think, given the unique institutional use
7 here, we would ask that the Commission allow for a little bit of
8 a divergence from your normal process of only qualifying one
9 expert, given the specific use here that we're discussing.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Let me go back
11 to my colleagues. Commissioner Imamura, your thoughts on that?
12 You've heard from Ms. Moldenhauer.

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. Certainly, based off of
14 Ms. Clarke's resume, there is a narrow focus there on jails, but
15 I imagine that -- I think Mr. Cheney -- his expertise in
16 architecture is sufficient enough for this particular case, but
17 should we have any questions for Ms. Clarke, certainly, we'd, you
18 know, want to bring her up, but I think general architecture is
19 sufficient here.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
21 Wright, you have anything to add?

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. I'm actually fine with both,
23 but, again, I'm not as familiar with what's been done in the
24 past, in terms of only having one expert witness for architecture.
25 I'm actually fine with both of them, but I'm open.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Stidham, any
2 questions or comments?

3 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No, I'm good.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I also have no concern with having
6 both. I think it might be helpful in this case.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I'm actually of the mindset to
8 go -- I agree with Commissioner Imamura. I would like for us --
9 and as he stated, Ms. -- what was the name -- Clarke, we can hear
10 your testimony; we just won't give her expert status, unless
11 anybody disagrees.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Let's move in that
14 fashion. And, again, Ms. Clarke -- we will hear her testimony,
15 Ms. Moldenhauer. So anything -- any other preliminary -- oh, let
16 me go to Commissioner Imamura.

17 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
18 disclose to my peers on the Commission, as well as the public,
19 that I am a member of the Board of Directors for Congressional
20 Cemetery, as an ex officio member representing the Architect of
21 the Capitol. I'm aware that the applicant has met with
22 Congressional Cemetery, but was not a participant in that, and
23 so I just wanted to make the statement that my membership to the
24 Board doesn't affect my impartiality here and that my decision
25 will be solely based on the administrative record here, so --

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
2 Imamura. Any objections? I certainly don't see any conflict of
3 interest. I certainly -- I mean, we all are -- we all do -- we
4 do other things in this city, and sometimes we have things that
5 might be next to each other, but doesn't mean we've been involved
6 with it. We all have that. So I don't -- I personally don't
7 see any reason for Commissioner Imamura to step away from this,
8 period. Anybody else have any objections to anything that I
9 said?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Commissioner Imamura,
12 you can't get out of this one. You're going to stick with us
13 tonight.

14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: All right. Thank you, sir.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, Ms. Moldenhauer, we'll turn it
16 over to you.

17 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Wonderful. I'll do a brief
18 introduction and then ask if we can pull up the PowerPoint, but
19 good afternoon again. Meridith Moldenhauer, land use counsel at
20 Cozen O'Connor on behalf of DGS in connection with the Department
21 of Corrections for the Correctional Treatment Facility Annex
22 project. We're pleased to present this application for design
23 review in Zoning Case Number 24-21, with the support of ANC 6B,
24 7D, the Office of Planning, and the Department of Transportation.
25 For the reasons outlined today, as well as outlined in our record,

1 we believe the application can be found to be not inconsistent
2 with the Comprehensive Plan. The project has proposed many
3 benefits and services for the city, as a whole, as well as the
4 residents of the Department of Corrections. We also have extended
5 a substantial amount of community outreach, and the applicant has
6 worked to insure that the project addresses those in the
7 community.

8 We will present our presentation now, with testimony
9 from Director Faust, Deputy Director Wilson, Mr. Agyei Hargrove
10 from DGS, as well as Ms. Clarke, and we thank the Commission for
11 approving Mr. Erwin Andres and Mr. Cheney as experts. Their
12 resumes are in the record, as noted by the Secretary. And at
13 this point I would ask if our presentation can be pulled up, and
14 I'll turn it over to Director Faust to start us off.

15 MR. FAUST: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chairman Hood
16 and members of the Commission. I am Tom Faust, Director of the
17 D.C. Department of Corrections. We appreciate the opportunity
18 to present the zoning application for this very transformative
19 facility project.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Faust, did you go on mute?
21 That's a good way to get your case approved, if we don't hear
22 anything. I think you're on mute. You're not? Can anybody hear
23 me?

24 MS. MOLDENHAUER: I can hear you, Commissioner Hood.

25 MS. WILSON: I can hear you.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, Mr. Faust, I think it's
2 on you. We'll wait and let you get it together.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: I think he's off now. He should -- try
4 to say something now, Mr. Faust.

5 MR. FAUST: Can you hear me?

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, we can hear you now, yes.

7 DIRECTOR FAUST: Yeah, my button was showing unmuted.
8 Sorry.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No problem.

10 MR. FAUST: I'll start from the very beginning very
11 quickly.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

13 MR. FAUST: Again, good afternoon, Chairman Hood and
14 members of the Commission. I am Tom Faust, Director of the D.C.
15 Department of Corrections. We appreciate the opportunity to
16 present the zoning application for this very transformative
17 facility project. The Correctional Treatment Facility Annex
18 Project represents Mayor Bowser's vision to construct a new
19 correctional facility, which is focused on programming,
20 treatment, and re-entry, to replace the aging and very outdated
21 central detention facility in Hill East.

22 Next slide please. Just take a moment to recognize
23 that we have an extensive team of partners for the project. The
24 Department of General Services, our implementing agency, has been
25 working with CGL Companies, Cozen O'Connor, CORE Architect and

1 Design, and a number of others for this project to come to
2 fruition, and you will hear from several of these team members
3 during the hearing.

4 Next slide please. The DOC currently operates and
5 maintains the Central Detention Facility and the Correctional
6 Treatment Facility, which together contain nearly a million
7 square feet of walkable space. These buildings are commonly
8 referred to as the D.C. Jail. The D.C. Jail houses pretrial
9 offenders, (indiscernible) misdemeanors, and convicted felons
10 awaiting transfer to the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Jails are
11 unlike prisons in that they are shorter-term detention
12 facilities, not long-term prisons. The CDF opened in 1976 and
13 has experienced significant infrastructure and repair challenges
14 due to the aging nature of the building. We have also seen
15 changes in our population that increase the need for mental and
16 behavior health services. What the CDF lacks is critical
17 programmatic spaces. We are thankful for Mayor Bowser has
18 committed to funding this transformative project that will
19 address the many challenges of the current CDF building.

20 Next slide please. The goal of the CTF Annex Project
21 is to provide a modern, secure, and resilient facility with the
22 necessary infrastructure to address critical rehabilitation,
23 treatment, and re-entry needs of those in the custody and care
24 of the Department of Corrections. By creating a singular unified
25 correctional complex, the project will serve the needs of

1 residents, DOC staff, and other key stakeholders, while
2 appropriately integrating the building within the surrounding
3 Hill East community.

4 Next slide please. And I will now like to turn it over
5 to DOC Deputy Director, Michelle Wilson, for the next slide.
6 Thank you.

7 MS. WILSON: Thank you, Director. Again, my name is
8 Michelle Wilson. I'm the Deputy Director of Administration here
9 at the D.C. Department of Corrections. This slide is an overview
10 of how the project compares the existing CDF and CTF facilities
11 at the property. We will have a modest increase from the recent
12 count of 2,009 beds to approximately 2,144 beds in the project,
13 and this includes beds in the existing CTF facility. So if you
14 compare slide one to slide two, the future Annex of one and two
15 buildings plus CTF, we'll have approximately 2,144 beds. You
16 will see that the existing facilities actually have a higher
17 number -- the current CDF and CTF have a higher number of capacity
18 than either the current number of residents or the projected
19 number of beds in the new facility.

20 From a parking perspective, we have approximately 230
21 spaces currently onsite at the CDF and CTF facilities, which will
22 be significantly increased to 409 spaces in the project's
23 underground garages. As you will hear more later in the
24 presentation, the project will offer an opportunity to greatly
25 improve the programmatic services for residents, as compared to

1 our existing facilities. For example, the project will have a
2 specialized behavioral health housing unit -- will have
3 specialized behavioral health housing units, which is not present
4 in our existing buildings.

5 Slide -- next slide please. Here is a more detailed
6 breakdown of the project programming. The behavioral health
7 facility in Building One, for example, will have 112 beds and is
8 specially designed for the residents being housed there and
9 this -- and will include individualized counseling rooms and
10 group counseling rooms. Building One will also have an inmate
11 reception center that is in close proximity to intake housing
12 units, allowing more direct management, better services and
13 support, and programming for new intake residents. There will
14 also be 30 infirmary beds in Building One for residents under
15 medical care for specialty and chronic conditions. Building Two
16 will primarily be for housing units, facility administration, and
17 resident and staff support. I also want to note that DOC hopes
18 to complete a large-scale renovation of the CTF Building, which
19 will be connected to the project. However, those plans are still
20 in the early stages.

21 Next slide please. Understanding the significance of
22 this project, we have conducted an extensive amount of community
23 engagement and outreach in connection with this project. Since
24 Spring 2024, we have held 24 community meetings with various
25 groups, including ANCs 7F, 7D, and 6B. We are happy to receive

1 votes of support from ANCs 7D and 6B, which are reflected in the
2 case record. ANC 7F has not yet taken a formal vote on the
3 project, and we look forward to continued engagement with them.

4 Additional forms of engagement include the project
5 website and community question-and-answer forms. In 2023 and
6 2024, we conducted extensive surveys of our residents, our staff,
7 and advocacy groups, which helped inform many of our programming
8 and programmatic decisions in the project. Finally, we are happy
9 to have received Commission of Fine Arts concept approval in
10 February and will be presenting to National Capital Planning
11 Commission in early April. And I now will turn it over to Tamara
12 Clarke with CGL Companies, and the next slide please.

13 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Actually, we're going to turn it over
14 to Mr. Hargrove at the Department of -- at DGS to review this,
15 and then Ms. Clarke.

16 MR. HARGROVE: Okay. No worries. Good afternoon. My
17 name is Agyei Hargrove. I'm the Executive Program Manager with
18 Department of General Services, Capital Construction, Public
19 Safety and Justice Portfolio. Thank you for hearing my testimony
20 today. I'm here to present the timeline of the project.

21 We started this project in 2023 with the predesign
22 services we procured with CGL. During that process, we've engaged
23 DOC and other stakeholders to come up with the population
24 projections, finalize the architectural program, outreach to ANCs
25 and to other entitlement agencies, such as OP, CFA, NCPC, and we

1 have completed the -- well, initiated the conceptual design,
2 which will be finalized by the Architect of Record.

3 In 2025, we will be procuring the services of the
4 Architect of Record, and we anticipate the design services to go
5 from '25 to '27. In '27, we anticipate construction to start
6 for three to four years. During that time, in 2029, we will be
7 making modifications to building -- to the CDF to allow for
8 construction to commence for Building Number Two of the Annex.
9 In 2029, that will start the -- excuse me -- in 2031, Building
10 Two of the Annex will -- construction will start. In 2035, CDF
11 will be discontinued and all members of the facility will be
12 transferred over to Building Number Two.

13 Next slide please, and turning it over to Ms. Clarke.

14 MS. CLARKE: Thank you very much. Tamara Clarke with
15 CGL Companies. I appreciate this opportunity to express my
16 expertise.

17 Next slide please. So the special architectural goals
18 for this facility include the interior of -- that was created by
19 a very rigorous programming process that included, as you've
20 heard, feedback sessions from multiple stakeholders, as well as
21 best practices and examples specific for correctional facilities
22 of this type. Those included a very important scientific analysis
23 of the future of the Department of Correction's resident
24 population. This concept that's being presented responds to the
25 very specific programmatic and operational needs presented for

1 the DOC residents and the staff that work at these facilities.
2 It includes the site constraints of this specific location and
3 the long-term fiscal opportunities for the District. In addition
4 to that, the building envelope is specifically responsive to the
5 layouts that are inside of the building, as they are expressed
6 to the exterior. The resulting concept represents a welcoming,
7 yet still secure correctional facility that doesn't appear like
8 a traditional correctional facility and, most importantly,
9 supports the vision of the District and of Hill East.

10 Next slide please. I'll skip this slide. If you'll
11 please continue to the next. Looking specifically at the
12 locations here in the zoning map, you're familiar, no doubt, with
13 Parcel L, which is the location of the existing parking lot for
14 the CTF facility. To the left of that is Parcel O that represents
15 the CDF. And south of Parcel L is Parcel N that represents the
16 location of the CTF.

17 Next slide please. In the first component of the
18 sequence, the parking lot that is located there at Parcel L will
19 be the site of the location of the new building, and you see the
20 surrounding buildings.

21 Next slide please. When Building One, which is
22 represented by the letter "D", is built, it will encompass the
23 entire parking lot and Parcel of -- portion of Parcel L, as well
24 as a little bit of Parcel O. Next slide please. As you'll see
25 by the red box there, a portion of the CDF, labeled as Building

1 C, will be required to be removed, so that there will be vacant
2 land to build the second component of this project.

3 Next slide please. As you'll see here, Building E,
4 which is the second building in this complex, will then connect
5 to Building D, and all three with E, D, and A will comprise the
6 new complex. Building B will no longer be used. Next slide
7 please. I'll skip this slide. Thank you.

8 Next slide please. In the original concept, the fire
9 lane that encompasses the site for the CTF requires addition or
10 enlargement for safe travel of the fire vehicles and also
11 appropriate consideration for the bioretention in the southwest
12 corner. That was slightly revised to improve and increase the
13 amount of bioretention, and so the fire road was slightly
14 modified.

15 Next slide please. And at this point, I'll turn the
16 presentation over to Mr. Cheney. Thank you.

17 MR. CHENEY: Great. Thanks. Can everyone hear me?

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, we can hear you.

19 MR. CHENEY: Great. So David Cheney with CORE
20 Architecture and Design. Again, we -- as Tamara noted, the
21 internal program has very -- several complexities and
22 requirements for adjacencies that need to be expressed on the
23 building in a way that makes the building have a lively
24 streetscape, has an accessible entrance so that everybody can
25 come in at one location, including staff, and functionally

1 anonymous, meaning that we're trying to, again, blur the
2 appearance of the jail with all the other program requirements
3 of health, behavioral, administrative, and all the security
4 aspects of the -- of the design to hopefully combine into a place
5 to be healed.

6 Next slide. Some more precedent images. Again, it's
7 a very organic though, warm and inviting. We're using sort of
8 this organic appeal of lots of landscape that are a buffer between
9 the pedestrian and the street edge, a water sort of effect as
10 the scrim becomes part of the facade, and then the elements of
11 biophilia where the motifs within the facade represent the
12 silhouette of trees and a forest and that create shadows both on
13 the side of the building and also internally.

14 Next slide. You can see a rendering here. This is on
15 Massachusetts Avenue looking south down Mass. The two masses of
16 the building, Building One is the taller building further down;
17 Building Two is the one closest to you. It's a very warm,
18 shimmering, very lacy, very translucent architectural expression
19 of the scrim. It's aluminum powder-coated in several different
20 colors to kind of give it a variation of weathering and age. The
21 shadow will play across it into the window wall system that's
22 behind it. The idea is that the scrim is a waterfall effect
23 that's coming over the parapet, broken by these horizontal sort
24 of leaf elements that allow us to pull back the scrim in very
25 prescribed areas where there needs to be more visual appearance

1 from inside and out, but also I think just to get, you know, a
2 different play of light that, again, starts to blur the different
3 programmatic elements.

4 Next slide. You can see more of this landscape element
5 that is that buffer. Hill East requires this sort of 30 foot
6 pedestrian sort of landscape piece, and this is reflective of
7 that. It's sort of, again, trying to reduce the scale of the
8 building by stepping these board-formed concrete walls with
9 native materials that are less maintenance, but allow for a secure
10 environment adjacent to the building.

11 Next slide. The entrance. So the entrance is very
12 important. We wanted staff to come in the same way as the public
13 comes in, as visitors might come in, as lawyers representing
14 their clients might come in, and then release is adjacent to it
15 as well, and we'll get to that in a second, but you can start to
16 see the landscape elements, how it starts to point you towards
17 this very accessible entrance and the gap between the buildings,
18 again, becomes this more cascading landscape element to help
19 soften the distance between the phase construction of Building
20 One and Building Two.

21 Next slide. Again, much more an overall effect. You
22 can start to really I think appreciate how the -- as the sun
23 moves across the sky, it starts to, again, move the shadow of
24 this window wall system behind it with different frits and
25 different opacities and that the scrim becomes more of an artist

1 expression of the building to try and, again, feel this warm,
2 inviting space that's right on Massachusetts Avenue.

3 Next slide. Again, more of that full elevation along
4 Mass Ave. You see there more of the scale of the building. Next
5 slide. More of an update, again, sort of a zoomed-in view of
6 the Building One elevation; again, as little scrim as possible,
7 but enough to sort of, again, blur that idea of the programmatic
8 elements of where the housing units reside and where the other
9 programmatic elements are within the building.

10 Next slide. The section between the two buildings,
11 looking at that -- again, that slope to the retaining wall that
12 goes to the sort of connection between Building One and Building
13 Two. We wanted to sort of soften that and not have this sort of
14 floating sort of object that connects the two buildings, keeping
15 the two secure elements adjacent, but not too connected, and
16 this, I think, helps to soften that linkage between the two. You
17 can sort of see in the back, too, as well, where there's really
18 a requirement for much more daylighting, much more viewing from
19 inside and outside. We did pull back the scrim as much as we
20 could to give -- to allow for that to happen.

21 Next slide. Again, Building Two, same kind of idea.
22 This one, again, as you've heard before in past testimony, is
23 mostly housing units, and so we didn't want to show that there's
24 a difference in the architectural expression between Building One
25 and Building Two, whether it has more housing units or less

1 housing units, so we wanted to keep that expression the same
2 between both.

3 Next slide. Again, a section looking the other way to
4 Building Two, again, showing that on (indiscernible) and how the
5 scrim gets pulled away for different programmatic elements.

6 Next slide. In plan, again, you start to see how
7 this -- again, this landscape element is that true buffer between
8 the building facade adjacent to the property line and the
9 pedestrian way, still incorporating as the extension of Mass Ave
10 and it goes down further south; street trees are still aligned
11 with the building, there's still stormwater management, all those
12 different aspects. There's a slight different change in the
13 scoring pattern of the concrete as you enter the building. Still
14 concrete, still within I think the Department of Transportation's
15 sort of standards, but a little special sort of -- again, a little
16 extra scoring on the on the landscape to try and signify a little
17 better entrance. You'll notice a path that comes out of Building
18 One. That's where the release -- they're released into this sort
19 of landscape environment into -- back into the neighborhood. We
20 think that's a more appropriate way then sort of allowing them
21 to come from the back of the building or some other location.

22 Next slide. More detail of the section. So you start
23 to see we have on Building One the floor elevation where the
24 parking below is higher than the street. Massachusetts Avenue,
25 even today before the extension happens, is a very steep drop-

1 off in grade from one -- from the north end to the south end,
2 and so the building located at the center, where the lobby is,
3 at grade. The rest, again, the grade starts to slope, and so
4 these retaining walls are helping sort of put the landscape in a
5 very nice sort of boundary, again, native species easily to
6 maintain, but still have the secure aspect of it.

7 Next slide. Building One in plan. I mention again
8 that release sort of path through the landscape to get you out
9 into the zone. We have bicycle parking. There's a few areas to
10 sit, but not to linger; not too many in that regard, but enough
11 to sort of have a seat and feel like you're in a nice sort of
12 landscaped garden.

13 Next slide. Sections to Building Two are very similar.
14 Building Two's floor-to-floor height is much higher. As you
15 start to go up, it's aligning with the other adjacent building,
16 and so there's a -- there's more of a need for this buffer, and
17 that's where we've extended it, between Building One and Building
18 Two, again, not treating one differently than the other.

19 Next slide. More detail of that. Again, more of
20 species -- more description of the actual landscape itself.

21 Next slide. More details onto the multi-layered sort
22 of facade. Again, it's a -- it's a powder-coated aluminum scrim.
23 It has a punched or laser-cut openings in it that have a biophilic
24 sort of response to sort of the silhouetted version of the sun
25 going through a tree canopy. There are four different types of

1 glazing materials. There's still glass within a typical window
2 wall, but True Vision glass, completely open, more for the lobby
3 spaces where that's really truly needed; a translucent film,
4 which again has some translucence, but is still very opaque enough
5 to not see -- where you can see through it; a window wall glazing
6 that has a frit, but is, again, biophilic, but is more I think a
7 shading and has different gradients within it; and then, finally,
8 the window wall that is -- that is truly opaque, that is solid,
9 that kind of gives that sort of solid void effect in the facade
10 behind the scrim. And so we mixed those up with board-formed
11 concrete, again, to sort of give it this sort of -- sort of tree
12 trunk effect. And then the columns behind it is more of -- again,
13 more of a warm color as well to try and blend the two.

14 Next slide. More detail. You can see the scrim. We've
15 talked to CFA, as has been mentioned before. We reduced the
16 amount of scrim and the opaqueness. It's much more lacier. You
17 can see the previously proposed versus the revised pattern; still
18 essentially the same pattern, but much, much less of it. The
19 folds and the overlaps allow it to be very structurally sound,
20 and so it allows us to reduce it as much as we can.

21 Next slide. The window wall itself. As you start to
22 combine those four different glazings in a pattern that, again,
23 blurs from the use that's happening within the building, it allows
24 for this very, I think, way of seeing from out -- from the
25 outside, not in, but in/out. And so if you're in an office or

1 if you're in one of the housing units, you can see through the
2 frit, as it's close to your eye, whereas when you're outside
3 looking in, you -- it's obscured by this -- by this -- by its
4 pattern.

5 Next slide. And I'll turn this back over to Tamara to
6 talk about the section.

7 MS. CLARKE: Thank you, David. So looking here --
8 whoops -- back at the section, if we might go back -- thank you
9 very much -- here along Mass Ave are the elevations at street
10 level for Building Two on the right and Building One on to the
11 left. The important components here are at the public lobby
12 entrance that David described that shows where the veil and the
13 scrim is raised so that this area is clearly visible for the
14 public, making it easy to understand the entry point for this
15 campus. At this level, there is staff support on the left and
16 the public lobby through that glazed entrance. That public lobby
17 in plan is shown with blue coloring and is the only area within
18 the building that is part of the accessible area by the public.
19 In Building Two, the first floor above there that is shown with
20 scrim and in the section provides spaces for staff support and
21 resident housing.

22 Next slide please. This is a section of Building One,
23 which is the first building and also the taller building to be
24 built. It starts with two levels of underground parking, two
25 levels of staff support areas, and then three floors that include

1 housing for the residents, as well as support in programs and
2 staff areas. Next slide please. If you step back, you'll see
3 that Building One is in the background, and this is now a section
4 through Building Two. It also has two levels of underground
5 parking and two levels of resident housing areas, as well as
6 program spaces and staff support.

7 Next slide please. Given that we're not able to share
8 with you the specifics of what happens within the footprint of
9 each of the buildings, we have pulled together representations
10 of what the intention is for these areas, and this will be
11 provided to the Architect of Record for their development and
12 continuation. This represents a typical housing unit. The use
13 of normative furnishings, the use of good, bright light, natural
14 light having abundance within the space, as well as bright colors,
15 interest, bringing in images of nature and soft finishes that are
16 more normal and less institutional.

17 Next slide please. Within each of the housing units,
18 there is a program requirement for outdoor recreation area, but,
19 in order for this to be safe and secure, it is provided off of
20 each housing unit with the opportunity to provide louvers, should
21 there be inclement weather, but, other than that, these louvers
22 are open for lots of natural ventilation, good sunlight, and the
23 opportunity for views to the sky to see what happens with the
24 weather. This is an area that allows large muscle activity and
25 exercise.

1 Next slide please. Also very important to the program
2 of this facility is to provide modern and current healthcare and
3 medical services. So included in this program will be spaces for
4 clinics and an infirmary, as well as nursing stations and current
5 opportunities for people to heal. This is a healing environment.

6 Next slide please. Also included in this program is
7 the opportunity for visitation for the residents, and that'll
8 happen in a number of different environments and opportunities,
9 using technology, as well as in-person visitation. Again, use
10 of color, natural light abundantly, and warm biophilic materials.

11 Next slide please. And at this point I'll turn it over
12 to the rest of the team. Erwin.

13 MR. ANDRES: Great. Thank you, Tamara. Good afternoon,
14 Chairman Hood, members of the Commission. For the record, Erwin
15 Andres with Gorove Slade Associates.

16 Next slide please. The site is well situated
17 approximate to two Metrorail stations, both Stadium-Armory to the
18 north and Potomac Avenue to the south. There are some bus routes
19 that will also provide access to the site. In addition to that,
20 the site is well served by bicycle facilities and has great
21 vehicular access to some of the regional roadways that include
22 I-295 and I-495.

23 Next slide please. The access and circulation is
24 primarily centered on Massachusetts Avenue with the main
25 pedestrian entrance. Mr. Cheney had identified where that is and

1 how that's -- how that's situated relative to Massachusetts
2 Avenue. Just to the east of that pedestrian entry, there is the
3 main vehicular entry for the employee garage serving the site
4 underneath the facility. This garage that is below -- that will
5 be below the building is geared essentially to consolidate all
6 of the parking that currently takes place both onsite, as well
7 as some surface lots adjacent to the site that will be
8 consolidated underneath the building. Pedestrian access, as I
9 mentioned, is up and down Massachusetts Avenue, with a loading
10 access coming off of E Street.

11 Next slide. Relative to the trip generation, as has
12 been identified at the beginning of this presentation, the
13 capacity -- the overall capacity of the facility is actually
14 going to be reduced. Staffing levels are projected to be similar
15 to the current existing staffing levels, and, with that, we've
16 looked at the trip generation associated with that. As I
17 mentioned before, the number of parking spaces and -- are geared
18 to essentially be consolidated with all of the parking that takes
19 place in and around the public streets and the adjacent lots.

20 Next slide. As part of our coordination with DDOT,
21 we've submitted a Comprehensive Transportation Review report,
22 which DDOT has reviewed and has provided their recommendation of
23 no objection, with the condition that we implement the TDM plan.
24 as proposed. So, with that, I'm available for questions, and
25 I'll turn it over to Ms. Moldenhauer.

1 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Thank you very much, Mr. Andres.
2 Next slide please. So we are here this afternoon before the
3 Zoning Commission to review the HE Zone design requirements. The
4 project is compliant. It's a split-zone site between HE-3 and
5 HE-4. The site does comply with the split zone requirements for
6 each zoned height requirement; penthouse, lot occupancy, FAR,
7 side yard, rear yard, parking, loading, and bicycle requirements.
8 We are, however, here to review special exception relief for the
9 large-scale government use; one area variance relief, based on
10 the HE requirements for primary streets under Subtitle K-420.5;
11 and two design waivers under Sections 417.1(e) and 419.3.

12 Next slide. First, I will walk through the special
13 exception relief for the large-scale government use. As
14 indicated earlier, this is located on the site. The project is
15 located on Parcels O, L, and -- O, N, and L. The existing
16 facility is on O and N, and a new portion of the structure will
17 be constructed on Parcel L, and so we are seeking special
18 exception relief for the large-scale government use there.

19 We believe it is in harmony with the general purpose
20 and integrity of the zone plan and the zoning map, as consistent
21 with the HE Zone. It is intended to meet the diverse public
22 needs, including, obviously, government services and
23 administration. The new facility is a critical need for the
24 District government, and it is in keeping with the Hill East
25 Master Plan. We also believe this relief will not tend to

1 adversely affect the use of neighboring properties. This is a
2 continuing longstanding use of the property as the CDF opened on
3 this site in 1976, and we have done extensive outreach and
4 communication.

5 Next slide. In addition to the general exception
6 criteria, we also have special conditions here. They are --
7 include that parking and transportation conditions associated
8 will not adversely affect adjacent neighbors and uses. We are
9 providing 409 parking spaces below grade. We also have no
10 objection from DDOT. The special exception criteria requires
11 that noise associated with the operation of the proposed use
12 would not adversely affect the adjacent or nearby uses. The
13 correctional operations largely occur inside the structure, as
14 well as the fact that there is a substantial 160-foot right-of-
15 way here that would be separating the facility from any
16 individuals in the public.

17 Additional criteria of the proposed building will
18 comply with applicable ground floor uses, and, in that regard,
19 we are compliant, except for the requested two waivers. The
20 building's architectural design will enhance the urban design
21 features, and we do believe this modern and memorable building
22 will obviously be consistent with the Hill East design
23 requirements, as well as provide a new opportunity and a new
24 asset to the neighborhood, as well as the existing landscaping,
25 which will improve the current condition.

1 Finally, that vehicular access and egress will be
2 located in a way that will be safe and improve and provide
3 efficient pedestrian and other requirements for transportation.
4 We are only asking for one curb cut. We have worked with DDOT
5 and believe that this project will, with the build-out of
6 Massachusetts Avenue, enhance transportation and access to the
7 Anacostia Waterfront.

8 Next slide. We are seeking one area variance from the
9 building entrance requirements on primary streets. This is under
10 Subtitle K-420.5. The requirement states that entrances into a
11 building shall be no more than 50 feet apart and recesses no more
12 than six feet deep and ten feet wide. Massachusetts is a primary
13 street in the HE zone, and there are no permitted waivers under
14 this section, so, thus, we have to request the variance
15 requirements.

16 We believe that under the Monaco and the more recent
17 Neighbors for Responsive Government Court of Appeals cases, that
18 the caselaw for public service is clear that we would satisfy the
19 exceptional conditions and practical difficulty associated with
20 the programmatic needs of the CDF and of this program, and that
21 providing these types of entrances is not consistent with this
22 programmatic need and thus the practical difficulty associated
23 with the relief, and that this would not create a substantial
24 detriment to the public good or the zone, given the fact that
25 the overall use was contemplated in the Hill East Master Plan.

1 Next slide. I'll go over the two waivers we're
2 requesting. The first is the 65 percent of the ground floor
3 dedicated to preferred use. Preferred uses include in this zone
4 retail, entertain, assembly, and performing arts. Given the
5 programmatic requirements, the need for the jail, co-locating
6 these type of preferred uses would be inconsistent with the use,
7 and, therefore, we request a waiver.

8 Next slide. We're also requesting a waiver from
9 requiring that the facade be built along the property line and,
10 if not, within 25 feet of the property line. Only in one
11 location, where we are connecting Buildings One and Buildings
12 Two, are we seeking relief from this. It's actually set back
13 104 feet, and that is mostly based on the sloping. As you saw
14 from the plan, there is a large grade change from 19th Street
15 down to the Anacostia Waterfront, and, in order to connect the
16 buildings, we're seeing a waiver from this section.

17 Next slide. I'll briefly review the racial equity
18 analysis that is required in connection with the Comprehensive
19 Plan. The Comprehensive Plan and racial equity tool lays out
20 four different sections to review for consistency.

21 Next slide. First we reviewed the Future Land Use Map
22 and Generalized Policy Map, and, as outlined in our filings, as
23 well as in OP's report, we believe that this proposal is
24 consistent with both of these. Next slide. We have listed the
25 various specific elements throughout the Comprehensive Plan for

1 which this proposed use is consistent and believe that the overall
2 programmatic need for the city to provide a modern, as well as
3 safe environment for the residents that is provided here and is
4 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

5 Next slide. Community outreach and engagement. We
6 have had extensive community outreach and engagement at 23
7 different community meetings since May 2024. These have been
8 conducted both virtually and in person. They have also -- DOC
9 has engaged with their staff and the residents with surveys, and
10 we have a specific dedicated website that provides opportunities
11 for community members or individuals to comment or provide
12 questions and get back with them.

13 I do want to identify that the properties we said is
14 actually -- requires notice in three different ANCs. We have ANC
15 6B's letter of support in the record at Exhibit 12. We have ANC
16 7D in the record at Exhibit 17. ANC 7F, which is actually our
17 SMD and our ANC, we do not have a letter in the record. We have
18 met with them on six different occasions, starting in May of 2024
19 until most recently, January 30 of 2025, in which we had a sit-
20 down with their executive group. We have, after that January
21 meeting, e-mailed them and communicated with them four different
22 times, one phone call and three e-mails, to try and connect to
23 see if they would finalize our review and ask for a letter of
24 recommendation, and that is still pending, and we're happy to
25 discuss that further with the Commission.

1 Next slide. In regard to Section 3, we defer to the
2 Office of Planning's report, which has Attachment Number 3 and
3 provides, you know, demographic data as part of this section.

4 Next slide. When evaluating the zoning actions, we
5 review whether or not there are any direct displacement issues.
6 We believe that, obviously, the proposed correctional facility
7 would not result in any displacement of any residents or buildings
8 or businesses, that there would be no anticipated indirect
9 residential displacement, and that this facility would not
10 negatively impact housing affordability in the area, as well as
11 it would be a benefit, however, though to employment, education,
12 wellness, and transportation, and environment.

13 Next slide. With that, I respectfully appreciate the
14 Commission's time and we look forward to your consideration of
15 this application. That completes our presentation, and myself
16 and all of the other witnesses are available to answer your
17 questions.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Moldenhauer
19 and to the team. Ms. Moldenhauer, did you all practice your
20 presentation for this evening? I'm just curious. I ask this
21 question sometimes.

22 MS. MOLDENHAUER: We did, yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: How long did it take you all to
24 practice it? Did you all time it?

25 MS. MOLDENHAUER: We did time it.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: How long did it take you?

2 MS. MOLDENHAUER: We were -- so we were taking about,
3 you know, 50 minutes.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, you all have done --
5 let me just say this. You all have done very well with your
6 presentation. I'm sure we have some questions and comments, but
7 I like the way your presentation was organized, and I'm sure my
8 colleagues agree -- would agree with that. We really appreciate
9 the way your presentation was this afternoon. Thank you. Okay.
10 Let's see if we have any questions or comments. Commissioner
11 Imamura.

12 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms.
13 Moldenhauer, thank you to you and your team, in addition to
14 Director Faust and Deputy Director Wilson. To the Chairman's
15 point, very thorough presentation, so thank you very much. I
16 have a couple comments and a couple questions. Architecturally,
17 I think, you know, CFA has already provided remarks, and it is a
18 unique design solution I think. So I'm curious, Mr. Cheney, just
19 for my own sort of curiosity and interest, where the idea of the
20 Cor-Ten scrim came from.

21 MR. CHENEY: Well, we started Cor-Ten, and originally
22 that was more of a durability issue and more of a -- you know,
23 able to get the folds and the perforations that we wanted. CFA
24 I think -- and rightfully so, I think were worried over an
25 extended period of time that it could all essentially become one

1 color and become probably too dark. And so that's where we went
2 to an aluminum powder-coated scrim, still keeping it colored in
3 four different colors to kind of give it that subtle variation,
4 and then reduce the -- the aluminum allowed us to get a much more
5 lacy effect as well, and so it kind of did two things at once.

6 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Well, I think it's very
7 effective. It's a very complicated -- it seems like a very
8 complicated window wall system and scrim there, in addition to
9 the programming for this project type, so I'm certain supportive
10 of the special exception relief that's being sought, the area
11 variance, and the design waivers. What I will ask a little more
12 about for this particular project type -- 24/7 operation, I
13 imagine one could call it probably an energy hog -- but I noticed
14 that we are achieving LEED Sliver here, and I was curious just
15 about the discussions, in terms of use of photovoltaics or a
16 green roof or anything like that, to increase your points for
17 LEED Silver and how far off you are from achieving LEED Gold.

18 MR. CHENEY: Is this for me as well?

19 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

20 MR. CHENEY: Yes. So, again, I think it's -- you know,
21 it's PV ready at the roof. There is no green roof. Due to the
22 secure nature of the building and the access to the roof and
23 other parts of that, we went to a bioretention sort of solution,
24 and so we've got enough of a site on campus in order to get our
25 stormwater management through that aspect. I will say the

1 daylighting, as Tamara mentioned, is very important to a lot of
2 these spaces. We're boring a lot of light into this very deep
3 building. There are skylights on the roof of Building One, which
4 is more the behavioral housing unit, which, again, gets much
5 greater light through the day, and I do think that the quality
6 of light is also important as well. I do think that the scrim
7 will give that play of light, that variety during the day and
8 through the seasons that -- and it's also pulled back quite a
9 bit, where it needs to be more vision glass, where there is
10 more -- I think an opportunity to really have that dynamic between
11 inside and outside a little more clearer.

12 The units -- the housing units, themselves, they have
13 the biophilic scrim, the frit pattern on it, and so they all get
14 the same view outside as everyone else. They can see the horizon.
15 They can see the weather. They can see views without being --
16 feeling like they're on display from the public looking in. And
17 it also, I think, protects, I think, the public from the people
18 inside as well, to kind of keep them, I think, feeling safe and
19 secure, that they're being looked after inside without being on
20 display from the outside as well.

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Sure. I think that's an
22 interesting aspect, is the biophilic components to all of this.
23 You mentioned a little bit about bioretention, your stormwater
24 management strategy. I think I had seen a comment somewhere
25 about one of the agencies encouraging you to exceed your

1 stormwater management -- your stormwater management goals or
2 requirements along that. I'd like to talk a little bit -- I
3 think a lot of focus has been placed on the architectural
4 elements, as well as the landscape features along Mass Ave, and
5 I think that's pretty successful.

6 Your description of the scrim parapet cascading down
7 and then introducing the board-formed concrete in the landscape
8 reminded me of Freeway Park there in Seattle, if you're familiar
9 with Lawrence Halprin's work. It didn't quite achieve that, but
10 I think, in terms of the retaining walls and the cascading down
11 to the pedestrian scale and the sidewalk there, I think is pretty
12 successful. I would also I guess agree with CFA's comments about
13 simplifying the landscape, as they identified -- Mr. Luebke
14 identified in their letter there in the last paragraph.
15 Certainly, I think that's on par.

16 But back to the bioretention, I'm -- less attention has
17 been given to Congressional Cemetery, where the property meets
18 Congressional Cemetery there and the fire lane, I think, that was
19 described. I acknowledge that there was a revision made, I think,
20 to narrow the fire lane there. Curious if that also includes
21 pervious paving. What was difficult to tell from the drawings,
22 just because it was one inch to 80 feet I think, was sort of the
23 distance between the edge from the curb to the property line or
24 the limit of disturbance. When I looked at the grading plan,
25 it's pretty tight, and so I'm not sure that it's fully fleshed

1 out. I recognize it's at the concept level here, but I would
2 like for you to address a little bit more about the stormwater
3 management there. There are three or four existing trees --
4 mature trees that offer a really large canopy with a pretty broad
5 root system that probably extends over into Congressional
6 Cemetery there. The plan seemed to illustrate the replacement
7 of those trees along the southwest part there. I think one would
8 argue that it might be more sustainable to keep the trees there
9 that are there now, but also along the southeast perimeter there,
10 and there's not a lot of space between the curb and the chain
11 link fence, so if you could just describe what that design
12 solution looks like and what that tree planting might be.

13 MR. CHENEY: Yeah. No, that's a good point. I think
14 we've struggled with trying to make sure that we could save as
15 many trees as we could, especially as we develop Building One in
16 the sequence to Building Two. And so, you know, you'll see I
17 think in one of the slides where we actually are planting trees
18 between One and Two in an interim basis, as it takes, you know,
19 quite a while to drop that portion of the CTF in order to get
20 the room to build these other elements.

21 Now, one of the things that we really try to do in
22 stormwater management, not necessarily all just on Mass, but also
23 in the back, is -- you know, those retaining wall elements with
24 all the trees are built in phase one, so they're in place, that
25 they're maturing as we go, and we believe we can build everything

1 behind it in a way not to disturb it. Now, to your point about
2 the access in the back, that is a more utilitarian sort of fire
3 lane, vehicular access. I think we're trying to sort of thread
4 as much of that bioretention within it without disturbing what's
5 there currently, and I think that does -- you know, we'll look --
6 also, we'll get further exploration as we go into further design.

7 I think your comment about still in concept, I think
8 we're trying to go as far as we can now, not knowing I think,
9 you know, all the other maybe technologies that could be sort of
10 at our disposal in another year or two, and also knowing just
11 how much we're really retaining either on the Mass Avenue side
12 or in between the two buildings. That's also a bioretention
13 between Building One and Building Two, and I think that's a great
14 sort of -- that's where the public's going to really see I think
15 most of it. So we're trying as best we can to mitigate that.

16 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I'm pleased to hear that. I'm
17 curious what your thoughts are; what would it take to save those
18 trees that provide -- because the focus here has been really been
19 biophilic, right, and so you're talking about how the backhouse,
20 you know, functions with the fire lane there. It would be
21 regrettable to remove those mature trees I think, right? That
22 would actually help and aid in your stormwater management
23 already. So what would it take do you think to save those trees?

24 MR. CHENEY: Agree. I've had experience on other
25 projects where we've moved those trees at -- even of that size.

1 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Well, since this is a D.C. project,
2 I'm not sure moving the trees is really going to be as much of
3 an option, from a budget perspective. I know -- I do know that
4 Ms. Clarke might be able to talk a little bit about the grading
5 challenges that we have, because we did talk through this and
6 kind of had some extensive conversations on kind of how this was
7 impacting that back road as well, so I don't know if I can also
8 kind of identify Ms. Clarke to address some of those questions
9 on the ability to save those trees and how that was analyzed.

10 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: That would be great. Thank you,
11 Ms. Moldenhauer.

12 MS. CLARKE: Thank you. Thank you for that. A number
13 of components were considered and are still in consideration.
14 The width of the fire drive was actually a component that was
15 discussed with the Fire Marshal, and, while they have preferred
16 widths, they were open to considering reduced widths. I believe
17 the preferred width is 24 feet. I could be incorrect on exactly
18 how much they're willing to reduce in order to still safely bring
19 a fire truck around. The issue at hand is the existing wall that
20 cannot come down and the truck must safely pass that, but,
21 absolutely, that would be a consideration and discussion for
22 further development, and an opportunity to save as many trees as
23 possible is always welcomed. The other thing that I wanted to
24 add is that -- regarding other things for LEED and for
25 sustainability, more importantly, is the consideration of

1 geothermal heating and cooling for the building. That's
2 something that we understand is available in the area and will
3 be part of the investigation when the geotechnical work is done.

4 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Perfect. That's really good to
5 hear. Thank you, Ms. Clarke. And I'm pleased to hear, too, that
6 the team is paying close attention to the grading on the back
7 side there. I don't know -- again, it's difficult to tell,
8 because of the scale of the drawing, if it's reasonable -- if
9 there's enough space there between the limit of disturbance and
10 the edge -- or the curb for the fire drive there. It seems
11 awfully narrow there.

12 MS. CLARKE: It is. And, certainly, to your point,
13 that it does not necessarily have to be a paved drive. The Fire
14 Department and Fire Marshal are open to any material that is
15 drivable, and so that certainly opens up the opportunity for
16 permeable pavers or other material that could be considered by
17 the design team.

18 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Very good. And,
19 certainly, I know that there's -- as you know, there's some
20 existing trees back there. It might be maple, oak, and sweetgum
21 there along that property line, so that limit of disturbance is
22 going to be critical in how that's graded and addressed and
23 handled, so -- certainly, with care. The other question I have
24 is about the CDF, Building B. Ms. Clarke, as you -- it was one
25 of -- earlier in your slides, as -- the existing buildings now,

1 what will happen to Building B once the facility is completed?

2 MS. CLARKE: So as I -- I went through the slides pretty
3 quickly. Building C is the administrative functions of that CDF.
4 The other components are housing units, and those resident units,
5 when the residents are moved into the new building, they will no
6 longer be required, and the DOC intends to no longer use that
7 building. Any further discussions on the use haven't been
8 constructed yet, and I'm sure that those will be part of future
9 discussions, but, at this point in time, the only intent is that
10 that is no longer utilized for housing or occupancy.

11 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Clarke.

12 MS. MOLDENHAUER: -- Commissioner Imamura -- OP's
13 report references demolition. That's not currently contemplated
14 by the applicant, just simply discontinuation. And, obviously,
15 they understand that the property is subject to the HE design
16 guidelines, and whenever that building is -- a plan is formulated
17 for that building, whether it is demolition or modernization or
18 what have you, they would have to come back to the Zoning
19 Commission, to you, to discuss exactly what would happen to that
20 structure.

21 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Okay. Very good. Thank you,
22 Ms. Moldenhauer. Well, I think that concludes all the questions
23 and comments that I have, Mr. Chairman. And this is an important
24 project for the city. It's critical work that needs to be done.
25 I'm glad to see that the team has come together and, I think,

1 provided a comprehensive design solution here. I would just add
2 that I think that -- please, you know, give due consideration to
3 the back side as much as you have to the, I guess what we would
4 say, front side, right, along Mass Ave. So I think, certainly,
5 I'd be interested to see where that goes and what happens.

6 Otherwise, I'm in agreement with CFA that it is a really
7 unique design solution. I think the revised scrim, Mr. Cheney,
8 with additional porosity is -- will be notable and certainly
9 something that we haven't seen quite like this, I think, in the
10 District. I think maybe the only other building that would be
11 close might be the African American History and Culture Museum,
12 so it's certainly an interesting take on that for this type of
13 project. So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Let's go to Commissioner
15 Wright. You have any questions or comments? And then I'll come
16 to Commissioner Stidham, and we'll go out that way.

17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thank you. I think the design
18 solution for the facade of the building is a very good one, and
19 I really like a lot of what you spoke about, Mr. Cheney, regarding
20 you know, the effort to create opportunities for looking out, for
21 a sense of nature. All of those were great ideas. The -- I
22 think the extension of Massachusetts Avenue and creating
23 Massachusetts Avenue as a much, much more important street is
24 also a huge benefit of this project.

25 I do have a couple of questions about the way the

1 building meets the street, the urban design, sort of pedestrian
2 aspects, because those seem to me to be where we're asking to
3 approve waivers from really the Hill East design guidelines. You
4 know, that they -- there is a number of the guidelines that really
5 I think contemplated a different, you know, perhaps kind of
6 building that would have a more traditional set of uses and ways
7 of meeting the street. And you've dealt with the sort of unique
8 purpose of this building with a sort of stepped landscaping,
9 which I assume is also your bioretention areas as well, or helps
10 with your bioretention, and I think that's a good solution. I
11 think it's not the most pedestrian-friendly, but I don't know
12 what else would be more pedestrian-friendly, I mean, in terms of
13 trying to pick a solution. I think the fact that you've stepped
14 the planting areas is great and that helps make it more
15 pedestrian-friendly, but I guess I had a question, particularly,
16 about your lobby entrance, which is the one area along
17 Massachusetts Avenue where the building actually meets the
18 street. And what I didn't fully understand, and maybe you can
19 explain it, Mr. Cheney, is why is the doorway not facing
20 Massachusetts Avenue; why is it facing that sort of little inset
21 area?

22 MR. CHENEY: Yes, that's a good question. Actually,
23 we were trying to sort of I think take the curse off, if you
24 will, of the gap between the two buildings. You know, that was
25 something we struggled with in the sequence of the operational

1 construction and the distance between the two are really required
2 for the fire separation to get the fenestration to work. And so
3 we wanted to really use that as an opportunity to highlight the
4 entrance from that side, and, really, that cascading -- and that
5 part is used for bioretention in between the two buildings. It's
6 really also I think a great opportunity to really see it in a
7 much more closer fashion, where I think the rest of the Mass Ave
8 is really more of a pedestrian walking past the building.

9 We get a lot of pushback I think from CFA to make it
10 less of a park, less of a place to sit. There are some seating
11 elements in it, but not as much as we had originally shown them
12 in some earlier drafts, and so, yes, the idea is that it's offset
13 from that to kind of get you in between the buildings, actually,
14 and not feel like it's a space where trash could be or other
15 places could be. It's more of the welcoming entrance into the
16 building, so we wanted to use that to our advantage, not to our
17 disadvantage.

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: But you do have a path -- again,
19 I think the way you described it is where people are released
20 and they actually walk through the planted area to get to the
21 sidewalk.

22 MR. CHENEY: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Could you explain that a little
24 bit more?

25 MR. CHENEY: Sure. Again, part of the secure nature

1 of being released, you're going through a series of operations
2 internal to the building, but not into the lobby, and so, again,
3 it's on -- we wanted it to be Mass Ave. It actually makes a lot
4 more sense than to be released in the back of the building, and
5 how do you get picked up, and how are you again part of the new --
6 the neighborhood as you do that. And so the grade change between
7 that floor, as you go down Mass Ave, allowed us to have this sort
8 of path that is within the landscape. We wanted to obscure it a
9 little bit, so that people from the public can get into it, but
10 enough so that when you're released, you're -- you feel like
11 you're getting out the front of the building and not the back of
12 the building, but security required that it doesn't go through
13 the lobby proper. That's the balance we wanted to sort of take
14 with that part of it.

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: The only thing that I -- that
16 bothers me a little bit about that is it feels like -- I fully
17 agree with the idea of departing from the front of the building,
18 and I understand that you really can't do that through the lobby.
19 I understand all of that. The path that sort of winds its way
20 through the landscaped area just seems like a -- I mean, I think
21 that's something that might need a little more study. You know,
22 I don't know if you're at the, like, decision point on that, but
23 I think that, you know, maybe there could be some combination of
24 a direct set of actual stairs that come down plus a path, so
25 that -- yeah, I know you need the path for ADA probably, but,

1 you know, where there's a clear set of -- I don't think you
2 necessarily want to look like you're taking an odd circuitous
3 path to depart the building.

4 MR. CHENEY: Yeah.

5 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I think something maybe a little
6 more, you know, clear and direct with some steps, but with a path
7 for ADA as well, might be something to consider.

8 MR. CHENEY: Yeah, it's a --

9 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: And that would also help break
10 up that -- in a way what the pedestrian experiences along the
11 facade of that building, because it is a pretty long facade for
12 all of that planting. If you had, in the midst of it, you know,
13 an actual set of more formal, broad stairs with -- you know,
14 again, with the ADA ramp, you might actually break up that facade
15 a little bit more from a -- the person -- pedestrian just walking
16 by.

17 MR. CHENEY: Yes. We did sort of study that quite a
18 bit. I mean, it's a pretty decent grade change from that door
19 to grade, and the further you get down Mass, the longer -- and
20 the stairs, we didn't want anyone really hanging out on the stairs
21 or feel like they can walk up the stairs in the other direction.
22 The one thing that that path also does -- it does two things,
23 and, one, it's the release of the -- of the residents that come
24 out, but it's also an egress door as well. The one egress door
25 that does go on Mass Ave, it does share that, and so we need to

1 kind of balance between the security of not letting people go up
2 to the facade from that point of view, not just the lobby, and
3 let people kind of come out in a way that's not, you know, just
4 getting thrown to the curb, you know, from outside the building,
5 so we wanted to sort of balance those two. It's -- again, it's
6 conceptual. It's very conceptual still, but that's the idea. I
7 think it can be expanded in the landscape design as it starts to
8 move forward with the AOR, but the thought is that's how they
9 would get released.

10 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah, I -- you know, I just -- I
11 feel like, with all of the beautiful work of the scrim and the
12 facade, it's still going to be a pretty unfriendly building to
13 walk along the street and be near. It's very large. I mean,
14 you know, the plantings are what, at least ten or more feet above
15 grade, so that you're going to have a nicely landscaped, but
16 a -- but still a wall, sort of, of planting before you get to
17 the scrim as a pedestrian walking along. And I do -- you know,
18 I do wonder if there are ways to think about breaking that up a
19 little bit there. I know the Capitol Hill Restoration Society
20 said in a letter -- and, you know, I think they expressed a
21 concern, which I sort of also share, which is, you know, this
22 is -- these are very big buildings. Is there any -- and, you
23 know, I understand why they have to be set back, and I understand
24 the use of the landscaping, but is there any way to -- you know,
25 you are creating a beautiful boulevard along Massachusetts

1 Avenue. I mean, there's a lot of work being done to create a
2 beautiful street, but if what is on the building side of the
3 street isn't as friendly to the pedestrian, it won't, you know,
4 succeed as a beautiful boulevard. So that's my only concern.

5 And, you know, I mean, I definitely am -- and I'm --
6 and I'm concerned about it, because, again, the things we're
7 specifically asked to look at are waivers from design criteria
8 that really, I think, were put in the Hill East to try to create
9 a good pedestrian experience. And I do understand those
10 contemplated buildings with a different kind of use and a
11 different, you know, program of requirements. I get that, but
12 it does concern me that one of the big goals of the Hill East
13 was to create Massachusetts Avenue as a really great pedestrian
14 environment. And I think that the landscaping -- and I actually,
15 you know, in a way, feel like the variation that you've done in
16 the landscaping is a good thing. I know the Commission of Fine
17 Arts said simplify that, but I actually think the variation is a
18 good thing. I just think it may need even more and different
19 kinds of variation to break it up a little bit more.

20 MR. CHENEY: Okay. Noted. Yeah. The landscape I feel
21 is the most -- has the most flexibility in the current concept
22 to incorporate those elements that you spoke about. Now, again,
23 the Hill East Master Plan has about 30-foot, if you look at the
24 section, of landscape. We're right on the property line with the
25 building, but the right-of-way is very, very wide, and so the

1 balance between DOT of what's paved versus what's entitled in the
2 Hill East Master Plan is that balance between the two. And I
3 think that grade change between the secure part of that civic
4 building, without having a plinth, is what we really tried to get
5 away from; that it isn't that, you know, ten-foot difference in
6 stairs and rails and, you know, handicap ramps, and all those
7 other parts that become part of those buildings unintentionally,
8 because of those rules. We try to kind of keep the entrance at
9 grade, which is that point where we set the building at, and then
10 the rest is as soft as we can. And it is a tall building, but
11 it's not as -- I think it keeps within the height of if it was
12 an apartment building or anything like that. I think it would
13 still be at the height and mass. We tried to just keep it soft.
14 So I appreciate the comments.

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you. That was my
16 only -- really my only comment.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Wright, you finished?

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes. Yes, I am.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Good. Thank you.
20 Commissioner Stidham.

21 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Well, so much has been said
22 already. Really just a few things to add. I agree with the
23 comments both by Commissioner Imamura and Commissioner Wright.
24 It is a big building, but I really appreciate the way that you
25 have designed the landscaping to provide that setback in such a

1 way as that people don't know that you're sort of pushing them
2 away from the building so that they can't really see in, so that
3 the programmatic of the functions -- of the building can happen
4 without people peering in the window for -- you know, out of
5 curiosity. It just feels more natural and a part of the building
6 landscaping.

7 And I also appreciate the facade. I do think it needs
8 a bit more work, but the way that you have designed it to provide
9 the ability to look out and be able to see what's going on
10 outside, but still preserving the privacy needed for people
11 either looking in or people looking out I think is really
12 important. I think the way you've simplified it through your
13 work with the Commission of Fine Arts, you're getting really
14 close to a really good design. This is going to be somewhat of
15 a signature building, so blending into the neighborhood, you're
16 not getting there by any means, but it's sort of -- what was the
17 phrase I was looking at earlier? It's sort of like, you know,
18 hiding a toad in the middle of a pond, right? It's -- everybody
19 knows what it is, whether -- walking by there, so sort of breaking
20 it up and giving it that character I think will be a really
21 interesting part of the neighborhood and will provide the
22 services that this building really needs to provide in the way
23 that it really needs to do that. So thank for the presentation.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. You finished? I don't know
25 when -- okay. All right. Thank you. Vice Chair Miller.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank
2 you to the team here, including DCD -- Department of General
3 Services on behalf of the Department of Corrections, Director
4 Faust, Deputy Director Wilson, Meridith Moldenhauer, and the
5 architects Cheney and Clarke, and the transportation engineer,
6 Andres. I think I've -- well, Mr. Hargrove was -- also spoke.
7 So I appreciate all of the time and effort that's been put into
8 this very critical project to replace a long overdue replacement
9 of a central facility for the District, the D.C. Jail, the Central
10 Detention Facility, part of it, which is outdated, outmoded, and
11 has had a number of problems for a number of years. So I'm glad
12 you've reached this stage of concept design.

13 And I appreciate the community engagement -- all the
14 community outreach and engagement that -- I guess mostly led by
15 the Department of Corrections -- I appreciate that -- that's been
16 done with the three different ANCs and community groups in the
17 neighborhood. You got the support of ANC 6B and 7D, and 7F you've
18 met with, I think, four times you said, I think, at least, and
19 you're -- do you expect to get any -- are they -- are you on
20 the -- an agenda for a vote or is it -- it's actually located
21 more in 7F, right, than it is within the other ANCs, although
22 that's -- some of them, because of the history, might be more
23 familiar with the site. Ms. Moldenhauer, do you know if 7F is
24 going to be taking any vote anytime soon?

25 MS. MOLDENHAUER: In our communication with the ANC,

1 they indicated potentially their April meeting, but we are not
2 yet confirmed to be on that agenda. But we also -- our specific
3 single-member District representative is a resident at the DOC,
4 and participates in both meetings as a resident of DOC and through
5 the surveys, as well as, obviously, through all of their meetings,
6 so we do believe they are very much, you know, aware and have
7 been engaging with us extensively.

8 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, that's good to hear. I had
9 forgotten that there was a DOC resident who's part of the ANC,
10 so that's an important stakeholder position to have. So I would
11 commend the community architectural team on the design. I mean,
12 this is a very challenging, unique project, and I think the design
13 is very attractive, given what -- especially given what the
14 programmatic purposes are here and what you're trying -- to try
15 to achieve as many of the design goals of the Hill East District.
16 And I -- my own view of this -- of the waivers and exceptions
17 are all related to the unique programmatic needs -- security
18 needs primarily -- of this facility, and that people aren't going
19 to be walking up going to a gift shop or a restaurant here. I
20 mean, this isn't -- this isn't the typical Hill East
21 neighborhood, but you've managed to I think compliment what are
22 all the design standards for the rest of the -- of the -- of the
23 Hill East Area -- District, so I think that's been -- you know,
24 the massing, the facade, the colors, with the very warm colors,
25 the scrim and the variations, it's all -- it's very attractive,

1 and I -- and it's -- I think it's certainly consistent with all
2 the development standards of the height and massing and FAR and
3 all that, much less FAR than what's permitted here -- far less.
4 So I guess I had a question on the mechanical penthouses that
5 you have there. They're mechanical penthouses; they're not --
6 nobody's living up there or working up there, but they were --
7 they're a whitish color; is that what I recall from the -- from
8 the plans?

9 MR. CHENEY: Yes. Yeah. They're a metal panel system
10 that is sort of in the same token as the window wall system, so
11 they have the same kind of variation in color, slightly gray,
12 white, slightly dark, and so it kind of reads more of the window
13 wall than the scrim, but just the screen.

14 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. And I'm just recalling the
15 years of being schooled by former Commissioner Peter May about
16 the color of the mechanical penthouses, and it took a while for
17 those of us who aren't architects maybe -- I don't know -- or
18 those of us who don't have a certain eye, to come around to his
19 view that a darker mechanical penthouse at the top of a building
20 was -- would fade away and not stand out as much, which he always
21 said was counterintuitive to having it against the gray sky.

22 I think he talked about the reflective nature of it and
23 that white does stand out and that it gets dirty and streaky.
24 And so -- but I understand you have -- your facade is a darker
25 color and you have this white and the gray in there, so maybe it

1 will blend in more, but do you have any comment on that or did
2 you consider --

3 MR. CHENEY: Yes. I mean, actually, we did talk to
4 staff a couple of times about that. And I think what we're trying
5 to do is make it really appear that it's part of the window wall
6 system and not a screen, and I that's the difference I think that
7 you're alluding to. Typically, screens are just a different
8 materials altogether. It's -- it is metal versus the glass, but
9 it will appear from a distance -- and it's hidden quite a bit --
10 it's pushed back and hidden, unless you're really, you know, far
11 away, and then I think it will become less obvious that it's not
12 the same true material, but the same look, same patterning, same
13 scale. That's the goal of -- so we're not -- we're not trying
14 to sort of use a cheaper material, although it is, other than
15 glass, but it's not a -- it's just -- really just a screen than
16 a penthouse, per se.

17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And it does meet the height and
18 setback requirements of the zone; is that correct?

19 MR. CHENEY: Yes, that's correct.

20 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. So I guess my only other
21 question is that you're up for an NCPC consideration I think at
22 the April meeting, and I think one of our members here on the
23 Zoning Commission is a member of the Zoning -- of the NC --
24 National Capital Planning Commission as well, at least as of
25 today, hopefully. So is there any value for us to be waiting?

1 I mean, it's always the issue of who goes first and whatever,
2 but I know you have flexibility if there's certain minor design,
3 I think, changes, refinements, as a result of the NCPC action.
4 I don't know if it would cover everything that they would cover.
5 I wouldn't want you to have to come back to us. Is there any
6 value to waiting until after -- I don't know if we were
7 considering voting today, the same day as the hearing. We may
8 want to be waiting for ANC 7F, to see if they would -- might want
9 to give us something official for the great weight record, but,
10 Ms. Moldenhauer, is there any -- is there any value in waiting
11 until NCPC takes action in a couple weeks?

12 MS. MOLDENHAUER: We think that any action by the Zoning
13 Commission could be -- provide flexibility, based on NCPC
14 comments or review. We have been working with staff and
15 discussing the project with them, but we also would be fine if
16 the Commission feels it's necessary to keep the record open for
17 anything from NCPC. So we're flexible both ways.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Oh, I appreciate that response. I
19 really don't -- I'm not pushing necessarily one way or the other.
20 I just wanted to know if there was -- if you had a reading of
21 what was maybe going to be the Executive Director's
22 recommendation at this point or what's going on there. So I
23 really don't have any -- I don't think I have any further
24 comments, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the team's work. I
25 appreciate all the community outreach and engagement that

1 Corrections has made in this case, and wish you luck going forward
2 in the very near future hopefully. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller. I
4 will tell you that when you mentioned was there any reason --
5 possibility that we may hold off -- we know this is a one-vote
6 case -- I thought about John Parsons, and he served on both, and
7 he said the Zoning Commission does what it does and NCP does what
8 it does, but we also respect each other, so that's the Parson
9 rule that I never mentioned. But, anyway, I will tell you, to
10 the development team -- and I heard -- I agree with my colleagues,
11 let's look at some of that, maybe breaking it up like, I think,
12 former Commissioner Alberti from CHRS had mentioned. But I will
13 tell you, when I first opened this up and looked at the facility,
14 I had to -- I thought the -- I know what the mission is, but when
15 I looked at the design, I thought I actually had the wrong case
16 open. So I want to commend you all for what you've done in making
17 it mix in and not look as exactly what it does, but I also believe
18 that it helps those who are being re-engineered back into the
19 community. I think it helps us.

20 And I'm going to ask the same question I asked about
21 another case, and I'm going to ask it to Ms. Clarke. I noticed
22 the colors, and I know some of -- you know, I was looking to see
23 how the living facilities were, but I understand why I'm not
24 seeing it. But I want to know the colors, as you all mentioned,
25 some of the programmatic things that I see, is that part of the

1 rehabilitation process? I mean, does that help us rehabilitate
2 even more? Now, I asked this question about the school, so this
3 is not my first time asking this type of question, because I
4 believe all that has to do with the -- coming back to the
5 community. Is that part of it?

6 MS. CLARKE: Absolutely, yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay.

8 MS. CLARKE: Very important.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's a very important piece to it.

10 Okay. Good.

11 MS. CLARKE: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I will tell you, I think you all
13 have really done a great job. I'm very impressed with the
14 facility, because I thought that -- I said, "Wait a minute; is
15 that the right case?" But, anyway, I know things from the last
16 prison -- and I'm thinking back in 1998, for the last facility --
17 correctional facility that I dealt with, and I can tell you we've
18 come a long way. And hats off to the Mayor, Director Hunter,
19 Mr. Hargrove, and to the development team and DGS and everybody,
20 because I think -- I think we've done it. There's some -- a few
21 things that my colleague, Commissioner Wright, as well as CHRS,
22 to talk about let's break up the sizing, so I kind of -- you
23 know, that's something to look at. And I also want to say, Ms.
24 Moldenhauer, Monaco seems to be the caselaw for every case,
25 period, and I'll just leave it -- you know, I'll just -- that's

1 all I'm going to say. I heard you cite Monaco. But, anyway,
2 Mr. Andres, nobody asked you any questions, right?

3 MR. ANDRES: No, sir.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, I'm -- I don't want you
5 to feel left out. If I could find the rendering that shows the
6 schematics of the electric charging stations, and then the ones
7 that I think that are -- can be transformed, if needed to be
8 electric charging stations -- I guess my question is -- and I'm
9 not against it. I think it's always good to forecast, but why
10 do we have so many spaces to start with? I mean, I guess it's
11 room for growth, but it looks like -- no, let me ask my question
12 this way. The ones that have "EV" on the drawing, are those only
13 for electric vehicles?

14 MR. ANDRES: So the short answer is yes. DDOT, in
15 their recommendation, identifies a certain number that they'd
16 recommend to be implemented. And then, in addition to that, to
17 accommodate potential future demand, as vehicles become more
18 sustainable and the presence of electric vehicles starts
19 increasing in the marketplace, they're -- you want to provide the
20 facilities to potentially expand in the event that the demand is
21 there for that. So DDOT is also here to identify, you know,
22 what -- why their recommendations are, but they do have
23 recommendations -- there's nothing -- I guess there's no,
24 necessarily, zoning requirement for electric vehicles, but DDOT
25 does, in the spirit of sustainability, have recommendations for

1 a number of vehicle charging stations per number of spaces.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I actually get that. I'm
3 just thinking, until we get to that maximum number of electric
4 vehicles --

5 MR. ANDRES: Uh-huh.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- I think that we can also utilize
7 that space -- but you're right, I can talk to DDOT about it, but
8 I believe that, as you said, you know, the ones that's proposed,
9 that's good to have room to grow --

10 MR. ANDRES: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- but, also, we're going to have
12 room sitting idle, because we only have maybe -- I'm just saying
13 off the record -- say if we only have five people to drive an
14 electric -- those other ten spaces are going to be empty. So,
15 anyway, I guess I can have that conversation with DDOT. Let's
16 see -- and I think the word used -- Mr. Cheney, I don't know if
17 you said you all wanted things to blur; you did a good job at
18 it, because I believe that the facility -- I'm very impressed
19 with the architecture, and that's all I'm going to say on that.
20 All right. I don't have any other questions, and, as my
21 colleagues have said, this is well needed, long overdue, and I
22 think we need to make sure that we -- as people are being
23 rehabilitated and coming back to society, I think the city has
24 hit a homerun here, and I'll just leave it at that. Any follow-
25 up questions or comments?

1 | (No response.)

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And, also, Ms. Moldenhauer,
3 I am a little shocked that Tyrell Holcomb, Chair -- I guess he's
4 still the Chair of ANC 7F -- has not responded. I've known him
5 and worked with him over the years, and I'm sure that at some
6 point, hopefully, to your question, Vice Chair, we will get some
7 kind of response from Tyrell -- I mean, from Chair Holcomb and
8 others. All right.

9 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Chairman Hood, we have communicated
10 with him. I don't want you to think that he has not responded.
11 We have been communicative with him, and he did indicate that we
12 would hopefully be on their April agenda. You know, we just --
13 he is aware and we had told him of our hearing today, and there
14 was, you know, a conversation about, you know, us asking to keep
15 the record open, which is what we've done. You know, obviously,
16 you indicated that we don't have a letter from them yet, and so
17 obviously -- but we have met with them six different times, you
18 know, for this project.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Well, thank you.
20 Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone from any of the ANCs here to
21 cross-examine?

22 MS. SCHELLIN: We do not.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We do not.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: We do not. And none of them signed up
25 to testify either.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And, Vice Chair, before we
2 get to the reports we do have, if you can get those ready, and
3 you can just give us a snidbit when we get to that point. Ms.
4 Schellin, do we have anyone from any -- do we have anyone from
5 any other government agency, other than DDOT?

6 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Do we have someone from DDOT?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: We do.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. Let's bring DDOT up. Let's
10 see, who do we have?

11 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Jutte.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Hold on, Mr. Jutte. Let me
13 pull you down on my screen.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: I may have pronounced it wrong.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I see you. There you go.
16 Mr. Jutte, you may begin.

17 MR. JUTTE: Thank you. Good evening, Chairman Hood and
18 members of the Commission. For the record, I'm Preston Jutte
19 with the District Department of Transportation. DDOT is
20 supportive of the applicant's proposal to modernize the DOC
21 complex, which includes constructing two new buildings and
22 refurbishing the existing CTF building, as well as funding and
23 constructing the extension of Massachusetts Avenue along the
24 site's frontage. In our March 7th, 2025 report, which is in the
25 record as Exhibit 13, we had no objection to the approval of this

1 application, with one condition, implementation of a
2 Transportation Demand Management Plan with a couple requested
3 revisions noted in the report.

4 As you heard in the applicant's presentation, they
5 have agreed to our requested revisions and condition. With those
6 included in the zoning order, DDOT has no objection to the
7 approval of the design review application. We look forward to
8 continuing to work with the applicant on the submittal, review,
9 and construction acceptance process for horizontal development
10 projects, which will require design review of the proposed
11 Massachusetts Avenue extension by DDOT's Infrastructure Project
12 Management Administration. Thank you, and I'd be happy to answer
13 any questions.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Jutte. Also, let me
15 back up. I also want to commend Mr. Faust and Ms. Wilson as well
16 and every -- the whole team. I left their names out when I
17 mentioned the Mayor and all them -- thanking all them. I want
18 to mention them as well, the Department of Corrections. Mr.
19 Jutte, let me ask you a question. You've heard me talk about
20 the electric vehicles charging stations. So when I go by Costco,
21 I get it, because it's always crowded. But now for this facility,
22 do we see -- and I agree with the proposed and building for the
23 future, but starting off, will those spaces -- do we know the
24 demand is there for all those stations? I'm saying -- I'm not
25 saying not to build them. What I'm saying is, until we get the

1 demand to fill up those spots, will they -- will they just sit
2 empty? I guess that's what I'm trying to figure out.

3 MR. JUTTE: Yeah, I just -- I'll just admit, electric
4 vehicle demand is not my expertise, so I just want to put that
5 up front. So I don't have answer, but I've put that note down
6 as an inquiry, so I can investigate the origin of that -- the
7 one per 50 recommendation that DDOT does have, and then I know
8 there's obviously like the EV Readiness Act that's sort of some
9 of the genesis of those specific numbers, but, personally, I just
10 can't -- don't have enough information to speak to that specific
11 question.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I guess the reason I'm asking is
13 because I don't want that space -- until we get up to speed with
14 electric vehicles, I don't want that space to just sit there and
15 not be used, but I guess the applicant and DDOT can work all that
16 out. I'll leave that alone, Mr. Jutte.

17 MR. JUTTE: Okay.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll leave that alone. Okay. But
19 take that as a note back to Director Kershbaum.

20 MR. JUTTE: I will.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Commissioner Imamura,
22 you have any questions or comments?

23 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: (Shakes head negatively.)

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Wright?

25 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: (Shakes head negatively.)

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Commissioner Stidham?

2 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: (Shakes head negatively.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Vice Chair Miller?

4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No. Thank you, Mr. Jutte, for the
5 DDOT report.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I, too, want to thank you, Mr. Jutte,
7 and I appreciate your honesty, because you and I both are not
8 well up to speed on that, but I'm getting there. Let me see,
9 Ms. Moldenhauer, any questions for DDOT?

10 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Thank you, Mr. Jutte, for working
11 with us. No questions at this time.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jutte. I
13 don't think we have anyone from the ANC, as noted previously, but
14 we appreciate your report. Thank you. All right. Ms. Schellin,
15 let's go to the Office of Planning. Okay. I think it's Ms.
16 Brown-Roberts. Yeah, Ms. Brown-Roberts.

17 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and
18 members of the Commission. Maxine Brown-Roberts from the Office
19 of Planning. As stated by the applicant earlier, the proposed
20 Correctional Treatment Facility Annex is a project of high
21 priority for the District. The project is located on Hill East,
22 and the new and renovated buildings are -- were anticipated by
23 the Hill East Master Plan and design guidelines and were further
24 incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. As seen in the OP
25 report, the proposal meets most of the design guidelines outlined

1 in the zoning regulations, and the applicant has requested
2 waivers, a special exception, and variance relief where the
3 proposal was unable to meet the requirements, mostly due to the
4 unique security and safety requirements of the facility. The
5 Office of Planning therefore recommends approval of the requested
6 design review and associated waivers, special exception, and
7 variance request. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm available for
8 questions.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts.
10 Always an excellent job. We appreciate your report. Let me see
11 if we have any questions for you or comments. Commissioner
12 Imamura.

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: No questions.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Wright.

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. Thank you for your succinct
16 report.

17 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thanks.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Stidham.

19 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: No. Thank you for the report.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice Chair Miller.

21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts for
22 the Office of Planning report and your work on this case. It's
23 a very thorough report. I had one question, which I was going
24 to ask the applicant. Commissioner Imamura or one of my fellow
25 Commissioners asked -- got into it a little bit. In the rest of

1 the Central Detention Facility -- most of it's not being
2 demolished. Part of it's being demolished to make way for this
3 Annex, but most of it is not, and the answer given by the
4 applicant, who's still with us on the screen, was that it's going
5 to be discontinued, but I guess a decision about whether it's
6 going to be reused or demolished has been put off to some future
7 date. Has -- is that the case, that that decision's been put
8 off and what -- it seems like it would be good to just get rid
9 of that whole thing. And even if you need the space for
10 expansion, you wouldn't want to, I don't think, have that
11 horrible -- well, that building adjacent to this building
12 necessarily, I don't think. Is there a reason why we're not
13 going to have -- why demolition of the entire building is not
14 part of this case, because you didn't want to have to have them --
15 is it cost or the cost of demolition and the cost of doing
16 temporary landscaping that might have to be used for the
17 Corrections Department in the future? It's a lot of space. Or
18 it may be used; it may be needed, I guess, for something.

19 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Commissioner Miller, I mean, I'm also
20 happy to turn it over to potentially Mr. Hargrove, but, you know,
21 we are proposing on our Exhibit C, which is actually a part of
22 the CDF, we are planning on demolishing that in order to have
23 room to build Building Two, as we call it, the second building.
24 We are not proposing to demolish Building B, which is the current
25 larger CDF. That's the one that you're referencing, that we are

1 referencing right now. It's just simply going to be discontinued.
2 And it really is a city budgetary scope question. Right now,
3 you know, this project's scope includes -- and we have kind of
4 in some of our diagrams just like little yellow hashmarks as to
5 kind of what the scope is for this project, and that building is
6 just not part of the scope. You know, obviously, DOC and DGS do
7 know that they will have to come back and provide a plan for
8 that, but right now that has not been contemplated. And I'm
9 sorry I don't have any, you know, better answer for you than
10 that, but that's just the honest kind of truth as to where we
11 are today.

12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, I appreciate that response, and
13 the cost is enormous before you get into demolishing that large
14 building as well, so I understand that, so I appreciate your
15 response at this point. Thank you very much. Thank you all for
16 your work. Ms. Brown-Roberts, did you want to say something?
17 I'm sorry. Ms. Brown-Roberts, you --

18 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: No. Thank you for asking me.

19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I saw your light come on, so
20 I thought maybe I -- and I had originally directed the question
21 to you, so thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Again, Ms. Brown-Roberts, I,
23 too, want to thank you, along with my colleagues, for your
24 excellent report. Ms. Moldenhauer, you have any questions for
25 the Office of Planning?

1 MS. MOLDENHAUER: No. Thank you, Ms. Brown-Roberts for
2 working with us and for your report for approval. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Thanks again, Ms. Brown-
4 Roberts. Ms. Schellin, let's go to the public. Do we have anyone
5 in support, opposition, or undeclared? Oh, no, wait a minute.
6 Before I go there --

7 MS. SCHELLIN: The ANCs, yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- Vice Chair, could you give us a
9 synopsis of both -- what the two ANCs have submitted so far?

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 Quickly, ANC 6B, at Exhibit 12, has submitted a letter dated
12 March 7th to the Zoning Commission stating that they are -- at
13 their meeting on January 14 -- it says 2024 -- I'm not sure if
14 it's 2024 or 2025, but it says 2024 -- with a quorum present,
15 ANC 6B voted nine to zero to zero to report to the Zoning
16 Commission that it supported Case Number 24-21.

17 And we have, at Exhibit 17, a letter from ANC 7D -- oh,
18 the 6B letter was from the Chair, Vince -- 6B Chair, Vince Marino,
19 Exhibit 12. ANC 7D's letter to the Commission is from Chair --
20 7D Chair, Brian Alcorn, stating that at their March 11th, 2025
21 meeting, the Commission voted six to zero to one to support the
22 design for this case, 24-21. Each of the ANC's letters at the
23 end mentioned they appreciate -- they hope and appreciate the
24 applicant's continued consultations with them about issues that
25 are not related to the design, but the construction going forward

1 and interaction with the neighborhood, and they noted that there
2 have been consultations about that and there will be some in the
3 future. So that's the reports of those two ANCs, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Vice Chair. We
5 appreciate that. And, also, we do have a letter I saw from Mr.
6 Ernest Johnson, who did a lot of work back in 1972, some years
7 ago, and he also mentions -- and a lot of what I read in this
8 letter I want to make sure I cite it, because he took the time
9 to write it. Again, this is a design review. We're not getting
10 into the money and how much the jail costs and the project. Those
11 are other forums, but not this particular forum. So I want to
12 acknowledge that he did write us a letter, and we appreciate all
13 the work that he did back in '72, which we remember and which
14 probably got us to where we are now, as being one of the people
15 to help get us here. All right. Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone
16 who's here in opposition, undeclared, or -- opposition,
17 undeclared, or in support, or did I say that --

18 MS. SCHELLIN: We have no one in any of the three.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No one in any of the three.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: No one in any category.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, wait. You know what? I want to
23 check one person though. There was one name I -- let me just
24 double check. No, that was part of the applicant's team, so we
25 are good.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. All right. Ms.
2 Moldenhauer, you have any rebuttal or closing?

3 MS. MOLDENHAUER: I don't feel that we need to provide
4 any rebuttal. I do know there were some comments made about the
5 scale, but I do think that in our initial oral testimony we did
6 provide a lot of information on the programmatic requirements for
7 the scale of the structures. If the Commission feels that they
8 would like us to, we're happy to elaborate on that. I know that
9 we have all of our members present and are able to kind of walk
10 through that in a little more detail.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. That's your closing?

12 MS. MOLDENHAUER: Hearing none, then I would just
13 simply say that I think that DGS and the Department of Corrections
14 have put forward an amazing project that really will provide an
15 improved environment for the residents that are in the care and
16 custody of the Department of Corrections.

17 We feel as though the new structure will both be an
18 opportunity for those individuals to feel as though they are part
19 of the community from the outside, as well as the inside. We
20 think that the opportunities for those visiting residents and
21 family members or clients in this facility will greatly improve,
22 based on the ability for the structure to be completed. I commend
23 my clients for the outreach that they've done and for the
24 architectural team and everyone to provide something that we do
25 think fits into the Hill East Master Plan, that we do think fits

1 into the neighborhood. And we ask the Zoning Commission to
2 approve the special exception use request, as well as the two
3 waivers and the one area variance request that is before you.
4 And thank you for your time.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I know some of
6 my colleagues have mentioned some things that they wanted to see,
7 and I don't see where they are. And I know the Vice Chair has
8 mentioned Parson's rule, but I just thought about it, Vice Chair.
9 You were the Vice Chair of the NCPC too, so that's the Parson
10 and Miller rule. So, anyway, let me hear from you all on how
11 you want to proceed and if we're going to wait or what we want
12 to do. Commissioner Imamura, you'll start.

13 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm
14 comfortable moving forward. There's nothing that I need to take
15 a look at. I think it's important that this project move forward.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Wright.

17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I'm comfortable moving forward,
18 but I do want to reiterate that I think that there needs to be
19 additional work done on the landscaping plan, particularly for
20 the first building to be built, and how the egress for the people
21 being released is handled and how the pedestrian experience of
22 how the landscaping transitions to the building works. And so
23 I'm fully in support of moving forward, but I do want to just
24 reiterate that I think more work needs to be done on the
25 landscaping.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
2 Stidham.

3 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: I don't have -- I'm able to
4 support. I don't have anything further that I need.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And Vice Chair Miller.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm ready to move forward this
7 evening. Are we able to, even if we move forward, leave the
8 record open, under our rules, for an ANC report, if it were to
9 come in, in April? I'm seeing Secretary Schellin shake her head
10 no. I don't need that report necessarily. I know there's been
11 a lot of community engagement with that -- with that ANC and with
12 the single-member District Commissioner who's a resident of the
13 Department of Corrections there, so I'm ready to move forward,
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Sounds good. Because if we
16 close it, that's it for us. But, anyway, I, too, am ready to
17 move forward. I think, as Commissioner Wright has mentioned, I
18 believe this applicant -- they've shown that they are continuing
19 to work on things, as requested. We might not get all the way
20 where we -- where some of us may want, but they will take a look
21 at it and see how they can maybe address some of our issues. All
22 right. So, with that, if there's no other comments, I'm going
23 to ask Commissioner -- I've been calling on Commissioner Imamura
24 today, and always in a design case -- I'm going to ask him if
25 he'll make a motion.

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: I can do that, Mr. Chairman. I
2 move that the Zoning Commission take final action on Case Number
3 24-21, D.C. Department of General Services on behalf of D.C.
4 Department of Corrections, Design Review in Hill East Zone
5 District at Square 1112-E, Lot 826, at 1900 Massachusetts Avenue
6 Southeast, and ask for a second.

7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. It's been moved and properly
9 seconded. Any further discussion?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Not hearing any, Ms. Schellin, would
12 you do a roll call vote please?

13 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. Commissioner Imamura.

14 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Yes.

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Miller.

16 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

17 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hood.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Commissioner Wright.

20 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yes.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Stidham.

22 COMMISSIONER STIDHAM: Yes.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: The vote is five to zero to zero to
24 approve final action in Zoning Commission Case Number 24-21. And
25 I would ask that the -- that the applicant provide a draft order

1 within the next two weeks, findings of fact, conclusions of law.
2 Since there wasn't any opposition -- who's the attorney on here?
3 I'm trying to see. Is this going to be a summary order or does
4 the Commission want to a full order on this one?

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If we can do a summary order -- I'll
6 leave that up to the legal team -- we can -- let's do a summary
7 order, if we can do one.

8 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. All right. I'm sure she knows.
9 If it's legally sufficient, go for it.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Go for it, right. Okay. Ms.
11 Schellin, do we have anything else.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: That's it. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Before I close this out, let
14 me just say the Zoning Commission will meet again on these same
15 platforms on this coming Thursday at four p.m., Zoning Commission
16 Case Number 24-20. I believe that's what it is. This is an
17 Office of Planning text amendment.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: That got postponed. I'm sorry. It got
19 changed. So your next meeting will not be until --

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: -- your meeting on the 27th.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, we had to change that date to the
24 31st.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, good news. Anyway --

1 well, not -- we got to deal with it anyway.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: So you have Thursday off. That is good
3 news.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So March -- our next meeting is
5 March the 27th. This is our regular meeting. It will be at four
6 o'clock on these same platforms. Again, I want to thank everyone
7 who participated in this case tonight, and, with that, this
8 meeting is -- this hearing is adjourned. Good night, everyone.
9 Thank you.

10 (Whereupon, the above-entitled hearing adjourned at
11 6:10 p.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing - Case No. 24-21

Before: D.C. Zoning Commission

Date: 03-17-25

Place: Webex Videoconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Deborah B. Gauthier

Deborah B. Gauthier