

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

JULY 2, 2025

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment 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:

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

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Public Hearing held on July 2, 2025

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

ALSO PRESENT:

DANIEL SOLOMON
THOMAS SMITH
PATRICK BROWN
ERKIN OZBERK
TRICIA DUNCAN
BLAINE CARTER

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

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

Case No. 23-08(1)

The Wesley Theological Seminary of the United
Methodist Church

Introduction - Chairman Hood.....	4
Cross-Examination of Applicant - Mr. Smith.....	5
Applicant's Presentation	
Mr. Ozberk.....	11
Cross-Examination of Applicant - Mr. Smith	13
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	
Commissioner Duncan	20
Cross-Examination of Duncan - Mr. Smith	21
Presentation of NLC and SVWHCA	
Mr. Smith	22
Mr. Carter	31
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	
Commissioner Wright	20
Vice Chair Miller	38
Presentation by Mr. Brown	41
Closing Remarks by Mr. Brown	42

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

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But I need you to help us see that
3 point. So to say COVID and the way people are educated now and
4 the way they're doing things has changed. The way people work
5 now has changed, so when you're making your statements to help
6 us love your point, I guess what I'm -- what I want you to do
7 is bring it up to date.

8 We keep going back to 2012. A lot of stuff has
9 changed since 2012. A lot of stuff has changed since 2020. So
10 bring your cross-examination for us, unless my colleagues
11 disagree, up to date. And I'll let you continue.

12 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, thank you, and that is
13 exactly what I'm trying -- what you just said is exactly what
14 I'm trying to point out, that -- that this -- and I'm trying to
15 do it without testifying here. We have a CTR that's relying on
16 old data that -- that's when it was collected. That's the --

17 CHAIRMAN HOOD: (Indiscernible.)

18 MR. SMITH: -- opinions. It's not --

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm not going to make that choice.

20 MR. SMITH: Correct. I understand.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But we also have a CTR, which I
22 have looked at, and see my colleagues have. I think the review
23 is just what it is -- comprehensive. It's a technical review,
24 and that's what we have in front of us. Anyway, I'm just
25 reminding you, help us see what you're doing, and I'll leave it

1 alone. You may continue.

2 MR. SMITH: Okay. So again, going back to this
3 question about the model that you used for the proposed
4 landmark building, the trip generation model, did you account
5 for that, that there would be non-students living in that
6 building?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. SMITH: Does your model even account for that?

9 MR. SOLOMON: We used the (indiscernible) of off
10 campus student apartment adjacent to campus as agreed to with
11 DDOT.

12 MR. SMITH: Okay. What -- were you and DDOT aware
13 that there would be people living in the building who weren't
14 just students?

15 MR. SOLOMON: I can't speak to that.

16 MR. SMITH: Am I correct in saying that you didn't
17 examine potential traffic or parking issues stemming from the
18 other developments that are a part of this plan, you know,
19 special events on the campus, or a playground or any of that;
20 is that correct?

21 MR. SOLOMON: We did not study those. That was not
22 required by DDOT.

23 MR. SMITH: And of the seven study intersections that
24 you examined, what are the two that the CTR concluded operated
25 on acceptable levels of service?

1 MR. SOLOMON: All the intersections operated on
2 acceptable levels of service under the access scenario that we
3 have proposed.

4 MR. SMITH: I don't -- maybe you can -- why does your
5 report say otherwise? Why does -- why does your report
6 otherwise say the Massachusetts Avenue and Wesley Circle
7 intersection, and the Massachusetts Avenue driveway operate at
8 unacceptable levels of service?

9 MR. SOLOMON: For which access scenario?

10 MR. SMITH: You can find it on page 24. It's
11 intersection capacity under existing conditions.

12 MR. SOLOMON: I apologize, I thought you were
13 referring to total future conditions, with the Campus Master
14 Plan onsite.

15 MR. SMITH: Well, actually, it has Massachusetts
16 Avenue and Wesley Circle Northwest proposed --well, for
17 existing, background, and future conditions. So -- but all
18 right, I'll leave that -- I think we'll leave it with that.

19 But you also identified some queuing issues in the
20 study, isn't that correct, as far as the Mass Avenue and Wesley
21 Circle study intersection?

22 MR. SOLOMON: There were queueing issues, correct.

23 MR. SMITH: And are you also recommending that DDOT
24 conduct a safety audit in the CTR -- didn't you also recommend
25 that DDOT conduct a safety audit of the Massachusetts Avenue

1 and Wesley Circle intersection after examining the crash data?

2 MR. SOLOMON: I believe that was recommended in the
3 CTR.

4 MR. SMITH: Okay. So in terms of looking at what
5 you're proposing for the TDM, what is the specific mitigation
6 that's being proposed that would target the level of service at
7 those two intersections that we mentioned previously?

8 MR. SOLOMON: Those issues are not being caused by
9 the proposed Campus Master Plan. Those are existing issues,
10 and not the responsibility of the applicant to mitigate.

11 MR. SMITH: Okay. And my -- I have two other
12 questions, and then I'm finished. And this has to do with the
13 turnaround -- the pickup/dropoff area that DDOT asked you all
14 to reconsider and redo, and which you did. In your technical
15 memorandum of March 25th, 2025, stemming from the CTR, and the
16 scoping study that's part of that CTR, is it a typical method
17 for vehicle drop-offs -- well, let me rephrase this.

18 That the -- is it correct that the dropoff that you
19 are proposing, pickup and dropoff, is at the -- a residential
20 loading entrance of the proposed new building?

21 MR. SOLOMON: No, my understanding -- excuse me. My
22 understanding is that it is part of the residential entry.

23 MR. SMITH: Not at the -- I think the -- did you look
24 at the figure Exhibit -- hold on just one second. Should should
25 be the last slide in here. I'm sorry, the last slide that you

1 | offered at the last CLC meeting. It's in --

2 | MR. SOLOMON: Correct. So it says -- I think it
3 | shows the vehicular pathway, but it doesn't identify on there
4 | in terms of callouts where the designated pickup and dropoff
5 | is. It just shows that the loading driveway can be used for
6 | cars to do a (indiscernible) point turn in order to head back
7 | out to Massachusetts.

8 | MR. SMITH: Okay.

9 | MR. BROWN: If it helps, that all that's attached to
10 | our presentation tonight, I believe.

11 | MR. SMITH: Yeah, but I don't think you showed it.
12 | Can you put it up? Can you put that back up?

13 | MR BROWN: Mr. Young would have to do that.

14 | MR. YOUNG: Exhibit 9.

15 | MR. SMITH: Okay. It says primary vehicle -- this is
16 | from your March 25th, '25, technical memorandum to DDOT dealing
17 | with the CTR, and it says -- it's a diagram also. And it says
18 | here, "Primary vehicles enter the site from Massachusetts
19 | Avenue through the campus entry/exit, and turn around on site
20 | at the residential loading entrance"; is that correct?

21 | MR. SOLOMON: Yeah. Correct. I just said that area
22 | can be used as a three-point turn.

23 | MR. SMITH: Okay. So is that a typical method for --
24 | for dropoffs and pickups -- pickups and dropoffs?

25 | MR. SOLOMON: That's definitely acceptable.

1 MR. SMITH: But is it typical?

2 MR. SOLOMON: I'd say it's atypical.

3 MR. SMITH: Okay. Do you believe that during periods
4 of high traffic volumes such as move-in or move-out, or other
5 events that the proposed dropoff, turnaround, and loading
6 entrance would be adequate?

7 MR. SOLOMON: -- so.

8 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry?

9 MR. SOLOMON: I believe so.

10 MR. SMITH: Okay. Mr. Chairman, just one last
11 question. I think I tried to ask this before, but I'm not sure
12 I asked it correctly, so let me try again. Why does the CTR
13 state that it is for a proposed landmark building and not the
14 Campus Plan as a whole?

15 MR. SOLOMON: Can't speak to that.

16 MR. SMITH: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.
17 That's all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Just trying to
19 get something straight. Ms. Duncan is here. I believe I just
20 need to ask, Chair Duncan, do you have any question in cross on
21 the transportation?

22 MS. DUNCAN: Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And again, Ms. Schellin
24 maybe we can (indiscernible) coordinated. I don't think
25 anyone -- any other party is here. We've been looking and

1 called, so I believe that we are complete.

2 Ms. Schellin?

3 MS. SCHELLIN: That's my understanding. You already
4 checked Mr. Carter. We got the ANC, we got Mr. Smith. I
5 believe that it is.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So do we have anything else
7 for cross?

8 MS. SCHELLIN: (Indiscernible.) Did we get
9 everybody? The other ANC might have said they are not coming
10 today, right, that's correct.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So we get (indiscernible) --

12 MS. SCHELLIN: (Indiscernible other party.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So our next course of action, and
14 again, we've already covered those in opposite -- do we have
15 anyone here -- persons here in opposition? We've covered that,
16 right?

17 MS. SCHELLIN: We need to do the government agencies.
18 Did we hear from DDOT, Mr. Oz -- I think I'm going to mess up
19 his name. Let me find it.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ozberk.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Look at that. You did one
22 correct.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. Because I didn't follow
24 your lead. All right. Let's call Mr. --

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh. Good one, Mr. Hood, Chairman

1 Hood. Good, you got me.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's do the DDOT
3 (indiscernible) --

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- thank you.

6 Mr. Ozberk, good evening, sir. You may begin. You
7 have a presentation for us this evening?

8 MR. OZBERK: No presentation. Brief testimony. So
9 good evening Chairman Hood, members of the Commission. For the
10 record, my name is Erkin Ozberk, Development of (indiscernible)
11 Program Manager with the District Department of Transportation.

12 DDOT is supportive of the applicant's proposal. In
13 our May 1st, 2025, supplemental report, we recommended approval
14 on the condition that the Wesley campus implements the
15 transportation demand management and performance division
16 command that include bike share station, constructing
17 pedestrian facilities, and study the need for a future traffic
18 signal at Massachusetts Avenue driveway after the building
19 opens, with one addition of requiring bike racks near the
20 entrance of the playground on University Avenue, as well as the
21 installation of a scooter corral.

22 As you heard in the applicant's presentation, they've
23 completed the TDM plan and it's management plan, with the
24 additions requested in DDOT's supplemental report. DDOT has no
25 objection to the approval of the application. We look forward

1 to continuing to work with the applicant on the design of the
2 streetscape, sidewalks, and bike share station as they go
3 through public space permitting.

4 Thank you, and happy to answer questions.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Ozberk. Again, I
6 apologize for mispronouncing your name. We can see if my
7 colleagues have any questions for DDOT, because I looked at
8 DDOT's report as your affirmation of their -- with the
9 exception of those conditions. All right. We'll go back.

10 Any questions, anyone? I'm looking. I'm looking, no
11 questions. Okay. All right.

12 All right. Ms. Schellin, do we have - Ms. Duncan, do
13 we have any questions of DDOT?

14 MS. DUNCAN: No questions.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And again, I don't think Chair
16 Bender is here. Ms. Schellin, the parties of support
17 (indiscernible) at this hearing as well? Mr. Clarkson?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Clarkson, I don't believe he was. Did
19 you ask the applicant? I didn't hear you ask him.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, okay. Mr. Brown, do you have
21 any questions of DDOT?

22 MR. BROWN: No, I do not have any questions. I thank
23 them for --

24 MS. SCHELLIN: And I do not see Mr. Carter -- I mean,
25 I'm sorry, Clarkson.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So Mr. Brown said no
2 witnessing to Clarkson.

3 Mr. Smith, do you have any questions of DDOT?

4 MR. SMITH: Yes, sir.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Then go ahead.

6 MR. SMITH: Thank you. When the CTR -- sorry, I'm
7 looking for -- he dropped off my screen. Oh, there. I'm
8 sorry.

9 When the CTR was initially composed with the 380-plus
10 parking spaces for the campus, the scoping report for the CTR
11 and then the subsequent DDOT report indicated support for that
12 proposal.

13 So is there any data that DDOT has seen now that
14 justifies a change in the amount of parking from the 380-plus
15 down to the 295? Is there anything that you've seen -- that
16 DDOT has seen?

17 MR. OZBERK: Yes, thank you. I believe when I was
18 reviewing all the past records for this case in our 2023
19 report, we identified that the parking number at that time was
20 higher than what we would anticipate for this development, and
21 therefore, when the parking was reduced, more recently, we were
22 in support of this reduction. Which is actually still in
23 excess of what our preferred parking rate would be for a
24 development like this at this location.

25 MR. SMITH: And do you know whether -- I realize that

1 | you were not the person on this project back then, but to your
2 | knowledge, and based on your review of the records, do you have
3 | any sense as to whether DDOT had reviewed previous DDOT reports
4 | for the Wesley campus going back, for example, to the 2012
5 | study that was used for the -- for preparation of the CTR?

6 | MR. OZBERK: I cannot answer that question, no.

7 | MR. SMITH: Thank you. Does DDOT have any concern at
8 | all with Wesley's request for the flexibility to increase or
9 | decrease its parking supply by 10 percent?

10 | MR. OZBERK: Can you point me to where that is and
11 | what you're looking at?

12 | MR. SMITH: That is one of the conditions that has
13 | been proposed by Wesley as part of the campus plan. That they
14 | would have the flexibility to increase or decrease the parking
15 | supply by 10 percent.

16 | MR. OZBERK: So yeah, your question was whether we
17 | are comfortable with that? Yes, that is --

18 | MR. SMITH: Okay. In the questions that I posed
19 | previously to Wesley, to Mr. Solomon, he pretty much said that
20 | they did what DDOT told them to do.

21 | In the course of doing a scoping study, how does this
22 | work? Does it -- is it -- is it that the applicant comes in
23 | and makes the proposal for what they're going to do, and then
24 | you review it, or do you sit down and tell the applicant this
25 | is exactly what we want you to do?

1 MR. OZBERK: The CTR, the Comprehensive
2 Transportation Review guidance document, which is about a
3 hundred-page document, explains what the applicant is required
4 to provide terms of the scoping and the report itself, both in
5 terms of the methodological approaches and assumptions that
6 should be made to produce the study, and the different triggers
7 based on the (indiscernible) that would require different
8 portions of the study and different things to be studied.

9 So in that sense, the guidelines are there up front,
10 providing them with our expectations, and then when they submit
11 the scoping form, there is some back and forth on whether we
12 felt they met the expectations, if there was any -- any points
13 that needed discussion or further refinement.

14 MR. SMITH: You heard Mr. Solomon say that the CTR
15 recommended a safety audit of the Massachusetts and Wesley
16 Circle intersection -- back in 2022 was when that CTR was done.
17 Has DDOT conducted any -- has DDOT conducted a safety audit of
18 that intersection, or does it have any plans to do that?

19 MR. OZBERK: I am not aware.

20 MR. SMITH: Okay. And you -- the DDOT is also -- am
21 I correct in saying DDOT is also proposing that Wesley conduct
22 the study on the need for -- the potential need for a traffic
23 or pedestrian signal at the Massachusetts Avenue and Wesley
24 Circle driveway; is that correct?

25 MR. OZBERK: Correct. I believe that is a component

1 of the performance management plan moving forward.

2 MR. SMITH: Okay. In reading the conditions, it
3 appears that Wesley is saying that they will ask DDOT to study
4 this. Is this an issue that maybe needs to be clarified by the
5 condition in any kind of final order?

6 MR. OZBERK: (No audible response.)

7 MR. SMITH: I'll just -- actually, let me strike that
8 question.

9 MR. OZBERK: Yeah. Sure.

10 MR. SMITH: Let me just -- we'll just strike that
11 question.

12 So why did DDOT accept, in the course of preparing
13 and doing the scoping study for the CTR, why did DDOT accept
14 the use of the old data from the 2012 Campus plan and the 2020
15 plan for AU?

16 MR. OZBERK: So from my review of the documents, it's
17 my understanding that DDOT and the applicant agreed to apply a
18 growth rate to those older counts, to bring it up to a
19 comparable date when this study was performed in 2022.

20 MR. SMITH: Was DDOT aware that the 2012 report
21 relied on data from 2005?

22 MR. OZBERK: I don't know.

23 MR. SMITH: Given that there's already a pedestrian
24 signal just about 200 feet from the driveway of the Mass
25 Avenue/Wesley Circle driveway, why would an additional study be

1 needed? I mean, isn't -- isn't there an assumption that that
2 pedestrian signal is the result of a study that justified its
3 need at that location, just 200 feet away from the driveway?

4 MR. OZBERK: It's my understanding that the impacts
5 at that driveway intersection are subject to the future study
6 and may require future improvements based on this project once
7 it is open.

8 MR. SMITH: My last question, that given that this
9 report was filed in the spring of 2022 with very limited new
10 data collection because of COVID, why didn't DDOT require the
11 applicant to update the CTR as part of filing the updated
12 Campus plan in this case this past March?

13 MR. OZBERK: The DDOT felt that the existing analysis
14 was appropriate for the projects, in particular given its
15 reduced scope.

16 MR. SMITH: When you say its reduced scope, you mean
17 the (indiscernible) numbers of beds, and the elimination of the
18 retail?

19 MR. OZBERK: Correct. From the original -- yes.

20 MR. SMITH: Well, actually it didn't reduce the
21 number of beds. It reduced the size, now that I -- so that the
22 number of beds couldn't change. So what are you -- what kind
23 of changes are you talking about?

24 MR. OZBERK: (No audible response.)

25 MR. SMITH: You said it's reduced scope. I mean,

1 | what's reduced here?

2 | MR. OZBERK: Correct. There was the reduction of --
3 | well, the elimination, I believe, of a retail component, and --
4 | yeah.

5 | MR. SMITH: All right. I have no more questions, Mr.
6 | Chairman. Thank you very much.

7 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you Mr. Smith and Mr.
8 | Ozberk. Did I get that right that time, Ozberk -- Ozberk?

9 | MR. OZBERK: Ozberk, yeah. No extra vowel between
10 | the Z and the B. Just --

11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, you'll probably be back some
12 | more and I'll probably have it messed up again. I just want
13 | you to know that, but I'll do my best to make sure I get it
14 | correct eventually. It takes me a little while. Is this your
15 | first time with us?

16 | MR. OZBERK: Maybe the second or third.

17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. So let me see,
18 | so we've already been -- thank you. Thank you both.

19 | So we've already been through everyone asking DDOT
20 | question, right, Ms. Schellin?

21 | MS. SCHELLIN: -- with everyone, yes.

22 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. This is out of our normal
23 | format. Are we finished? Because I think it was just the
24 | parties --

25 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- asking with DDOT and the
2 applicant.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: And now we go to if the parties
4 have -- of the ANC, for the parties to --

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: (Indiscernible) more cases.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: -- after the ANC in presentation that
7 they may have on this.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Again, we don't have Chair
9 Bender.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: So we need to the ANC first, I'm
11 sorry. I don't think they presented. Did she say she didn't
12 have one? I didn't hear, sorry.

13 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. I'm going to do the ANC
14 first, but Chair -- I was just giving Chair Bender an option,
15 right, because he's not here.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, correct. Correct.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So let's go to Chair Duncan. You
18 have a presentation you want to give us tonight transportation
19 and CTR? If not, we can keep going.

20 MS. DUNCAN: I was not intending on giving a
21 presentation today, but I would like to add about the
22 developments that are going on around Ward Circle there that
23 gets a lot of traffic. I want to say back in 2012 --

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So Chair Duncan, we don't want to
25 have testimony --

1 COMMISSIONER DUNCAN: Okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- Ms. Chair, unless you want to
3 give us some, because then what you want to bring up, then
4 you're going to have cross-examination. If you want to go
5 ahead, if that's your presentation, you --

6 COMMISSIONER DUNCAN: I just want to -- I just want
7 to give one point, is that back in 2012 when we're talking
8 about data from around there, the Department of Homeland
9 Security had, I think, 1200 employees at the site there, and
10 they're all gone. So right now we're experiencing a little bit
11 less traffic there. That's end of my testimony.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So let's see if we have any
13 cross on that.

14 COMMISSIONER DUNCAN: Sorry.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's all right.

16 Do my colleagues have any questions? Okay. That was
17 pretty straightforward. Does the applicant have any questions?

18 MR. BROWN: No questions.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Again, we don't have anyone
20 from the parties in support, Mr. Clarkson.

21 And Mr. Smith, do you have any questions -- any
22 cross?

23 MR. SMITH: I can't help myself. I just have one
24 question.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

1 MR. SMITH: Ms. Duncan, are you aware that the Ward
2 Circle is not one of those study intersections in the CTR?

3 MS. DUNCAN: Oh, no. Good point. No, I was not
4 aware.

5 MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Thank you for letting
7 us know about that. I'll remember that next time around.

8 All right. Ms. Schellin where do we go next? We've
9 got our order confused now.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Party in support is not here. I think
11 we've called for them several times now, correct?

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right, the party in support is not
13 here. The ANC, Chair Duncan, and I think Chair Bender is not
14 here, so we would go to Mr. Smith's presentation. And how much
15 time does he have?

16 MS. SCHELLIN: I believe the applicant, and if I'm
17 not correct, Mr. Young will correct me, I believe they took the
18 entire 15 minutes, and so that's what I'd call Mr. Smith for.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Smith?

20 MR. SMITH: It'll both myself and Blaine Carter --

21 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, I'm sorry, I forgot. Are you
22 going to split it in half, or are you going to --

23 MR. SMITH: We're splitting it mostly in half.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. Great. So seven and a half
25 each.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. You may begin.

2 MR. SMITH: It'll be 15 -- it should be less than 15
3 total. It may not be seven and a half each, okay, but --

4 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

5 MR. SMITH: Chairman Hood and members of the
6 Commission, Subtitle X, Section 101.2 establishes the standards
7 for review of a campus plan which include that the uses are,
8 quote, "not likely to become objectionable to neighboring
9 property", end of quote, due to traffic and parking.

10 The comprehensive data review is a tool for data-
11 driven decision making. This CTR serves as evidence that
12 Wesley's Campus Plan is objectionable to neighboring property
13 because of traffic and parking, and consequently, the Campus
14 plan application fails to meet the standards for approval at
15 this time under Subtitle X, Section 101.2.

16 The CTR filed in this case on June 12th was developed
17 for a different Wesley Campus Plan case that went undecided and
18 was closed. The CTR has made complete analysis of the traffic
19 and parking impacts associated with the Wesley Campus Plan,
20 relies on old data, and is not timely.

21 Consequently, the CTR's analysis on existing traffic
22 conditions, background conditions, and future conditions are
23 not valid. Despite triggering DDOT's threshold for mitigation,
24 the CTR also fails to include any specific mitigation for two
25 critical study intersections it grossly concludes operated at

1 unacceptable levels of service.

2 There are seven major issues presented by the CTR.
3 One, the CTR is limited to impacts associated with the proposed
4 landmark building. The CTR states clearly on page 11 that the
5 subject of the CTR is the new student housing building. The
6 CTR's data announced its focus almost exclusively on the
7 traffic impacts associated with the residents of the proposed
8 landmark building.

9 The CTR would seem to be more appropriate if this
10 case was a part of the processing for the proposed landmark
11 building. The CTR is not an assessment of the traffic impacts
12 of the campus plan as a whole, as it typical in campus planning
13 cases.

14 Two, the CTR relies on old data collected between 5
15 and 22 years ago. Limited new data was collected for this CTR
16 in the fall of 2021, but the CTR states this data is not
17 credible and, quote, "not representative of typical
18 conditions," end of quote. Instead, the CTR relies on data
19 collected more than five years ago in February of 2020 for the
20 2021 American University Campus Plan, and data collected 14
21 years ago for the 2012 Wesley Campus Plan Update, which itself
22 relied on data collected 22 years in ago in 2003.

23 Industry best practices suggest that historical data
24 is most reliable if extrapolated over no more than two years,
25 and even then it has recommended the extrapolated data be

1 tested against those referred to as, quote, "real-world ground-
2 truth data", end of quote. In this case, the data is
3 extrapolated over a period of 5 to 22 years.

4 Three, the multimodal trip generation data is limited
5 to residents of the proposed landmark building. The CTR's
6 multi-modal trip generation data which shows how the campus is
7 accessed by students, faculty, and staff is based solely on
8 trips made by residents of the proposed landmark building using
9 a trip-generation model.

10 The CTR includes no, quote, "real world," end of
11 quote, trip generation data for Wesley's faculty, staff, or
12 other students, including commuter students who comprise 80
13 percent of the Wesley student body.

14 Wesley's 2012 Campus Plan Update noted that commuter
15 students have the most significant impact on traffic generation
16 and parking demand on Wesley campus. Any analysis of
17 transportation impacts tied to the Wesley campus that does not
18 include new data on Wesley's commuter students is simply not
19 credible.

20 Four, the CTR includes no analysis of future
21 conditions as required. The CTR's assessment of future
22 conditions, another critical element of any traffic analysis,
23 projects out only to 2024. 2024 is no longer the future; it's
24 not even the present.

25 Five, The CTR's assessment of background conditions

1 is outdated and no longer applicable. The CTR almost assesses
2 background conditions, that is how the campus plan when
3 examined within the context of other new developments, might
4 impact the transportation network and future conditions.

5 This CTR did not include any other new developments,
6 but Grosslaine (phonetic) determined that there were none when
7 this CTR was completed in 2021. That is no longer the case.

8 Six, the CTR fails to offer mitigation for two
9 critical failed study intersections as required by DDOT policy.
10 The CTR states on page 43 that the two study intersections
11 operate at unacceptable levels of service, and under DDOT
12 rules, must be mitigated. The Massachusetts Avenue and Wesley
13 Circle study intersection operates at an E-level of service.

14 This is the intersection off Massachusetts Avenue
15 that many Spring Valley residents, especially those closest to
16 Wesley, use for neighborhood ingress and egress. The report
17 shows this intersection experiences high traffic volumes and
18 longer-than-appropriate traffic queueing delays. Grosslaine
19 even recommends that DDOT conduct a safety audit of this
20 intersection stemming from a review of crash data.

21 The second studied failed intersection, which
22 operates at an F-level of service, is where Massachusetts
23 Avenue intersects with the Wesley main entrance driveway. This
24 is only about 440 feet from the Massachusetts Avenue and Wesley
25 Circle intersection, and about 200 feet from an existing

1 pedestrian signal.

2 Let me now turn this over to Blaine Carter.

3 MR. CARTER: Okay. Can you hear me? I just wanted
4 to make sure everybody -- okay. Thank you.

5 As the CTR states, DDOT policy requires that Wesley
6 develop a transportation demand management plan to mitigate
7 these failed intersections. Wesley's TDM proposal is standard
8 (indiscernible). The proposed TDM offers nothing targeted
9 specifically to mitigate problems with these two intersections.

10 DDOT has required that Wesley develop a performance-
11 monitoring program, PMP, to track progress in achieving its TDM
12 goals. The PMP sets a baseline of trip goals for the campus,
13 but it's based on the old and incomplete data use in the CTR.
14 However, it's 101 trip threshold, which is considered
15 acceptable, exceeds the number of trips permitted in Wesley's
16 current campus plan. Wesley also proposes a survey to collect
17 data on how Wesley residents, faculty, staff, and commuter
18 students access the campus. This is precisely the type of data
19 that is collected for a campus plan. Without this data, it
20 would be impossible to develop a reliable TDM plan.

21 Wesley's proposed parking proposals are not supported
22 by any parking utilization data. Wesley parking proposal for
23 this plan is another new problem. Wesley, which now has 174
24 service parking spaces, started this process by proposing 391
25 parking spaces, that's Zoning Case No. 22-13, increased it to

1 394 for the PUD case, Zoning Commission Case No. 23-08, and is
2 now proposing 295 spaces, Zoning Commission Case 23-08(1).

3 Wesley's parking proposals have never been data
4 driven, because the CTR includes no parking utilization study.
5 It's another common element of the campus plan CTR. The study
6 is missing in this case.

7 The absence of any parking data means that over the
8 course of the last four years, nobody has even bothered to
9 count the number of cars parked in Wesley's lot, despite the
10 number juggling in the campus plan proposals.

11 Where are the results of Wesley's semi-annual parking
12 reports that were required as a condition of the current campus
13 plan? If these sort of patterns are to be used, the 295
14 parking spaces would be woefully inadequate, resulting in
15 drivers choosing instead to park on nearby neighborhood
16 streets.

17 Wesley is proposing that 187 of these 295 parking
18 spaces will be used by the 695 residents of the proposed
19 landmark building and visitors to the campus. Wesley's staff
20 and faculty, Wesley's commuter students, and on-campus
21 residents living in other Wesley housing, will share 108
22 spaces.

23 The latest field data from Wesley's parking use is
24 included in the 2012 Wesley Campus Plan Update that included
25 parking utilization data collected nearly 14 years ago in

1 | October 2011 for 174 parking spaces on Wesley campus.

2 | That reported noted that parking demand at Wesley
3 | historically exceeded supply with 91 percent of the commuter
4 | students preferring to drive alone to the campus. The parking
5 | data showed an average of 93 percent utilization of parking
6 | spaces from 10:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

7 | When the parking lot was busiest, the data showed
8 | University Avenue in the Spring Valley neighborhood was a
9 | preferred place for overflow parking. Based on the CTR in this
10 | case, Wesley's Campus Plan creates objectionable conditions
11 | based on traffic and parking, and fails to provide and specific
12 | proposals to mitigate these objectionable conditions.

13 | The CTR was prepared at a time when the world was
14 | emerging from a frozen pandemic. Wesley's Campus Plan cases
15 | have been postponed multiple times at Wesley's request, because
16 | the application is not ready for the final action.

17 | Nearly a year passed from when this case was held in
18 | abeyance to when Wesley requested it in March 25 that the
19 | Commission was able to review after Wesley submitted another
20 | revised campus proposal. There has been more than enough time
21 | to collect real-world ground truth data, and compare a revised
22 | CTR in a post-COVID environment.

23 | Based on the CTR's data and analysis, Wesley's campus
24 | plan does not comply with the standards for approval outline in
25 | Subtitle X, Section 101.2. We call on the Commission to

1 require the applicant to do the work it should have done at
2 least a year ago, and submit a new CTR that may offer more
3 insight into existing future and background conditions, and
4 allows them to form data-driven decision making in this case.

5 Thank you. This concludes our testimony.

6 MR. SMITH: And Chairman Hood, if I might add, we
7 were working on this testimony up almost to the time of this
8 hearing today, and did not have a chance to submit it for the
9 record. If you would like us to submit it for the record, we'd
10 be happy to do that as soon as this concludes, if you can
11 indulge us on that.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I was going to ask you, because I
13 was looking for your testimony and I also wanted Mr. Carter's
14 to be on the record. So we will allow time for both of y'all's
15 (indiscernible).

16 So I do have a question, couple of them. And I'm
17 just trying, as I'm thinking through this -- so DDOT is our
18 subject matter experts. They don't just do transportation
19 stuff that's here. They've informed me -- and I don't always
20 agree with you guys, and that's no secret -- and what I
21 didn't -- I was really disagree on some (indiscernible), but
22 they informed me they were an award-winning district department
23 of transportation. And I thought about -- I've been thinking
24 about that ever since, and I didn't disagree with them because
25 they've got awards in transportation across the country, and I

1 don't.

2 So I know that -- so here's what I'm faced with, Mr.
3 Smith and Mr. Carter. I need you all to help me understand.
4 So I think you bring up some valid points, but we are going up
5 against -- and I think they had four or five conditions. They
6 have examined this, and had been examined, that those
7 (indiscernible) conditions, they're given -- and given a few
8 more tasks for their applicability. They're the experts.

9 Not (indiscernible) maybe someone on the Commission,
10 maybe, but I'm not. So how do I disregard the experts, unless
11 you all have -- do you all have backgrounds in transportation?
12 I'm not asking to slight you, I'm just trying to help --
13 help -- help me get the way you all are.

14 Do you all have that, or are these guesstimates, or
15 what you think? Because here's the thing, I'm going to tell
16 you this -- and I was thinking of this as you all were talking.
17 When we did National stadium, I knew there was a serious
18 transportation issue, because the hearings lasted forever. The
19 community showed up, and they told a story, and we knew that
20 there was some mitigation measures that needed to take place.

21 I'm not getting the same result here, unless I'm
22 missing something. You know -- you know, no disrespect to
23 anybody, but I'm not feeling the same push. So something
24 that -- that DDOT and Wesley have been doing must be working.
25 So help -- help me understand where you all are. Are you just

1 data driven, or actually practicality, and what's actually
2 going on? That's kind of where I am.

3 What's really going on? Is that actually what's
4 going on, or are you all looking at that data? It might not be
5 a question, but that's what I'm -- that's what's running
6 through my head.

7 MR. CARTER: Okay. I will just tell you anecdotally
8 that in the past five years, DDOT has been taking capacity of
9 the traffic network -- alternative transportation. Traffic has
10 gotten worse since COVID, and yet people are not coming into
11 D.C. to work. So that's what I'm seeing, and what I'm saying
12 is -- I think what our testimony is saying is we don't have the
13 data to support this, the current data.

14 In other words, this data is going back five years
15 before COVID, and some back 22 years. The problem is there
16 isn't any current data to make these decisions. So I'm going
17 off of both data and what I'm experiencing. I do drive into
18 the District every day, Mr. Hood, from where I live, and
19 traffic is ridiculous. And part of it is because that capacity
20 has been taken out of the network with bicycles, DDOT is trying
21 to get alternative transportation. And traffic's gotten worse,
22 and yet the data's not there to support this report -- or I
23 should say the data is being extrapolated, you know, from five
24 to 22 years back.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay.

1 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make two
2 points, if I might.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure.

4 MR. SMITH: Fortunately or fortunately, I'm a victim
5 of having been an ANC commissioner for ten years in the area,
6 and so consequently I've had a review of quite a lot of
7 transportation studies for campus plans. So there, you know --
8 am I data driven? I'm pretty accustomed to seeing what's in a
9 campus plan. What -- in a campus plan transportation analysis,
10 there's a lot of missing stuff here. That's why it has taken
11 us so long to digest this and not filing something with you
12 that was based on nonsense, but was really the result of a lot
13 of close work.

14 That's the first point I'd like to make. But the
15 second point I'd like to make is -- and I would add, I would
16 not have expected Wesley to have filed this type of CTR if this
17 case were beginning now. That the reason -- the only
18 justification for this CTR is that it was done when it was
19 done, which was back in 2022 because of COVID.

20 Otherwise, I have a hard time believing that DDOT
21 wouldn't accepted using data that old, and with such -- without
22 any kind of requirements for collecting new data. I don't know
23 that I've ever seen a campus plan in which there is not new
24 data collected, and that looked at the totality of the campus
25 plan, not just a new development.

1 The second point I wanted to make, and much, much --
2 much, much more briefly, is that from the very onset of this
3 project, back many years ago, you know, longer than even you
4 all have been dealing with it, the neighbors have expressed
5 deep concern about parking. And I will say that from our
6 standpoint as representatives of NLC and Spring Valley Wesley
7 Heights Citizens Association, we didn't minimize those
8 concerns, but we thought there were greater concerns with this
9 project than just the parking.

10 So with the limited time that we have before you,
11 that may have been where we put our focus. But I think that if
12 you go back and you look, for example, at the Scholz's
13 testimony throughout this entire process, who live right across
14 from Wesley Seminary, they're at ground zero on this stuff.
15 They have been very consistent in stating their concerns about
16 traffic impacts on University Avenue, Wesley Circle, and also
17 particularly about parking.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I see my colleague has -- and I'm
19 not finish, but let me go to Commissioner Wright. She's got to
20 get something in there, so --

21 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. I just had a question
22 about parking. Does Spring Valley have resident parking
23 permits such that if you are not a resident you can only park
24 for two hours?

25 MR. SMITH: There are certain parts of Spring Valley

1 that have that, but not all parts of Spring Valley have that.

2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Specifically along University,
3 do you know if that has residential parking permits?

4 MR. SMITH: Blaine?

5 MR. CARTER: Yes, yes, yes. I have a Zone 3 sticker
6 on my registration.

7 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: All right. So I understand the
8 parking concern. However, the residential parking permits are
9 supposed to assure that people who are not residents in Ward 3
10 are not able to park beyond two hours. I am assuming that the
11 residents of the -- whatever we're calling it now, the
12 residential hall, or dormitory, or whatever the correct term
13 that we're using now -- I'm assuming they would not, for the
14 most part, be able to obtain Ward 3 parking permits.

15 So are your -- is your concern that they will just
16 park illegally, and so is it more of an enforcement issue in
17 the neighborhood?

18 MR. SMITH: I think the concern, frankly, is more
19 about the commuter students. You know, the -- you know, 80
20 percent of Wesley student body are commuter students. It's
21 always been a commuter campus.

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: The bail --

23 MR. SMITH: On the side -- I'm sorry, on the side of
24 the University, you know, where Blaine is, he lives on -- he
25 lives on the residential side of University Avenue, on the

1 opposite side of University, there is no RPP. So --

2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I see. Okay.

3 MR. SMITH: -- it's a three- to four-hour parking
4 limit there, however. But, you know, the -- I will say this.
5 The neighborhood, for a long time, has worked very closely with
6 American University on these parking issues, because they're
7 also part of the problem. But what AU does is they go around
8 and they have a system in place where they are monitoring the
9 parking in the neighborhood, and they are able to do some
10 enforcement with their students beyond what the required signs
11 say.

12 You know, whether it's three hours or four hours,
13 because their students are not supposed to be parking in the
14 neighborhood period. And but Wesley does not have that kind
15 of -- does not have that kind of capacity in place. And so
16 that is a concern. When you -- and I hate to look at -- none
17 of us like looking at old data. I mean, you know, 2012 data,
18 but if that's the only thing you have, you know, I think it was
19 pretty remarkable that when that data was collected, they also
20 collected data not only on the parking utilization on the
21 Wesley campus, but also in the nearby streets, and whether
22 their students were parking on the nearby streets.

23 And that data showed that during the peak hours of
24 uses on the campus, it was cars were parking on University
25 Avenue as opposed to on Mass Avenue where the meters are, or

1 | some other place. That was what that data showed.

2 | So, you know, it's always been a concern to the
3 | neighbors there. So I think it's all of the above --

4 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Right. So I think that, you
5 | know, it's interesting to hear, and I guess this is for the
6 | applicant, maybe Mr. Brown. There's a proposed transportation
7 | demand management plan, which I have to tell you, I think is
8 | actually a very robust TDM. And the trick is -- and the
9 | reporting is pretty robust. The trick is that it needs to be
10 | followed through on, and you need to actually get the regular
11 | reports. And it sounds to me like that's been maybe not
12 | happening, but it really needs to happen in the future.

13 | Would it be possible to add to the Transportation
14 | Demand Management Plan a condition that the -- that Wesley will
15 | oversee their students, if that's really the issue, just as
16 | your describing, sir, that American University does. And try
17 | to strongly instruct them not to park illegally in the
18 | neighborhood. I mean, if you're allowed to park for two hours
19 | in the residential parking permit area, you should be allowed
20 | to park for two hours. If you -- just as a visitor to a home
21 | would be parking for two hours. But they shouldn't be allowed
22 | to park illegally.

23 | Can't hear you.

24 | MR. BROWN: I agree, and I think we've -- we've
25 | attempted to incorporate at the campus plan level some of those

1 | ideas, and our expectation is to tighten that for the
2 | processing level, so that Wesley has a method of registering/
3 | monitoring their student vehicles in a way that no -- if the
4 | problem exists, and then how to deal with it, should it become
5 | a problem.

6 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay. It seems to me a good
7 | place for that would be in the TDM, actually.

8 | MR. BROWN: Yes. And the TDM and taking Mr. Solomon
9 | under a little bit, but the TDM works in conjunction with the
10 | PMP, the Performance Management, in so that you trust but
11 | verify, and we're committed to that.

12 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thanks. I just wanted to get
13 | that conversation in about residential parking permits as we
14 | were discussing parking. I didn't mean to interrupt you, Chair
15 | Hood, and you can go back to the questions that you had if I
16 | haven't completely disrupted you too much.

17 | MR. BROWN: Can I interject real quickly? On the
18 | RPP --

19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Brown --

20 | MR. BROWN: Okay. I stand --

21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- (indiscernible) --

22 | MR. BROWN: -- I stand silent.

23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- because I'm going to get on you
24 | about not doing reports, and you're doing further in the
25 | process and you have to be compliant. So wait. Don't worry, I

1 haven't forgot you were here. We're coming back to you.

2 I'm going to go back to my colleagues. Any
3 additional questions or comments, Commissioner Imamura? I see
4 you shaking your head. Commissioner Stidham? Vice Chair
5 Miller?

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No questions. I would just
7 comment that in addition to Commissioner Wright commenting that
8 she found the TDM plan to be pretty robust, that's the
9 conclusion of the -- of our experts in the DDOT, Department Of
10 Transportation. That's the exact word or phrase they used,
11 "sufficiently robust". And then they -- with all the updates,
12 they continue to support the TDM and the -- and the PMP, that
13 we'll monitor all that. And on the RPP, but I won't --
14 (indiscernible) to come up with it. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Commissioner
16 Wright, any additional questions? Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No additional questions at this
18 time. The only thing I would make as a comment, which is that
19 if there are intersections that are below the threshold, that
20 is a very typical urban situation. There are probably
21 intersections throughout this city of Washington that are --
22 are failing left and right, but that doesn't mean that nothing
23 could ever happen again in the city.

24 That is why, as an alternative to making road
25 widenings and other kinds of physical improvements, that is why

1 the TDM is the solution. And, you know, I mean, I have to say
2 that there are probably many failing intersections in the
3 neighborhood I live in, and if there is -- and the traffic
4 isn't great. But the only solution to that is to not basically
5 say, okay, stop everything forever more.

6 The solution is to come up with TDM programs that are
7 going to really push people to use other forms of
8 transportation. And that's why, again, I am pleased in this
9 particular project that they are reducing the amount of
10 parking, frankly, both for the Wesley users and they've reduced
11 the amount of parking dedicated to the residential building,
12 dormitory, again, whatever the right term is that we're using
13 right now, because minimizing parking is one of the most
14 effective ways to encourage people to get out of their cars,
15 and to use other forms of transportation.

16 So, you know, just as sort of a general comment that
17 in an urban area like Washington, you're never going to have
18 physical improvements to intersections that are going to make
19 them stop being failing intersections. It's just not going to
20 happen, unless you widen them to the wide suburban roads that I
21 dealt with in Montgomery County. I mean, we don't want that to
22 be the case.

23 You want to keep the roads the way they are, because
24 they actually create the environment that we all need in terms
25 of sidewalks and vegetation, and so on and so forth.

1 And so reducing parking and doing really robust TDMS
2 are the way to address the issue. And I think that's what I
3 understand this particular CTR is trying to promote. So I'll
4 just put that out there.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Wright
6 with a well-respected analysis. And I'm not going to follow
7 that, so I'm going to move on.

8 All right. So let's see, who else do we have? And I
9 actually agree with you. It was very well said.

10 Anything else, colleagues? I see nothing. Okay.
11 Let's see. Mr. Brown, do you have any cross? Not any rebuttal
12 or anything -- any cross?

13 MR. BROWN: No cross, Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Chair Duncan, do you have
15 any cross?

16 MS. DUNCAN: No cross.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And again, Mr. Clarkson and
18 others are not here, Chair Bender is not here.

19 Okay. Well, thank you, Mr. Carter and Mr. Smith. We
20 will see how we will proceed forward.

21 Ms. Schellin, I think that's it, right? Am I leaving
22 anything out?

23 MS. SCHELLIN: For him to do rebuttal, or any cross
24 if he has any. I'm sorry, rebuttal and closing.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. Mr. Brown, let me just say

1 | this. Vice Chairman (indiscernible) about the RPP, I think you
2 | wanted to address that, I think -- or did you? Something about
3 | RPP?

4 | MR. BROWN: No -- well, okay. Since you're giving me
5 | the opportunity. All I was going to say is that neighborhoods
6 | do have an opportunity to petition for, yeah, one side of the
7 | street -- all resident parking. Not even the two hours, as
8 | they do in impacted neighborhoods around Dupont Circle and I
9 | think around the stadium, I think, during events there. So
10 | there's opportunity if the two-hour RPP isn't working, we could
11 | just resident all the time one the residential side.

12 | On the parking reduction that the -- that
13 | Commissioner Wright was talking about, and that the party in
14 | opposition was talking about, I just wanted to comment. I
15 | don't have a question. I just wanted to comment that that
16 | reduction of 95 spaces from the original amount is something
17 | that was desired by the Advisory Neighbor Commission 3E and
18 | favored by DDOT as well.

19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. And Mr. Brown,
20 | I just wanted to say that if -- depending how the Commission
21 | moves here, if we get to anything for the process, you have to
22 | be in compliance. And I'm disturbed when I hear Mr. Smith and
23 | Mr. Carter mention about reports not being done. And I need to
24 | go back and to see if any reports -- and I'm going to ask our
25 | counsel to make sure that whoever is supposed to be giving

1 | those reports will be giving those reports.

2 | I don't mean to comment on it. I just need to make
3 | sure it's being done. I should've been done, because if it has
4 | not been done for years, as far as I'm concerned, you're out of
5 | compliance.

6 | So if we get to that point, I'm hoping that we're
7 | going to hear stuff that's not being done. So with that, Mr.
8 | Brown, you can give us any rebuttal and your closing.

9 | Do your rebuttal first, and then I have to do cross
10 | on rebuttal, and then we'll do closing.

11 | MR. BROWN: I'd ask Mr. Solomon if there's any points
12 | you'd like to make in rebuttal.

13 | MR. SOLOMON: (Indiscernible.)

14 | MR. BROWN: I can't hear you.

15 | MR. SOLOMON: (Indiscernible.)

16 | MR. YOUNG: Now -- we hear you now.

17 | MR. SOLOMON: Okay. Yeah. No points on rebuttal.
18 | Thank you.

19 | MR. BROWN: Then I'd like to turn really just to
20 | closing very briefly. And I'm -- before I forget, I want to
21 | pick up a point that Chairman Hood brought that I think is
22 | relevant. The here and now is very different than it was
23 | before the COVID, and even going back to 2012. And we included
24 | it in our presentation's historical analysis of enrollment, and
25 | going back to 2011.

1 And as a practical matter, there are fewer Wesley
2 students, there are fewer Wesley students coming to campus
3 because more and more are either hybrid, on campus and virtual,
4 or entirely virtual. So history is relevant only to a certain
5 point, and I think the process that began in 2022 with the CTR
6 involved through ongoing interaction with DDOT, and certainly
7 input from the AMCs, has brought us to a point where we're
8 comfortable that the TDM with the PMP in place mitigates or
9 eliminates objectionable conditions on these issues, and really
10 satisfies the criteria set forth.

11 And we'd like to move forward with the underlying
12 campus plan, and then obviously embark on the further
13 processing where there's obligations that we've taken note of
14 and will include.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Brown, have you
16 concluded? You finished?

17 MR. BROWN: I have concluded, I have a scheduling
18 request but that's, perhaps, premature at this point.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Well, you can always ask --
20 go ahead and put your request out there.

21 MR. BROWN: Well, we were -- on the 12th of June, we
22 were scheduled for final action, and we appreciate the
23 opportunity to have this focused hearing. I think we've aired
24 the issues probably more than what would have been in the
25 context of the normal hearing proceedings. But I think we're

1 ready to put this back into the Commission's hands for final
2 action, and would ask you to do that at the earliest
3 opportunity.

4 In a perfect world, you could take final action
5 tonight, but I don't expect that. But the soonest available
6 date, I think, would be appreciated.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Brown. There are
8 some things I want to examine from the present party,
9 especially dealing with the transportation issues
10 (indiscernible), and we will -- I'm sure others, my colleagues
11 as well, we need to examine some of those points that were
12 made. But what I will say is that the goal has always been to
13 finish this before we take our August break.

14 I don't think we've asked for anything, because we
15 don't get to August and then try to remember everything we've
16 already done. So the goal is to finish this -- I think we're
17 looking at May the 31st.

18 Ms. Schellin, could you tell us about the scheduling
19 of this, when we're going to deliberate on this case?

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. Let's see --

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Did I say May? No, not May. July
22 the 31st. That's a whole other year.

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. May would be a long time off.
24 I don't think --

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Please.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: So July 31st, I didn't hear the
2 Commission ask for anything, so I believe the record is now
3 closed.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. We didn't -- oh, I do
5 want -- I do need Mr. Smith and Mr. Carter's testimony to be --

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, other than that. Which I think
7 they're going to submit this evening. They said as soon as the
8 hearing was over, they will submit that. So they can submit
9 that, we'll just say, by noon tomorrow, give them time to enjoy
10 the evening.

11 So by noon tomorrow, if they would submit their
12 testimony, and then other than that, the record is closed.
13 Except for I believe they've already submitted draft findings
14 (indiscernible) conclusions of law. We already had dates for
15 that. So other than that, we just will put this on for
16 consideration on the July 31st meeting agenda for 4 o'clock
17 p.m.

18 MR. BROWN: Is it at all possible to do it sooner
19 than that?

20 MS. SCHELLIN: No. The agenda for the 10th is
21 already finalized, and our attorneys will not have time to
22 review it.

23 MR. BROWN: I had to ask.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: You had to.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, you got your time, Mr.

1 Brown. You're really pushing, but the Commission wants -- we
2 want to be able to examine what's coming to us.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Right, and they have to.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. They have to as well.

5 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. They have to have time to
6 absorb everything you guys gave them.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, anything else
8 on this case now that everybody's on the same page? Any
9 issues?

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Smith, any question?

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right.

12 (Indiscernible.)

13 MR. SMITH: No questions. Thank you. We'll --

14 MS. SCHELLIN: So we're all good.

15 MR. SMITH: -- we'll get that into you tonight.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: That's fine. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Ms. Schellin, for
18 Tuesday -- for next Thursday's case, is it Thursday? When is
19 that -- no.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: Monday. Monday --

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Monday's case.

22 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: If you could just let Ms.
24 (indiscernible) know where we start off at, because I have
25 questions.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, we've always discussed that. She
2 is going to take good care of you guys.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Great. Okay. Again,
4 before I close out, do we have anything else? The Zoning
5 Commission meets again this coming Monday. The top of the case
6 is the Brooklyn -- hold on one second, I'm going to make sure.
7 We're doing the same platforms at 4 p.m., 901 Monroe Street
8 LLC (phonetic), that'll be a continuation of 24-15, and we'll
9 be starting with, I think, with closer to 4:00.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: 4 o'clock, yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

12 MS. SCHELLIN: We're going to finish up with those in
13 support. It's only about two or three.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, you --

15 MS. SCHELLIN: Just so you guys know, as far as
16 where -- how long you think that they're going to take. I
17 looked today. I think there were only like two or three left
18 in that category --

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay.

20 MS. SCHELLIN: -- and then you'll move on to your
21 party in opposition. And then the opposition --

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Yeah. (Indiscernible) to
23 where we are.

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. I told her, yeah.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ms. Schellin, just a real
2 quick request. That was the meeting I had to leave early. I
3 had to leave at 7 p.m. Can you send me a link to where I need
4 to review the record, whether the transcript is in, and I can
5 read the transcript, or if I just watch the video --

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. I'll do that this evening.
7 Sure --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you could send me the link,
9 I would appreciate it.

10 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. So with that, I'm
13 going to thank everyone for their case tonight and all the work
14 that's been done. I'm looking forward to having our
15 deliberations. You all have a great holiday. And if you're
16 doing fireworks, don't hold them in your hand. Don't try to
17 just -- just don't use them at all.

18 So anyway, be safe, and I hope you enjoy the holiday
19 with your friends. Take care, this hearing's adjourned.

20 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
21 record at 5:10 p.m.)
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. 23-08(1)

Before: D.C. Zoning Commission

Date: 07-02-25

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.



Barrington Moxie