

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING
CASE NO. 25-12

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

NOVEMBER 5, 2025

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened via teleconference, pursuant to notice at 5:20 p.m. EDT, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson
ROBERT E. MILLER, Vice Chair
GWEN WRIGHT, Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING LEGAL DIVISION STAFF PRESENT:

BRIAN LAMPERT, Esquire
JACOB RITTING, 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:

JOEL LAWSON, DC Office of Planning
NOELLE WURST, DC Office of Attorney General
NOAH HAGEN, DC Department of Transportation
ERKIN OZBERK, DC Department of Transportation
JOE BISHOP-HENCHMAN, Commissioner, ANC 5F
GWENDOLYN LOHSE, Commissioner, ANC 2B
DENNIS SENDROS, DC YIMBY
SHELLY REPP, Committee of 100
PETE RODRIGUE
LAN MARGOSIS

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the
Regular Public Hearing held on November 5, 2025.

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

Case No. 25-12 - Office of Planning

Introduction - Chairman Hood	4
Preliminary Matters	6
Presentation of Office of Planning - Mr. Lawson	7
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	
Commissioner Wright	23
Vice Chair Miller	25
Chairman Hood	28
Presentation of Office of Attorney General - Ms. Wurst	30
Presentation of DDOT - Mr. Hagen	35
Testimony from ANC 5F - Commissioner Bishop-Henchman	38
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	
Chairman Hood	43
Commissioner Wright	44
Vice Chair Miller	44
Testimony from Dennis Sendros	45
Testimony from Lan Margosis	49
Testimony from Pete Rodrigue	51
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	
Chairman Hood	52
Commissioner Wright	53
Vice Chair Miller	54
Chairman Hood	54
Testimony from Committee of 100 - Shelly Repp	55
Questions/Comments from Commissioners	
Commissioner Wright	60
Vice Chair Miller	64
Chairman Hood	66
Response from OP - Mr. Lawson	67

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

(5:20 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are convening and broadcasting this public hearing by videoconferencing. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me this evening are Vice Chair Miller and Commissioner Wright. First, let me just thank to my two colleagues. I know they have been busy today doing other -- watching -- I've watched some of BZA and I've had some other things I've been doing. And I know Commissioner Wright, her duties -- doing her civic duty, so thank you both, and it shows the commitment. I know Vice Chair Miller was -- has been on the line since early this morning, and I'm sure that Commissioner Wright has been busy all day, as well as others, so thank you both.

We are also joined by our Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Sharon Schellin, as well as our Office of -- as well as Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations; also, our Office of Zoning Legal Division, Mr. Ritting and Mr. Lampert. I will ask all others to introduce themselves at the appropriate time. Copies of today's virtual public hearing notice are available on the Office of Zoning's website.

Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live via Webex and YouTube Live. The video will be available on the Office of Zoning's website after the hearing. Accordingly, all those

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

1 listening on Webex or by phone will be muted during the hearing
2 and only those who have signed up to participate or testify will
3 be unmuted at the appropriate time. Please state your name before
4 providing oral testimony on your presentation.

5 Oral presentations should be limited to a summary of
6 your most important points. When you are finished speaking,
7 please mute your audio so that your microphone is no longer
8 picking up sound or background noise. If you experience
9 difficulty accessing Webex or with your telephone call-in, then
10 please call our OZ Hotline number at 202-727-0789 to receive
11 Webex log-in or call-in instructions or if you need assistance
12 in -- to sign up to testify.

13 All persons planning to testify either in favor,
14 opposition, or undeclared must have signed up in advance and will
15 be called by name. If you wish to file written testimony or
16 additional supporting documents during the hearing, then please
17 request that submission to be entered into the record and be
18 prepared to describe it at the time of your testimony.

19 The subject of this evening's -- which is day three of
20 Zoning Commission Case Number 25-12, day three, is the -- will
21 consist of the following topics: Pre-ZR-16 approved vehicle
22 parking requirements, Subtitle C-701; Priority Corridor Metrobus
23 route update, Subtitle C-702; garage door height and setback,
24 Subtitle C-711; and surface parking screening along alley --
25 along the alley, Subtitle C-714.

1 Written testimony must be submitted at the time prior
2 to the close of the record. Witnesses at tonight's hearing must
3 limit their testimony to specific text amendments under the
4 consideration for this evening, and I just read those.

5 Again, the hearing will be conducted in accordance with
6 the provisions of 11-Z DCMR, Chapter 5, as follows. We will have
7 preliminary matters; report of the Office of Planning; report of
8 other government agencies; report of the ANC; testimony of
9 organizations and individuals -- organizations, five minutes;
10 individuals, three minutes, respectively -- and we will hear in
11 the order from those in support, opposition, or undeclared. While
12 the Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for
13 presentations, if necessary, it intends to adhere to the time
14 limits as strictly as possible and notes that no time shall be
15 ceded.

16 At this time, the Commission will consider any
17 preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Just very quickly. ANC 5F submitted
19 their report at Exhibit 10, supporting the topics for this
20 evening, 9, 11, and 12, and they support -- went on mute there --
21 and they support condition 10 with -- I'm sorry -- they support
22 10 with conditions. ANC 5E, their report's at Exhibit 83 and
23 83A. They, too, support the same way, 9, 11, and 12, and 10 with
24 conditions. The Commission already considered the request for
25 postponement from ANC 3/4G. DDOT's report at Exhibit 16, no

1 objection. At Exhibit 17, the Office of the Attorney General's
2 report, and Ms. Noelle Wurst is here to testify this evening, so
3 I'm sure she will give her thoughts on this evening's topics.
4 That's all I have. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Schellin.
6 Let's bring up Mr. Lawson, and we can go ahead and get started.
7 Mr. Lawson, when you're ready, you may begin.

8 MR. LAWSON: Great. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good
9 evening, members of the Commission and members of the public.
10 Once again, Joel Lawson with the DC Office of Planning. Thanks,
11 Mr. Young. We can go to the next slide please.

12 As you all know, we're here for the third of six
13 hearings on the omnibus text amendment proposal. This one deals,
14 as the Chair said, mostly with the vehicle parking-related
15 proposals. The introduction section to this presentation is
16 going to be included with each of our presentations for each of
17 the hearings, as it forms the basis of this initiative and there
18 may be different members of the public attending each of these
19 hearings. However, I'm only going to provide a very brief summary
20 of the slides as part of the verbal presentation. This slide
21 provides the process -- kind of a summary of the process to date.
22 The public portion began in June of this year with ANC open house
23 sessions and continues through the hearing tonight.

24 Next slide please. There we go. The proposed text
25 amendment generally addresses one or more of the main objectives.

1 The first, obviously, is to address Comprehensive Plan policy and
2 objectives, including ones, in particular, that help to address
3 housing policy and equity issues. They're intended to remove
4 unnecessary barriers to housing, including the provision --
5 provisions of processes for providing IZ units in all part of DC.
6 They're intended to add clarity to the zoning regulations; to
7 remove redundancies; and to add consistency of language to make
8 them easier for residents and designers to use and for staff to
9 interpret and administer, consistent with the intent. I'm having
10 a little trouble with my computer, so I'm going to try stopping
11 my video for a while and seeing if that helps. Sorry.

12 In addition, they're intended to help ease
13 administrative burdens for homeowners and property owners, as
14 well as the BZA, ANCs, and staff, by removing unnecessary hurdles.
15 This could -- this is intended to decrease the time and expense
16 for all property owners in obtaining permits. And, finally, the
17 intent is to update the 2016 zoning regulations to current
18 requirements, regulations, standards, and practices within the
19 city. OP's tried to balance the desire to protect neighborhood
20 or community character with the needs and aspirations of all
21 property owners to modernize their homes to current standards or
22 update them to reflect changing family needs, whether it be a
23 growing family or aging in place or intergenerational family
24 living, so that our residents can remain within their community.
25 The Office of Planning also considers future residents of the

1 city; are we providing an inviting and accessible opportunity for
2 new residents as well?

3 Next slide. The various proposals that we're going to
4 be talking about through these six hearings were raised by kind
5 of a multitude of different sources and sometimes by more than
6 one source. These, obviously, included the Zoning Commission,
7 itself, as well as BZA members, through comments and instructions
8 to OP as part of the Zoning Commission or BZA hearings or
9 deliberations. Multiple DC agencies provided comments.
10 Department of Buildings -- we worked very closely with the DoB
11 staff, and they've been just extremely helpful throughout this
12 process. We've also worked with DBR, DOEE, DDOT -- I should have
13 mentioned DDOT there; oh, I did -- and other agencies as well.
14 Architects, designers, and builders have raised many of these
15 issues, as have the individual ANC Commissioners. And, finally,
16 of course, many of them are in response to homeowner and community
17 comments provided through the -- particularly provided through
18 BZA reviews.

19 Next slide. As I said, as with any Zoning Commission
20 case, the proposals in this text amendment are not inconsistent
21 with the Comprehensive Plan, including when viewed through a
22 racial equity lens. The OP setdown report and the hearing report
23 provide this analysis in much more detail than I'm going to go
24 into during this presentation. The proposals do not include any
25 rezonings of property or substantial changes to permitted use,

1 height, or density beyond what is anticipated by the existing
2 zoning. Although the proposals being discussed tonight address
3 parking, OP is not proposing any changes to the base parking
4 required amounts or expansions of exemptions from parking.

5 While any one amendment could have a significant impact
6 on a particular proposal for an individual property, either in
7 terms of regulation or in terms of process, these are not
8 considered major moves. They would help to address barriers to
9 the provision of housing, including to the provision of
10 affordable housing units, consistent with the IZ program, in all
11 parts of the city. They would also reduce some impediments to
12 creative building design, the provision of outdoor space valued
13 by residents of all neighborhoods, and the provision of services
14 throughout the city. They could provide additional clarity to
15 aspects of the regulations and remove unnecessary procedural
16 hurdles to residents and property owners in all parts of DC.

17 Next slide. Just very quickly, collectively and
18 individually, the proposed amendments would address policy
19 statements for multiple citywide elements of the Comprehensive
20 Plan. The changes proposed tonight would particularly address
21 policies of land use, transportation, and implementation
22 elements. The proposals do not generally target any specific
23 part of the city or address any area-specific Comp Plan area
24 element policy objectives or specific guidance from approved
25 Small Area Plans for individual neighborhoods.

1 Next slide. With respect to a review of Comprehensive
2 Plan policy through a racial equity lens, it is often difficult
3 to determine the potential impact when it's a series of discrete
4 text amendments which do not significantly impact use or building
5 type or form. In general, they should not result in direct or
6 indirect displacement of residents or businesses, and, in some
7 cases, may make it easier for existing residents and property
8 owners to use and update their property in a way that's both
9 consistent with policy and consistent with the intent of the
10 zoning itself. They are intended to add clarity and certainty
11 to the regulations, which would also be a benefit to all residents
12 of the city. In summary, we don't anticipate that the proposals
13 would have a significant impact on overall demographics in the
14 city or of any particular neighborhood or neighborhood type.
15 Overall, they could have some limited positive impact on equity
16 throughout the city.

17 Next slide. As noted earlier, these proposals include
18 ones that respond to suggestions and comments made by ANCs, by
19 committee (sic) -- community and business groups and individuals,
20 often made through past BZA and Zoning Commission cases. On June
21 24th and 26th, we held virtual open houses -- house meetings for
22 ANC members and then -- intended to provide advanced awareness
23 of the text amendments, to solicit early feedback, and answer
24 questions about the issues and the proposed zoning. OP amended
25 the proposal, as discussed as part of the setdown meeting, based

1 on those discussions. OP held two additional ANC virtual open
2 houses on October 7th, 2025. Again, a video of the meeting we
3 posted -- was posted on the OP website, along with the OP
4 presentation made to the ANCs. Since then, there have been
5 additional discussions with members of the public and individual
6 ANCS. At the time the OP hearing was drafted, some public
7 comments had been added to the record, and OP tried to address
8 those comments in the hearing report, and, in a few cases, have
9 recommended adjustments or additional amendments based on those
10 comments. The record includes comments in support from DDOT and
11 OAG and some ANCs and community groups. OP will briefly discuss
12 some comments in the record as we go through this presentation.

13 Next slide. Okay. So for the remainder of this
14 presentation, I'll provide a quick overview of the four proposed
15 amendments on the agenda tonight. The hearing tonight deals
16 mainly with vehicle parking. Although, we are not proposing any
17 changes to the vehicle parking requirements, themselves, we are
18 proposing amendments, updates, and clarifications regarding how
19 vehicle parking requirements are calculated, administered, and
20 applied.

21 I believe I'm joined tonight by my colleagues from
22 DDOT, and there is already a DDOT memo in support at Exhibit 16.
23 The OP hearing report at Exhibit 82 in the record provides
24 additional analysis for each of these proposals, including more
25 information on their origin, intent, potential or intended

1 impact, as well as illustrations and analysis of past BZA cases,
2 where appropriate. The report also notes other proposed
3 technical or corrective changes to regulations otherwise being
4 amended as part of this -- as part of this initiative, such as
5 reordering or correcting references, which I typically will not
6 address in this verbal presentation.

7 And next slide. Okay. So the first proposal for this
8 evening is simply to require the number of vehicle parking spaces
9 based on current parking requirements. In the ZR-16 regulations,
10 the parking requirements were reduced for many zones and types
11 of uses, compared to what was required under the ZR-58
12 regulations. These reductions were the result of analysis and
13 study on parking needs and costs by District staff. However, at
14 the hearings, there were concerns about the potential for
15 wholesale immediate loss of parking, and the Commission adopted
16 text that essentially has been interpreted as requiring buildings
17 constructed under the ZR-58 regulations to retain any required
18 parking spaces under those regulations.

19 This is actually pretty unique in that, typically, when
20 the zoning regulations change, a building constructed under the
21 old regulations is considered vested under the former
22 regulations, so is not required to be brought into conformity
23 with the new regulations, but it's also not restricted from
24 becoming consistent with the current regulations. These parking
25 provisions do the opposite. They require conformity to the former

1 regulations and restrict owners from being consistent with the
2 current ones. This, of course, can be very confusing to
3 landowners and it can impact the ability to update or convert an
4 existing building from one use to another. It can also limit
5 the ability to meet current surface parking, landscaping, or
6 stormwater management for surface parking lots. Parking that's
7 internal to the building, which is typically underground, might
8 be less feasible for conversion to another use, just because of
9 the logistics of doing so.

10 Next slide. So the OP proposal is to delete these two
11 provisions and allow existing buildings and uses to become
12 consistent with the ZR parking standards, if they wish to.
13 Buildings would be allowed to conform to the current adopted
14 matter-of-right zoning regulation. Of course, any proposal to
15 reduce parking below the current requirements would continue to
16 require BZA review and approval. Although many multifamily and
17 nonresidential buildings will continue to provide more parking
18 spaces than the regulations currently require, this zoning
19 requirement would allow underutilized parking spaces to be used
20 for other purposes or for the surface parking lot spaces to be
21 converted back to green space.

22 As with any zoning regulation, parking required under
23 the current parking regulations could not be reduced below what
24 the regulations require, except through BZA approval, and the
25 regulations would not require -- would not require an owner to

1 reduce their parking. As with any parking property, parking in
2 excess of the current requirement would be permitted to be
3 retained, if the owner wished to keep it.

4 The record currently includes support from ANCs 5F and
5 5E, the Coalition for Smarter Growth, three land use attorney
6 firms, OAG, and DDOT. The Committee of 100 indicates opposition
7 and refers to this as a benefit to property owners. OP disagrees.
8 We do not consider allowing a property to conform to the zoning
9 regulations of benefit. It's not easy or inexpensive to convert
10 parking to another use, so it's likely that most property owners
11 would retain their existing parking, but, when it makes sense,
12 an owner should have the flexibility to conform to the current
13 regulations. Such converted parking spaces could be put to use
14 that would provide amenities to residents, such as the provision
15 of additional green space on the site, which would also support
16 biodiversity in meeting GAR impervious surface requirements.

17 The Committee of 100 also questions the OP comment that
18 this could impact conversions. Based on that, OP consulted again
19 with the Office of Zoning, and, although the regulations are not
20 always entirely clear in instances of conversions from one use
21 to another and what the parking situation might be, the ZA's
22 office concurred with OP that these provisions could provide
23 barriers to conversions.

24 Finally, the Committee of 100 noted that the proposal
25 does not include a caveat that any parking required under BZA or

1 Zoning Commission order would need to be retained, despite the
2 parking requirements in the zoning regulations. Such a
3 provision, as part of this proposal, is not needed, as this is
4 the case for any condition of a BZA or Zoning Commission order.
5 In order -- an owner who wants to reduce parking and has a BZA
6 condition order addressing parking would have to seek a
7 modification to the order from the BZA or the Zoning Commission,
8 as the case may be. If the reduction would result in a number
9 of spaces consistent with the ZR-16 minimum requirements,
10 however, they would not also have to seek special exception relief
11 from that parking requirement.

12 Next slide. The second proposal tonight would update
13 the former Priority Corridor Network bus routes provisions with
14 the current zoning in -- of the current zoning regulations and
15 to update them for clarity and consistency with current WMATA
16 high-frequency bus corridors. As part of ZR-16 zoning
17 amendments, OP and DDOT recommended areas where the provision of
18 particularly frequent and consistent transit supports a reduced
19 parking requirement in zoning as a reasonable alternative to car
20 ownership. It's not every bus route in the District, just ones
21 that offer this frequent and consistent transit service.

22 The Commission approved a parking reduction for sites
23 within one-half miles of a Metro station, a quarter-mile of a
24 streetcar line, or a quarter-mile of a Priority Corridor Network
25 Metrobus route (indiscernible). Even at the time of their

1 adoption, it was noted that at some point it was likely that
2 these routes would have to be updated, and that time is now.
3 WMATA recently implemented a new High-Frequency Metrobus Corridor
4 Program. Any of these routes, although renamed, generally
5 correspond to existing Priority Corridor Network routes that are
6 named in the zoning regulations. However, some additional
7 corridors have been added and some existing routes have been
8 changed. These new routes are shown in WMATA maps and described
9 in detailed route profiles on the WMATA website. All of these
10 new routes provide bus service with headways of 12 minutes or
11 less during peak daytime hours, and they offer weekend, early
12 morning, and nighttime service, as well as connections to Metro
13 stations, major employment and commercial areas, and/or the
14 downtown. This is what makes them a viable alternative to
15 automobile ownership, consistent with the existing parking
16 reduction provision in the zoning regulations.

17 Next slide. Given this, an update to the current zoning
18 regulations provision is needed and is proposed. OP's also
19 proposing to add more definitive descriptions of the bus
20 corridors, themselves, rather than simply the bus route names,
21 which can change a little bit over time. OP is not proposing to
22 change the actual parking required along these corridors. The
23 baseline amount would be unchanged, as with the 50 percent
24 reduction of the otherwise required amount for sites with a
25 quarter-mile of a High-Frequency Bus Corridor. However, as some

1 of these routes have changed, it does mean that the reduction
2 would apply in new -- in some new areas and would cease to apply
3 in a few others. Any existing building would be vested, of
4 course, but the updated zoning regulations would apply to any new
5 building.

6 Next slide please. I know that the maps are very small
7 and will be difficult to read, but this slide shows a map showing
8 the existing and proposed routes, as well as a map showing the
9 areas within -- where the quarter-mile parking reduction would
10 generally apply, including a comparison to the existing system.
11 Of course, many of these areas also overlap with parking
12 reductions permitted by proximity to Metro stations. In
13 addition, the areas zoned R or RF would remain excluded from this
14 reduction. Again, I recognize that these maps can be tough to
15 read, but they are available on both the Office of Zoning and
16 the Office of Planning website, where people can zoom in and see
17 more detail.

18 So the record currently includes support from ANCs 5F
19 and 5E again, the Coalition for Smarter Growth, the three land
20 use attorney firms, and, of course DDOT. Many of the responses,
21 including ones from 3E and 3F, recommend additional segments or
22 transit corridors that do not the WMATA definition of a High --
23 of a High-Frequency Bus Corridor. OAG has indicated support for
24 this position. We understand that position and we discussed this
25 again with DDOT, which is recommended approval of the proposal,

1 as drafted, and we concur that incorporating into the zoning the
2 new WMATA bus routes, as established by WMATA, is most
3 appropriate. Neither OP nor DDOT has studied routes which do not
4 meet the WMATA criteria, such as routes that provide a 15-minute
5 headway instead of a 12-minute headway. OP also notes that the
6 quarter-mile parking reduction would not apply to some of the
7 areas of routes noted in the ANC memo, because they are zoned R
8 or RF, where the reduction does not apply, or it could be captured
9 by other listed routes or Metro stations. Separately, the
10 Coalition for Smarter Growth recommends deletion of vehicle
11 parking requirements from zoning altogether. OP is not proposing
12 that, as it would be well beyond the scope of this proposal.

13 The Committee of 100's position is a little bit
14 unclear, but they do raise questions of racial equity, which is
15 an important issue. The proposed parking amendment is in response
16 to WMATA's new high-frequency routes -- high-frequency bus routes
17 which are currently in place. Although there are high-frequency
18 bus routes in all Wards, the new WMATA routes do appear to provide
19 increased service to Wards 7 and 8. This seems to be a good
20 thing, and this results in corresponding changes to the areas
21 with or without the parking reduction permission. These changes
22 in areas that would now or would no longer be eligible, appear
23 to be proportionately larger in Wards 7 and 8, although much of
24 the area that shows as being eligible for the reduction under the
25 proposal seems to be federal land, which would not be subject to

1 the zoning requirements at all. Parking would continue to be
2 required and allowed. This is not a prohibition on providing
3 parking. The costs of vehicle parking are passed on to all owners
4 of the building, whether they have an automobile or not, so having
5 the option to right-size parking would result in overall benefits
6 to residents, including in Wards 7 and 8. Increased access to
7 frequent, dependable bus service, which would lessen the need for
8 automobile ownership expense, combined with a resident not having
9 to pay for parking that's unused, even in -- and even if they do
10 not use it, would also provide benefit to residents. As such,
11 OP disagrees with the Committee of 100's assertion.

12 Next slide please. The third proposal impacts only
13 parking garages for single-family homes and flats. Parking
14 regulations require that for parking spaces provided within a
15 building or structure, the garage door must be 10 feet in height
16 and must be set back 12 feet from the center line of the alley.
17 This is just the garage door, not the structure of the garage
18 itself. This is intended to insure safety and ease of use to
19 garages serving multiple vehicles. And, in fact, this is kind
20 of carried forward from the ZR-58 regulations, which included
21 these reasonable requirements for parking garages for multiple
22 vehicles within a building. However, under ZR-58, these rules
23 did not apply to parking garages serving a low-density
24 residential building, such as a house or a flat. In ZR-16, the
25 provisions were removed and inadvertently applied to all parking

1 structures, including that accessory garage to a single-family
2 dwelling.

3 Next slide. So OP is basically proposing to revert
4 back to the regulations in the -- to the requirements in the ZR-
5 58 regulations to make it clear that these requirements would not
6 apply to a low-density private garage, but would continue to
7 apply for the bigger garages that serve multiple vehicles.
8 Although this seems like a small matter and may not even have
9 been consistently applied to such garages through the permitting
10 processes, it has resulted in unnecessary uncertainty of
11 homeowners and expense and time-consuming BZA cases. So far,
12 there are indications of support from ANC 5E and F and the three
13 land use law firms. Once again, the Committee of 100's position
14 is a bit unclear, but they raise a question about whether this
15 could lead to trash bins being located in the alley. This would
16 not be expected any more than at present, because the provision
17 applies to the garage door only, and the setback of the building
18 from the center line of the alley -- the required setback of the
19 building from the center line of the alley would remain in effect
20 and in place.

21 Next slide. The screening requirements for surface
22 parking lots were generally, again, carried forward from the ZR-
23 58 regulations, although, in ZR-58, most of the screening
24 requirements were actually for commercial parking lots only. In
25 ZR-16, the screening requirements were expanded to apply to any

1 surface parking area, a position that OP continues to feel is
2 appropriate. However, the new regulations did not address
3 surface parking -- surface vehicle parking spaces individually
4 accessed directly from the alley, where each parking space only
5 has access directly from the alley. This is actually pretty
6 common, especially for smaller buildings, commercial or
7 residential, with a small number of vehicle parking spaces, as
8 it is an efficient way to provide required or needed on-site
9 vehicle parking, while minimizing onsite driveway pavement and
10 disturbance.

11 Next slide. So OP is simply proposing to not require
12 screening at the one location where it simply cannot be provided,
13 where the parking space is accessed from the alley. There have
14 been a number of BZA cases for exactly this relief, so this
15 amendment simply removes an unnecessary and unintended
16 administrative burden and expense. All other screening around
17 surface parking lots would be retained and would continue to be
18 required. For this amendment, there are indications of support
19 from ANCs 5E and 5F and the three land use firms. The Committee
20 of 100 did not indicate a position, but raised a question
21 regarding rear-yard setback. We're not quite sure what that
22 means, but we do not feel that neither -- we feel that neither a
23 surface parking lot, nor screening along the alley, would impact
24 rear-yard provisions one way or another.

25 And next slide. So here are the four topics before you

1 | tonight. In summary, OP recommends amendments -- these
2 | amendments as being consistent with and furthering District
3 | policies outlined above and in more detail in the OP report, and
4 | we are available for questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you again tonight, Mr.
6 | Lawson. We appreciate your very succinct, to-the-point
7 | recommendations to the Commission. And, as you mentioned, these
8 | come from a whole group of different organizations -- us, BZA,
9 | the residents, planning organizations, government organizations,
10 | so a lot of people that put input into what's going on here, and
11 | you all have just codified it and put everything together and
12 | come up with solutions for us to deal with, so thank you for
13 | that. Let's see if we have any questions or comments. Let me
14 | go to Commissioner Wright. Let me do this. Let me do this.
15 | Let's just talk about all of them, if you want to. Let's do
16 | that.

17 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Uh-huh. Thank you. I mean,
18 | these four text amendments seem to be really pretty
19 | straightforward. One question I had about the transit corridors
20 | is -- you know, I understand one of the reasons for the change
21 | is that the DC Department of Transportation has now rebranded and
22 | slightly changed the map of these transit corridors. And so one
23 | of the things I -- and that's probably going to happen in the
24 | future as well. And so I was wondering, rather than specifically
25 | referencing the existing program and the existing corridors,

1 | might it not be better to say, you know, whatever program is in
2 | place at that time, so that you don't have to go back and change
3 | the zoning code if a corridor is added or taken out or something
4 | like that. Is that a thought?

5 | MR. LAWSON: Yeah, I think that's a great question, and
6 | it was certainly discussed as part of ZR-16, when the original
7 | Priority Bus Corridors were put in place. I think, in the end,
8 | it was decided that it would be clearer and easier for people to
9 | understand what their parking requirement was, potentially easier
10 | for staff to administer the parking requirement as well if those
11 | routes were listed in the regulations themselves. I think that,
12 | for the purposes of this amendment, we would recommend continuing
13 | forward with listing these new routes. I think we would be happy
14 | to kind of take this under advisement and see if there may be
15 | ways that this could be done where maybe a document outside of
16 | zoning is prepared that the zoning document refers to. It's not
17 | something we do a lot in our zoning regulations, but maybe it's
18 | something that we should consider doing a little bit more. So I
19 | think I would recommend going forward with this proposal for now,
20 | but I do like the idea of simplifying this so that, you know, in
21 | theory, we would not have to come back to the Zoning Commission
22 | to amend these -- to amend these routes. They are proven to be
23 | relatively stable. You know, it's been almost ten years since
24 | they've changed, which is not -- which is not too bad. Of course,
25 | there's no guarantee that that's going to be the case in the

1 future. They could change more frequently in the future, so
2 point well taken. Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you. My other
4 question was -- and this is just clarification -- for the garage
5 setback, the height of the garage door I understand -- it all
6 makes sense. You created some rules that really were focusing
7 more on larger sort of multifamily or even commercial projects,
8 and they end up having an impact on single-family and smaller
9 projects, which was sort of an unintended consequence, and you're
10 trying to clarify that. But I do want to just make sure that I
11 understand and that the Committee of 100 understands, the setback
12 from the midline of the alley of seven feet -- seven-and-a-half
13 feet is what exists today in single-family neighborhoods. So
14 it's not like today in single-family neighborhoods it's 12 feet
15 and you're changing it to 7.5 feet; it's really what exists today.
16 So any problems with trashcans or anything else, basically,
17 exists today, if that -- if that is a problem. Is that correct?

18 MR. LAWSON: You're entirely correct, yes.

19 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Right. So I just wanted to
20 clarify that. Those were -- that was it for me. I thought these
21 were, again, very straightforward.

22 MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller.

24 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank
25 you, Joel Lawson, for a very cogent presentation again of an

1 aspect of these omnibus zoning text amendments, which are
2 intended to clarify and simplify and create certainty, as you
3 said. I think -- as Commissioner Wright said, I think they are
4 very straightforward recommendations. I think it's worth taking
5 under advisement the suggestion that she made to be able to
6 reference future DDOT/WMATA changes so we don't have to
7 continually go back -- or DDOT and WMATA don't have to continually
8 come back to us and ask for changes in our zoning regulations,
9 although the cross-referencing in the past -- with past zoning
10 regulations has always been an issue. People want to see right
11 there what it is that's required and not required, and so I
12 understand that clarity.

13 On the recommended additional routes -- segments of bus
14 lines that ANCs, I think, 5E and F and maybe the Coalition for
15 Smarter Growth recommended be added, because they didn't quite
16 meet the definition that we're -- that you're using in the
17 proposal, but there was such frequent headway -- I think they're
18 often from downtown to Ward 5 destinations in Northeast, in the
19 case of what was recommended by those two ANCs, are you taking
20 that under advisement as well? I'm not sure I -- maybe I'll ask
21 DDOT, if they're here, why they should not be included -- be
22 eligible for this -- these corridors to be eligible for the
23 reduction in parking as well, but maybe you have -- maybe you can
24 speak for them or speak to that answer -- to that question.

25 MR. LAWSON: I would -- I would never try to speak for

1 DDOT, but I have -- I have discussed this -- we have -- DDOT --
2 I have discussed this with DDOT. You know, it essentially gets
3 down to, you know, the regulations need to be based on something
4 definitive, and right now it is pretty definitive. You know,
5 it's a 12-minute headway; you know, it's evening, morning,
6 weekend service. You know, these other routes, you know, don't
7 provide all of that, so it would be establishing a new standard
8 different from what WMATA has established for High-Frequency Bus
9 Corridors, you know, for the purposes of zoning. We just felt
10 it was more -- particularly, if we end up taking, you know, the --
11 taking the option of providing a more generic, you know, kind of
12 a description of where these would be and then linking to some
13 external document that actually lists the routes.

14 It becomes all the more important in my mind to make
15 sure that the provision is based on, you know, something. We
16 chose -- in talks with DDOT, we agreed that the areas -- the
17 additional areas are relatively small; some of them are already
18 captured by other routes. The quarter-mile of other routes
19 captures portions of those areas already.

20 Other ones that are noted have a lot of R and RF zoning,
21 so they're not eligible for the reduction. So, you know, we
22 didn't feel -- we didn't feel that we had any kind of rationale
23 for including those other routes. Like, we really appreciate the
24 ANCs bringing them up, and I understand their position, I
25 understand, you know, their concern, but we felt that we needed

1 to make sure that our proposal was defensible, and we feel it
2 is.

3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: All right. Well, that makes sense,
4 and I think all the proposed amendments make sense as well. I
5 mean, I look forward to hearing whatever additional public
6 hearing testimony we have tonight, as you would as well, but I
7 appreciate you responding to the Committee of 100 concerns that
8 were previously expressed, and I think your responses made sense.
9 So I don't have any further questions, Mr. Chairman, at this
10 time. Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I actually don't
12 have any questions. I think this is pretty straightforward, with
13 all the sweat equity and the work that went into this, and I know
14 this is -- just again, this is not within a week or so, and these
15 changes -- and what I'm afraid of, all the work that's been put
16 in, if we diddle-daddle with some of it -- some of it we need to
17 diddle-daddle with; some of it that we diddle-daddle with, which
18 I think is straightforward, like what we have here in front of
19 us tonight, I feel like won't go nowhere; I feel like it won't
20 get lost; I feel like it'll be pulled back and that'll be the
21 end of it, so -- and when I look at the record, in two situations
22 that are before us tonight -- and, my colleagues, I'm sure you
23 all have read the information, like I have and others -- but
24 when I look at the case record on the BZA -- and I say this all
25 the time -- we got regulations and processes in place and it's

1 always approved, so that -- there's something -- there's a signal
2 there, because I'm looking at the -- they have one case on the
3 garage door height, which is very straightforward. There have
4 seven BZA cases, which included relief from these provisions, all
5 have been approved. OP did not identify any BZA cases where the
6 sole relief was from the provision, so, I mean -- and there's
7 another one in the surface screening, there's been no opposition.
8 All have been approved. So there is a track record there, and
9 I'm afraid that if we diddle-daddle with some of this, we'll be
10 in the same place. So that's just my thoughts on that. Others
11 may have -- and I don't mind hearing from others, but I just
12 think that a lot of sweat equity has went into this and at the
13 24th hour -- and we do have a time frame, because some people
14 will no longer be around for us to be able to piggyback, and then
15 it'll go back to square one and probably won't get dealt with
16 for years. So I'll just -- that's just my comments, and will
17 hear from others. Any other follow-up questions or comments?

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I agree with what you said, Mr.
19 Chairman. And this is -- these amendments largely are -- have
20 been evolving over a period of time, that we've had experience
21 with ZR-16 and whether they were inadvertently applied to small
22 single-family homeowners or whatever, I think, or the BZA cases
23 that all were approved, and we don't need to have people going
24 through a process that isn't necessary and burdensome. So I
25 agree with you.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And any time the people in Prince
2 George's County tell me that our process is better than theirs.
3 And I don't know about Montgomery County. My colleague would
4 know more about Montgomery. But I will tell you that we get
5 kudos when I go out to Prince George's County now. And my new --
6 my friend is now out there, Darryl, but I can just tell you that
7 we get kudos in Prince George's. I don't know what we get in
8 Montgomery -- maybe I'll ask the next time we meet -- but I know
9 we get kudos for what we're doing, and releasing the burden on
10 homeowners has always been, at least, the objective I think of
11 this Commission and of everybody, as we move forward. All right.
12 That's enough of my soapbox. Let's hear from the public. Ms.
13 Schellin -- thank you, Mr. Lawson, as always, and I know you'll
14 be around for any follow-up questions later.

15 MR. LAWSON: Mr. Chair, I would just remind you, I do
16 believe that DDOT is here.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, DDOT. Okay. Okay. Well, let's
18 bring up OAG first, and then we'll hear from DDOT. Thank you,
19 Mr. Lawson. Ms. Wurst, good evening.

20 MS. WURST: Yes. Good evening. Nice to see you for
21 the third time so far; second time this week though, not third
22 time this week. All right. So good evening, members of the
23 Commission and the public. My name is Noelle Wurst, and I am
24 testifying tonight on behalf of the Office of the Attorney
25 General. Once again, our written testimony may be found at

1 Exhibit 17 on IZIS, and these slides are at Exhibit 100. So I'd
2 like to reiterate the two guiding principles of OAG's support
3 throughout all of these hearings, which are the dual goals located
4 in the Comp Plan of, you know, supporting housing production and
5 especially affordable housing in the District, and then also and
6 especially by means of reducing various burdensome regulations
7 that do impede housing. And we think tonight's amendments that
8 we'll be testifying on, at least, do especially fall under that
9 latter goal here.

10 Next please. So tonight I'll just be testifying on
11 amendment number nine and amendment ten, so it'll be fairly brief.
12 The amendments, as you see earlier, were fairly straightforward,
13 so we'll go ahead and proceed. Oh, sorry. Next please. Thanks.
14 All right. So, as a quick reminder, amendment number nine removes
15 various pre-ZR-16 vehicle parking requirements; that is those in
16 the 1958 regulations. We see these as ultimately a positive
17 thing. You know, these could provide a lot of flexibility for
18 landowners, whether it's a residential building or a commercial
19 use, so regardless of use, to convert unneeded parking spaces to
20 more productive uses by expanding the property's building size
21 over this point, which, in the case of residential uses, could
22 be used to add additional units or make them a little larger,
23 provide perhaps amenity space using this extra land; facilitate
24 greater use onsite, as in the case of expanding perhaps the floor
25 plate of a commercial use, for instance or additional

1 landscaping, which is important not only for providing, you know,
2 an amenity to, you know, folks who might live onsite, but also
3 reducing the District's -- any possible urban heat island effects
4 by increasing tree canopy and green space. And we note that this
5 could also possibly decrease costs that landowners would
6 otherwise have to give out to, you know, upkeeping of these
7 parking spaces. I think the most recent figure that I've seen
8 was -- the maintenance of each parking space is about, you know,
9 20,000 to \$50,000, so it's in the five digits; it's quite
10 expensive, but also compliant with various regulatory bodies.
11 So, again, we think this is a very, you know, simple, very --
12 but, yet, very much needed amendment. We think that it's very
13 positive, that it's going to simplify, you know, this dual regime
14 to something that's more of a single consistent standard.

15 Next please. In amendment number ten, which updates
16 the Priority Corridor Metrobus routes in the zoning regulations
17 is another, you know, kind of common sense change here, updating
18 it to the WMATA's newest regime. So we see, you know, when it
19 comes, at least, to future development along these corridors,
20 this is something that would advance the Comp Plan's call for
21 mixed-use development, especially to leverage additional
22 affordable housing, you know, by reducing parking requirements.
23 And to call back to a point I made on the last slide, you know,
24 this could be because there's increased space for more units or
25 larger family-sized units or, otherwise, decreasing the costs

1 associated with maintaining the site. We do concur with ANC 5F
2 to retain three street segments that do meet the 12-minute headway
3 standard, but are otherwise included in the No Priority Metrobus
4 route regime, and to possibly retain two additional street
5 segments based on the 15-minute headway standard.

6 Now, earlier, Mr. Lawson noted that while, you know,
7 they considered these changes deeply, they will not be pursuing
8 at this time. We do encourage, at least, you know, taking a look
9 at the, you know, inclusion of these segments and perhaps some
10 other ones in the future. We think it'll help, you know, kind
11 of give credence to the significance and volume of these corridors
12 as well, and, you know, the additions to possible residential use
13 would be quite welcome I believe. And that is the end of this
14 brief testimony. Again, we see both of these two amendments as,
15 you know, both reducing these kind of outdated or perhaps complex
16 regulations to something that's more usable, and we hope it'll,
17 you know, facilitate some additional housing production or, at
18 least, more usable space for District residents in the future.
19 So that's the conclusion of my testimony, and I welcome any
20 questions you may have.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you again, Ms. Wurst. We
22 appreciate you sticking with us basically tonight. I guess we'll
23 see you tomorrow too, but we appreciate you sticking with us.
24 Let's see if we have any questions or comments. Commissioner
25 Wright.

1 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No, no questions, but thank you
2 so much for your testimony.

3 MS. WURST: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Vice Chair Miller.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I
6 have no questions, but I do thank you, Ms. Wurst, for OAG's
7 engagement in this process and focus on one of the goals of the --
8 this overall text amendment -- omnibus text amendment to reduce
9 regulations that impede the production of housing or that might
10 impede the production of housing, especially affordable housing,
11 so I think that's, obviously, a very important Comprehensive Plan
12 priority, so I appreciate OAG's involvement on that issue.

13 MS. WURST: Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And I, too, want to express
15 my appreciation. It's always good to have another pair of eyes
16 on things that we're doing and another lens on exactly what we're
17 trying to achieve, and we appreciate you all's analyzation and
18 OAG's participation in this process, so thank you.

19 MS. WURST: Yes, of course. We think the links here,
20 you know, between the amendments and these goals are fairly clear,
21 be we'd like to do our best to, you know, continue to highlight
22 the importance of these goals to the public.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Great. Thank you. We
24 appreciate all you all do. Thank you. And you can send that
25 back to Mr. Schwalb and tell him we appreciate all the work that

1 | you all do. All right. Let's go to -- let's go to DDOT. I'm
2 | not sure who's here. Ms. Schellin, who do we have from DDOT?
3 | Let's see -- oh, Mr. Ozberk.

4 | MS. SCHELLIN: Noah Hagen.

5 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No. Who? Noah? Okay. We got two
6 | people from DDOT. Well, I'm not sure -- either Mr. Hagen or Mr.
7 | Ozberk, whoever's going to -- Ozberk -- whoever's going to do the
8 | DDOT report.

9 | MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Ozberk is just observing.

10 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, he's just observing. Okay. Mr.
11 | Hagen.

12 | MR. HAGEN: Good evening, Chairman Hood and members of
13 | the Commission. For the record, I'm Noah Hagen with the District
14 | Department of Transportation. DDOT has no objection to any of
15 | the four text amendments subject to tonight's hearing. In our
16 | October 16th report, which is in the record as Exhibit 16, we
17 | recommended approval, and my testimony focuses on the second item
18 | under discussion, the Priority Corridor Metrobus route update in
19 | Subtitle C, Section 702.

20 | The proposed amendment replaces the Priority Corridor
21 | Network routes in the parking regulations with the street
22 | corridors currently on WMATA's high-frequency network to
23 | replicate as closely as possible the logic that sites on core and
24 | frequent bus routes should have flexibility to reduce their
25 | vehicle parking provided, since residents onsite and employees

1 and other patrons have additional transportation options to get
2 there. The amendment does not limit how much parking can be
3 provided, but, rather, increases the flexibility to provide less
4 parking near transit without requesting zoning relief. DDOT
5 notes that the request from ANC 5E and 5F and supported by OAG
6 to also include segments of corridors along 14th Street
7 Northeast, Rhode Island Avenue Northeast, and Independence and
8 Pennsylvania Avenue Southeast would not change the eligibility
9 of properties along these corridors, since they already fall
10 within the quarter-mile buffer of other high-frequency network
11 bus routes or a half-mile radius of a Metrorail station, so
12 they're already eligible.

13 There were also requests in the record for the reduced
14 parking requirement to expand to additional corridors outside of
15 the high-frequency network, such as North Capitol Street and
16 South Dakota Avenue. While these corridors may see a cumulative
17 bus service frequency of 12 to 15 minutes or less, DDOT prefers
18 that WMATA's published high-frequency network is used, since
19 these routes provide frequent and all-day service. Thank you,
20 and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Hagen. We appreciate
22 the report. Let's see if we have any questions or comments.
23 Commissioner Wright.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No, no questions or comments.
25 Thanks for participating.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller.

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank
3 you, Mr. Hagen, for your testimony and participation here tonight
4 and the response to the -- expanding upon the response that Mr.
5 Lawson gave about why the additional segments being recommended
6 may -- it may not be necessary or prudent. Do you have any idea
7 how often DDOT or WMATA is going to alter -- review and alter
8 those high-priority corridors? Is there a set schedule or it's
9 just on an as-needed kind of basis?

10 MR. HAGEN: Yeah, so there's no set schedule. WMATA
11 is the agency that provides the -- that runs the bus service.
12 There's no set schedule, but, I mean, last time -- you know,
13 2016 was when this was first put together, and now, you know,
14 we're almost ten years after that, so -- and it was -- you know,
15 up until this year, it was pretty much still relevant. So it
16 seems like we're going at a rate of once every ten years, but
17 there's no set schedule.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Well, thank you. I
19 appreciate the response and appreciate your testimony here
20 tonight. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, and thank you, Mr. Hagen,
22 for that exchange with Vice Chair Miller. It doesn't give me
23 any concern, every ten years, so thank you. Every one -- every
24 year, every six months would be a different story, but ten years,
25 really -- I mean, I don't think that's a showstopper. So thank

1 | you all, and thank you, DDOT, for all the work you all have done
2 | as well.

3 | MR. HAGEN: Thank you.

4 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Ms. Schellin, do we
5 | have -- let's go to those organizations -- do we have any ANCs
6 | first? Let me do that first.

7 | MS. SCHELLIN: Let me check. Yes, we do. We have,
8 | first, Joe Bishop-Henchman from 5F. We have Gwendolyn Lohse from
9 | 2E.

10 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

11 | MS. SCHELLIN: And that's it for ANCs.

12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Let's bring up
13 | Commissioner Henchman and Commissioner Lohse, and we will go --
14 | let's go with Commissioner Henchman. I don't see Commissioner
15 | Lohse yet. All right. Commissioner Henchmen, you may proceed.

16 | COMMISSIONER BISHOP-HENCHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
17 | and members of the Committee. Can you hear me okay?

18 | (All Commissioners nod in agreement.)

19 | COMMISSIONER BISHOP-HENCHMAN: Perfect. As I mentioned
20 | previously, you know, we submitted on all of the amendments, and,
21 | for the most part, were very complimentary and supportive. Some
22 | of them have some conditions. And like most of the other people
23 | you're hearing from and organizations you're hearing from, we're
24 | supportive of the amendments under consideration tonight. We did
25 | have a condition on the Metrobus one, and, unfortunately, that

1 | seems to be an area where we're just in disagreement with some
2 | of the facts that OP has stated about the non-inclusion of three
3 | segments and the suggested inclusion of two others. So WMATA
4 | recently did their bus overhaul. I think that's been mentioned
5 | already. It was first overhaul of their bus-out network since
6 | 1973, so while there's a list that's updated every ten years, you
7 | know, in terms of the overhaul of the actual buses, it's been
8 | quite some time. And I guess, if they keep to that standard,
9 | the next time they'll do it is in 2077. I certainly hope it'll
10 | be before that, but certainly not every six months, Commissioner
11 | Hood, so you don't need to worry about that.

12 | I'm thankful to Commissioner Miller for asking OP
13 | for -- already for more information on why these segments were
14 | not included. OP's response really only addressed two of the
15 | five that we mentioned, the North Capitol Street segment and the
16 | South Dakota Avenue segment. In those cases, the service on
17 | those routes is 15 minutes. I acknowledge that, you know, it's
18 | a factual statement that those do not meet the 12-minute standard.
19 | We think they should be included, but, yes, those do not meet
20 | the 12-minute standard, so it would be about changing the standard
21 | for those. But for three other segments they do meet the
22 | standards; they do meet the criteria that have been laid out and
23 | it's simply incorrect to say that these segments don't meet the
24 | 12-minute standard. And one of those is the D-32 bus that runs
25 | on Rhode Island -- Rhode Island Avenue, a block from my house.

1 That used to be the G8. The G8 ran every 10 minutes. The D32
2 runs every ten minutes. There's been no change. It used to be
3 on the list. Now the proposal is that it not be on the list.

4 The same story is true about the D50 on 14th Street,
5 that bus runs every eight minutes; and with the D10 on
6 Independence and Pennsylvania, that runs every 10 minutes. All
7 these routes have daytime service. All these routes have evening
8 service. All these routes have weekend service. They meet OP's
9 criteria. Why are they being left out? Well, I ask OP, and OP
10 refers me to DDOT, and DDOT refers me to WMATA, and WMATA says,
11 "Look at our map." So, really, this is a -- this comes down to
12 some WMATA mapmaker has included some routes and not included
13 others, and it's scaling up to us here today.

14 Our community noticed this, because it used to be on
15 the old map and now it's not on the new map, and we're wondering
16 why it was. We have a theory about why these are being
17 accidentally left out, and it's something that actually all three
18 of these segments have in common and is not true anywhere else,
19 is that these routes have multiple service patterns. So, for
20 instance, on the D32, while they all run west of Rhode Island
21 Avenue on the segment that we're talking about, some of them --
22 every other bus ends at Rhode Island Avenue Metro Station, while
23 the other route goes -- continues on to Fort Lincoln. Now, all
24 of them still serve this segment, and together they have that 10-
25 minute service, but if you're looking just at a list of bus

1 routes, it looks like it's a 20-minute bus, but it's one route --
2 one bus route, the D32,, and it runs every 10 minutes in the
3 segment we're talking about, during rush hour; they have daytime
4 service, nighttime service, weekend service. And this is also
5 the case with 14th Street, where they have the D50 and the D5X,
6 and on Independence and Pennsylvania, where they have the D10 and
7 the D1X. So, in short, all three of these segments have buses
8 more frequent than every 12 minutes -- actually, every 10 minutes
9 or even eight minutes on 14th Street, so they should be included.

10 As for DDOT's statement that these areas are going to
11 be included anyways, that's simply not true. If you look at the
12 maps -- the shaded areas on the maps, you'll see that there are
13 areas that are being left out along these corridors due to this
14 change. So, for all these reasons, we're absolutely opposed to
15 moving forward on this amendment without fixing this significant
16 error, as it will be moving backwards from the existing regulation
17 where these segments are included. And, you know, the question's
18 a simple one; like, on these segments, is there a bus every 10
19 minutes or every -- you know, less than every 12 minutes, and the
20 answer is yes. And so, you know, I don't know who's saying that
21 that's not true, but it is true.

22 As I mentioned, we did suggest the inclusion of the
23 only two 15-minute routes in the city that are not already
24 included, and those are on North Capitol Street and South Dakota
25 Avenue. In the North Capitol case, that bus used to run every

1 12 minutes, and now will run every 15 minutes. It was downgraded
2 a little bit in the bus service changes recently. But our
3 position is that 15 minutes is still frequent bus service, and
4 it would -- and making this change would prevent another segment
5 that was already included in the previous regulation from being
6 omitted under the new regulation.

7 In closing, I just want to say I was very intrigued by
8 Commission Wright's suggestion of maybe coming up with some
9 reference documents, so that this -- you know, maybe she raised
10 that just out of concern about how frequently the routes will be
11 updated, but also it might shift this debate over whether this
12 route counts or not maybe away from -- you know, because at this
13 point it's the Commission relying on what OP says, who's relying
14 on what DDOT says, who's relying on what WMATA says, and it kind
15 of turtles all the way down. Why not just have a WMATA document
16 that we're all referencing, and I can go argue with WMATA if they
17 make a mistake? You know, that's, you know, maybe an argument
18 for what is -- for what Commissioner Wright suggested. An
19 argument against it would be, does that mean everybody else has
20 to do that too, and if a developer needs to know what's in this,
21 I mean, which of these people are they talking to, to get the
22 right answer? So, you know, we're -- as I said, we've been very
23 complimentary of OP's process and as all of you have been as
24 well. I'm a little saddened a bit that I have to disagree with
25 them on this, and, you know, I take comfort in the fact I'm not

1 | really disagreeing with them; I'm disagreeing with who in WMATA
2 | left this off their map and everyone else has been relying on
3 | it. But in terms of the facts are, you know, I'm happy to take
4 | any of you to the street and we can count how many buses come,
5 | but it's every 10 minutes on these segments. So I hope that we
6 | can adjust it and just add these segment back in, which,
7 | essentially, is preserving what already exists in the existing
8 | regulation. With that, I'll -- I'm happy to answer any questions,
9 | but I'll leave it there. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner Henchman.
11 | Mr. Lawson, I want you to put on our docket for us, I want more
12 | clarification on what 5F -- Commissioner Henchman was talking
13 | about, because I, too, lived in Rhode Island Avenue in the G8.
14 | I do, too, know about the 10 minutes. Sometimes when you're
15 | standing out there, you don't think it comes every 10 minutes or
16 | the bus comes every 10, but it does.

17 | COMMISSIONER BISHOP-HENCHMAN: They're scheduled every
18 | 10 minutes. They're not always 10 minutes.

19 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. Right, right, right. It's a
20 | schedule. So I think -- I think -- I'm not saying there's smoke,
21 | but sometimes where there's smoke, there is fire; there is truth
22 | to it. And I think Commissioner Henchman is dead on in his
23 | analysis, and I know -- I think there are two additional ones
24 | that I think 5F wants, and I think it has merit. So let's --
25 | and I'm not trying to hold up -- let's see how we can include

1 | it. And I'm sorry you had to go to OP, OP go to DDOT, DDOT go
2 | to WMATA, and then we just -- we're getting the runaround. So
3 | let's try to see if we can resolve that, OP. It's my ask. And
4 | let me hear from my colleagues. Commissioner Wright.

5 | COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah, I agree. I think, again,
6 | the key issue is that we want to include all the bus routes that
7 | meet the criteria, and the criteria -- one of the key parts of
8 | the criteria is less than 12-minute headways. And so we just
9 | need to clarify if these additional routes meet the criteria,
10 | and, if they do, they should be included. I guess that's the
11 | bottom line.

12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Vice Chair Miller,
13 | any questions.

14 | VICE CHAIR MILLER: No. Thank you, Commissioner
15 | Henchman -- Bishop-Henchman, and thank you to my colleagues. I
16 | agree with your comments, that they should take -- OP, DDOT, need
17 | to take another look at this. But in the end these are our
18 | parking regulations. And the goal was to allow the reduction of
19 | parking in the corridors that meet criteria, and if it didn't
20 | somehow meet WMATA's, because it's overlapping buses -- these are
21 | our parking regulations. If we're going to specify and we need
22 | to add something that meets the criteria, I think we should look
23 | at that carefully and do it. So I agree with my colleagues.
24 | Thank you.

25 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And it shouldn't take us five

1 | years to get this done. I think we can do this very quickly.
2 | And, again, thank you, Commissioner Henschman. You're probably
3 | saying, "Well, what are you talking about, Chairman Hood? You
4 | ain't doing no work." But, anyway, I shouldn't have said that.
5 | All right. Ms. Schellin, where is Commissioner Lohse? Is she
6 | on?

7 | MS. SCHELLIN: Let's see if she has gotten on yet. I
8 | did not see her.

9 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

10 | MS. SCHELLIN: I still do not see her.

11 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I remember you said she
12 | was on to testify. Let's go to persons in support.

13 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. So in support, I have Dennis
14 | Sendros, from DC YIMBY; Ike Ranin (phonetic), Parking Reform
15 | Network; Lan Margosis; and one more, Pete Rodrigues (phonetic)
16 | or Rodrigue maybe.

17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Let's start with
18 | Mr. Sendros, DC Yes In My Back Yard.

19 | MR. SENDROS: Hello. Can you hear me all right this
20 | time?

21 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, we can.

22 | MR. SENDROS: Awesome. Thank you so much. So thank
23 | you, Chairman Hood, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Wright, for
24 | the opportunity to speak today. I know -- I do want to note, I
25 | know continuing to work during the shutdown requires extra

1 commitment from each of you, and I just want to take a moment to
2 thank you for that as well. I'm here again representing DC
3 YIMBYs, a volunteer-led organization dedicated to ending the
4 housing shortage in DC and promoting affordability by building
5 more homes.

6 Today we submitted formal written comments to the
7 record making it clear that we support 22 out of the 24 omnibus
8 proposals, including all four of the proposals being discussed
9 today, although, in some cases, like the bus priority proposal,
10 we do have suggestions for improvements. I want to take a moment
11 to explain why DC YIMBYs, a housing organization, is concerned
12 about these parking issues.

13 Parking requirements raise housing costs, they suppress
14 home building, they lock in car dependence and greenhouse gas
15 emissions. They're also unnecessary. Parking is a valuable
16 amenity, and, if residents want it, builders will provide it.
17 Forcing homebuilders to include unwanted parking in their
18 developments means many homes simply don't get built, and that
19 leads to rising housing costs, but parking, itself, eats up space
20 that could be used for housing and can add thousands of dollars
21 per space, sometimes tens of thousands, if a parking structure
22 is required, not to mention the upkeep and compliance costs that
23 OAG mentioned.

24 And car ownership isn't required in DC. Thirty-six
25 percent of DC residents don't own a car. I lived in DC for 15

1 | years without a car. Another 31 percent of DC residents drive
2 | infrequently. I'm now in this bucket. I drive less than once a
3 | week and owning a car is a little silly, to be honest with you,
4 | but here I am. This is possible because of a robust and effective
5 | transit system. Many people get around the city from home to
6 | work to other places they need to go by walking, biking, taking
7 | the bus or Metro.

8 | I'll note that this week Baltimore virtually ended
9 | parking mandates citywide. It joins Minneapolis, Denver, San
10 | Francisco, Portland, and a number of other cities. These cities
11 | still have parking included in new developments, but, where we
12 | have data, we can see that the elimination of parking mandates
13 | has reduced building costs, it's increased walkability and
14 | transit usage, it's boosted revenue from paid parking. The
15 | proposals being discussed today, of course, don't go nearly as
16 | far as eliminating parking mandates, but they begin to take steps
17 | to promote housing affordability, and that's why we support them.

18 | So I'll speak specifically in support of the first two
19 | proposals today. The first one about the ZR-16 approved vehicle
20 | parking requirements, we support this change. OP made changes
21 | to parking requirements in the ZR-16 regulations, after extensive
22 | study with DDOT, discussions with the task force, public
23 | hearings, and it is long past time that these reductions were
24 | allowed to take effect citywide. Eliminating this requirement
25 | doesn't eliminate any parking spaces; it just allows affected

1 | landowners to use their property the same way any other landowner
2 | in DC is allowed to use their property currently.

3 | And on the second proposal, the Priority Corridor
4 | Metrobus route update, Commissioner Bishop-Henchman has already
5 | discussed the issue, laid out, I think, very succinctly why the
6 | current map doesn't properly incorporate some of the routes that
7 | meet all of OP's criteria, and we support the changes 5F has
8 | proposed, including the suggestion to increase the headway
9 | criteria to 15 minutes.

10 | I will note that I live along the 14th Street corridor
11 | that would actually be affected, that, you know, is the subject
12 | of one of these routes that isn't covered, and the buses run
13 | frequently enough on my corridor that I don't bother checking the
14 | time table when I go out to catch one. That's the definition of
15 | where we don't need the same level of parking here that we do
16 | where no transit is available.

17 | Thank you for your time today. I will note that, in
18 | addition to our comments today, there are about 55 letters in the
19 | case record from DC residents supporting these proposals,
20 | including the changes to the high-frequency bus corridors, so you
21 | have ample community input here, and we hope you'll prioritize
22 | housing affordability when making decisions on these proposals.
23 | Thank you so much.

24 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. If you can hold tight --
25 | we're going to try to finish with the whole panel -- we may have

1 | some questions for you. I believe the next person is Margosis --
2 | Lan Margosis. Hopefully, I didn't mispronounce your name.

3 | LAN MARGOSIS: Hi. Good evening. I think you can hear
4 | me.

5 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.

6 | MR. MARGOSIS: I'm not sure if you can see me yet.

7 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No, we can't see you yet. There you
8 | go. We can see you.

9 | LAN MARGOSIS: Good evening, Chairperson Hood, members
10 | of the Commission. Thank you very much for the opportunity to
11 | testify this evening. I'm testifying as a community member.
12 | Sorry, I've got the timer going off. One sec.

13 | (Brief pause.)

14 | LAN MARGOSIS: So sorry about that. I'm testifying as
15 | a community member. I grew up in the region. I love, love, love
16 | living in DC. I'm a renter in Columbia Heights, and, like one
17 | in three other Washingtonian households, I don't have a car. I
18 | used to have one, but found that I really didn't need it, and
19 | it's been a huge relief being able to not have the stress of the
20 | car and, truly, not having the stress of the cost of the car. In
21 | this housing and cost-of-living crisis, it saves me thousands of
22 | dollars a year, which is huge. Even if I wanted a car again,
23 | which I don't, I wouldn't be able to afford it, like many of the
24 | other individuals and families living here in DC.

25 | I'm grateful to be able to take our world-class public

1 transit to get to where I need to go every day. As a frequent
2 Metrobus rider, I'm in strong support of the proposal to reduce
3 parking minimums, which will better align parking rules with
4 actual transit access. Like others on the call have mentioned,
5 I am also concerned about the proposal that would remove several
6 current segments from inclusion along the priority corridors.

7 I also live along the 14th Street bus lines and have
8 had, you know, similar experiences as Mr. Sendros. I don't need
9 to check the time tables. I don't need to stress that the buses
10 are going to come or not. I just know they will. I'm in favor
11 of restoring the omitted segments on 14th Street, Rhode Island
12 Ave, and Independence Avenue. I'm in favor of increasing the
13 minimum to 15 minutes or less on peak rush hour. This is
14 important, because the buses take me and other Washingtonians
15 where we need to go. These routes all connect to multiple
16 Metrorail stations, to key employment and commercial areas, and
17 most of them also connect to downtown. So I'm in favor of
18 modifying the proposal to reinclude all of these segments again.
19 And thank you again. I appreciate the opportunity to testify
20 this evening.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. If you can hold tight,
22 we may have some questions for you as well. I think the last
23 person, Ms. Schellin, is Pete Ragu (phonetic). Anyway, if you
24 could come on and help me -- help me and Ms. Schellin pronounce
25 your name correctly. First name is Pete. Maybe they had to

1 leave.

2 MS. SCHELLIN: It looks like he may have closed himself
3 out, instead of --

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: We must have did a bad job
5 pronouncing his name. Oh, there he is.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, there he is.

7 MR. RODRIGUE: Okay. Sorry. Can you hear me?

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. Yes.

9 MR. RODRIGUE: Okay. Apologies. I made Webex angry.
10 Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I'll keep this brief. My
11 name's Pete Rodrigue. It's a French Cajun name. My family's
12 from -- originally from Louisiana. I live in a coop in Lanier
13 Heights in DC. I actually used to live in Woodridge and would
14 occasionally take the G8 to get downtown. Yeah, but I've lived
15 in DC for almost ten years now, and I like it a lot. I'm not
16 going to talk about the screening requirements or the garage door
17 setback fixes. Those seem great. I'm in support of those. I
18 just wanted to quickly speak about the parking regulations that
19 would affect sort of older buildings. Those are great. My only
20 criticism is I wish this all would go further, as kind of Dennis
21 alluded to. You know, a lot of forward-thinking places are
22 removing their parking minimums for a very good reason, because
23 it can inflate the cost of housing. I live in a 398-square foot
24 studio, and if houses were cheaper, I would live in a slightly
25 bigger place, now that I'm 33 years old. Yeah, so I'm a fan of

1 | those. On the WMATA question, yeah, I work in Federal Triangle.
2 | I'm not -- but my thoughts are my own here. I'm not speaking on
3 | behalf of my employer. I also -- I will take, you know, the
4 | bus -- if I'm not biking or whatever, I'll take the bus home
5 | often, because to take the Red Line, it goes to Woodley Park,
6 | and I have to walk a ways, and if you can just go straight up
7 | 14th, that's kind of nice. That area of Columbia Heights is,
8 | like, a little more walkable and pleasant than crossing
9 | Connecticut Avenue. And, yeah, it just seems, as a layperson,
10 | like, if the bus that takes -- if a bus that takes you where you
11 | want to go comes every 10 minutes, it feels like that should meet
12 | the threshold. So I'm glad it sounds like people are thinking
13 | about sort of making sure that ambiguity is cleared up, and,
14 | yeah, I just wanted to echo what Joe said earlier, that that
15 | sounds like a good idea. Thanks for your time. I appreciate
16 | the chance to testify.

17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. I'm going to say this
18 | about every last one of the witnesses. You all were very
19 | enthusiastic and happy about transportation in this city, and
20 | that came over -- across very well. And Mr. -- how do you
21 | pronounce your name again, Rodrigue?

22 | MR. RODRIGUE: Rodrigue. Rodrigue.

23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Rodrigue. Rodrigue. Mr. Rodrigue.

24 | MR. RODRIGUE: Yeah.

25 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I, too, work in the Federal

1 Triangle, and I understand, so we probably have some similarities
2 there.

3 MR. RODRIGUE: Yeah.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I was glad to hear Lan Margosis
5 talk about the car, and it took me back to when I was raised.
6 You know, I think I heard that testimony before, not having to
7 pay insurance, not having -- I don't want a car, and it just --
8 it just shows the change in the times. And one thing I've learned
9 to do was be able to adapt, and I appreciate hearing that as
10 well. And, Mr. Sendros, you know how I feel about you all, Yes
11 In My Back Yard. I'm still getting -- I'm still getting
12 accustomed to that name, because I had not -- like my other
13 colleagues, I had not heard about it. But, anyway, that's all I
14 have to say. I appreciate you all's enthusiasm and your
15 testimony, and we're going to continue to try to make the best
16 decision possible as we can, so thank you all for taking the
17 time. Commissioner Wright.

18 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I appreciate the testimony, and
19 I really don't have any other questions. I think living a car-
20 free life is fantastic. I have a child who lives a car-free life
21 a different city, and, you know, it's all about good public
22 transportation. So, yeah, I think that, you know, again, where
23 we have good public transportation, we should be reducing parking
24 ratios. It's just -- it just makes sense. So it's a matter of
25 making sure we're factually doing -- getting the correct

1 information and putting the parking reductions in the right
2 places, and that's sort of a technical issue that we just need
3 to work out. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Vice Chair Miller.

5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank
6 you, Mr. Sendros and Mr. Margosis and Mr. Rodrigue, for your
7 testimony. I, too, appreciate the emphasis on the relationship
8 between good public transit and the need for -- or lack of need
9 for parking and the cost that that entails and how that affects
10 the production of housing and affordable housing, so I think it's
11 important to -- we always do keep affordable housing and housing
12 at the top of our mind, because at the top of the Comprehensive
13 Plan is civic priorities. And, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your
14 adaptability, and we all listen and learn, and we continue to
15 listen and learn. You know, I've been here long enough that I
16 think in the -- some original proposal from the Office of
17 Planning -- I don't know if it ever was formally presented to
18 us -- but parking minimums were eliminated, and there was such
19 an outcry from some of your fellow -- our fellow citizens, that
20 we went to a different way of reducing the parking minimums in
21 certain high-transit neighborhoods. So we're listening and
22 learning and learning by experience as to what's happening in the
23 District, so appreciate all of your work.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. And I want to piggyback off
25 of that. You're right. We are listening and we are learning,

1 | because I know I was one of the ones who was screaming and
2 | hollering myself, but I had to adapt, and my grandkids are
3 | teaching me that. So that's just the way that goes, so I think
4 | we all have to -- we can't stay stuck where we are; you know,
5 | things are going to move and we need to move along with them, as
6 | we progress. So thank you all. We appreciate that. Appreciate
7 | that. All right. Ms. Schellin, do we -- I think we got everybody
8 | in opposition, right -- I mean, in support.

9 | MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah, we got everybody in support. Yes,
10 | sir. There's only one more -- only one more witness, and that's
11 | Shelly Repp.

12 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: In support or --

13 | MS. SCHELLIN: In opposition.

14 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: In opposition. Okay.

15 | MS. SCHELLIN: Uh-huh, one more for this evening, and
16 | that's it.

17 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's it? Okay. Well, let's bring
18 | up Mr. Repp.

19 | MS. SCHELLIN: Uh-huh.

20 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Repp, whenever
21 | you're ready, you may begin.

22 | MR. REPP: Okay. Can you hear me now?

23 | CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, we can.

24 | MR. REPP: Okay. Good evening, Commissioners. My name
25 | is Shelly Repp. I'm testifying on behalf of the Committee of

1 100, and I'm addressing the text amendments that are on this
2 calendar for tonight. The Committee of 100's written submission
3 is -- concerning these amendments is posted at Exhibit 99. The
4 Committee of 100 has been limiting our written comments in each
5 of the six hearings to those proposals that are the subject of
6 each hearing. This evening I will focus on the -- just
7 principally on proposals that address parking; in other words,
8 nine and ten.

9 Before getting specific, the Committee of 100 believes
10 the Commission should address the racial equity considerations
11 involved in these proposals. Racial equity was not even mentioned
12 in the OAG's testimony, and it was glossed over in the Office of
13 Planning's testimony. And with respect to the people that have
14 testified tonight, I'm particularly going to focus on racial
15 equity as it applies to people living in Wards 7 and 8. We have
16 three people that were just witnesses a few minutes ago. They
17 all live on 14th Street. Their situation is entirely different
18 than people that live in Wards 7 and 8.

19 Having a car is important for almost all DC residents,
20 but -- obviously, not all, but almost all. Having a car is a
21 necessity for many living in Wards 7 and 8. Brookings has found
22 that, for DC residents, a majority of the jobs are not accessible
23 by Metro within a reasonable commute, and that access to jobs is
24 a critical component for providing low-income households with a
25 pathway to higher incomes. According to the Office of Planning,

1 Ward 7 has the highest percentage of residents who use a car to
2 report to work -- I think it's 50.4 percent -- followed by Ward
3 8, which is 47.4 percent. This is -- this is likely the result,
4 at least in part, of a mismatch between the location of low-
5 interest (sic) residents and suitable job opportunities, which
6 are often located in suburban areas accessible by car.

7 The Office of Planning has stated previously that while
8 those living in Wards 7 and 8 have the longest average commute
9 times to work via -- commute times to work via public transport
10 compared to other Wards and District average, their average
11 commute time using cars is about the same as those living in
12 other wards. The DC Policy Center has found that neighborhoods
13 with a higher proportion of Black residents are more likely to
14 be -- more likely to be in neighborhoods where car-free living
15 is less feasible.

16 According to our census, 82,000 DC residents work in
17 Alexandria, Arlington, PG County, and Montgomery County. Using
18 public transport to get to many of these locations is particularly
19 challenging for those living in Wards 7 and 8. Based on the
20 data -- and I could offer more -- reduced parking is -- as
21 proposed, does not pass the racial equity test. Where is the
22 data supporting the proposals? I think it's entirely missing.
23 Those needing a car need to have a place to park it. Reducing
24 parking has the unintended effect of discriminating against the
25 low-income residents in Wards 7 and 8, who are predominantly

1 Black and Brown. It is for this reason that we are surprised
2 that racial equity issues have not been raised more than they
3 have.

4 Also, I think we should not forget the COVID pandemic.
5 As you will remember, people just a couple years ago avoided
6 public transport like a plague. Back then, people needed a car
7 to get to work. This alternative may be needed again. In that
8 case, there will need to be the transportation infrastructure,
9 including parking, to support automobile use.

10 As for the specific proposals coming up tonight,
11 amendment nine proposes the deletion of a rule adopted in 2016,
12 when parking requirements were reduced. The effect of the
13 proposal would be to reduce parking minimums in some cases. The
14 2016 rule provides that existing parking not be reduced if the
15 use that generated the parking remains. Back in 2016, the Office
16 of Planning stated that this provision addressed public concern
17 over the rapid loss of parking. OP -- the Office of Planning
18 has provided no justification for changing the position it took
19 in 2016. In our view, these views are -- these considerations
20 and concerns are still valid.

21 The Office of the Attorney General states that the
22 amendment will provide flexibility for landowners to convert
23 unneeded parking spaces to more productive uses by expanding the
24 property's building use or landscaping. In response -- in our
25 response, the text amendment does not require a showing that the

1 parking space is unneeded, nor is there any requirement on how
2 the use -- the use be freed -- on use of the space that's freed
3 up. If the Commission decides to seriously consider this
4 proposal, the repurposed parking space that would be eliminated
5 should benefit the community, not just the landlord. At the very
6 least, such a proposal to reduce parking should require special
7 exception review, where the tenants and neighbors can give their
8 input and argue for community benefits in exchange for the parking
9 reduction.

10 The Office of Planning states that the current zoning
11 requirement could be unnecessarily restricted and limit options
12 for repurposing or converting the building from a use with a
13 lower parking requirement to one that would have a higher parking
14 requirement. This is not a valid position, since the current
15 regulation does not even apply in cases where the building's use
16 is changed.

17 In proposal ten, I must say that I agree with -- I want
18 to emphasize what Commissioner Miller said. This -- while it
19 talks about bus corridors, this is really a parking requirement.
20 In proposal ten, the Office of Planning is requiring -- is
21 proposing to replace the reference to Priority Bus Lane corridors
22 in the current regulations with a reference to the new high-
23 frequency bus corridors. While this makes sense, wouldn't it be
24 better to merely reference the standards or criteria OP used,
25 headways of 12 minutes or less during peak, weekend, and nighttime

1 service and connections to Metro? Bus routes and schedules may
2 change again, and this approach provides for regulatory
3 adaptability. And I also should say, with Metro perhaps looking
4 at funding challenges going forward, they may reduce all these
5 times that would qualify bus routes as being -- as being high-
6 frequency bus routes.

7 So the Office of Planning is also proposing a change
8 to the minimum parking requirement for properties located on a
9 street where participation in the -- in the residential parking
10 permit program is not permitted. We -- the wording of the
11 existing provision is hard to fathom for us. The Committee of
12 100 opposes any reduction in the minimum parking requirement for
13 properties on streets not eligible for parking. In conclusion,
14 the Committee of 100 asks that the Commission reject proposal
15 number nine and revise proposal number 10, as discussed. I'm
16 available to answer any questions.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Repp and to the
18 Committee. We appreciate your testimony, but what I appreciate
19 most is your outlines in all of your submissions, which makes it
20 very easy for me to see what the issue is, what we're talking
21 about, where you all are, and, also, what you all recommend, so
22 thank you all for doing it that way. Let's see if we have any
23 questions or comments. Commissioner Wright.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: So perhaps I'm misunderstanding.
25 My understanding of number nine, the first one, is that the idea

1 is that if there is a change of use, you simply have to meet the
2 parking that is for that new use. And so it seems -- you know,
3 again, Mr. Lawson, in his presentation, I think affirmed that,
4 that the idea is simply to have buildings provide the parking
5 that is currently required for the use that they are putting the
6 building to. That seems pretty straightforward to me. Am I
7 missing something? I mean, I just -- I don't quite understand
8 if you're seeing this in a different way.

9 MR. REPP: Well, I do see it in a different way, and
10 let me explain. First of all, you know, my read of the proposed
11 regulation is that if there's a change in use, that the --
12 whatever parking requirement, higher or lower, that would apply
13 to that use, that would -- that would govern. What I think is
14 the real problem with this -- with this proposal is that, back
15 in 2016, what the Office of -- and with the Office of Planning's
16 support, in 2016 parking requirements were reduced. But
17 what -- there was a -- there was -- the regulation that we're
18 talking about here said that if it was higher -- if the parking
19 requirements were higher prior to 2016, that those higher
20 provisions would be retained. And it was -- it's because of
21 possible public outcry when parking requirements are reduced. So
22 does that help you?

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Well, I hear what you're saying.
24 Again, what I'm sort of struggling with a little bit is, you
25 know, if there was a high-generating use -- let's say it was a

1 retail use, which generally is -- generates a lot of parking, and
2 that retail use, for whatever reason, went away, and the space
3 that had been retail was converted to apartments, which have a
4 lower parking use, why would we ask for all of the excess parking
5 that a retail use might have required to be retained, even if
6 the new use -- again, let's just call it residential, you know,
7 apartments for the moment -- why would we ask for that extra
8 parking to be retained, even if the current use wasn't going to
9 need it?

10 MR. REPP: I mean, once again, I don't believe that's
11 what the -- this proposal says. I mean, if the use changes, the
12 parking applicable to the new use, whether it be higher or lower,
13 would apply. But what if we had a -- back in 2016, the parking --
14 the required parking for residential uses was reduced, but what
15 the -- what the regulation that we're talking about here provided
16 is, that basically protected people that were subject to the --
17 I mean, buildings that were subject to the higher pre-2016 parking
18 requirement, because of concern, which OP stated at the time,
19 they were concerned about the outcry from residents. So it's a
20 change -- it's not a change in use. It's solely a residential
21 building that will be subject with what requirement; the higher
22 requirement that was applicable before 2016 or the lower one that
23 might be applicable now? Which one applies?

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: So, again -- and we may have to
25 come back to Mr. Lawson to get clarification on this -- you know,

1 | it was my understanding, if there is a residential building and
2 | it stays a residential building -- maybe it changes in some way;
3 | maybe they, you know, go from rental to co-op or they go from,
4 | you know, larger units to smaller units or, you know, whatever
5 | it is, that they would still have to meet whatever the residential
6 | requirements are today. And that makes sense because, you know,
7 | when change is made to a building, you're generally required to
8 | meet current codes and current parking requirements. But, you
9 | know, there is a change in use, like the example I was giving,
10 | where maybe a retail space hasn't been leased and they convert
11 | that retail space to residential, why wouldn't you, of course,
12 | say residential requires less parking; you can take some of those
13 | parking units and create a -- you know, a gym for the residents
14 | or you can create some other beneficial use of the space. I
15 | mean, that's my understanding of what the text amendment -- the
16 | number nine is about, but maybe I'm -- you know, again -- and
17 | we'll get back to Mr. Lawson, but maybe I'm misunderstanding.
18 | That's my understanding of what nine is trying to get at.

19 | MR. REPP: Yeah. What our testimony said, when I said
20 | tonight, is that if there's a change in use, that this -- that
21 | the new -- the parking applicable to the new use would apply.
22 | And what I heard Lawson -- Joel Lawson say was that he --
23 | actually, he thought there was some ambiguity in the regulations,
24 | so he wanted to clarify it. But what I'm getting at -- what the
25 | Committee of 100 is getting at here, if you have a residential

1 building with no change in use that's subject to the pre-2016
2 rules that -- and the parking there was protected under the 2016
3 change, that that should -- that should not -- that should --
4 that that protection should continue. That's what I'm getting
5 at.

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: And I agree. If you have a
7 residential building that has a certain number of parking units
8 and they aren't doing anything, they're not converting to condo
9 or co-op, they're not, you know, doing -- they're not doing
10 anything, then they should just have the parking that they have
11 and not be able to -- you know, to do less parking. I thought
12 of this as an option for, you know, when there was a change,
13 recognizing -- change in use, recognizing that there might be a
14 whole different parking regiment, but, again, maybe Mr. Lawson
15 can address that after we -- after we finish the testimony portion
16 of this -- of this meeting.

17 MR. REPP: Yeah, I think we're in agreement here, so
18 thank you. So -- and, by the way, I totally agree with you --
19 with your statement the other night. There's an awful lot of
20 stuff that's going through right now; these 24 amendments,
21 there's Cleveland Park, Woodley Park, you know, there's an awful
22 lot, you know, and -- too much, actually, so I'll stop there.

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: It is pretty exhausting, no
24 question.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller.

1 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, thank you, Shelly Repp and
2 the Committee of 100 for all of your active engagement in this
3 case and so many other cases. I appreciated your recent statement
4 about the recent atrocity happening at the White House. That's
5 not part of this record; it's a gratuitous comment, but I want
6 to agree with you on something. Very strongly agree with you on
7 that statement.

8 I appreciate the dialogue that Commissioner Wright had
9 with you and your testimony. I hadn't (indiscernible) on the RPP
10 deletion until you said it, and I went back and looked at the
11 proposal, and so -- and I'll look forward to Mr. Lawson's
12 response, whether it's this evening or later, to your dialogue
13 with Commissioner Wright. But I will just say that, you know,
14 if that pre-existing building -- if people aren't using that
15 minimum required parking -- if there's a whole floor -- a whole
16 level, for example, that isn't being used and could be used for
17 maybe more residential units or amenities serving for the
18 residents, that should happen. I mean, the market does take care
19 of a lot of things that we try to regulate, so I'll just make
20 that comment, but if you want to comment in reaction, that's
21 fine, but I thank you and the Committee of 100.

22 MR. REPP: Yeah. As I said, I mean, there's no -- I
23 mean, what if -- what if the parking was needed, right? There's
24 no -- there's no test here in this reduction in the parking
25 requirement that the -- that the -- that there's unneeded parking

1 space. And most -- as far as, you know, my experience is that
2 most parking spaces are utilized, so --

3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, that was my point. What if
4 it isn't needed though and --

5 MR. REPP: Well, that could be -- there could be a --
6 you know, there could be a carve out for that, if it's not needed,
7 so -- but, you know, I would -- I would assume that landlords
8 would say -- the landowners would say that the parking is not
9 needed, and the many tenants would say that it is needed. That's
10 the tension here between the tenants and the landowners, so --
11 and we got to -- and is there a way to basically address that in
12 a way that's equitable for both, so --

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, they want to keep tenants.
14 If the tenants are demanding parking, I think they'll provide it,
15 but maybe they'll get different tenants that don't need parking.
16 Maybe that's what your point is.

17 MR. REPP: No.

18 VICE CHAIR MILLER: All right. So --

19 MR. REPP: I was saying Ward 7 and 8 is harder. It's
20 harder for people to get away without having cars and parking,
21 so --

22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Understood. Thank you very much.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. Mr. Repp, I appreciate
24 your testimony and coming out and providing this information. I
25 do have some thoughts about Wards 7 and 8, and I heard your

1 | comments, but, again, as I said, we were doing parking minimums.
2 | These are real life situations. We live it. We can come down
3 | here and talk all this hoopla and hypothesis all we want, but we
4 | live this stuff. We know what's going on. And I do have -- I
5 | do have some opinions on this, but let me just see where we go,
6 | but let me ask this first, before Mr. Repp goes. Mr. Lawson,
7 | did you want to respond to that exchange that -- or did you want
8 | to do it later or -- I want to leave it up to you. If you're
9 | able to do it now, I think it would be better, but if you need
10 | to do it later, we'll do it later.

11 | MR. LAWSON: Sure. Hi. I'm happy to try to provide a
12 | response. It's kind of hard to choose what to respond to from
13 | that discussion, but I think to get to Commissioner Wright's
14 | original question of what the intent of the provision is and what
15 | the intent of OP's change is, so the current provision is intended
16 | to lock in stone parking requirements from the 1958 regulations
17 | for buildings that exist within the city that were built under
18 | those regulations. So that's what makes it really odd, you know.

19 | Like, in most cases, as I said, you know, we require
20 | that people conform to the regulations that the Zoning Commission
21 | has adopted, not the set of regulations that some other body has
22 | adopted in the past. So with regards to how this would play out,
23 | you know, in -- you know, if this change was adopted, it would
24 | apply to either -- it would apply to any building, basically,
25 | that was built under the 1958 regulations where there was parking

1 space that the owner of the property felt was not being utilized
2 and could be utilized in some better way, providing more green
3 space on the property, providing amenity to residents, whatever
4 that might be. That would apply for a residential building, so
5 that the residential building would have to comply to the ZR-16
6 regulations.

7 It gets a little bit murkier, in my conversations with
8 DoB, with regards to a building that's changing use. DoB feels
9 that the provisions that exist in the regulations right now are
10 not sufficiently clear and could be interpreted as applying to a
11 building that is changing use, so as in the example you pointed
12 out, the retail parking requirement for the former use of the
13 building that's being converted to something else could continue
14 to apply to the new building. It's just uncertain, it's
15 unnecessary, and it doesn't make sense.

16 But with regards to Wards 7 and 8, I thought I had
17 addressed this in my testimony. Perhaps the Committee of 100
18 wasn't -- didn't hear me, but I think I pointed out that the
19 reason for the change in Wards 7 and 8 is the same as the reason
20 for the change everywhere else. The routes, themselves, are
21 changing, so there are more properties and different properties
22 that will now be close to -- a quarter-mile is really close --
23 to a high-priority bus corridor. You know, the parking provisions
24 beyond that, you know, for the rest of the District that are not
25 within one of those corridor areas, would not change, so the

1 existing parking requirement would continue to apply.

2 Within that corridor, where there is a real alternative
3 to car ownership, we feel that building owners should not have
4 to provide parking that's not wanted, and the owners of the
5 building should not have to pay for parking that they don't want.
6 So, absolutely, there will be some residents who want to own a
7 car; there will be lots of options for people in all parts of
8 the city who want to -- want to continue to own a car. The gist
9 here is that people shouldn't have to be paying for that parking
10 if they're not using it. So I don't know that answers -- if that
11 addresses all of your questions or even any of them, but that
12 would be my comment at this point.

13 MR. REPP: I think for me -- I mean, the racial
14 equity --

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Hold on.

16 MR. LAWSON: I'm happy to have a conversation with the
17 Commission -- I'm happy to have a conversation with you any time
18 you'd like to outside of a Commission process, but it's out of
19 order for us to have a conversation back and forth at this point.

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Lawson.
21 I like your chairmanship, man, because I wanted him to make sure
22 that Ms. -- Commissioner Wright was okay. Commissioner Wright,
23 let me come to you, and you heard from Mr. Lawson.

24 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. No, that's helpful in
25 explaining the current proposal. Again, sometimes I like to just

1 repeat it back, so that I understand exactly what I'm hearing.
2 So you're basically saying that an existing residential building
3 built before 1958 and that has a certain parking requirement
4 keeps that parking requirement; is that correct?

5 MR. LAWSON: Under the current regulations, that is
6 correct. Under what we're proposing, a building would be able
7 to conform to the 19 -- or sorry -- to the 2016 regulations,
8 which, in most cases, are lower. In some cases, the parking
9 requirement actually went up from ZR-58 to ZR-16, but those are
10 pretty infrequent kinds of circumstances. In most cases, the
11 parking requirement could go -- could go down. Under the existing
12 regulation, that building has to keep all those parking spaces,
13 whether they're needed or not. Under the proposal, those parking
14 spaces can be kept, you know, if the owner of the building wants
15 to keep them, or if they wanted to reduce the number of parking
16 spaces, presumably because they aren't being properly used --
17 parking spaces are really valuable; you know, they cost a lot to
18 build and are --

19 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Absolutely. Uh-huh.

20 MR. LAWSON: -- frankly, a good revenue generator, you
21 know, for owners of buildings. They're not going to just reduce
22 parking, you know, in their building on a whim. That seems to
23 be -- some people seem to think they would. We have not seen
24 that, and we wouldn't expect that to happen. This really deals
25 with circumstances where the parking is not desired, is not well

1 used, and they're looking for some other way to use it. And,
2 again, from my conversations with DoB, the change that we're
3 proposing would also deal with instances where a building is
4 being converted from a use that has a higher intensity of parking
5 to one that has a lower intensity of parking, which is --

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Which was example that I gave of
7 retail going to residential.

8 MR. LAWSON: Yes, exactly.

9 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: So my example about retail going
10 to residential was accurate, but, in addition to that, if there's
11 an existing residential building, it's saying you can meet the
12 2016 parking standards, and if you have excess parking spaces,
13 you can repurpose those.

14 MR. LAWSON: Yes, as a -- as a new building being built
15 would conform to the 2016 regulations.

16 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Great. But it's not saying that
17 they don't have to do any parking; it's just saying that you have
18 to meet 2016 standards, not 1958 standards.

19 MR. LAWSON: Correct. Correct.

20 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Got it.

21 MR. LAWSON: But I would say --

22 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: That's very clear.

23 MR. LAWSON: Yeah. I think the intent of the
24 regulations is -- as both you and Mr. Repp pointed out, I think
25 these regulations are intended that if you're converting a

1 building, when you convert it, you use the parking requirements
2 for that new use. The problem is that the provisions in the
3 regulations provide some ambiguity there, and I -- and DoB felt
4 that they could lead to some confusion and some problems with
5 administering the provision.

6 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: That's great. I mean, I think
7 all of this conversation, essentially, just helps everyone
8 understand exactly what it is we're talking about. And I -- you
9 know, again, from what you've described -- and it may be an area
10 where Mr. Repp and I don't agree -- I agree that existing
11 buildings -- you know, just as, you know, when they modernize,
12 they're required to put in modern sprinkler systems, they should
13 only have to do modern parking requirements as well.

14 And, you know, again, I think there's a practical
15 aspect to it, because, you know, a lot of parking -- some of
16 it, it is integrated into the building, some of it may be surface
17 parking, but a lot of the parking isn't easily reused. And so
18 to make that decision to abandon some parking spaces and reuse
19 them for something, that's -- I think that's going to be a -- I
20 don't know that that's going to be a frequent decision of a
21 landlord. Honestly, in my dealings in development review, most
22 landlords want to keep as much parking as they can. If they have
23 it, they want to keep it. You know, and, again, if it's
24 structured parking, it's really hard to reuse it for something,
25 you know, other than maybe, you know, a workout room or -- I

1 mean, there aren't necessarily always really great ways to reuse
2 parking. Surface parking is another issue. But, honestly, again,
3 we don't have a lot of that in residential buildings in most of
4 the District. Some of the District -- certainly, garden
5 apartments -- there are some garden apartments and so forth that
6 do have it, but okay. Thank you. I think you've -- I've gotten
7 the clarification I needed. Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller. Anybody
9 else have anything else that we need to --

10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I have nothing further to say. I
11 thank Commissioner -- Joel Lawson for your responses and
12 responsiveness and bringing forward these amendments as part of
13 this case. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Repp. And,
15 Mr. Lawson, thank you for coming back and having that colloquy
16 and that discussion with Commissioner Wright and all of us. Thank
17 you. All right. Ms. Schellin, do we have anyone else?

18 MS. SCHELLIN: No other witnesses.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So what I have on my list -- I've
20 been keeping a list and we can still talk about them, but things
21 that I think that -- and I know we don't want to vote on right
22 now -- we're not going to do that, but things that I think are
23 pretty straightforward, I have number 8, GAR, Green Area Ratio;
24 number 11; and number 12. Is that -- is that the same list that
25 you all have that we probably don't have to deliberate about a

1 lot, that are pretty straightforward?

2 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: (Nods head affirmatively.)

3 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm glad you're keeping the list.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm keeping the list to try to help
5 so I can remember.

6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So that's the whole thing. And I
8 know we have plenty of help --

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Appreciate that.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. So, all right, Vice Chair,
11 could you tell us what we're going to hear tomorrow, the four,
12 because you -- since you always have that handy?

13 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Tomorrow, Thursday, November
14 6th, we're going to hear various four items: number one,
15 penthouse habitable space affordable housing contribution,
16 Subtitle C, Section 1507; secondly, inclusionary zoning opt-in
17 provisions for R-2, R-3, and RF zones, Subtitle C, Section 101
18 (sic) -- 1001, Subtitle D, Section 201, and Subtitle E, Section
19 201; number three, relief from front setback requirement,
20 Subtitles D-5201 and E-5201; and fourth, redundant building form
21 language, Subtitle U, Section 301. That's tomorrow's hearing
22 agenda at five p.m. I believe.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. We will -- we will be here
24 at five. We may not start until 5:30. We will wait until our
25 colleague is able to join us, whenever she gets here and gets

1 settled, and don't rush.

2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: You didn't make -- you didn't
3 convict the person already?

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Well, we only finished testimony
5 today, so I am hoping that we do deliberation tomorrow, and that
6 I will be finished and able to join you right at five o'clock.
7 And I will do my best to try to be right -- there right at five
8 o'clock.

9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Perfectly fine.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So don't tell us anymore about that
11 situation. Just go ahead and handle your business, because we
12 know they may be watching and we don't want any problems. All
13 right. So whenever you get here tomorrow -- let me just say
14 this -- and I'm saying this for the Court -- whenever she gets
15 here, that's when she gets here. We will go from there.

16 All right. So thank you all. Again, I appreciate your
17 commitment -- both of you all's commitment, because I know where
18 you all were today. You had a lot of commitment going on. I
19 had some things, but not the commitment that you all had, and
20 it's most appreciated. I just want to say that.

21 So, with that, we will start tomorrow whenever, but we
22 plan on -- we will be here at 5:00. Ms. Schellin will be here
23 at five, and we're not sure when we'll start, but we will start
24 in a timely frame, and we will give everybody plenty of
25 opportunity to be able to discuss like we did this evening. So,

1 with that, this hearing is adjourned. We'll see everybody
2 tomorrow -- well, not everybody -- whoever shows up tomorrow.
3 Good night.

4 (Whereupon, the above-entitled public hearing was
5 adjourned at 7:20 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

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. 25-12

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 11-05-25

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