

GOVERNMENT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

JULY 2, 2025

+ + + + +

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

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

PAUL YOUNG, Zoning Data Specialist
DENNIS LIU, Attorney for Zoning Commission
SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

THOMAS SMITH
DANIEL SOLOMON
PATRICK BROWN

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

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

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

Case No. 23-08(1)

The Wesley Theological Seminary of the United
Methodist Church, limited in scope to the
Comprehensive Transportation Review (CRT)

Introduction - Chairman Hood	3
Applicant's presentation	
Mr. Brown.....	5
Mr. Solomon.....	6
Questions/comments from Commissioners:	
Commissioner Miller.....	13
Cross-Examination of Applicant - Mr. Smith.....	16

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

(4:48 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. This is the continuation of the Zoning Commission Case Number 23-08(1). I will incorporate the beginning opening statement of our previous case -- previous session to this hearing as well. This evening, we will hear Wesley Theological Seminary of United Methodist Church. This is a limit to scope hearing on the comprehensive transportation review, which better known as -- better known as the CTR only.

And I would ask everyone to keep their comments to the CTR, which has been submitted, and questions of the CTR only. We are not revisiting commercial use. We are not revisiting none of that -- of the other things that were germane to this case. Those things have been discussed, and we will deal with those later. But for tonight, CTR only.

Joining me are Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Imamura, Commissioner Stidhman, Commissioner Wright, as well as Commissioner Imamura. Commissioner, I don't think I called your name, as well as Ms. Sharon Schellin, Office of Zoning staff and Mr. Paul Young, who will be handling all of our virtual operations, as well as Mr. Dennis Liu who is our Office of Zoning Legal Division Counsel.

And again, my name is Anthony Hood, I'm Chair of the

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

1 Commission. So think I've covered everybody off the top of my
2 head, which is dangerous.

3 So Ms. Schellin, do we have any preliminary matters?

4 MS. SCHELLIN: I do not have any preliminary matters
5 other than to say that the Commission did set a schedule for the
6 applicant to submit their transportation report and then allowed
7 the parties seven days to respond. I just want to advise that
8 there were no written responses received. So the parties did not
9 submit any responses to what was received, just so you know.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. I would also think -- I
11 believe the presentation that we're going hear this evening is
12 going to be 15 minutes. And then I think the parties will split
13 that time, if I'm correct.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: That is correct. They need 15 minutes
15 for their -- he said 15 minutes. Yeah, It may not take that
16 long, but we'll just say 15.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Let's bring everybody up.
18 And once you come up, Mr. Brown and others, unless my colleagues
19 have anything else, we can get started. And again, let me thank
20 the Commission for doing this on a night that you all probably
21 have something else that you normally do. So thank you. Staff
22 too, I think the staff, I think everybody.

23 Good afternoon, Brown, whenever you're ready. I have
24 reviewed the record; my colleagues have as well. I believe we
25 have everything that we've asked for that should have been here

1 previously. In the case, I don't think I may have missed
2 something, I don't think we did.

3 So Mr. Brown, when you're ready, you may begin.

4 MR. BROWN: Okay. If you could give us a second. There
5 were some problems with link. And my witness, Daniel Solomon, I
6 don't know if he's --

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I see him -- I see him on, Mr. Brown.

8 MR. BROWN: Okay. Then we're ready to go.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

10 MR. BROWN: Some others may be having trouble to get
11 in, but let's move forward. And very quickly, as I've said in
12 writing and to staff, we expect to take 15 minutes or less. I'll
13 let Mr. Solomon testify. I would -- I submitted his resume. I
14 would like him recognized as an expert. He is taking the place
15 of Mr. Zeid and Mr. Andres, who are no longer with Gorove Slade.
16 So he's continuing on behalf of Gorove Slade, in their capacity
17 in this case.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And Mr. Brown, let me deal with Mr.
19 Solomon, right quick. I think, my colleagues, we have, I know
20 for a fact, I remember Mr. Solomon. We have given him expert
21 status. Any objections to continuing that?

22 Okay. Let's continue that so we can keep -- we can
23 keep moving. Thank you, Mr. Brown and Mr. Solomon. We're right
24 here.

25 MR. BROWN: Oh, very well. And I would just like to

1 introduce, we submitted the entire CTR and subsequent record as
2 requested by the Commission. To be honest, I'm surprised, but
3 nobody responded to that and nobody's filed anything pre-hearing.
4 But we're going to march forward, and I'll turn it over to Mr.
5 Solomon to run through the CTR and its evolution into the current
6 transportation plan.

7 MR. SOLOMON: Mr. Young, I believe there's a
8 presentation that was filed. If you could pull that up. If you
9 go to the next slide. Next slide, please. Perfect. Thank you.

10 Good afternoon, Commissioners. For the record, I'm
11 Daniel Solomon, Transportation Planner and Principal at Gorove
12 Slade. I'm here this afternoon to supplement the previous
13 testimony provided by my colleagues Will Zeid and Erwin Andres,
14 and to provide an overview of the transportation review process
15 for the Wesley Theological Seminary's proposed campus plan.

16 I'll cover the timeline of coordination with DDOT as
17 well as what's changed over time in response to community feedback
18 and agency review. We'll also explain how the project aligns
19 with district transportation policies and standards and give an
20 overview of the TDM and PMP plans.

21 As shown here, there is no effective change in the
22 number of students or staff under the proposed campus plan as
23 compared to the previously approved plan. The previously
24 approved plan identified 7:50 full-time, equivalent FTE students
25 and one hundred FTE staff, while the current plan uses 1000

1 students and 100 staff as total head counts, which reflects the
2 change in how the zoning regulations now require institutions to
3 report caps. It's important to note that this isn't a growth in
4 population. It's simply a shift in how it's counted.

5 The FTE metric previously used/accounted for part-time
6 and full-time students differently, whereas the current standard
7 counts all enrolled students equally. When you translate the
8 number between the two systems, the actual impact remains
9 consistent with the prior approvals. Because of that
10 consistency, the transportation analysis did not need to reassess
11 the broader campus population and instead focused on the real
12 source of new trips, which is the new residential building, its
13 parking program and updated access strategy.

14 Next slide, please. I want to emphasize that this has
15 been a thorough multiyear transportation review process. The
16 initial, comprehensive transportation review or CTR was submitted
17 to DDOT back in April of 2022. That study included a full traffic
18 impact analysis of seven nearby intersections covering all major
19 modes, vehicles, transit, bikes, pets. Following that, DDOT
20 issued its formal report in June of 2022, and we submitted a more
21 detailed transportation event management and performance
22 monitoring plan the following week.

23 By July 2022, DDOT had provided detailed comments. We
24 continued working with them and held a technical coordination
25 meeting in August of 2023 to address questions and refine the

1 plans further. In response, we submitted an updated plan later
2 that month. This version proposed a slightly smaller residential
3 building with fewer beds and no retail space on the ground floor.
4 By September 2023, DDOT had reviewed and issued another report
5 confirming that the changes were reasonable and still met their
6 expectations. In March 2025, we submitted one final update to
7 reflect the current proposal. This included the same number of
8 beds, but a substantial reduction in parking and a strengthened
9 TDM plan.

10 And just recently, in May of 2025, DDOT issued its
11 supplemental report concluding that the proposed development with
12 the updated design and TDM and PMP strategies in place would not
13 have a detrimental impact on the surrounding transportation
14 network. This has been a transparent iterative process involving
15 collaboration between the applicant team, DDOT, and feedback from
16 the community.

17 Next slide, please. Throughout the process, we've made
18 several significant updates to the transportation plan based on
19 what we've heard from both the community and DDOT. First, in
20 terms of access to University Avenue, we heard concerns from
21 neighbors about cut-through traffic, so we proposed restricting
22 site access to University Avenue. That means vehicles will only
23 access the site by Massachusetts Avenue. Second, in terms of
24 parking, we've significantly reduced the number of parking
25 spaces. The earlier plan had 350 spaces. The updated plan

1 removes 99 of those, which encourages less car usage and supports
2 district goals and the goals of TDM plan.

3 Third, in terms of bicycle infrastructure, we've added
4 more long and short-term bicycle parking than is required by
5 zoning. This encourages students and staff to use active
6 transportation modes. We've also incorporated a performance
7 monitoring plan, which is a built-in feedback loop to track how
8 the transportation plan is working in practice and not just on
9 paper. And I'll also note that DDOT requests that we conduct a
10 signal warrant analysis as part of the PMP at the site's main
11 entrance on Massachusetts Avenue. That's now part of the
12 commitment. So if the analysis finds that a signal is needed,
13 will design, fund, and install it.

14 Next slide, please. It's important to stress that the
15 entire review process followed DDOT's comprehensive
16 transportation review guidelines. Every assumption we made from
17 trip generation rates, access scenarios, mode splits, traffic
18 growth assumptions, et cetera, was scoped, vetted, and approved
19 by DDOT. In fact, the number of trips generated by this project
20 during peak period is below DDOT's threshold for acquiring a full
21 traffic impact study, but we did one anyway to ensure a rigorous
22 and transparent process. We tested multiple access
23 configurations and our analysis showed that all studied
24 intersections operate within acceptable levels of service under
25 the future development scenario.

1 Even as the development program changed slightly over
2 time, dropping the retail space and adjusting the number of beds,
3 our analysis used conservative assumptions. For instance, the
4 traffic study was originally based on 690 beds and a small amount
5 of retail, while the final plan includes 659 beds with no retail.
6 So we're confident those findings remain valid.

7 Next slide, please. TDM is the application of policies
8 and strategies used to reduce travel demand or redistribute
9 demand to other times or spaces. TDM elements typically focus
10 on reducing the number of single occupancy private vehicles
11 during peak travel times or on shifting single occupancy vehicle
12 demand to off peaks. The TDM plan for the proposed project was
13 based on zoning regulations in addition to DDOT expectations for
14 TDM programs for this type of use. As such, the applicant will
15 implement the following TDM measures.

16 Those include unbundling the cost of vehicle parking,
17 inclusion of EV charging stations, commitment to work with AU to
18 allow WTS students, faculty, and employees to use the AU shuttle
19 to Metrorail station, installation of transit screen displaying
20 transit shuttle, and bike share information in the lobby of the
21 new building. The identification of a coordinator for the WTS
22 campus, commitment for the transportation coordinator to
23 coordinate with goDCgo, which is DDOT's TDM program, hosting and
24 distribution of TDM materials, providing residents with carpool
25 information, meeting or exceeding zoning requirements for bicycle

1 parking.

2 Offering free SmarTrip cards to each new resident,
3 offering a Capital Bikeshare one ride coupon for each new
4 resident, funding a 19 DOT capital bike share station, which also
5 includes one year of maintenance and operation costs near the
6 campus or other locations as selected by DDOT. The installation
7 of scooter corral near the Wesley Library, an on-site rideshare
8 turnaround area for convenient pickup and drop offs, and a host
9 of pedestrian infrastructure improvements as listed on this
10 slide.

11 In addition, after further consultation with the
12 community and DDOT, as of the time of the previous hearing, the
13 applicant is committed to enroll in the Capital Bike Chair for
14 University program, which offers heavily discount membership to
15 students. All of these commitments are real concrete strategies
16 aimed at reducing traffic, improving safety, and expanding
17 mobility options, and DDOT is supportive of these commitments.

18 Next slide, please. In addition to the designing a
19 strong TDM program, we've also committed to monitoring its
20 effectiveness over time. The Performance Monitoring Plan, PMP,
21 includes annual data collection starting the spring after the
22 building opens and then every two years after that, assuming
23 goals are met. We'll be tracking key indicators like morning and
24 evening peak hour vehicle counts, mode split surveys of students,
25 faculty and staff, parking permits and usage data, bike parking

1 occupancy, and carpool participation. We've committed to a trip
2 cap of 101 peak hour trips, and if the monitoring shows that
3 number is exceeded, we'll work with DDOT to make additional
4 adjustments or enhancements to the TDM program.

5 Next slide, please. To close, we understand the
6 community's desire for thoughtful growth that doesn't come at the
7 expense of traffic safety or quality of life. That's exactly why
8 this review process has taken place over several years and in
9 coordination with DDOT, and why we've made so many updates along
10 the way. The campus plan is being shaped by transportation best
11 practices, by agency review, and by community input. It supports
12 multimodal access, reduces car dependency, and includes
13 monitoring mechanisms to make sure we stay on track.

14 Thank you. That concludes my testimony, and I'll be
15 available for any questions.

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Solomon, are you
17 complete?

18 MR. SOLOMON: (No audible response.)

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Very straight to
20 the point. Thank you.

21 Let me see if we have any questions or comments.

22 Commissioner Wright, any questions or comments?

23 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: No. I think it was a very
24 (indiscernible) report.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Commissioner Inamura?

1 COMMISSIONER IMAMURA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank
2 you, Mr. Solomon. I don't have any questions. I appreciate the
3 succinct report.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Stidham, any
5 questions?

6 COMMISSIONER STIDMAN: No questions or comments. And
7 I too appreciate the significance of your part and with the
8 relevant detail. Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. And Vice Chairman
10 Miller?

11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I
12 concur with my colleagues. We've covered a lot of this
13 information in previous hearings on both this case and related
14 cases. And I appreciate the applicant providing all this
15 information in one place in this hearing record. And as I
16 indicated previously, I appreciate the commitment to work with
17 American University in the future to make sure that the practice
18 of allowing Wesley staff, faculty, and students to use the AU
19 shuttle continues. And we said -- you said that that will happen
20 in the further processing part of this campus plan.

21 And I appreciate also that the -- in response to the
22 community, you also will be looking at whether a traffic signal
23 is necessary at the Massachusetts Avenue driveway after one year,
24 I think, of monitoring in the performance management plan. So I
25 appreciate all the dialogue that you've had with DDOT and with

1 the community and trying to mitigate any concerns that are there.
2 So thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I too want to join all my colleagues,
4 and I appreciate you dotting all our I's are crossing all the
5 T's and making sure all the transportation information is in this
6 record for this case. And some of the stuff we have seen
7 previously in other cases, and I just appreciate it as well.
8 It's already been said in one place.

9 I don't have any questions. I think it's pretty
10 straightforward. But others may have a few questions. But I
11 don't know. We've been dealing with this quite a bit. It's been
12 very exhaustive. So thank you, Mr. Solomon. And thank you, Mr.
13 Brown.

14 But let me see if others are here.

15 Ms. Schellin, I didn't see anyone for cross-examination
16 from the ANC. Is Mr. Bender or Chairperson Duncan -- Duncan
17 here? Either one of them.

18 MS. SCHELLIN: I don't see them, but give me a few
19 minutes and let me directly send the link to them. They have
20 not reached out, but let me send them the link to make sure
21 they're not trying to get on. I'm not sure what happened with
22 that. Maybe there was some confusion because it's a Wednesday
23 and the BZA met today. So there may have been some confusion
24 with that with the two links. So -- but let me reach out to --
25 that's ANC, where's my paperwork?

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: ANC what is it? Three -- hold on
2 let me pull my notes up.

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Is that 3(e) I think for Bender --

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 3(e) is one and I think Mr. Bender
5 is -- no, 3(e) is Mr. Bender and I think 3(d) is Chair Duncan.

6 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I may have that mixed up, but they'll
8 know.

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. I thought that she was on here.
10 I knew that she signed up before. Okay. All right. Let me do
11 that real quick. So if you want to --

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You know what, we can come back to
13 them if they have questions.

14 MS. SCHELLIN: If you want to move to the others, yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes. Let's -- can you tell us what
16 it is for the Spring Valley Neighbor's Association and also the
17 NLC Spring Valley Wesley Heights Citizens Association? The time
18 frame --

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. Yes. Fifteen minutes for each
20 of them. We have Tom Smith is on for cross-examination for NLC,
21 the neighborhood that and we have Dennis Paul is also on. I
22 think he was representing a group also. Blaine Carter.

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: One of them is in support, right?
24 So --

25 MS. SCHELLIN: Right.

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. Let's do them first. If they
2 have any cross --

3 MS. SCHELLIN: For cross-examination. Yeah.

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. For cross-examination.
5 (Indiscernible).

6 MS. SCHELLIN: I believe that's Mr. Carter. Yeah. And
7 I will send that email real quick.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Mr. Clarkson
9 (phonetic)? Is Mr. Clarkson here? I don't see him on. I don't
10 see Mr. Clarkson on. So I'm going take that as not having any
11 questions.

12 Okay. Well, let's go to Mr. Smith. Let's bring him
13 up. He's representing both NLC and Spring Valley Wesley Heights
14 Citizens Association.

15 MR. SMITH: Good evening, Commissioners. And thank you
16 very much for holding this hearing. I didn't have a chance to
17 say that at the last hearing. And I will tell you, I'm trying
18 to -- we've been assessing this project up until about 3 o'clock
19 this afternoon. So that's why there was nothing that we filed.
20 But let me start off by asking some questions that weren't on an
21 issue that wasn't raised in that presentation, and that's
22 parking.

23 Does the CTR include a parking utilization study for
24 the Wesley campus?

25 MR. SOLOMON: Believe it does not.

1 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

2 MR. SOLOMON: I don't believe it does.

3 MR. SMITH: Is there a reason why the CTR then also
4 doesn't reference any kind of the semiannual parking reports that
5 were required as part of Wesley's current campus plan that's been
6 in effect since 2012?

7 Did you hear me?

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Solomon, all those questions are
9 directed to you.

10 MR. SOLOMON: Oh, sorry. My connection
11 (indiscernible) --

12 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry -- I'm sorry, Mr. Solomon.

13 Do you want me to ask that again?

14 MR. SOLOMON: No, no, I heard you. Am I coming across?

15 MR. SMITH: Yes, I hear you.

16 MR. SOLOMON: Okay. Sorry.

17 MR. SMITH: I didn't hear you previously.

18 MR. SOLOMON: Apologies. And then I know, Pat, if you
19 tried to say something, where I couldn't hear you either. So to
20 your first question, no, the parking utilization study was not
21 required by DDOT as part of the campus master plan, so none was
22 conducted. And then to your second question, I don't believe the
23 CTR referenced the PM -- any requirements from monitoring
24 studies, that were previously required.

25 MR. SMITH: And so how many parking spaces are there

1 currently on campus?

2 MR. SOLOMON: Bear with me, I have that information
3 right here.

4 MR. SMITH: Well, is it 174? Is 174 the number of
5 parking spaces?

6 MR. SOLOMON: I want to get you the exact number, so
7 just bear with me. Correct. There are 174 parking spaces right
8 now.

9 MR. SMITH: Wesley proposed increasing its parking
10 capacity to 394 as part of the PUD case; isn't that correct?

11 MR. SOLOMON: Checking those numbers.

12 MR. SMITH: Okay. That's -- and now you're proposing
13 the 295, correct?

14 MR. SOLOMON: Correct.

15 MR. SMITH: Okay. And of those 295, how many of those
16 spaces will be available for Wesley's use only, not the residents
17 of the landmark building? So for anybody but the residents of
18 the landmark building.

19 MR. SOLOMON: I believe there are 31 surface spaces
20 that will remain. And then there are, I believe, 77 that will
21 be located in the new building.

22 MR. SMITH: Okay. And so in reviewing the campus plan
23 update that was filed in March, did you take -- did you take note
24 of the previous campus plan at all, the conclusion in that plan
25 that there was a high demand for parking on the campus as part

1 of that -- as part of that plan when you were preparing the CTR?

2 MR. SOLOMON: No, we worked with the applicant to --
3 and coordinated with them and based on information that they had
4 provided to understand what they believe to be an appropriate
5 amount of parking for their needs.

6 MR. SMITH: You -- so you can't really point tell me
7 if I'm correct in saying this, you can't really point to any data
8 that would show that Wesley's parking demand has declined since
9 either the last parking utilization study was done back in the
10 previous campus plan or since the PUD case was filed to justify
11 this two ninety five. I'm trying to get an understanding of how
12 do you justify going from the 394 that the CTR proposed initially
13 to the 295 that you're now proposing now?

14 MR. SOLOMON: I don't have data to point to. It was
15 based on coordination with the applicant and the project team in
16 terms of what they need for the site, as well as understanding
17 that there's DDOT policies and goals that encourage the building
18 of less parking, if possible, to encourage other modes of
19 transportation, given that parking induces, demand for vehicular
20 trips.

21 MR. SMITH: Okay. So knowing historically that parking
22 has been an issue on the campus when and with --

23 MR. SOLOMON: I can't speak to that. And Pat, your
24 audio is not coming through if you're --

25 MR. BROWN: I object to his characterization of parking

1 being a problem. He's making that up, I think.

2 MR. SMITH: I don't -- I think that if the 2012 campus
3 plan that you're operating under right now required you to conduct
4 semiannual parking reports, it would be hard to conclude that
5 parking has not been an issue, Pat. I think parking -- I think
6 you know as well as I do, but I don't want to testify, but I
7 think I've made my point. So let me move on.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: (Indiscernible) with Mr. Brown, you
9 said you had an objection. I think the transportation expert
10 answered as well as he could. So I'm just going to we're going
11 to forego that objection. Mr. Smith, next question, please.

12 MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you. In assessing parking
13 conditions on the campus, did you account for Wesley's commitment
14 to offer free parking for up to 100 people for those attending
15 meetings on the campus?

16 MR. SOLOMON: You mean during off-peak times?

17 MR. SMITH: I can't answer that. That's not quite --
18 I don't know the answer to that question. Wesley's proposal is
19 not clear on that. But in terms of making space available for
20 meetings, they indicated that they would provide parking for up
21 to 100 people on the campus. Did you account -- my question is,
22 did you account for that?

23 MR. BROWN: I object. He's mischaracterizing one of
24 the written conditions that was requested by ANSI 3(d) and
25 involves after-hour meetings for the community up to a maximum

1 of 100 attendees.

2 But again, the point Mr. Solomon was making is that was
3 after hours, not during normal operating times.

4 MR. SMITH: Okay. That's fine. So after hours, the
5 question is, did you account for that in terms of assessing
6 parking conditions on the campus?

7 MR. SOLOMON: No, we didn't.

8 MR. SMITH: Maybe up to 100 parking spaces available
9 for these folks?

10 MR. SOLOMON: No, we did not.

11 MR. SMITH: Okay. And just from a, again, relying on
12 your expertise here, without a parking utilization study, how do
13 you know 295 parking spaces is enough?

14 MR. SOLOMON: We are going to be monitoring this as
15 part of the performance monitoring plan.

16 MR. SMITH: Okay. So let me move on to another topic
17 that being future conditions. The CTR examined both -- examined
18 existing background and future conditions; is that correct?

19 MR. SOLOMON: Correct.

20 MR. SMITH: Okay. When assessing background
21 conditions, what other new developments in the area did you
22 consider?

23 MR. SOLOMON: Hang on. I have to find that. Based on
24 the fact that they were not located in the study area, as defined
25 as having an origin or destination point within the cluster of

1 the study area intersections, have existing entitlements at the
2 time, or have a construction completion date prior to when the
3 original study assumed of 2024 as discussed, and agreed to with
4 DDOT during the scoping process, no background developments were
5 included. On top of the inherent background growth that was
6 assumed.

7 MR. SMITH: Okay. So if you were to do the report now,
8 would you have to take into account the new Lady Bird development
9 that's happening just a couple blocks down the street from Wesley?

10 MR. SOLOMON: The Lady Bird's origin and destination
11 points do not fall within the cluster study area intersections?

12 MR. SMITH: That despite the fact that the
13 transportation study done for that included some of the same
14 intersections as you all took a look at?

15 MR. SOLOMON: Speak to that because it's not part of
16 this case.

17 MR. SMITH: Okay.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm going overrule that question.
19 Mr. Smith, let's stay specific to this particular case.

20 MR. SMITH: All right. I understand. And I'm trying
21 to do that, but I was dealing with background conditions.

22 So for future conditions then, what year did you
23 project out to?

24 MR. SOLOMON: 2024, that didn't come through.

25 MR. SMITH: So given that we're now in 2025, doesn't

1 that render the analysis for future conditions? I mean, you put
2 a nice word on it, inoperable?

3 MR. SOLOMON: No. We coordinated extensively with DDOT
4 as the timeline for the project was pushed out. And in terms of
5 the underlying analysis of impacts and trying to understand what
6 is the impact of this development, and you compare it to
7 background conditions with and without development, that hasn't
8 changed. If anything, now that we continue to assume the
9 assumptions of a slightly larger development, which included more
10 beds and retail, which they are no longer now, which no longer
11 exists as part of the current application, you could assume that
12 those assumptions that we had analyzed are conservative in
13 comparison to what would be built now.

14 MR. SMITH: So if you were doing the report now,
15 however, what year would you project out to?

16 MR. SOLOMON: If we assume the same amount of time, it
17 would be two to three years in the future.

18 MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you. I wanted to talk a little
19 bit about the trip generation, and you mentioned about the 101
20 figure that -- the 101 peak hour trips. Where does that number
21 come from? What's the basis of the 101 number? Just --

22 MR. SOLOMON: I can't speak to that. It was based on
23 coordination with DDOT.

24 MR. SMITH: Did DDOT pick the number?

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

1 MR. SMITH: So is it just a random number?

2 MR. SOLOMON: I believe DDOT is here. And you might
3 be able to --

4 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Smith, hold tight. He said he
5 can't answer that. You asked him who picked the number and he
6 could not answer that. So next question, please.

7 MR. SMITH: Okay. In looking at the trip generation
8 data for this CTR, did you did you look at the trip generation
9 data in the current campus plan, the current campus plan, the
10 2012 campus plan?

11 MR. SOLOMON: I did not, no.

12 MR. SMITH: Were you aware that the 2012 campus plan
13 also required a traffic performance monitoring, a PMP for
14 monitoring vehicle trips?

15 MR. SOLOMON: That's my understanding.

16 MR. SMITH: So were you aware of what the threshold
17 numbers were for those -- for that report?

18 MR. SOLOMON: I do not know it, no.

19 MR. SMITH: Okay. Do you know why that performance
20 monitoring report requirement was made?

21 MR. SOLOMON: I do not.

22 MR. SMITH: The CTR shows the vehicle trip data in
23 terms of the only number you have that you're talking about is
24 the 101. Okay. But the performance -- I'm sorry, the CTR makes
25 reference to the trip generation data for the new landmark

1 building; is that correct?

2 MR. SOLOMON: Can you clarify that question?

3 MR. SMITH: So am I correct in saying that the CTR
4 documents the vehicle trip data for the new landmark, the proposed
5 landmark building; is that correct?

6 MR. SOLOMON: Correct. It assumes the trip generation
7 rate for the new residential hall.

8 MR. SMITH: Was what -- it was like 13 or 14 in the
9 morning, I believe; is that correct? And 70, I'm sorry, 30-
10 something in PM peak hour; isn't that correct?

11 MR. SOLOMON: It's 6 inbound in the morning and 8
12 outbound in the morning, and then 16 inbound in the PM peak hour
13 and 17 outbound the PM peak hour.

14 MR. SMITH: And then I think the 14 though included the
15 retail; isn't that correct? So it'd be one less than that, if
16 I'm not -- if my memory is correct from reading; is that correct?

17 MR. SOLOMON: That is correct.

18 MR. SMITH: Okay. So where is the -- where's the trip
19 generation data for the rest of the campus in terms of how people
20 are accessing the campus?

21 MR. SOLOMON: It has assumed no change there.

22 MR. SMITH: But you said you didn't look at any of that
23 data. You assume no change from what?

24 MR. SOLOMON: Existing conditions.

25 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry?

1 MR. SOLOMON: Existing conditions.

2 MR. SMITH: And where are those exist -- where are you
3 getting those existing conditions? Where are the numbers come
4 from the existing conditions?

5 MR. SOLOMON: They were part of the data that was used
6 to -- as the underlying data to establish existing conditions.

7 MR. SMITH: But you didn't collect any new data on
8 that; is that correct?

9 MR. SOLOMON: Data was collected. And then if it was
10 older data, it was grown to account for years, correct.

11 MR. SMITH: So where in the CTR have you quantified the
12 number of trips that have been generated campus wide? Where is
13 that in the -- in the CTR?

14 MR. SOLOMON: It would be under -- if you look at the
15 existing peak hour volumes, you will see that coming out of the
16 WTS driveways on University Avenue as well on Massachusetts
17 Avenue, and coming in has vehicular trips. (Indiscernible).

18 MR. SMITH: So Mr. Solomon, can you give me the numbers
19 tonight? Can you tell me, like, how many trips are generated,
20 not by intersection, but by adding it all up and showing the
21 totality of how many trips are generated? And from what I'm
22 hearing you say, and correct me if I'm wrong, all that data is
23 historical data, correct? It's not anything that is newly been
24 generated. It's coming from other sources.

25 MR. SOLOMON: It was data that was --

1 MR. SMITH: Is all that correct?

2 MR. SOLOMON: It was data that was collected at these
3 locations, some of it in previous years, and then grown to account
4 for time that has passed in terms of the actual ins and outs,
5 total ins and outs from the driveways. I'll pull that together
6 right now or have my colleagues actually do it while we're --

7 MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that.
8 That's very nice of you to do.

9 But in terms of new data, though, I'm not talking about
10 the use of the old data from old studies and the like, because I
11 do want to ask you about that as well. But in terms of new data,
12 as far as trip generation is concerned, there really -- is there
13 any?

14 MR. SOLOMON: Recently collected data? No.

15 MR. SMITH: Okay.

16 MR. SOLOMON: That's in the past year, no. We didn't
17 collect that.

18 MR. SMITH: Was there any data that was collected for
19 the CTR, which was done back in -- I mean, we know you collected
20 some data back in 2021. The CTR says that you collected some
21 data in 2021, but that it wasn't considered to be reliable. And
22 I'll ask you about that in a minute. But -- so what I'm asking
23 is, from the time that you started working on the CTR till now,
24 did you collect any new that would inform the trip generation
25 -- or trip generation purposes?

1 MR. SOLOMON: No, not that I'm aware of.

2 MR. SMITH: Okay. All right. Thank you. So again,
3 from your standpoint as an expert, and you also, though, didn't
4 -- that means then you didn't collect any multimodal trip
5 generation data that would tell you how many people are arriving
6 by public transit, by cars, by walking, you don't have that data
7 either. Any new data on that as well? That would be -- isn't
8 that -- wouldn't that be correct?

9 MR. SOLOMON: The most recent data would be 2021.

10 MR. SMITH: Yeah, okay. So without any of that data,
11 how can you develop an effective data-driven traffic demand
12 management program or performance monitoring plan? I'm just
13 asking you that from trying to get a sense of, you're the expert,
14 tell me, how can this be done?

15 MR. SOLOMON: The study that was conducted in 2022 and
16 submitted and reviewed by DDOT has assumptions that compared to
17 the development program that we have now would be considered
18 conservative because of the reduction and development program.

19 MR. SMITH: Okay. I understand. Okay. So am I correct
20 in saying then that the subject of this CTR is basically the new
21 student housing building?

22 MR. SOLOMON: Understand the difference that would come
23 as a result of the change on campus, which is the new residential
24 home.

25 MR. SMITH: I just wanted to check something in the

1 report. I'm sorry. The field data you talked about collecting --
2 you collected some field data in the fall of 2021; isn't that
3 correct?

4 MR. SOLOMON: That's my understanding.

5 MR. SMITH: Okay. And didn't the report conclude that
6 that data would not be "representative of typical conditions,"
7 given primarily it was during the COVID emergency that was in
8 effect at the time?

9 MR. SOLOMON: That is my understanding.

10 MR. SMITH: Okay. And that field data that you
11 collected was primarily of two study intersections; isn't that
12 correct?

13 MR. SOLOMON: I'm confirming that now.

14 MR. SMITH: I believe that if I'm not mistaken, I think,
15 and I'll put it in the form of a question if that's easier, but
16 I think it was the Wesley Circle I'm sorry, yes, Wesley Circle
17 and Mass Avenue study intersection and the Wesley driveway and
18 Massachusetts Avenue intersection; isn't that correct?

19 MR. SOLOMON: That's correct.

20 MR. SMITH: Okay. So then did you use other data to
21 assess those two intersections since you weren't sure whether the
22 data you got was representative of typical conditions?

23 MR. SOLOMON: Could you repeat that?

24 MR. SMITH: Okay. Let me change it. Let me just try
25 to cut through some of this a little bit. You use data, am I

1 correct, from the 2021 AU campus plan; is that correct, as part
2 of this study?

3 MR. SOLOMON: I believe so, I can (indiscernible).

4 MR. SMITH: I think you can find it on page -- I think
5 this is an important question, and I don't want to testify here,
6 but I do want to -- that's why I wanted to ask you about this.
7 I believe you can find it on page 21 of the CTR. It talks about
8 using data from the 2021 AU campus plan that would have been
9 collected in 2020. But it also talks about using data for -- at
10 these intersections from the 2012 Wesley Seminary campus plan
11 that was --

12 MR. SOLOMON: Correct.

13 MR. SMITH: Okay. Okay. So you're fine with -- you
14 do agree that data -- that you use the data from the data
15 collected in 2011 for the 2012 Wesley campus plan and data
16 collected in 2020 for the 2021 AU campus plan, correct?

17 MR. SOLOMON: We had discussed and scoped that with
18 DDOT.

19 MR. SMITH: Yes.

20 MR. SOLOMON: DDOT believed that was appropriate and
21 we performed the analysis accordingly.

22 MR. SMITH: Right. And this was because, am I correct
23 in saying that just because -- look, this is a time of COVID and
24 it was very -- you weren't sure whether you're going to get
25 typical data, correct?

1 MR. SOLOMON: That is my understanding as to why it was
2 agreed to with DDOT.

3 MR. SMITH: Were you aware that that traffic study of
4 2012 for the Wesley campus plan stated that commuter students
5 have the most significant impact on traffic generation and
6 parking demand for campus?

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

8 MR. SMITH: Okay. When you assess the traffic impacts
9 for the new student housing building, did you adjust your model?
10 You used data, correct, from the ITA trip generation manual;
11 isn't that correct? Did you adjust that --

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Smith, Mr. Smith, let me just
13 interrupt. I hear what you're saying, and I've tried to being
14 very lenient. And I think the CTR is exactly what it is. It's
15 a review. It's not an actual sign. It's comprehensive. And I
16 think -- I don't know if this is helpful to my colleagues, but I
17 can tell you it's not that helpful to me.

18 I have reviewed what they have here and to tie it in
19 with the COVID, to me, things have changed. My granddaughters

20 -- I know how they go to school now. So your argument
21 is stale. So I need you to bring it so -- and what you're trying
22 to do, bring it to us because the way people have lived since
23 COVID has changed. So to say that there's a lot of things going
24 on, I can tell you, and I'm not being contradicting or trying to
25 be adversary here, but I need you to help us see your point. So

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

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

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

15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: (Indiscernible.)

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

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

18 MR. SMITH: Correct. I understand.

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

25 MR. SMITH: Okay. So again, going back to this question

1 about the model that you used for the proposed landmark building,
2 the trip generation model, did you account for that, that there
3 would be non-students living in that building?

4 (No response.)

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

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

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

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

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

17 MR. SOLOMON: We did not study those. That was not
18 required by DDOT.

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

22 MR. SOLOMON: All the intersections operated on
23 acceptable levels of service under the access scenario that we
24 have proposed.

25 MR. SMITH: I don't -- maybe you can -- why does your

1 report say otherwise? Why does -- why does your report otherwise
2 say the Massachusetts Avenue and Wesley Circle intersection, and
3 the Massachusetts Avenue driveway operate at unacceptable levels
4 of service?

5 MR. SOLOMON: For which access scenario?

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

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

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

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

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

18 MR. SMITH: And are you also recommending that DDOT
19 conduct a safety audit in the CTR -- didn't you also recommend
20 that DDOT conduct a safety audit of the Massachusetts Avenue and
21 Wesley Circle intersection after examining the crash data?

22 MR. SOLOMON: I believe that was recommended in the
23 CTR.

24 MR. SMITH: Okay. So in terms of looking at what you're
25 proposing for the TDM, what is the specific mitigation that's

1 being proposed that would target the level of service at those
2 two intersections that we mentioned previously?

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

6 MR. SMITH: Okay. And my -- I have two other questions,
7 and then I'm finished. And this has to do with the turnaround --
8 the pickup/dropoff area that DDOT asked you all to reconsider and
9 redo, and which you did. In your technical memorandum of March
10 25th, 2025, stemming from the CTR, and the scoping study that's
11 part of that CTR, is it a typical method for vehicle drop-offs --
12 well, let me rephrase this.

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

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

18 MR. SMITH: Not at the -- I think the -- did you look
19 at the figure Exhibit -- hold on just one second. Should should
20 be the last slide in here. I'm sorry, the last slide that you
21 offered at the last CLC meeting. It's in --

22 MR. SOLOMON: Correct. So it says -- I think it shows
23 the vehicular pathway, but it doesn't identify on there in terms
24 of callouts where the designated pickup and dropoff is. It just
25 shows that the loading driveway can be used for cars to do a

1 (indiscernible) point turn in order to head back out to
2 Massachusetts.

3 MR. SMITH: Okay.

4 MR. BROWN: If it helps, that all that's attached to
5 our presentation tonight, I believe.

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

8 MR. BROWN: Mr. Young would have to do that.

9 MR. YOUNG: Exhibit 9.

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

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

18 MR. SMITH: Okay. So is that a typical method for --
19 for dropoffs and pickups -- pickups and dropoffs?

20 MR. SOLOMON: That's definitely acceptable.

21 MR. SMITH: But is it typical?

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

23 MR. SMITH: Okay. Do you believe that during periods
24 of high traffic volumes such as move-in or move-out, or other
25 events that the proposed dropoff, turnaround, and loading

1 entrance would be adequate?

2 MR. SOLOMON: -- so.

3 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry?

4 MR. SOLOMON: I believe so.

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

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

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

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

17 MS. DUNCAN: Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. And again, Ms. Schellin maybe
19 we can (indiscernible) coordinated. I don't think anyone -- any
20 other party is here. We've been looking and called, so I believe
21 that we are complete.

22 Ms. Schellin?

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

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So do we have anything else
2 for cross?

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

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

7 MS. SCHELLIN: (Indiscernible other party.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So our next course of action, and
9 again, we've already covered those in opposite -- do we have
10 anyone here -- persons here in opposition? We've covered that,
11 right?

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

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ozberk.

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

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

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh. Good one, Mr. Hood, Chairman Hood.
20 Good, you got me.

21 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let's do the DDOT
22 (indiscernible) --

23 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- thank you.

25 Mr. Ozberk, good evening, sir. You may begin. You

1 have a presentation for us this evening?

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

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

16 As you heard in the applicant's presentation, they've
17 completed the TDM plan and it's management plan, with the
18 additions requested in DDOT's supplemental report. DDOT has no
19 objection to the approval of the application. We look forward
20 to continuing to work with the applicant on the design of the
21 streetscape, sidewalks, and bike share station as they go through
22 public space permitting.

23 Thank you, and happy to answer questions.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Ozberk. Again, I
25 apologize for mispronouncing your name. We can see if my

1 colleagues have any questions for DDOT, because I looked at DDOT's
2 report as your affirmation of their -- with the exception of
3 those conditions. All right. We'll go back.

4 Any questions, anyone? I'm looking. I'm looking, no
5 questions. Okay. All right.

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

8 MS. DUNCAN: No questions.

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

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

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

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

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

20 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So Mr. Brown said no
21 witnessing to Clarkson.

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

23 MR. SMITH: Yes, sir.

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Then go ahead.

25 MR. SMITH: Thank you. When the CTR -- sorry, I'm

1 looking for -- he dropped off my screen. Oh, there. I'm sorry.

2 When the CTR was initially composed with the 380-plus
3 parking spaces for the campus, the scoping report for the CTR and
4 then the subsequent DDOT report indicated support for that
5 proposal.

6 So is there any data that DDOT has seen now that
7 justifies a change in the amount of parking from the 380-plus
8 down to the 295? Is there anything that you've seen -- that DDOT
9 has seen?

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

18 MR. SMITH: And do you know whether -- I realize that
19 you were not the person on this project back then, but to your
20 knowledge, and based on your review of the records, do you have
21 any sense as to whether DDOT had reviewed previous DDOT reports
22 for the Wesley campus going back, for example, to the 2012 study
23 that was used for the -- for preparation of the CTR?

24 MR. OZBERK: I cannot answer that question, no.

25 MR. SMITH: Thank you. Does DDOT have any concern at

1 all with Wesley's request for the flexibility to increase or
2 decrease its parking supply by 10 percent?

3 MR. OZBERK: Can you point me to where that is and what
4 you're looking at?

5 MR. SMITH: That is one of the conditions that has been
6 proposed by Wesley as part of the campus plan. That they would
7 have the flexibility to increase or decrease the parking supply
8 by 10 percent.

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

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

14 In the course of doing a scoping study, how does this
15 work? Does it -- is it -- is it that the applicant comes in and
16 makes the proposal for what they're going to do, and then you
17 review it, or do you sit down and tell the applicant this is
18 exactly what we want you to do?

19 MR. OZBERK: The CTR, the Comprehensive Transportation
20 Review guidance document, which is about a hundred-page document,
21 explains what the applicant is required to provide terms of the
22 scoping and the report itself, both in terms of the methodological
23 approaches and assumptions that should be made to produce the
24 study, and the different triggers based on the (indiscernible)
25 that would require different portions of the study and different

1 things to be studied.

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

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

12 MR. OZBERK: I am not aware.

13 MR. SMITH: Okay. And you -- the DDOT is also -- am I
14 correct in saying DDOT is also proposing that Wesley conduct the
15 study on the need for -- the potential need for a traffic or
16 pedestrian signal at the Massachusetts Avenue and Wesley Circle
17 driveway; is that correct?

18 MR. OZBERK: Correct. I believe that is a component
19 of the performance management plan moving forward.

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

24 MR. OZBERK: (No audible response.)

25 MR. SMITH: I'll just -- actually, let me strike that

1 question.

2 MR. OZBERK: Yeah. Sure.

3 MR. SMITH: Let me just -- we'll just strike that
4 question.

5 So why did DDOT accept, in the course of preparing and
6 doing the scoping study for the CTR, why did DDOT accept the use
7 of the old data from the 2012 Campus plan and the 2020 plan for
8 AU?

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

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

15 MR. OZBERK: I don't know.

16 MR. SMITH: Given that there's already a pedestrian
17 signal just about 200 feet from the driveway of the Mass
18 Avenue/Wesley Circle driveway, why would an additional study be
19 needed? I mean, isn't -- isn't there an assumption that that
20 pedestrian signal is the result of a study that justified its
21 need at that location, just 200 feet away from the driveway?

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

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

6 MR. OZBERK: The DDOT felt that the existing analysis
7 was appropriate for the projects, in particular given its reduced
8 scope.

9 MR. SMITH: When you say its reduced scope, you mean
10 the (indiscernible) numbers of beds, and the elimination of the
11 retail?

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

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

17 MR. OZBERK: (No audible response.)

18 MR. SMITH: You said it's reduced scope. I mean, what's
19 reduced here?

20 MR. OZBERK: Correct. There was the reduction of --
21 well, the elimination, I believe, of a retail component, and --
22 yeah.

23 MR. SMITH: All right. I have no more questions, Mr.
24 Chairman. Thank you very much.

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you Mr. Smith and Mr. Ozberk.

1 Did I get that right that time, Ozberk -- Ozberk?

2 MR. OZBERK: Ozberk, yeah. No extra vowel between the
3 Z and the B. Just --

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

9 MR. OZBERK: Maybe the second or third.

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

12 So we've already been through everyone asking DDOT
13 question, right, Ms. Schellin?

14 MS. SCHELLIN: -- with everyone, yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. This is out of our normal
16 format. Are we finished? Because I think it was just the
17 parties --

18 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- asking with DDOT and the
20 applicant.

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

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: (Indiscernible) more cases.

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

1 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Again, we don't have Chair
2 Bender.

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

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

9 MS. SCHELLIN: Oh, correct. Correct.

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

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

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

19 COMMISSIONER DUNCAN: Okay.

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

24 COMMISSIONER DUNCAN: I just want to -- I just want to
25 give one point, is that back in 2012 when we're talking about

1 data from around there, the Department of Homeland Security had,
2 I think, 1200 employees at the site there, and they're all gone.
3 So right now we're experiencing a little bit less traffic there.
4 That's end of my testimony.

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

7 COMMISSIONER DUNCAN: Sorry.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's all right.

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

11 MR. BROWN: No questions.

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

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

15 MR. SMITH: I can't help myself. I just have one
16 question.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

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

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

21 MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

7 MS. SCHELLIN: I believe the applicant, and if I'm not
8 correct, Mr. Young will correct me, I believe they took the entire
9 15 minutes, and so that's what I'd call Mr. Smith for.

10 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Mr. Smith?

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

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

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

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

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: All right. You may begin.

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

19 MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.

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

25 The comprehensive data review is a tool for data-driven

1 decision making. This CTR serves as evidence that Wesley's Campus
2 Plan is objectionable to neighboring property because of traffic
3 and parking, and consequently, the Campus plan application fails
4 to meet the standards for approval at this time under Subtitle
5 X, Section 101.2.

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

11 Consequently, the CTR's analysis on existing traffic
12 conditions, background conditions, and future conditions are not
13 valid. Despite triggering DDOT's threshold for mitigation, the
14 CTR also fails to include any specific mitigation for two critical
15 study intersections it grossly concludes operated at unacceptable
16 levels of service.

17 There are seven major issues presented by the CTR.
18 One, the CTR is limited to impacts associated with the proposed
19 landmark building. The CTR states clearly on page 11 that the
20 subject of the CTR is the new student housing building. The
21 CTR's data announced its focus almost exclusively on the traffic
22 impacts associated with the residents of the proposed landmark
23 building.

24 The CTR would seem to be more appropriate if this case
25 was a part of the processing for the proposed landmark building.

1 The CTR is not an assessment of the traffic impacts of the campus
2 plan as a whole, as it typical in campus planning cases.

3 Two, the CTR relies on old data collected between 5 and
4 22 years ago. Limited new data was collected for this CTR in
5 the fall of 2021, but the CTR states this data is not credible
6 and, quote, "not representative of typical conditions," end of
7 quote. Instead, the CTR relies on data collected more than five
8 years ago in February of 2020 for the 2021 American University
9 Campus Plan, and data collected 14 years ago for the 2012 Wesley
10 Campus Plan Update, which itself relied on data collected 22
11 years in ago in 2003.

12 Industry best practices suggest that historical data
13 is most reliable if extrapolated over no more than two years, and
14 even then it has recommended the extrapolated data be tested
15 against those referred to as, quote, "real-world ground-truth
16 data", end of quote. In this case, the data is extrapolated over
17 a period of 5 to 22 years.

18 Three, the multimodal trip generation data is limited
19 to residents of the proposed landmark building. The CTR's multi-
20 modal trip generation data which shows how the campus is accessed
21 by students, faculty, and staff is based solely on trips made by
22 residents of the proposed landmark building using a trip-
23 generation model.

24 The CTR includes no, quote, "real world," end of quote,
25 trip generation data for Wesley's faculty, staff, or other

1 students, including commuter students who comprise 80 percent of
2 the Wesley student body.

3 Wesley's 2012 Campus Plan Update noted that commuter
4 students have the most significant impact on traffic generation
5 and parking demand on Wesley campus. Any analysis of
6 transportation impacts tied to the Wesley campus that does not
7 include new data on Wesley's commuter students is simply not
8 credible.

9 Four, the CTR includes no analysis of future conditions
10 as required. The CTR's assessment of future conditions, another
11 critical element of any traffic analysis, projects out only to
12 2024. 2024 is no longer the future; it's not even the present.

13 Five, The CTR's assessment of background conditions is
14 outdated and no longer applicable. The CTR almost assesses
15 background conditions, that is how the campus plan when examined
16 within the context of other new developments, might impact the
17 transportation network and future conditions.

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

21 Six, the CTR fails to offer mitigation for two critical
22 failed study intersections as required by DDOT policy. The CTR
23 states on page 43 that the two study intersections operate at
24 unacceptable levels of service, and under DDOT rules, must be
25 mitigated. The Massachusetts Avenue and Wesley Circle study

1 intersection operates at an E-level of service.

2 This is the intersection off Massachusetts Avenue that
3 many Spring Valley residents, especially those closest to Wesley,
4 use for neighborhood ingress and egress. The report shows this
5 intersection experiences high traffic volumes and longer-than-
6 appropriate traffic queueing delays. Grosslaine even recommends
7 that DDOT conduct a safety audit of this intersection stemming
8 from a review of crash data.

9 The second studied failed intersection, which operates
10 at an F-level of service, is where Massachusetts Avenue
11 intersects with the Wesley main entrance driveway. This is only
12 about 440 feet from the Massachusetts Avenue and Wesley Circle
13 intersection, and about 200 feet from an existing pedestrian
14 signal.

15 Let me now turn this over to Blaine Carter.

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

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

23 DDOT has required that Wesley develop a performance-
24 monitoring program, PMP, to track progress in achieving its TDM
25 goals. The PMP sets a baseline of trip goals for the campus,

1 but it's based on the old and incomplete data use in the CTR.
2 However, it's 101 trip threshold, which is considered acceptable,
3 exceeds the number of trips permitted in Wesley's current campus
4 plan. Wesley also proposes a survey to collect data on how Wesley
5 residents, faculty, staff, and commuter students access the
6 campus. This is precisely the type of data that is collected
7 for a campus plan. Without this data, it would be impossible to
8 develop a reliable TDM plan.

9 Wesley's proposed parking proposals are not supported
10 by any parking utilization data. Wesley parking proposal for
11 this plan is another new problem. Wesley, which now has 174
12 service parking spaces, started this process by proposing 391
13 parking spaces, that's Zoning Case No. 22-13, increased it to 394
14 for the PUD case, Zoning Commission Case No. 23-08, and is now
15 proposing 295 spaces, Zoning Commission Case 23-08(1).

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

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

24 Where are the results of Wesley's semi-annual parking
25 reports that were required as a condition of the current campus

1 plan? If these sort of patterns are to be used, the 295 parking
2 spaces would be woefully inadequate, resulting in drivers
3 choosing instead to park on nearby neighborhood streets.

4 Wesley is proposing that 187 of these 295 parking
5 spaces will be used by the 695 residents of the proposed landmark
6 building and visitors to the campus. Wesley's staff and faculty,
7 Wesley's commuter students, and on-campus residents living in
8 other Wesley housing, will share 108 spaces.

9 The latest field data from Wesley's parking use is
10 included in the 2012 Wesley Campus Plan Update that included
11 parking utilization data collected nearly 14 years ago in October
12 2011 for 174 parking spaces on Wesley campus.

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

18 When the parking lot was busiest, the data showed
19 University Avenue in the Spring Valley neighborhood was a
20 preferred place for overflow parking. Based on the CTR in this
21 case, Wesley's Campus Plan creates objectionable conditions based
22 on traffic and parking, and fails to provide and specific
23 proposals to mitigate these objectionable conditions.

24 The CTR was prepared at a time when the world was
25 emerging from a frozen pandemic. Wesley's Campus Plan cases have

1 been postponed multiple times at Wesley's request, because the
2 application is not ready for the final action.

3 Nearly a year passed from when this case was held in
4 abeyance to when Wesley requested it in March 25 that the
5 Commission was able to review after Wesley submitted another
6 revised campus proposal. There has been more than enough time
7 to collect real-world ground truth data, and compare a revised
8 CTR in a post-COVID environment.

9 Based on the CTR's data and analysis, Wesley's campus
10 plan does not comply with the standards for approval outline in
11 Subtitle X, Section 101.2. We call on the Commission to require
12 the applicant to do the work it should have done at least a year
13 ago, and submit a new CTR that may offer more insight into
14 existing future and background conditions, and allows them to
15 form data-driven decision making in this case.

16 Thank you. This concludes our testimony.

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

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

1 So I do have a question, couple of them. And I'm just
2 trying, as I'm thinking through this -- so DDOT is our subject
3 matter experts. They don't just do transportation stuff that's
4 here. They've informed me -- and I don't always agree with you
5 guys, and that's no secret -- and what I didn't -- I was really
6 disagree on some (indiscernible), but they informed me they were
7 an award-winning district department of transportation. And I
8 thought about -- I've been thinking about that ever since, and I
9 didn't disagree with them because they've got awards in
10 transportation across the country, and I don't.

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

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

23 Do you all have that, or are these guesstimates, or
24 what you think? Because here's the thing, I'm going to tell you
25 this -- and I was thinking of this as you all were talking. When

1 we did National stadium, I knew there was a serious transportation
2 issue, because the hearings lasted forever. The community showed
3 up, and they told a story, and we knew that there was some
4 mitigation measures that needed to take place.

5 I'm not getting the same result here, unless I'm
6 missing something. You know -- you know, no disrespect to
7 anybody, but I'm not feeling the same push. So something that --
8 that DDOT and Wesley have been doing must be working. So help --
9 help me understand where you all are. Are you just data driven,
10 or actually practicality, and what's actually going on? That's
11 kind of where I am.

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

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

23 In other words, this data is going back five years
24 before COVID, and some back 22 years. The problem is there isn't
25 any current data to make these decisions. So I'm going off of

1 both data and what I'm experiencing. I do drive into the District
2 every day, Mr. Hood, from where I live, and traffic is ridiculous.
3 And part of it is because that capacity has been taken out of
4 the network with bicycles, DDOT is trying to get alternative
5 transportation. And traffic's gotten worse, and yet the data's
6 not there to support this report -- or I should say the data is
7 being extrapolated, you know, from five to 22 years back.

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay.

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

11 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure.

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

22 That's the first point I'd like to make. But the second
23 point I'd like to make is -- and I would add, I would not have
24 expected Wesley to have filed this type of CTR if this case were
25 beginning now. That the reason -- the only justification for

1 this CTR is that it was done when it was done, which was back in
2 2022 because of COVID.

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

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

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

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

4 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Yeah. I just had a question
5 about parking. Does Spring Valley have resident parking permits
6 such that if you are not a resident you can only park for two
7 hours?

8 MR. SMITH: There are certain parts of Spring Valley
9 that have that, but not all parts of Spring Valley have that.

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

12 MR. SMITH: Blaine?

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

15 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: All right. So I understand the
16 parking concern. However, the residential parking permits are
17 supposed to assure that people who are not residents in Ward 3
18 are not able to park beyond two hours. I am assuming that the
19 residents of the -- whatever we're calling it now, the
20 residential hall, or dormitory, or whatever the correct term that
21 we're using now -- I'm assuming they would not, for the most
22 part, be able to obtain Ward 3 parking permits.

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

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

5 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: The bail --

6 MR. SMITH: On the side -- I'm sorry, on the side of
7 the University, you know, where Blaine is, he lives on -- he
8 lives on the residential side of University Avenue, on the
9 opposite side of University, there is no RPP. So --

10 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I see. Okay.

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

19 You know, whether it's three hours or four hours,
20 because their students are not supposed to be parking in the
21 neighborhood period. And but Wesley does not have that kind
22 of -- does not have that kind of capacity in place. And so that
23 is a concern. When you -- and I hate to look at -- none of us
24 like looking at old data. I mean, you know, 2012 data, but if
25 that's the only thing you have, you know, I think it was pretty

1 remarkable that when that data was collected, they also collected
2 data not only on the parking utilization on the Wesley campus,
3 but also in the nearby streets, and whether their students were
4 parking on the nearby streets.

5 And that data showed that during the peak hours of uses
6 on the campus, it was cars were parking on University Avenue as
7 opposed to on Mass Avenue where the meters are, or some other
8 place. That was what that data showed.

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

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

20 Would it be possible to add to the Transportation
21 Demand Management Plan a condition that the -- that Wesley will
22 oversee their students, if that's really the issue, just as your
23 describing, sir, that American University does. And try to
24 strongly instruct them not to park illegally in the neighborhood.
25 I mean, if you're allowed to park for two hours in the residential

1 parking permit area, you should be allowed to park for two hours.
2 If you -- just as a visitor to a home would be parking for two
3 hours. But they shouldn't be allowed to park illegally.

4 Can't hear you.

5 MR. BROWN: I agree, and I think we've -- we've
6 attempted to incorporate at the campus plan level some of those
7 ideas, and our expectation is to tighten that for the processing
8 level, so that Wesley has a method of registering/ monitoring
9 their student vehicles in a way that no -- if the problem exists,
10 and then how to deal with it, should it become a problem.

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

13 MR. BROWN: Yes. And the TDM and taking Mr. Solomon
14 under a little bit, but the TDM works in conjunction with the
15 PMP, the Performance Management, in so that you trust but verify,
16 and we're committed to that.

17 COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Thanks. I just wanted to get
18 that conversation in about residential parking permits as we were
19 discussing parking. I didn't mean to interrupt you, Chair Hood,
20 and you can go back to the questions that you had if I haven't
21 completely disrupted you too much.

22 MR. BROWN: Can I interject real quickly? On the RPP --

23 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Brown --

24 MR. BROWN: Okay. I stand --

25 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- (indiscernible) --

1 MR. BROWN: -- I stand silent.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: -- because I'm going to get on you
3 about not doing reports, and you're doing further in the process
4 and you have to be compliant. So wait. Don't worry, I haven't
5 forgot you were here. We're coming back to you.

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

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

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. Commissioner
19 Wright, any additional questions? Okay.

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

1 again in the city.

2 That is why, as an alternative to making road widenings
3 and other kinds of physical improvements, that is why the TDM is
4 the solution. And, you know, I mean, I have to say that there
5 are probably many failing intersections in the neighborhood I
6 live in, and if there is -- and the traffic isn't great. But
7 the only solution to that is to not basically say, okay, stop
8 everything forever more.

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

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

25 You want to keep the roads the way they are, because

1 they actually create the environment that we all need in terms
2 of sidewalks and vegetation, and so on and so forth.

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

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

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

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

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

16 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Chair Duncan, do you have any
17 cross?

18 MS. DUNCAN: No cross.

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

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

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

25 MS. SCHELLIN: For him to do rebuttal, or any cross if

1 he has any. I'm sorry, rebuttal and closing.

2 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah. Mr. Brown, let me just say
3 this. Vice Chairman (indiscernible) about the RPP, I think you
4 wanted to address that, I think -- or did you? Something about
5 RPP?

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

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

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

1 to make sure that whoever is supposed to be giving those reports
2 will be giving those reports.

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

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

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

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

14 MR. SOLOMON: (Indiscernible.)

15 MR. BROWN: I can't hear you.

16 MR. SOLOMON: (Indiscernible.)

17 MR. YOUNG: Now -- we hear you now.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Please.

25 MS. SCHELLIN: So July 31st, I didn't hear the

1 Commission ask for anything, so I believe the record is now
2 closed.

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

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

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

16 MR. BROWN: Is it at all possible to do it sooner than
17 that?

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

20 MR. BROWN: I had to ask.

21 MS. SCHELLIN: You had to.

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, you got your time, Mr. Brown.
23 You're really pushing, but the Commission wants -- we want to be
24 able to examine what's coming to us.

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

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

2 MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. They have to have time to absorb
3 everything you guys gave them.

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

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

7 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. All right. (Indiscernible.)

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

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

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

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

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

14 MS. SCHELLIN: Monday. Monday --

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Monday's case.

16 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

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

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

22 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Great. Okay. Again, before
23 I close out, do we have anything else? The Zoning Commission
24 meets again this coming Monday. The top of the case is the
25 Brooklyn -- hold on one second, I'm going to make sure. We're

1 doing the same platforms at 4 p.m., 901 Monroe Street LLC
2 (phonetic), that'll be a continuation of 24-15, and we'll be
3 starting with, I think, with closer to 4:00.

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

5 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

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

8 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, you --

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

12 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Okay.

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

15 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Yeah. (Indiscernible) to
16 where we are.

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

18 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.

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

24 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure. I'll do that this evening.

25 Sure --

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

3 MS. SCHELLIN: Sure.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

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

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

13 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
14 record at 5:10 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing - Case No. 23-08(1)

Before: D.C. Zoning Commission

Date: 07-02-25

Place: Webex Videoconference

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



Barrington Moxie