IN THE MATTER OF:

Comprehensive Zoning
Regulations Rewrite: Parking

Case No.: 08-06-2

Thursday,
July 31, 2008

Hearing Room 220 South
441 4th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 08-06-2 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD Chairman
GREGORY N. JEFFRIES Vice Chairman
CURTIS ETHERLY, JR. Commissioner
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL FAIA, Commissioner (OAC)
PETER G. MAY Commissioner (NPS)
OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN  Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

HARRIET TREGONING   Director
JENNIFER STEINGASSER
TRAVIS PARKER

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT PRESENT:

RUTHANNE G. MILLER   Chairperson

DDOT PRESENT:

KARINA RICKS       Assoc. Director

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on July 31, 2008.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME:
Anthony Hood .................................. 5

ZC CASE NO. 08-06-2 - COMPREHENSIVE ZONING REGULATIONS REWRITE: PARKING:
OFFICE OF PLANNING:
Harriet Tregoning .............................. 8
Travis Parker .................................... 32

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1 - Eliminate Min. Parking Standards .... 35
2 - Implement Parking Maximums .......... 37
3 - Car-Sharing ................................ 38
4 - More Matter-of-Right Relief .......... 39
5 - Car-Sharing ................................ 41
6 - Parking Size ............................... 43
7 - Parking Access ............................. 44
8 - Lot Parking Space Location .......... 46
9 - Parking Lot Refuse ....................... 47
10 - Landscaping Requirements .......... 47
11 - Bicycle Parking ......................... 53

DDOT:
Karina Ricks .................................. 23

COUNCIL MEMBER TOMMY WELLS' OFFICE:
Neha Bhatt .................................... 56

PERSONS/PARTIES IN SUPPORT:
Allen Greenberg ............................... 65
Cheryl Cort .................................... 71
David Duxbury ................................ 76
Louise Brodnitz ............................... 101
Geoffrey Hatchard ............................. 104
David Alpert .................................. 108
Jason Hesch .................................. 116
Alan De Castro ................................. 118
Gary Petorsa .................................. 121
Ralph Garboushian ......................... 125
Alice Speck .................................. 131
Jeff Speck .................................... 134
Ken Archer ................................... 140

ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSIONS:
Dave Garrison - ANC-6B01 .................. 83
Ken Jarboe - ANC-6B ......................... 89
Alma Gates - ANC-3D05 ..................... 93
Wilson Reynolds - ANC-1C .................. 96
TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERSONS/PARTIES IN SUPPORT (CONTINUED):
Abby Hall ........................................... 145
Lindsley Williams ................................. 149
Steven Sher ......................................... 153
Paul Tummonds ................................. 159
Christopher Zieman ......................... 163
Steven Jones ....................................... 169
Heather Whitlow ................................. 173
Glen Harrison ..................................... 179
Matthew Yglesias .............................. 190
Drew Pusateri ..................................... 193
Brian O'Looney .................................. 196
Ellice Perez ....................................... 202
Lance Brown ...................................... 216
Patrick Lynch ..................................... 219
Erwin Andres ..................................... 222
Janee Grant ....................................... 260

PERSONS/PARTIES IN OPPOSITION:
George Clark .................................... 227
Marilyn Simon ................................... 233
Barbara Zartman ................................. 239
Bill Crews ......................................... 245

BOARD DISCUSSION: .............................. 266

ADJOURN:
Anthony Hood ................................. 280
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the Public Hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, July 31, 2008. My name is Anthony J. Hood. Joining me this evening are Vice Chairman, will be, Jeffries. We are also joined by Commissioner Etherly, Commissioner May and Commissioner Turnbull.

We are also joined by the -- we're honored to have tonight the Chair of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, Ms. Ruthanne Miller. And do we have any other members? Okay. Seeing none.

To my left we are joined by the Office of Zoning staff and to my right the Office of Planning staff and the District Department of Transportation staff.

This proceeding is being recorded by Court Reporter and is also webcast live.
Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room.

Notice of the hearing was published in DC Register on June 13, 2008. This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR 3021 as follows:

Preliminary matters, presentations by the Office of Planning, report of other Government agencies, report of the ANCs, persons in support and persons in opposition.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this hearing: ANCs and organizations 5 minutes, individuals 3 minutes. If you are an individual ANC Commissioner, you will have 3 minutes.

Okay. All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the door. Upon coming forward to the Commission, please, give both
cards to the reporter sitting to my right before taking a seat at the table.

Okay. The decision of the Commission in this case must be based exclusively on the public record. The staff will be available throughout the hearing to discuss procedural questions.

Please, turn off all beepers and cell phones, at this time, as not to disrupt these proceedings.

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

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.

Again, let me just say how we're going to proceed tonight, because we have a lot of people that this Commission would like to hear from. We know a lot of work has been put into play by the Task Force, the Office of Planning and all parties and interests involved here in the city.
The ANC's and organizations, if you are representing the ANC, you have 5 minutes, organizations will have 5 minutes. If you are an individual ANC or individual citizen, you will have 3 minutes. And I will tell you that the time clock will stop. I do not want to be rude. My parents didn't raise me to be rude, but, please, let's be respectful to all those who want to give their comments in.

If we have your submittals, we will read them. Believe me. We might not read everything tonight, which we will not be able to, but honestly, we will peruse and we will read every comment and everything that we have, so we can take everything into consideration when we start deliberating.

So can we all agree to that, we're all on one accord? Thank you so much.

Okay. With that, let me turn it over to the Director of the Office of Planning, Ms. Tregoning.

MS. TREGONING: Thank you very
much, Mr. Chairman. I'm very pleased to be here this evening and delighted with the turnout for this hearing. And I'm very interested in hearing what people have to say.

I'm going to start out this morning or this afternoon by saying a little bit about some context for this decision. As I think many of you know, we are going through an update of our Zoning Regulations. And you know, some of the topics that we cover, I think, are perhaps a little esoteric.

We have a Zoning set of Regulations that really hasn't been comprehensively updated for more than 50 years and some of the things in our code are a little bit archaic. But I have to say that the topic we are speaking about tonight is not one of those archaic things.

It's a very important thing. And I think that a lot of what determines the kind of city we're going to be and the kind of mobility our citizens are going to have, the
kind of energy and climate future that we are going to enjoy in the District of Columbia depends very much on the kinds of decisions that we are going to be discussing this evening.

So I just wanted to take the opportunity to maybe start at the 30,000 foot level with a little bit of context about how we came to these set of recommendations this evening.

Washington, D.C., as I think all of you here in the audience tonight know and certainly our Commissioners know, is a wonderful city and aspires to be an even more wonderful city. In particular, while we might have been known, you know, for many years as the Federal City, as a place that is the center of a lot of federal employment, the nation's capital, that in every way we are really becoming a wonderful, livable international city.

A great city that whether a
capital or not would be able to stand on its own. And that means that we have certain attributes that we share with other great cities of the world, including being a city of very distinctive wonderful neighborhoods and districts, places that have terrific amenities that are historically significant, that are unique, that have great waterfronts and great community centers.

We are a city that has multiple transportation choices, a place that really allows citizens to have many different options for how they get around, a place that is incredibly walkable. And I'm going to speak a little bit more about this later. And walkability means a couple of different things. That we have safety in much of our city that people feel secure about walking.

We have the facilities, but we also have the destinations. We have the places to go to where we can meet our daily needs as citizens without having to
necessarily get in a vehicle or even in some cases leave our neighborhoods.

We are a city that is committed to green and sustainable development practices. We have passed one of the most ambitious Green Building Laws in the country. The City Council passed another important provision last week that creates a sustainable energy utility that will allow us to massively retrofit a lot of our existing building stock.

You know, we have firmly declared that our future is very green and very sustainable when it comes to buildings. We think it also has to be that when it comes to transportation as well.

We think a city that is globally competitive and sustainable also shares its economic prosperity. It uses its growth to channel that prosperity into all neighborhoods and into -- and to create jobs and opportunity for all of its citizens. And that is probably no more true in Washington than in our
transportation policies.

   You know, we invest in a lot of
different types of transportation, so that the
cost of automobile ownership which AAA tells
us is more than $11,000 per year, that's not
the price of admission to a job in the
District of Columbia. It's not the price of
admission to an education, that we have
invested in other types of transportation, so
that we can have low cost mobility in our city
that everyone can enjoy.

   And that we are a city that has a
lot of wonderful parks and open spaces, more
per capita than any other city, probably still
not enough, but more than many other places.

   But let's be honest, we have also
been known for many, many years as a place
that is number one or number two, no lower
than number three, as a Metro area for
congestion. You know, we are a place that the
Texas Transportation Institute gets us on the
front page, you know, every year when they do
their ratings.

And congestion is something that Washingtonians and people in the Metro area spend a lot of time and energy talking about. So much so that it begins to -- that it has drowned out what is really emerging about D.C., that we are not just the leader in congestion. We are the leader in things that reduce congestion and that increase livability.

We are number one in the number of walkable places per capita. And fully 12 percent of our residents walk to work. We think that number is actually rising. Biking magazine called us the number one most improved city for biking. We are number two in the country for rail ridership.

It's already true that fully 50 percent of our citizens commute by something other than vehicles, which is pretty astonishing. So in some ways, the whole notion of alternative transportation is really
changing for us. The alternative might be vehicles, because we have so many other choices.

And we're not stopping and resting on our laurels. This is a slide from our center city action agenda and DDOT would probably have a lot more to day about this. But it's intended to illustrate that we are not satisfied just with our Metro system, just with our existing bus system. We really see a future with a lot more transit of every kind, streetcar, BRT, light rail, express bus, many, many more transportation choices and much greater convenience and frequency of service.

This is a photo of our streetcar being tested in Prague. And I think a lot of you are aware that any minute now Smartbikes is going to be opening in the District of Columbia. We are the first U.S. city to bring this style of bike-sharing to the United States. Paris is famous for their year-old
program that is now generating more than
100,000 additional bicycle trips a day with
their system.

We have great car-sharing here.
More than 700 Zipcars in 26 neighborhoods
providing great convenience and choice to
citizens.

And we are talking about this at a
time when things are really beginning to
accelerate in terms of change. And I can't be
-- I can't tell you that I know what is going
to happen with energy. I don't think anybody
does know exactly what is going to happen. I
mean, if I could lay a bet on what energy
prices would be 15 years from now, I might be
a rich woman.

But we do know that the higher
energy prices that we are experiencing are
already manifesting themselves in changes in
how people choose to travel and to some degree
where they choose to live. This is a chart
that shows what gasoline prices have been
doing in inflation adjusted dollars. And like
I say, even the author of this chart is
hesitant to predict what might be happening.

The 72 month average retail price
chart in the U.S. shows a pretty compelling
story about where gasoline prices have been
headed. And whatever you think about the
future of energy prices, you know, one of the
things that is hotly discussed is how much of
a role petroleum is going to be playing in our
future.

There are many people who say that
we have passed the peak of production. And
whether you agree with them or you think that
that time is years away or a decade away, in
our lifetimes, maybe very soon, we are going
to be facing a time of a lot more uncertainty
about energy, a lot more difficulties with
extracting that energy.

That energy is in places where it
is hard to get and sometimes controlled by
regimes that aren't so friendly to us. And so
it is certainly not going to be the way it was on the way up that peak oil curve.

And the other thing that is different now is that we are stretched so tightly with respect to capacity that any disruption in supply, any disruption that might be weather-related, anything that happens to a key piece of equipment or a key piece of transportation of the structure that is bringing supply to or from can have a very disruptive and costly effect.

So that's kind of where we are with energy prices, that alternatives are being -- are absolutely being sought, but we may not know what, if anything, we are going to be able to find as a substitute for gasoline in our vehicles. So we are in for a future that is going to have at least, we know, higher costs and uncertainty, but we also know that the market has already begun to signal support for more compact growth, particularly in neighborhoods that have
1 convenience.

2 And what is convenience? This is a chart of the growth centers, the activity centers in our metropolitan region. And we have categorized them kind of very broadly as mixed-use urban, employment centers, which Tyson's is one of those, suburban employment centers, like some of the others in Fairfax, emerging employment centers like those in Manassas Park.

3 And you know, they really vary in terms of how convenient they are and how successful we have been in attracting development to those areas. But when you look at those areas, two weeks ago Walkscore came out with the second version where they rate their -- rating not just addresses, but cities.

4 Walkscore is a website and it is intended to be sort of a real estate tool that lets people know how convenient different neighborhoods are. Washington, D.C. ended up
No. 7 on the Walkscore list out of the top 40 cities in the U.S. And you know, some of our neighborhoods are 99 and 98 out of 100 Walkscore.

So the difference isn't that our most walkable neighborhoods aren't so great. They are fantastic. The difference is that we don't have as many walkable neighborhoods as some cities like San Francisco or New York who are higher up on the list. So the green areas are the most walkable neighborhoods. The lighter green still walkable, but less so. And the redder the neighborhoods, the more auto dependent.

You know, so our challenge in the city is to make more of this map green and give people more of that convenience. But you can see that what we already have in the city has given us enough walkability that we are -- that we have at least snagged the No. 7 rating. Certain neighborhoods are more walkable than others.
And how they consider walkability or looking at well, what are the things that people need to get to every day and where are they? Grocery stores, libraries, theaters, parks, fitness centers, drug stores, hardware stores, etcetera, and giving them a score based on how near they are to a given address.

You know, walkability is our future in Washington and almost everything we are doing in the Office of Planning from retail studies to this update of our Zoning Code is designed to provide more convenience in neighborhoods and give people more choices. And as you are going to hear about today in the rest of this presentation, an important part of that policy is figuring out how we govern the amount of parking that we create in the city.

Unlike a lot of other types of building uses, we can't convert a parking space, you know, into another convenient use. It can't be a condo. It can't even be a dog.
house. You know, once we build that parking and it is there, there is not a lot that we can with it.

So if we guess wrong or force more parking than might be necessary in this changing environment, we are stuck with it for a really long time.

So I just wanted to end with this illustration. These are one mile walks in different development forms. You know, the city -- the grid to the left is not us, right? Not enough diagonals to be us. But that finely grain gridded street network is something that we do enjoy in many parts of the city and the ability to get to many different destinations conveniently is part of what makes it so great to live in Washington.

Our challenge is to bring that convenience, if not necessarily the rigor of the grid to all parts of the city, so that people do have choices, both for transportation and for destinations that they
can easily reach on bike or on foot, as well as accommodating, you know, the automobile, which we will have, but we don't want it to be the only choice that people have in our city.

We want to be known as a place where people have all the transportation choices that there are to be had. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We're just going to go right through the whole presentation.

MS. RICKS: Yeah, I'm going to need light. I don't have the presentation, but I'm Karina Ricks. I'm the Associate Director for Transportation Policy and Planning with the District Department of Transportation.

And Harriet is always a hard act to follow, but we are thrilled for all the recognition of the great programs that DDOT has initiated over the recent years, the Smartbike Program, New Transient Initiatives, Pedestrian Planning, Car-Sharing and others. But these great new initiatives can really
only be realized if we give them a competitive playing field and sort of right size the traditional orientation that we have had in recent years toward automobile accommodation and facilitating that particular mode.

Parking supply is irrefutably related to auto trip generation. The greater the parking supply, the greater the vehicles miles traveled and the greater the associated air emissions.

D.C. is, of course, not the only region to struggle with these issues. Boston and Atlanta have also taken similar steps to look at their air conditions and the relationship with parking. Boston looked to curbing motor vehicle emissions by controlling the growth of parking spaces as a way to decrease the vehicle miles traveled and keep auto usage levels down to a level that can be accommodated by the practical capacity of their local street network.

The EPA reviewed this proposal and
concluded that it would, indeed, reduce the emissions of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides below the levels that traditional development would expect.

Likewise, Atlanta looked at implementing parking management plans and constraining parking supply as a way to reduce the VMTs in their area and they found that associated emissions were reduced by 3 and 5 percent, respectively. So there is a connection. It is something that is important.

We are a region that struggles with air quality. We think that this initiative that has begun is something that we should support and DDOT is happy to have been a partner with the Office of Planning and this update.

Parking is, of course, expensive, both for those who choose to own cars as well as those who don't. The construction of parking spaces is costly. A simple surface
parking space can cost on average upwards of $5,000, while an underground space can easily surpass $40,000.

In fact, providing one below-grade parking space per residential unit, a study by the University of Colorado found increased housing costs anywhere from 20 to 40 percent conveyed to the actual buyer.

We have done great work in recent years to try and decouple parking costs from residential costs, but the indirect costs are hard to really determine and segregate in that way. The Bureau of Transportation Statistics estimates that there is roughly five parking spaces available for every one vehicle in any urbanized area. Four of which are vacant at any given time.

These spaces impose a cost of about $3,000 a year just to exist and these costs as passed indirectly to the general population. Clearly, these are compelling reasons not to build more parking than is
absolutely necessary and to review these Zoning Codes to ensure that they are appropriate.

The zoning modernization will support DDOT's mission to create a more balanced system where diversity of modes are equally competitive for trips. As Harriet mentioned, D.C. has the second highest non-motorized split for trips, second only to New York. We have over 50 percent of all trips made in the city made by non-motorized means and compared to our friends in Arlington that we love to compete with, who do quite well, they still only achieve about 32 percent while in Fairfax it's less than 12 percent.

This proposal will help expand those non-motorized trips and continue the trend that we think is quite positive. It will right-size the parking supply. It will also promote car-sharing and improve bicycle facilities and amenities. The reduction in parking supply will protect our local networks
from over-saturation and will reduce local traffic impacts.

While we hope to see the benefits citywide, the report appropriately recognizes that there is not a one-size-fits-all solution to parking supply. It provides four different approaches and four different transportation and land use contexts. And it also allows some flexibility to respond to market demands and other local conditions.

For all these reasons, DDOT hardly supports the adoption of the proposal the Office of Planning has outlined. We are aware that there are concerns, notable that if sufficient parking is not provided off-street, then residents, workers or patrons will seek parking spaces on the local streets, the so-called spill-over effect.

This is not an insignificant concern, but neither is it an unsolvable one. DDOT has already successfully piloted two performance-based parking areas, one in
Columbia Heights and the other by the ballpark, as well as additional parking pilots in Wards 3 and 4.

These pilots are shown tremendous promise in managing the demand of on-street spaces in both residential and commercial settings. We also have several examples of communities that have successfully negotiated to have new developments ineligible for entry into the RPP Program, as the new vehicles from these properties would further put pressure on the residential supply.

The residents of new properties know at the time of purchase what their parking travel options are and are able to make informed decisions regarding their housing choice. DDOT will continue to reform the RPP system in our commercial parking management in the years ahead, as we know that these two are in need of modernization.

We do wholeheartedly support the proposals concept. There are some details in
the proposed language that we would recommend modification of.

The first is the provision that grants flexibility of up to 50 percent more/50 percent less than a minimum or maximum requirements. While we support the flexibility, we are concerned that 50 percent might be too great a variance and propose further review of this number.

Furthermore, DDOT doesn't wish to have sole discretion in granting or denying this variance. We recommend that some amount of flexibility be granted as a matter-of-right. But that any amount greater than the threshold require review by the Board of Zoning Adjustment, which is a standing body with prescribed opportunities for public comment and technical review.

Secondly, as regards bicycle parking, DDOT robustly supports the intention of the section, but we believe it might prove so complicated in its elaborate calculations
specific to a multitude of uses that the final result may be an unintentional shortage of bicycle parking compared to current regulations.

We proposed significantly simplifying the table to broad categories of residential, office, retail, institutional and industrial. Furthermore, it's our understanding that Class A bicycle parking is for spaces within a building or on private space. While Class B bicycle parking is provided on the public space immediately surrounding a building.

While the Class A space must be mandated in this code revision and already guarantee that it is delivered, the Class B will require further review to ensure compliance with all public space rules and coordination with other demands of the public space. We therefore recommend that only the Class A spaces be required in the updated code with the Class B spaces as recommended.
We look forward to working with the OP staff to hammer out the details of the bicycle parking requirements to ensure that this amenity is provided.

The updated code presents a new high water mark for development in the District and a progressive approach to parking that accommodates both market and community concerns. DDOT is proud to have been a co-sponsor of the report leading to this code update. We believe its adoption will lead to even more livable, sustainable and thriving world class city than we enjoy today.

MR. PARKER: Can I trouble you for the lights one more time? I've got slides for the recommendations. Good evening. I'm Travis Parker with the Office of Planning. You have heard a lot of great information on what we are here about and why we should be making changes. And now, I'm going to follow-up with a little bit about the how.

I'm going to talk very briefly for
just a minute or two on the process leading up to this point and then I'm going to go through all 11 recommendations that we have proposed tonight. And I can certainly go through all of them and come back for questions, but certainly if the Commission has questions as we go, I would encourage you to interrupt me and ask them while the slides are up.

As far as the process, this parking study, in particular, and the zoning review as a whole, in general, is a product of the Comprehensive Plan. This is an attempt to implement a lot of the policies in the Comp plan. The Comp Plan, as you know, has an entire chapter devoted to transportation. And it encourages a lot of the things that Harriet and Karina talked about, the modal shift away from automobiles, the greener status of other types of transportation and moving in that direction.

So with that in mind, in 2007, Office of Planning brought on consultant,
Nelson Nygaard, from New York to look at parking in the District of Columbia, both the supply of parking, the existing parking policies and regulations, as well as parking as it is handled by other jurisdictions around the country. And they spent the latter half of 2007 doing that.

Then in February of this year, as a part of this zoning review process, OP convened a public working group that included ourselves and Nelson Nygaard and a large group of public participants, including community activists, Casey Trees and several parking interested parties.

And we met through the months of February, March and April and that public process culminated in both a report from Nelson Nygaard that laid out all of their research and their recommendations and then both the working group and the Nelson Nygaard report culminated in some -- a set of Office of Planning recommendations on how the parking
chapter should be changed.

That subsequently went through review by the Task Force that is reviewing the work of all of the subject areas in this zoning review. We met with them in May and again in July for their comments. And the culmination of all those comments, both from the working group, the Task Force and the last three or four months of public review on our website and through the Public Hearing notice have all been a part of the recommendations that you see here today from the Office of Planning.

So with that, I'll start going through the recommendations. The first recommendation that you have heard a lot about tonight is that as a general rule, we should be eliminating minimum parking standards throughout the city, for the reasons that both Harriet and Karina talked about, the increased cost that is associated with providing extra parking, the threats to urban design that
comes from access to and from that parking and
the simple matter that large amount of parking
and greater amounts of parking lead to greater
amounts of auto trips and increased congestion
in general.

In an ideal world, this would be
just a straight rule and parking minimums
would be eliminated entirely. But of course,
we don't live in an ideal world and there are
still concerns of residential spill-over from
uses that produce a lot of auto trips and have
the potential to impact neighborhoods
negatively.

And so our recommendation is
coupled by a recommendation that we keep
parking -- minimum parking requirements in two
specific areas. In the lower and moderate
density residential areas for non-residential
uses, things like churches, schools and any
commercial uses that are in residential areas
would maintain minimums. And then the same
commercial uses in our commercial corridors
that are near those uses, so the C2 areas of
the city, in particular.

Coupled with parking -- with the
first recommendation, the polices that we
talked about earlier tonight couldn't be
accomplished by reducing the parking minimums
alone. The demand for parking, the market
demand for parking generally is greater than
our standard parking minimums.

So the only way to accomplish all
the policies that we have been talking about	onight is to couple that with the
implementation of parking maximums. And the
goal here is that parking maximums would be
applied generally, but specifically to the
downtown and areas around transportation hubs
or at least more stringently in those areas.

For those of you who have read the
report, you know that we haven't recommended
yet any particular parking maximums. There is
a lot of work that needs to go into setting
these numbers. We don't want to do it
arbitrarily.

So the plan from here is to have each of the land use subject areas as we go through, the downtown area, the commercial corridor area, the high density commercial area look at the maximum parking requirements for those specific areas and work on setting those. So you will get those recommendations piecemeal as we look at those individual areas.

Recommendation 3 has to do with car-sharing. One of the things that the current code does not do well now is allow for the sharing of parking structures. Each use requires its own parking. So if you have an office space next door to a nightly restaurant, that you know the office only uses daytime and the restaurant only uses nighttime, they each have to provide their own parking and can't use a shared facility under the current code without some sort of relief.

The intent of this provision would
be to allow uses that have the option, because of different time of day or day of week usages, to share their parking requirement in the same facility. And of course, we have got some ideas about how this would be implemented and we can get -- we will get further into that when the language is written, but it should be, of course, accompanied by an agreement and reviewed by the Zoning Administrator and several other things that are in our report.

The fourth recommendation, I think, was mentioned briefly by DDOT is there should be some more matter-of-right relief for the maximums or the minimums. And the thought behind this is that there are often spaces in the city that are or properties in the city that have no opportunity to put parking in. And the vast majority of variance cases are for one, two or three spaces on properties that can't possibly provide parking.

Something on the order of 94
percent of all parking variances that come forward for this reason are approved over the last, I think that stat holds our, seven or eight years.

So the thought being that up to 50 percent of the required parking could be waived through a monetary contribution and up to 50 percent, you could go up to 50 percent higher than a maximum requirement through a monetary contribution.

The contribution would be used for transportation improvements, hopefully in the local area, but that's certainly up for discussion. And the fee would serve as a disincentive from using it. Obviously, if the fee is set at a price near the price of providing the parking, an applicant is not going to choose to pay for the parking and not get it, unless it really can't be built.

Similarly, for the maximums, most applicants will not choose to provide extra parking and pay double for it if it's not
truly needed. So this is intended to allow
for more matter-of-right options for those
situations.

Recommendation 5 has to do with
car-sharing in the city. And this is
something that is more and more common around
the city and Arlington has provisions along
these lines right now. But the basic concept
is that for any parking garage that is built
with 50 or more parking spaces, you would have
to provide one parking space that would be
made available to a car-sharing entity, be
that profit, nonprofit, Government, private.

But that space would have to be
available in perpetuity. We understand that
car-sharing entities can't take all the spaces
that will be provided to them, so if it's not
taken available, it is certainly available for
the applicant to use, but it would have to be
available with 90 days notice in perpetuity.

And those required parking spaces
then would not count against any parking
maximum.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Parker, if I could just stop at this point?

MR. PARKER: Sure.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have done five recommendations and I would ask my -- we want to hear from OP, DDOT and the public. But I wanted to ask my colleagues was there anything that just jumped out or if they wanted to take this time, we have done five and a lot of information, if you wanted to pose a question or maybe put something that we can pose a question to OP at this time and maybe get an answer at a later date or a later time. Okay.

MS. MILLER: One.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have one question. Chair Miller?

MS. MILLER: With respect to the payment for not providing the minimum parking, what if the entity can't afford to pay? I mean, is that an element in the analysis?

MR. PARKER: Well, the thought is
that the price of the fee would be less than the price of providing a parking space. And that number would be set by DDOT. So it would be the same as asking for a variance from providing the parking space because they couldn't afford to pave that.

I mean, the cost of a paved parking space is not that astronomical and the fee would be set lower than the cost of providing the space.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: No problem.

Anyone else? Okay. Thank you.

MR. PARKER: And just on that note for the 50 percent, DDOT did mention that, and we did hear that comment from them. And we are certainly willing to talk about that number if that should be a 25 percent number or something lower than 50 percent. That's certainly something that we are open to.

Requirement 6 has to do with parking size. Right now, our aisle widths and
our general parking space size and width
standards are not always compliant with modern
DDOT and ITE Standards. This proposal would
simply allow us to bring those up to date with
-- we would sit down with DOE and the current
ITE Standards and bring those up to date.

I think we put some of those in
our report, but we would make sure that all of
those were the most current standards.

And right now, there is a limit on
the number of compact spaces that can be
allowed in a garage and the compact spaces are
required to be bunched in groups of five. And
that often presents difficulty and leads to
variances. We would suggest that up to 50
percent of the parking provided in a building
could be built at compact space standards and
there would be no requirement to bunch them
together. They would still have to be marked
as compact.

No. 7 deals with access to
parking. This is something that the working
group was very excited about. It has to do with the driveway, the drive access to your parking, be it a parking garage or a parking lot.

And the intent of this recommendation is that first preference for access should always be off the alley. If you have an approved alley that is wide enough for travel, your parking should be accessed off the alley. If no alley exists and you have two or more streets, it should be off a secondary street, if possible. And we will work out with DDOT definitions of primary and secondary streets.

And only when you have single access should you have a curb cut coming from the front of the property into your building. A later part of this recommendation deals with if you only have the single access and DDOT policy doesn't allow a curb cut, one of the situations where this might arise is the required distance between an intersection and
the first curb cut.

If your property is more narrow than that distance, that policy would not jive with the requirement to access parking, but you can't access. So in those situations we would recommend that the parking requirement be waived.

And then finally, we would update the distance requirements from 25 feet to match the current standard of 60 feet, distance between the driveway and the nearest intersection.

Recommendation 8 deals with the location of parking spaces on the lot. And this is -- this has to do with surface parking lot, not structure parking in the form of a garage or a parking garage. But the base recommendation is that parking is preferred in the rear of the building or in the rear yard, would be allowed in the side yard if it is appropriately screened from view of the right-of-way with the reverse of this being,
obviously, no parking lots in front of the building, between the building and the road.

In the case of a corner lot, obviously, you have two fronts and two sides and you could put the parking lot on either side, as long as it is appropriately screened.

No. 9 is a fairly simple recommendation dealing with refuse on parking lots. This follows a lot of our best practices. Just a standard statement that the parking lot shall be kept free of refuse and debris and a requirement that restaurants and retail uses would have to have at least one trash receptacle on open parking lots.

Recommendation 10 gets into the landscaping requirements. We worked a lot with Casey Trees on this and I have some graphics to go through. But the basic standard -- the current practice is for any lot more than 10 parking spaces, you are required to have 5 percent of the lot in landscaping.
There is no requirement for trees or for canopy cover. And one of the things that we are seeing is that these surface parking lots are a huge contributor to our urban heat island effect. And so common practice around the city and increasingly is to require canopy cover for trees or excuse me, for surface parking lots.

And our proposal would be to require that 10 percent of the parking lot surface be in landscaping and our goal is to have 30 percent of the lot covered by tree canopy. We have gone back and forth with Casey Trees on how to accomplish this. It is our goal to be as simple and straightforward in our regulations as possible and requiring 30 percent canopy coverage and be hard to measure.

So right now, we are working on appropriate ratio of trees to parking space to try and accomplish the 30 percent canopy coverage in a simple easy to understand way.
And you will see that in some of the future slides. And for those who have read the report there, we get into a lot of other regulations on how far the trees should be from curbs and different things like that. 

But we have got two example parking lots here. A small one and then I'll get to a much larger one in D.C. This existing parking lot has 27 spaces and right now zero landscaping, zero trees. It doesn't even meet the current requirements.

Meeting the current requirements, you could put three trees in with 7 percent landscaping without losing any parking spaces. Those are dead spaces in the corner of this sort of awkwardly shaped parking lot. This accomplishes, like I said, about 7 percent landscaping and about 13 percent canopy covering.

By taking one spot out of the middle of this, you can reach the ratio that we are looking at of one tree per five parking
spaces. You reach a standard of 22 percent canopy cover and you cross the 10 percent landscaping range. So we're getting to the landscaping range and getting closer to the canopy cover.

And then with that same amount of landscaping and putting trees around the edges, you can reach your 30 percent canopy covering of the parking lot by providing some edge trees. Again, this then would be more than one tree for -- per five spaces. And we're still working on how that ratio would pan out.

A much larger lot in D.C., which will remain nameless, because it has no landscaping or trees. If you took a lot of just the existing parking -- excuse me, existing striped medians and landscaped areas, you could fit in about, I think this is 47 trees, you could cover about 13 percent of the lot with canopy coverage. And this is about 4 percent landscaping.
You can see it's not that significant on a lot this large and it would result in about 12 spaces. But keep in mind, this doesn't even meet the current standard of 5 percent landscaping.

Something like this would be about one tree per five spaces. It gets us to about 26 percent canopy cover and about 8 percent landscaping. It results in the loss of about 38 spaces from the existing parking lot, but keep in mind about 20 of those would have to go just to meet the current 5 percent.

So it is not a significant cut down in the number of spaces. You can fit a lot of trees in between the rows and such and at the end of rows.

And then finally, this would be what the parking lot would look like with a 30 percent canopy cover requirement. It meets the 10 percent landscaping requirement, 30 percent canopy cover. And this actually works out to about one tree for -- per three and a
half to four parking spaces.

Here are some sort of grainy pictures that we have. The one on the top left shows the -- shows a typical suburban parking lot with just trees in the medians. That's about a 5 percent canopy cover. The bottom right shows you what a 20 percent landscaping cover and the one on the, excuse me, bottom left, the one on the right is actually showing 50 percent landscape cover.

There are communities in our country and as is more common, there are cities that are requiring 50 percent canopy cover. It does take up a lot of space and it can cut down on the efficiency of parking lots. So we haven't tried to go that far, because we know space is at a premium in D.C. And 30 percent was a number that we could reasonably get in without a significant cost in efficiency of parking lots.

So that's -- if there is no questions on landscaping, at least for now,
I'll go on to the last recommendation.

Recommendation 11 is bicycle parking. We -- as you heard from DDOT, our general recommendation is that bicycle parking should be required in new buildings throughout the city, residential buildings of 10 or more units and commercial buildings of 5,000 square feet or more.

Our current proposal calls for both interior and exterior spaces. Class A would be interior spaces for residents or employees or long-term users of the building. Class B would be outdoor spaces for visitors, customers, bike messengers, etcetera.

The proposal in the report largely adopted the Nelson Nygaard chart for determining the bicycle requirements, although we completely agree with DDOT and would be happy to simplify it to just providing requirements for categories of uses, commercial, retail, residential, industrial. And I think that would make a clear and
simpler requirement.

And then finally, we would also recommend that any use of -- any commercial building of 50,000 square feet or more that requires Class A spaces would also provide shower facilities for bikers in the city.

We have some graphics here. This is from Cambridge, Massachusetts. It shows dimensions and layout of interior bike space and our code could include graphics similar to this about how parking spaces would have to be laid out. This is a picture of a current enclosed bicycle parking space.

It can also be done in lockers or in a secluded part of an underground parking garage, as far as Class A.

Class B spaces, here are some best practices in Class B. There is no requirement for covering, but here are some ones that are behind a building, in front of a building, to the side of an entrance.

And then DDOT currently has some
standards for where on public space this type of parking has to be and the types of racks that are acceptable in public space. And DDOT did comment earlier that they would prefer to keep the requirement for Class A and drop the requirement for Class B and make it a recommendation and we're open to that possibility as well. We understand their concerns on that issue.

That concludes our presentation of the recommendations. And I'm happy to open it up to the Commission for questions.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Colleagues, we want to -- again as we stated -- we really want to hear from the citizenry, but let's see if we have some. We don't want to hear from the citizens at 10:30. We want to hear from them much sooner than that, so for right now, I'm sure, unless there is something that is really pressing, and I know I have drilled that home, but if someone has a question that may be germane in general, let's ask that at
this point. Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, if we can get a copy of the PowerPoint presentation?

MR. PARKER: You certainly can.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything else? Thank you all. Okay. Let me ask, I have someone representing the Council Member Tommy Wells' office, Neha Bhatt. And is there anyone else representing the Council Member's office? If you can come forward at this time. Ms. Neha Bhatt? Okay. Anyone else representing the Council Member's office or the administration? Okay. Ms. Bhatt, you are listed as proponent. You may begin, Ms. Bhatt.

MS. BHATT: I want to convey Council Members Wells' apology, He couldn't be here today, because he is out of town, but he was planning when this -- before this was scheduled to come and testify. So he asked me
to deliver this for him. So I'm just reading
this as he has written it. So there will be
some first person references that refer to
him.

"Good evening, Chairman Hood and
Members of the Zoning Commission. Thank you
for holding this important roundtable about
the District's Zoning Regulations as they
relate to parking requirements. The updating
of the Zoning Code is a laudable and Herculean
task. I would like to thank the Commission
for your leadership in overseeing this process
which I know will be lengthy, but educational
and fruitful.

Parking is a hot button issue all
over the city and this discussion about how to
set the rules governing parking is very
timely. The development boom in the District
continues and my ward is no different. I am
told 50 percent of all development over the
next 10 years is located in Ward 6.

In fact, the southeast/southwest
neighborhoods just south of Capitol Hill alone will see about 10,000 new residents and about 20 to 25,000 new jobs. I have enjoyed working closely with community members and developers in making sure that the projects contribute toward a highly walkable multi-modal mixed-use community experience for current and future residents, workers and visitors.

But I am keenly aware that we must proceed very thoughtfully if we are to get the results we want, especially when it comes to the balance of transportation modes. In many ways, parking is the linchpin issue that has cascading effects on all other aspects of quality of life.

If very high proportions of the coming new households will require multiple cars, what will that do to the goal for more walkable, transient-oriented communities throughout the city?

On the other hand, if we proactively balance the transportation modes,
how will that serve neighborhoods and people? The Office of Planning has presented a visionary set of recommendations to update and modernize the parking regulations. The recommendations cover many areas, but I urge adoption specifically of the following recommendations:

   No. 1, elimination of minimums and installation of maximums. I support removing parking minimums from the code and letting market conditions drive what the minimum number of parking should be. I also strongly support placing maximums -- putting in maximums to make sure parking is not overbuilt in those areas of the city -- in those areas where the city has invested millions of tax dollars to provide multi-modal transportation choices.

   Predetermining how much minimum parking is appropriate without consideration of market trends and other local conditions, such as transportation choices is not idea.
It distorts the actual market demand for parking and this has negative effects on the effort to mitigate the ill-effects of car domination.

Removing minimums does not mean removing the right to build parking, but merely allows the decision of how much to build to be made in real-time, based on current demand trends. Observations and demographic data tell us that D.C. has seen a rise in population in the last few years and the new residents are coming back for the best of urban living, that includes living in a place where they can walk to a local restaurant, bike to work, have easy access to transit and a Zipcar.

People want these choices, which are not easily available in the suburbs. They are willing to trade in their cars to get this quality of life. Rising gas prices also add to this willingness to choose other modes. The severe excess of parking at DCUSA tells us
that these decisions about how much parking to build must be made carefully and based on real-time market conditions.

   No. 2, promotion of car-sharing and shared parking. Allowing the minimum parking requirements to be met by spaces that are shared among multiple uses or destinations is another important reform. Too often we fail to capitalize on the parking inventory we already have.

   In a mixed-use community, it makes all the sense in the world for an office that doesn't require many spaces in the evening to share the parking with area restaurants whose needs go up during dinner hours. The code shall allow and even encourage this kind of flexibility. Otherwise, we are leaving parking capacity on the table.

   The benefits of car-sharing are also manifold and are so manifold that it amazes me. Today, the Metro D.C. area has hundreds and hundreds of shared cars. On
average, each shared car takes 15 private cars off the roads. Let me repeat that once more. One shared car takes 15 private cars off the roads.

These are cars which households who become car-sharing members give up, because they don't need their own car any more. I strongly support requiring some number of spaces to be made available to car-sharing in buildings that have greater than 50 parking spaces.

Car-sharing is a real public amenity that effectively meets the goal of reducing car ownership and allowing for more walkable neighborhoods.

And finally, No. 3, requiring bike parking. Introduction of bike parking regulations into the Zoning Code is a true marker that we are modernizing a code that has not been open since the 1950s. I'm very happy to see that bike parking is included in the Office of Planning's recommendations.
However, I was disappointed to see that OP only recommends one Class A bike parking space per classroom for grade schools. This is too low and fails to recognize the City Safe Routes to School Initiative which aims to make it safe to walk and bike to grade schools around the city.

In fact, the first schools that will be assessed and improved for safe routes will be announced in the next couple of days.

I strongly urge the Commission to improve this low requirement. The Zoning Code and the City Initiatives should reinforce each other and for some unclear reason, the OP recommendation on this particular point has missed an opportunity. I recommend that Class A bike parking recommendations be changed to at least three spaces per classroom for all grade levels.

If you have further questions, please, feel free to direct them to my office, otherwise, Council Member Wells looks forward
to the process with update of the Zoning Code."

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much, Ms. Bhatt. We won't ask you any of those questions.

MS. BHATT: Okey-doke.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Let me ask one last time, is anyone else representing a Council Member? I don't see anyone representing a Council Member's office. Okay. With that, we will move with our witness list. We usually start with proponents and if I mess your name up, if it sounds close, just, please, come forward.

Allen Greenberg, Ms. Cheryl Cort, Joe Cascis? Okay. Joe is not here. So he won't know I messed his name up. And Otto Condo. Otto, Otto. Okay. It's nice to have a Vice Chairman who knows what's going on. Okay. He is not here. What about David Duxbury? Okay. We will begin with Allen Greenberg.
MR. GREENBERG: Thank you. Yes, my name is Allen Greenberg. I reside in Dupont Circle and have since 1992. I'm privileged to be here today to testify before you all on the important and visionary changes contained in the District Office of Planning's proposals that pertain to car parking requirements for housing developments, which would implement the Comp Plan Amendment Act of 2006.

Today the Zoning Commission has a rare opportunity to revise the Zoning Regulations in a way that would substantially improve housing affordability in and provide environmental benefits to the District and would allow the construction of new developments that are as walkable and charming as many of the District's historic developments that were built before today's off-street parking requirements made their construction illegal.

After allowing for extensive
deliberations and considerable public input, the D.C. Council enacted the Comp Plan Amendments in 2006. Action T3.2(d) from the Revised Comp Plan provides these specific instructions for amending the Zoning Code:

"Find ways to unbundle the cost of parking from residential units allowing those purchasing or renting property to opt out of or buyers renting spaces to do the same. These efforts should be coupled with programs to better manage residential off-street parking in neighborhoods of high parking demand, including adjustment to the parking, rather to the cost of residential parking permits."

The Office of Planning proposed a very sensible way to implement this by eliminating parking minimums for all housing construction and also for other developments except where it believes a potential for spill-over effects would be greatest.

Off-street parking requirements
interfere with adoptive reuse of older building and are an anathema to affordable housing. Requiring the construction of parking in excess of market demand has been shown through extensive research to add between $52,000 and $117,000 to the price of housing units.

An amount that exceeds the entire housing budget of many District minimum wage workers. And it guarantees more car ownership driving, traffic and air pollution if such parking were not mandated.

By the way, I could back those figures up. They are not some wild study that I found, so if people want that, the costs are really that large and they are huge.

The only reason we are requiring off-street parking with new housing is to reduce the likelihood that such developments will result in much new demand for on-street parking. Off-street parking requirements would be completely unnecessary if the
District adequately managed public on-street parking through accommodation of regulations and market rate pricing.

District Department Transportation has recently shown itself to be quite capable of managing on-street parking, so that it does not get overwhelmed as a result of spill-over development. Nothing OP is proposing now for the Zoning Code related to unbundling of parking could have near the spill-over effects of opening a new 41,000 seat baseball stadium with very few off-street parking spaces.

But stadium neighbors have been nothing but praise-worthy of the efforts, rather the effects of DDOT's system for requiring baseball fans who choose to drive to the stadium to pay what has been determined to be a market clearing price of about $20 to park on the street for up to four hours per game.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's do this, Mr. Greenberg. Let me stop you right now and I
hate to do this to you, Mr. Greenberg. It's just unfortunate you were first.

MR. GREENBERG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to give you 30 more seconds.

MR. GREENBERG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And the only reason why is because I want you to set the tone for everybody else. When we hear that from now on, we need to be ready to start. And what I should have mentioned when I saw your testimony, we will peruse it and read it. You want to hit the highlights, because 3 minutes it not an awful lot of time to read your presentation.

MR. GREENBERG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But let's do this, let me give you 30 seconds to finish it off.

MR. GREENBERG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But from now on, I would ask everybody to, please, be cautious and know that you need to stop, because if you
look behind you, you'll see a number of people ready to testify.

MR. GREENBERG: I appreciate that.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Mr. Chair, and I just want to say, Mr. Chair, that if people who are coming up to testify, if you could just also just keep an eye on the clock as well, as you are reading, so you can start to prepare yourself to close.

MR. GREENBERG: Okay. I apologize. I'll summarize with just a few sentences. There is a requirement to amend the Zoning Code. OP has stepped up to the plate, suggested a very sensible way to meet that requirement. In order for the off-street -- on-street parking to be managed well, I'm convinced that the Office of Planning with Council providing the needed authority can do that and I provide some details in the testimony to show you how that would transpire.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
MR. GREENBERG: I very much appreciate this opportunity and thank everybody for considering, I think, the excellent recommendations of the Office of Planning. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good. Thank you. Mr. Cort, and if you could hold your seat, we may have questions.

MS. CORT: Thank you, Commissioners. I'm Cheryl Cort. I'm the Policy Director for the Coalition for Smarter Growth. I have actually resided in Ward 1 since 1988 and I am very proud of my adoptive home. I really love living here. And I am representing my organization, the Coalition for Smarter Growth.

And I have actually participated in a lot of these deliberations over the years. I was on the 2006 Comprehensive Plan Task Force which started several years before that and also actively participated in Office of Planning's work group to shape these
parking recommendations. And I'm very pleased to be able to lend my full support to the recommendations on the parking amendments.

These revisions affirm what is best about our neighborhoods and our city and help chart a course for a more environmentally sustainable and economically vibrant and inclusive city. I think that what is important is to understand where we have come as a city.

In 1958, we instituted the Zoning Code. Urban planners of the day and Harold Lewis, who wrote the Zoning Plan for the city, envisioned a very different future than what we have today. The Lewis plan cited the need to require off-street parking for all new development hoping that for the eventual removal of curb parking and subsequent freeing of the traffic arteries.

Lewis anticipated the demise of public transit as a major mode of travel. Universal car ownership, a network of
expressways, bringing the downtown and criss-crossing our neighborhoods, and the razing of old buildings to make way for needed parking lots and garages.

Given these trends or perceived trends, Lewis called for the adaptation of the physical structure of the city to new forms of living, inability to adapt to new forms will almost inevitably lead to its economic decay. Life in a metropolitan city had come to be dominated by the ownership of the automobile.

While today's reality is very different than what Lewis perceived in 1958, today the city is very much transit-oriented with 20 to 50 percent of households not owning cars. The future vision did not come to pass and cities that relied on walking transit and bicycling did not grow obsolete.

D.C.'s vitality might best be credited by its compact walkable historic neighborhoods and the rebirth of its transit system. The Metrorail system was, in fact,
built with money that was originally allocated for the freeway, so were anticipated in the 1958 plan. Today transit ridership is a major form of access for D.C. residents and workers. A third of D.C. residents ride transit to work. 11 percent walk and over 1 percent bicycle to work.

D.C. has the second highest non-driving commute rate in the city -- in the country. And the second highest walk to work rate. Automobile ownership is far from universal. 37 percent of D.C. households don't own a car, according to the 2000 Census. Wards 2, 1 and 8 have the most households who do not own a car, at 47 percent. And I put into my testimony a chart showing each ward and the percentage of households that do not own a single car. In Logan Circle 38 percent of residents walk all the way to their jobs, far from universal car ownership is one of many
transportation options for D.C. households. The 2006 Comprehensive Plan is a major departure from the 1958 vision for our city.

Rather than viewing row house neighborhoods as obsolete, the 2006 Comprehensive Plan affirms the qualities of these historic neighborhoods as something to preserve and enhance. The Comp Plan promotes alternatives to single passenger automobiles and recognizes the city's planning efforts around Metro Stations have focused on responding to the region's growth by guiding growth in the city in ways that minimize the number and length of automobile trips.

It also affirms efforts to reduce household expenses on transportation by providing options for car-free or one car living. Unlike the 1950's vision, the Comp Plan sees a vision of investing in new transit service, improving walking and bicycling and better balancing the use of our public rights-of-way.
Another important thing that the Comp Plan does is recognize that we need to grow as an inclusive city. It lays out an ambitious set of policies for affordable housing and relieving the cost of parking requirements is an important opportunity to save costs on housing and provide more housing opportunities, especially in well -- in transit locations.

I ask you to read the rest of my testimony. And a lot of it actually is just illustrated through photos. Actually, mostly my neighborhood and what minimum parking requirements do to historic row house neighborhoods and why they are so destructive. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. Mr. Duxbury?

MR. DUXBURY: Good evening and thank you for allowing me to speak briefly on my experience as a resident of the District of Columbia. I hope that my experience will
illuminate the benefits of a language in our
code, which will encourage pedestrian and
transit-oriented activities within our city
and also highlight the current challenges to
those of us who live on a day-to-day basis
without automobiles.

Almost every day I bike 1.5 miles
from my apartment in LeDroit Park to Farragut
Square. The commute takes me, approximately,
10 minutes. By Metrorail 30 minutes, by bus
40 minutes. I have never made the trip by
car. This is intentional.

The up front purchase of a bicycle
is far less than the amount I would spend on
transit fare, let alone on parking fees and
gasoline. Additionally, there are a whole
series of other intangible benefits that
biking offers me as a resident.

Of course, being a committed
bicyclist comes with inherent problems under
the current code. During nighttime trips, cab
drivers looking for fares and drivers
searching for parking spots often drive erratically without paying attention to bicyclists.

On multiple occasions I have had to take evasive maneuvers to avoid being hit by a car pulling out of a spot or a cab driver trying to make a U-turn or a questionable legality. Commuting on our busy avenues and arterial streets can be equally harrowing as drivers often stop to unload passengers and packages in the bike lane.

I often times don't have a bike lane to take too and from work due to the current lack of bike lanes in the city, although I do appreciate the initiative that has been taken to encourage increased bike lanes.

When I do get to my destination, very rarely do I find a bicycle rack. It took me six months to find the Class A spot in my office and often times there is not Class B parking.
My own decision to develop a car-free lifestyle, I believe, reflects a trend of local commuters decreasingly relying on automobiles for their daily commuting needs and increasingly relying on mass transit, bicycles or their own two feet.

The present scenario comes from, obviously, a complex web of issues, most prominent which are the recent sharp rise in the cost of gasoline and the regeneration of our vibrant commercial and residential districts.

Increasingly friends of mine from the suburbs come to enjoy the wealth of dining and entertainment opportunities that the District has to offer. While many of them initially lamented the Herculean task of finding parking in the city on a Friday or Saturday night, they quickly discovered that mass transit often proved to be faster than circling for parking spots.

From our experience, the primary
problems stem partially from the lack of parking or primarily from the lack of viable transit opportunities. In particular, the poor and infrequent timing of buses which provide a vital supplement to Metrorail.

In conclusion, it seems many residents of the District and its suburbs, at least most of those I know, would embrace transit and pedestrian-oriented habits as those outlined by the current code.

My only concern is that the current recommendations don't take -- don't have any standards regarding permeable and impermeable paving. Obviously, that's a pretty large issue.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Finish your sentence.

MR. DUXBURY: Okay. That seems like a pretty large issue given water quality issues in the District of Columbia. And I would like to see that addressed.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
very much.

MR. DUXBURY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's -- we're going to align as we move forward. If you come up and you're giving us testimony, if we already have your testimony, actually, we do make marks on them, so when we get ready to deliberate things that we would like to bring back up, that would help us out if you let us know whether we have it already or you will be submitting it.

Do we have your testimony?

MR. DUXBURY: No, you do not.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We don't have your testimony. Okay. All right. Do we have any questions of this panel? Okay. I want to thank you all for your testimony. And I want to backtrack on what I have done.

I do have some ANC Commissioners local grass-reelected officials and I omitted to go in order and I want to correct that, at this point. Proponents, the only ANC person
I have on this list that is in support is Mr. William Reynolds from ANC-1C. If you can come forward. No, are you in support? Yeah, you are. If you can come forward and give us your testimony?

And you are representing your ANC.

I'm going to do the ANCs, organizations and individuals.

MR. REYNOLDS: I am not representing the ANC.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, okay, okay. All right. Yeah, he can come later. Let me also go now opponent and the only person I see representing ANC-6B is Mr. Dave Garrison. Okay. We just saw you all recently, didn't we? The last time we were here, so come forward and let's go ahead and deal with that.

One I have five in and one I have three in. You know what, I think what I'm going to do is, I'm just going to take all the ANCs regardless of whether you are proponents or opponents. In some of these situations,
you just can never win, but that's how we are going to deal with that.

Okay. Mr. Garrison?

MR. GARRISON: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, I'm David Garrison, Commissioner for ANC-6B01 and Vice Chairperson of ANC-6B's Planning and Zoning Committee. I appear this evening with my colleague, Ken Jarboe, to provide ANC-6B's comments on the Text Amendments 08-06-2 regarding parking.

We have a variety of concerns about the parking proposal before you, in particular, as regards to the suggestion that we should dispense with the minimum parking requirements. We realize that you and the Office of Planning hope that by bringing individual topics such as this forward for focus discussions, you will be able to manage your overall process of implementing the Comprehensive Plan Update in an orderly and thoughtful way.

Another -- at least as regards the
topic of parking, it is difficult to assess
the viability and logic of this proposal
before you out of context as it is with
proposals to implement other aspects of the
Comp Plan.

Beyond that, your Commission
surely would want to know what the city was
willing to do in a range of related policy
issue decisions regarding parking rules and
incentives, such as those overseen by DDOT and
DPW.

In our considered view, decisions
about how the Zoning Code should address
parking must be made as part of the large
fabric of decisions about goals for the city's
neighborhoods.

To begin with though, what does
the Comp Plan Update in Chapter 2 on Land Use
call for? It says "Ensure that parking
requirements for residential buildings are
responsive to the varying levels of demand
associated with different unit types, unit
sizes and unit locations, including proximity
to transit. Parking should be accommodated in
a manner that maintains an attractive
environment at the street level and minimizes
interference with traffic flow.

Reductions in parking may be
considered where transportation demand
management measures are implemented and a
reduction in demand can clearly be
demonstrated."

It is not clear to us that this
Comp Plan section supports the recommendation
before you. Rather, the sort of major policy
change envisioned in the proposal to eliminate
minimum parking requirements, one that would
surely result in increased competition for an
already scarce, very scarce resource by all
residents, moves well beyond what is required
to implement the Comp Plan.

In order to achieve the proper
balance sought by the Comp Plan, the city
needs to consider the full range of Government
decisions impacting access by cars to our neighborhoods, including such critical regulatory systems as the Residential Parking Permit Program.

If, as proposed here, the Zoning Code were to permit residential projects that had little or no sight -- on-site parking without the city also taking action to restrict the ability of new residents of such projects to get on-street parking permits, the result would simply be less on-street parking options for all residents.

In many of our Capitol Hill neighborhoods, we long since have reached the point where demand exceeds the supply of on-street parking spaces. And for those living in townhouses on blocks with no interior alleys and thus no off-street parking areas, parking one's car in the street is the only option.

In fact, many Hill residents have already reduced their car ownership to the
bare minimum, an accommodation surely to be praised. Introducing more demand into these neighborhoods while supply remains constant would fundamentally and detrimentally affect our ability to access and use our homes.

It isn't clear that people who are attracted to already walkable places like Capitol Hill want to abandon their ability to have a car. It appears to us that our residents want to do both to be able to access the nearby amenities by walking and at the same time have the option of driving to other areas of the city and region.

And since we have on-street space for residents to park near their homes, we would vastly prefer to use those spaces for residents then for some other use, such as for commuters and tourists.

Indeed, if the city wants to reduce the number of cars on the city streets, it should focus on the FAR logic problem presented by commuters. We can see how it
might make sense to use a tiered pricing policy to discourage multiple car ownership among residents and to encourage full use of off-street parking resources including garages in residential areas.

But we do not think it wise or effective to attempt to reduce car ownership outright among existing residents by either reducing the supply of parking spaces and/or increasing the demand for parking without increasing supply.

We support efforts by the city to reduce dependence on automobiles, especially in areas adjacent to major bus and transit nodes. However, we do not support approaches that would result in significantly reduced neighborhood parking options for existing residents.

Until all elements of the city are able to come together around a coordinated set of decisions on parking, we ask that Zoning Commission to withhold action on this
proposal. My colleague, Ken Jarboe, will
discuss our comments on the other aspects of
the proposal before you this evening. Thank
you.

MR. JARBOE: Mr. Chairman, Madam
Chairman, Members of the Council, I apologize
for having not been here the last time and
having to leave at the last hearing. I know
Commissioner Garrison gave my testimony in the
earlier case and I'm sure he did a good job.

For the record, my name is Ken
Jarboe. I am Vice Chair of ANC-6B. I think
you are going to see something a little bit
strange tonight, because for the first time,
I'm going to oppose my good friend Tommy Wells
on this issue.

There is a lot that I can support
in this -- in these recommendations, but the
problem with the complete elimination of the
minimums as Commissioner Garrison has said is
the major problem here.

I represent what APA has awarded
as "The Best Neighborhood in America," and I want to keep it that way. My walkability score in my neighborhood is 89. And the only reason it isn't higher is because the grocery stores aren't quite as close as we would like them to be, the Safeway and the Jenkin's Row. If I lived closer to the Safeway, I'm sure I would have a higher -- even higher walkability score.

What concerns me is that if I look at a number of the infill projects that were--that have happened over the last 10 years, and most of the Commission Members and Members of the BZA have looked at, I worry about the impact that this would have had on those. If you look at Ellen Wilson, Bryant School, Lennox School, Capper Carrolsburg, Jenkin's Row, what worries me is not so much that you want to cut down on excess parking, it's the blanket elimination of the parking requirements.

Mr. Parker mentioned that there
had to be some good analysis done to figure out what the maximums needed to be and drill down for all of the specific types of zones and areas. I would suggest that that same type of drill down detailed analysis needs to be done on the minimum side as well, rather than just simply eliminate them in most cases.

We have two other quick points that are in my testimony I would like to raise very quickly. One is the idea of being able to buy out the 50 percent, both on the upside and downside. To me, this is a case of unfair distributive cost of benefits.

When you have a developer who can buy out at 50 percent from the minimums, you are creating spill overs to the local neighborhood. They don't get any of those benefits, because it goes into a fund and it fits everybody. So there is an unfair mismatch of cost and benefits.

The second is the shared car. I support shared car, but you need to write the
regulations so that they are broad enough to encompass all types of business models, not just the current business models. For example, can van pools use those?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Jarboe?

MR. JARBOE: Those are my major points. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. Again, we have your testimony. Colleagues, any questions? Okay. Thank you both for your testimony.

MR. JARBOE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have two other ANC Commissioners, one is a proponent and one is in opposition. I'm going to ask Ms. Gates if she could come forward and I'm going to ask Mr. Reynolds if he could still come forward. I want to -- do we have any other ANC Commissioners that are here and would like to testify? Okay. Do we have any other ANC Commissioners that are here that would like to testify?
Okay. I said that twice. I see a Commissioner from Ward 5 who must not be testifying tonight. Okay. Ms. Gates, if you could begin?

MS. GATES: Good evening, Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission. I'm Alma Gates representing ANC-3D05. In Aristotle's *The Politics* we find the following quote: "A quality of possessions may exist and yet the level be fixed either too high with result in luxury or too low, which leads to the life of penury. It is clear, therefore, that it is not enough for a legislator to equalize possessions. He must aim at fixing an amount midway between extremes."

And so the Office of Planning comes to advise the Zoning Commission on an amount of parking that meets the needs of current residential neighborhoods as well as the needs of those coming in vehicles, on bicycles and on foot, while preserving an appropriate amount of green space.
This is no easy task as these convergent needs have created the push and pull that accompany change, especially in Metro-centric neighborhoods throughout the city.

Let me remind the Members of the Zoning Commission that in January of this year approval was granted for a PUD and Map Amendment for Sibley Hospital that includes a medical office building and a 750 space above ground parking garage. This amount of parking was granted to prevent spill over parking on neighborhood streets.

Turning your attention to transit-oriented development areas around Metro stops where a number of new buildings in this same block would exceed both the density and intensity Sibley proposed. In this scenario, OP presents under proposed minimum parking requirements found in Section P.2.1 for low density residential districts only 105 parking spaces would be recommended for the Sibley
The 645 spaces that would be eliminated under this proposal would certainly result in spill over parking on the residential streets that surround Sibley.

Another troubling observation was found under P.3 flexibility in parking requirements. Section 3.2 through 3.4 are ripe for all kinds of irregularities as well as lacking the requirement for sufficient review. No examination has been done by OP on whether or not what is being proposed is sufficient to mitigate the harm to neighborhoods from parking spill over.

P.3.2 does not offer District residents an opportunity to present their concerns, but rather leaves all decision making in the outstretched hands of DDOT. Surely the Zoning Commission would not approve the opportunity for DDOT to accept payments in lieu of requirements.

I strongly urge the Zoning
Commission to return the parking rewrite to OP and the Task Force for further study.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Commissioner Reynolds?

MR. REYNOLDS: Good evening, Commissioners and it's a pleasure to be here. Again, my name is Wilson Reynolds and I serve as the Chair of the Planning, Zoning and Transportation Committee for Advisory Neighborhood Commission 1C.

I come here tonight to speak in support of Case 08-06-2 and I have four suggestions that I wanted to bring to the attention of the Commission, which I'll just discuss briefly and let the comments stand for themselves in writing.

The first point is that the purpose of off-street parking minimums, I believe, today are no longer being served. There is an assess if you decouple the number of parking spaces that are privately held with the notion that they control or somehow
provide for more off-street parking. I think that notion is no longer evident or applicable to this day. And therefore, the minimum requirements are to be set aside.

Second, there is this argument that can be made that when you have a mixed building of owners with parking spaces and without parking spaces, it has been quite established even this evening in the opening remarks the cost of parking is very high. That parking is usually not recovered and the cost of those spaces are distributed among apartments that are both -- have parking and do not have parking, therefore, creating, in effect, a subsidy of non-car owners for car owners.

Second, the -- we have one of the few cities where not owning a car is actually a plausibility. It's actually encouraged. However, providing more off-street parking does not encourage ownership of apartments with people that do not want a car. By
allowing at least a mix, we are at least moving in a direction where we are finally addressing a balance of people that want to live in the city with cars and people that do not want to live in the city with cars.

And in my last remark that I want to make was last May the Department of Transportation charged ANC-1C with coming up with a series of recommendations for the reconstruction of the 2000, 2100, 2200 and 2300 and 2400 Blocks of 18th Street.

The most proudest achievement of the PZT Committee of ANC-1C was to be able to establish in doing the drafts and finally voting out through the full Commission a firmly established policy that all of these construction projects that were going to be taking place, these landscaping rules, the entire reconstruction of the street was going to be driven by a policy of being pedestrian friendly.

And we have worked from that
point. We have taken great pride in taking that position. I think we're one of the few ANCs that have actually worked to reduce off-street parking. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you both. Any -- great job actually. Thank you. Any questions for this panel? Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just had a quick question for Commissioner Gates, which was your calculation of the parking requirement for the Sibley PUD under the new regulations, is that -- that's a recommended level of 105 or is that the maximum level that would be permitted or?

MS. GATES: Under the proposed regulations, that is what would be required of Sibley to provide.

COMMISSIONER MAY: As the minimum or as the -- I mean, because --

MS. GATES: The maximum.

COMMISSIONER MAY: The maximum?
MS. GATES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: That's the maximum, right. Okay. Thanks.

MR. PARKER: We haven't proposed any maximums. That would be a minimum.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you. Thank you both. Let's move right along. Now, we'll go back to the list. And I'm going back to proponents. Steve Hill, I always get -- I have Bill Crews, he says in part, so I'm going to call you.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: He's here.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: The problem is he is on the opponent side and, you know, we got to -- we need to just come up with another system in the middle, okay. But for right now, for right now, we're going to -- you're leaning towards the opponent, so hold your seat for a second.

MS. BRODNITZ: Hello, and I do have testimony to turn in.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. BRODNITZ: Chairman Hood and Members of the Zoning Commission, thank you for the opportunity to speak out in support of the changes before you tonight. The first and one of the key pieces of the plan to move D.C. toward a more sustainable future.

I'm a Georgetown -- my name is Louise Brodnitz. I'm a Georgetown resident, 52 years-old, mother of two school-age kids. I guess I'm pretty typical of folks facing the time pressures and parking pressures that you
will be hearing about tonight.

    I live in the city, because I
don't want to be dependent on a car to get
where I'm going. We have 10 bus routes which
run fairly frequently during rush hour, at
least. We have the wonderful circulator bus
every 10 minutes and the blue bus to the Metro
every 10 minutes.

    Yes, in my experience, these buses
are often nearly empty and like everyone else
sometimes I do the math and hop in the car
when I could take the bus. The city's
resources are being spent on a system that is
woefully under used. What does this have to
do with zoning or parking?

    It is all about that crucial
decision to drive and how Zoning Regulations
manipulate people into driving when they have
a choice. For too long, zoning required --
made available so much parking that buses just
couldn't offer a compelling alternative.

    Most -- more people driving that
could have taken transit, clogged streets and
make buses go slower. Empty buses have to run
less frequently to have enough riders. Slow
and infrequent buses and the promise of
parking literally force people into driving,
rather than walking or taking transit. It's
a classic vicious cycle.

Removing parking minimums starts
to break that cycle. Parking minimums are not
needed. In this car-centric situation, I see
houses for sale without parking languish on
the market while those with a driveway fly
into contract. Developers of housing don't
need to be told to provide parking, they know
that's what buyers here want.

Also, in this car-centric
situation, I see two prime lots with open
space along pedestrian-oriented Wisconsin
Avenue becoming banks with parking dead zones.
Neighborhood serving businesses that could
have turned that open space into great foot
traffic generating street life lost out
because parking won out.

    Property owners don't need to be
told to provide parking. They go for parking
over street life too often. The challenge is
not to get developers to provide enough
parking, the challenge is to change the
parameters that push developers to provide so
much parking.

    What I wish we had was great
pedestrian-oriented businesses and street life
and great transit that people use. I think
these zoning changes will start to get us
there. Thank you.

    CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
much. Geoffrey Hatchard? Turn your mike on,
please.

    MR. HATCHARD: I faxed my
testimony in, so I believe you have it.
Chairman Hood, Co-Chairman Miller and the
Members of the Zoning Commission, my name is
Geoff Hatchard and I'm currently a proud
resident of the Bloomingdale neighborhood of
Ward 5.

And I'm speaking in support of the changes to the parking element of the Zoning Regulations that the Zoning Commission will hopefully be voting on this year.

I believe supporting these new regulations will help the city attract more residents in a way that will compliment the goals of an increased tax base and minimal spending outlays for infrastructure. The aspect of parking that I hope you will consider is the amount of driving that is associated with parking.

If current trends continue, the population of the District of Columbia will increase perhaps by 50,000 individuals over the coming decades. Surely some of these new residents will bring automobiles with them. If they all do, the already busy streets of the city will be pushed to the limit with traffic.

The city surely does not want to
spend more money on our road infrastructure when we could be using that money on other things, such as schools, recreation centers, aid for the homeless and financial help for our small businesses.

Since the city lacks the ability to increase roadway capacity, the only way to avoid this potential is to ensure that future automobile use does not significantly increase.

I feel that the city can help encourage these new residents to make an easy transition from the suburban to a more urban lifestyle. We can help them transition from car ownership by offering clear options that will allow these residents the high quality of life they expect.

The way to ensure this is to build a city that allows residents to do everything they need and want to do by using their feet, their bicycles and public transportation to get where they need to go.
Great examples of this already exist in neighborhoods like Dupont Circle, Capitol Hill and Georgetown. With the change in growth coming to neighborhoods like Anacostia, Brookland and Deanwood, we can ensure that these neighborhoods develop in ways that make them as exciting and livable as the areas that already thrive without the need for car ownership.

To tie this back into the Parking Regulations, I believe that requiring parking minimums would encourage car ownership, which would lead to crowding the streets and stress on the infrastructure that I spoke of earlier. This induced demand is something we can avoid by creating intelligent parking requirements in our Zoning Regulations now.

I'm not advocating against car ownership, but I am requesting the city to do all that it can to make it easier for people to live in the city without a car. I believe that by making it easier for people to make
that choice, the city will find that it is at
an even greater competitive advantage to
places where car ownership is the only choice
for residents.

Thank you for your consideration
in regard to this topic.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Mr.
David Alpert?

MR. ALPERT: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chairman, Madam Chairman, Members of the
Commission. Listening to the opponents who
spoke a few minutes ago, it occurred to me
that it sounded as though, from their
comments, that the Office of Planning was
recommending removing all of the parking in
the District of Columbia or at least policies
that would significantly decrease the amount
of parking.

This is not the case. They are
not recommending taking away any parking. And
they are not recommending -- none of these
policies will lead to suddenly the amount of
parking disappearing overnight.

And the point I want to make to you is that these changes, while very important, are not going to cause any enormous catastrophe. They are not even going to have a sweeping effect in a very short period of time.

The minimum -- removing minimum requirements is just that. Removing minimum requirements. It's not saying that you can no longer build parking. It is simply to say that henceforth buildings can choose if the market demand it to build less parking.

They are also suggesting implementing maximums and I wholeheartedly endorse those, because I know that they will choose very wisely as far as those maximums. Plus, if they don't, we can all debate that later when the time comes.

But for now, we are talking about minimums. And we know that developers build a lot of parking. In fact, at the Highland
Park Apartments in Columbia Heights, currently they built more than one parking space per unit and so far they have only rented 10 percent of those parking spaces.

So we know that many developers will choose to put a lot of parking and sometimes they will just build too much.

That's why we need maximums. But more importantly, it's not like all the buildings that are going to go in in our city are suddenly not going to ever have any parking. Most of the developers will decide that it is in their best interest to build some amount of parking. Many residents want parking, as several people have mentioned before, and we should give them that option.

But it's about having a choice. It's about whether people can choose not to have parking, not to buy parking with their units or with their townhouses or their condos or whether they have to. Based on the cost of these parking spaces being $40,000 or often
$60,000 per space, it's not possible to rent
those spaces at enough money, in most
neighborhoods, to make back that amount of an
investment.

At $60,000, if you amortize that
amount over time, they would have to rent
those spaces for $250 or more per month, just
to make back that cost, and that doesn't even
count the maintenance or the staff needed to,
you know, maintain the garage and keep up the
machines for people to be able to pay or, you
know, the gates and all of those things.

So as you probably know, most
parking spaces don't go for $250 to $300,
except, you know, right in downtown and a few
other places. In those areas, it's going to
be -- it's even more expensive to build the
underground parking spaces. So even if
residents are not forced to build parking
spaces, if we don't remove the minimums, they
are going to be forced to subsidize some
amount of the parking that the developers will
-- would be forced to build and that's simply wrong.

Because the key thing that we need to do with our Zoning Code is to ensure that a resident can make a full economic choice between whether they want to pay the cost of driving or whether they want to pay the cost of not driving. Someone earlier talked about bicycling and saving a bunch of money on transit. That's his choice and he should make that choice. Other people want to drive.

I actually own a car myself and I paid quite a bit of money on the townhouse that I built -- that I bought recently in Dupont Circle to have some space to park. And that's my choice and I paid the cost of that. And we should make sure that our Zoning Code does not force anyone to make choices they do not want to make.

The issue of spill over, which several people have raised, is a serious issue and we should definitely take steps to address
it. But there are ways to do that and the Performance Parking Pilot, such as those that have been tried in the Columbia Heights area and in the Navy Yard National's Ballpark area are the way to do that.

Many cities have tried these policies like Pasadena, Portland, Boulder and many others and they have been very successful. In all the cases that other cities have tried these systems, they have managed to manage the on-street parking by ensuring that the people who want to park can have a space to park and the people who don't want to park can save money by not having to pay for the subsidy of others having to park.

I'm completely confident that in the District of Columbia we will be able to work out a system that will work well for each neighborhood. It may be just like the pilots that we have now. It may be different. But there are many examples that have worked around the country and we will be able to do
one of those.

If you haven't read Professor Donald Shoup's book on the High Cost of Free Parking, I highly recommend it. And one point I specifically wanted to make from Mr. Jarboe's testimony is that he actually specifically advocates devoting revenue from things like parking fees or specifically parking fees to the local communities.

Mr. Jarboe mentioned that the fees would not go to the communities.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Thank you very much.

MR. ALPERT: And we should do that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did you --

MR. ALPERT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- provide your testimony in writing?

MR. ALPERT: Yes, I provided testimony that I think was included with the Office of Planning original report.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.

MR. ALPERT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good. All right. Thank you. Let me see if we have any questions of this panel?

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Just quickly. What organization do you represent, Mr. Alpert?

MR. ALPERT: I run a website called Greener Greater Washington, which covers issues such as this.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Oh, okay. Thank you.

MR. ALPERT: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. MILLER: Who was the author of the High Cost of Free Parking that you mentioned?

MR. ALPERT: It was Professor Donald Shoup, S-H-O-U-P. He is a professor at UCLA.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
questions? Okay. We want to thank this panel for your presentation. Next, let's move right along, Jason Hesch, Alan De Castro, Gary Peterson and Ralph Garboushian. Hopefully I didn't butcher that too bad. We will begin with Mr. Hesch.

MR. HESCH: First, I would like to thank the D.C. Zoning Commission for having this hearing today and recognizing an update in our zoning laws to reduce congestion and promote pedestrian friendly development.

Looking at the suburban neighborhood today, we see the effects of the 1958 Automobile-Oriented Zoning Code on places such as Rockville. We want -- do we want to continue this type of development? In my judgment, minimum parking requirements has degraded our city's quality of life as a place aesthetically pleasing landscape with asphalt.

I live in Tenleytown and I prefer to use public transit if I'm heading downtown.

The rationale for this is the limited
availability of street parking and expensive parking garages. Proximity to multiple Metro Stations in the downtown core and bus routes that serve my neighborhood, such as the N2 and Circular, provide me with alternatives to driving.

But we see along Rockville Pike very clear facts of parking minimums. For those neighborhoods such as Georgetown and Dupont were designed without parking minimums, if I had a choice to live in a neighborhood between Georgetown and the suburban landscape of Montgomery County, I would prefer to live in Georgetown.

I recently attended an open house concerning the redevelopment of Tyson's Corner and at that meeting one woman, I noted, as adamantly against planning for the record. In fact, I think she was against any development whatsoever. This has been a trend I have been hearing from residents whenever new development is proposed.
New growth has brought traffic congestion. In the minds of the average citizen, development is the creator of traffic congestion leading to the deterioration of quality of life. I believe this sentiment is in response to the requirement of parking lots with every building bringing cars.

From their perspective, they only have seen new development with parking minimums bringing more people and more cars.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. If you could hold your seat. Mr. De Castro?

MR. DE CASTRO: Good evening, Commissioners, as well as the rest of the Commission. My name is Alan De Castro. I currently reside at 5th and G Street, N.W., in Chinatown.

I'm here to speak in favor of the proposed amendments to the Parking Regulations. I support this proposal as I believe it encourages land efficient
development that supports alternative forms of transportation within the city, including the recommendations to eliminate the minimum parking requirements for new residential developments and the addition of bicycle parking requirements.

I spent the first 23 years of my life in a suburban setting in which the car was the only option for transportation. Mass transportation options were essentially non-existent and the great distance between any and all destinations made walking or bicycling dangerous and impractical.

For the last three years, I have lived in the D.C. Metro area and have commuted to work via the Metro, approximately, 99 percent of the time. About a year ago, I purchased a bicycle for transportation and recreational purposes. And two months ago I made the decision to return my vehicle to the home of my parents.

My decision to part with my
vehicle was driven by several factors, most noticeably the walkability of my neighborhood as well as the availability of alternative transportation options like Zipcar.

I have been privileged enough to be able to live and work in close proximity to Metro Stations. While I do pay a premium to live near a Metro, the costs are more than off-set by the ability to function without a vehicle and the convenience of having both necessary amenities as well as entertainment options within a short walking distance.

The high cost of parking in the city directly contributed to my decision to part with my vehicle. The cost of paying for parking in my apartment building and at work alone would have significantly increased my cost of living expenses and it would have provided a marginal, if any, increase in convenience.

Coincidentally, the parking garage in my building seems to be under utilized as
one out of three spaces consistently sits vacant. I would imagine that some of those spaces may better be utilized as space for resident bicycle parking, an option that my building currently lacks.

I believe that these proposed changes to the parking regulations will help to foster a more walkable city environment and encourage less vehicular dependence by giving the market more freedom to choose where additional parking is needed and promoting access to parking that is less disruptive to pedestrian traffic.

A personal transition from being car dependent to car-less has been positive and I believe is one that is representative of the decisions many people in a similar situation to mine are making. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Petorsa?

MR. PETORSA: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. This has been quite
a week twice. Let me say I am in support of the recommendations of the Office of Planning. And I think they have done an excellent job in writing their report and raising the issues for you.

It has been said that parking is a fertility drug for cars and I would like you to keep that in mind as you consider these proposals. The Capitol Hill Historic District has basically had no minimums, because no curb cuts are allowed within the Historic District. And therefore, we have lived a number of years with no minimum parking requirements and have survived quite well.

In fact, the infill buildings that have been built in that time period I believe almost all of them have provided parking voluntarily using the alley system as a way to provide parking and they are providing at least 1:1 parking in all of the cases I can think of.

Now, we do have a parking problem,
especially in the evenings and at night on Capitol Hill and I think it is going to take some innovative ways to deal with that. In my written testimony, I have suggested how the parking permit system could be revised to perhaps deal with those problems.

But I do believe that every dwelling should be able to have -- should have one parking space, whether it is on the street or off the street. And beyond that, I think there should be a cost for having additional parking.

You have heard a lot about minimums and maximums and in my testimony, written testimony to you, I discuss the advantages and disadvantages of minimums and maximums. Frankly, a minimum provide an oversupply of parking or can provide an oversupply of parking and maximums, if not property calculated, can provide an undersupply of parking. So there is a plus or minus to both of them.
I would also suggest to you that you could consider having both minimums and maximums for pieces of property. In other words, based on some system calculations, a piece of property would be required to have 25 parking spaces, but it could have no more than 50, something like that. So you can combine the two systems. They don't have to be -- it isn't an either or situation with minimums and maximums.

And then I would like to say finally, I'm concerned about the coordination here, because dealing with parking sort of requires a holistic approach to parking and not all of it relates to zoning. And what I'm concerned about is the zoning piece will get far ahead of the rest of the pieces and we won't end up with all of them dovetailing at the end.

And so I would like to suggest to you that you keep your eye on how the other pieces are going and keep prodding DDOT and
WMATA and who else -- whoever else is involved
so that when we do get to the end of the day
on parking, that all of the pieces come
together. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Garboushian? Hopefully I
didn't butcher that.

MR. GARBOUSHIAN: Garboushian.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Garboushian.

Okay.

MR. GARBOUSHIAN: Thank you.

Chairman Hood, Members of the Commission,
thank you for this opportunity to testify. My
name is Ralph Garboushian. I live car-free in
Ward 6. I'm a volunteer for the Washington
D.C. Chapter of the Sierra Club and currently
serve as its Transportation Chair.

We have submitted detailed
comments in support of the Office of
Planning's draft parking recommendations. The
Sierra Club is the nation's oldest and largest
grass roots environmental organization. With
more than 750,000 members nationwide,
including more than 3,200 here in the District
of Columbia.

The Washington D.C. Chapter of the
Sierra Club has a long history of advocating
for a balanced transportation system that
minimizes the impacts of transportation on the
environment and neighborhoods, respects
pedestrians and bicycle users and maximizes
investments in transits.

Global warming, the relentless
marches of urban sprawl, energy and security
and consumer sentiment demand that we make a
major shift in our region's transportation
investments towards high quality transit,
streets that are safe for pedestrians and
bicyclists and transit-oriented development in
mixed-use neighborhoods.

Simply put, business as usual
should no longer be an option.

Unfortunately, the District's
current Parking Regulations are business as
usual of the worst kind and run contrary to these policy goals. The current outdated Parking Regulations and their minimums, which are better suited to an automobile dependent suburb of 1958 have considerably harmed the District's urban fabric and are largely responsible for our city's glut of cars and the air pollution, visual pollution and noisy and unpleasant neighborhoods.

The draft parking recommendations from the Office of Planning represent the sensible reform of these outdated regs. Four key points in support of the draft parking recommendations.

First, neighborhoods within L'Enfant City, especially designated Historic Districts, such as Capitol Hill, already function largely along the lines of the draft parking recommendations. Indeed, under current Parking Regulations, it would be illegal to construct the District's most vibrant and best loved neighborhoods.
Second, plentiful parking encourages people to drive and robs neighborhood retail corridors of customers and vibrancy.

Third, parking requirements add considerable expense to new housing and are a major impediment to the creation of affordable housing.

Fourth, the District's competitive edge over its local competitors is its urbanity and it is amenity rich in livable communities. A mobility focused on automobiles and parking has already eroded much of this competitive advantage. The draft recommendations will help reverse this troubling trend.

Let me just give you two quick anecdotes from my daily life. My office is on the 1200 Block of H Street, N.W. One block from Metro Center. This block, which is not a very long block, has six curb cuts to access parking garages and alleys and it creates a
major hazard for pedestrians.

Why is there so much parking in a location that is served by three subway lines and dozens of bus lines? And second, at home, I live on a residential block on Capitol Hill that consists mostly of single-family row homes, but includes two apartment buildings of, approximately 8 to 12 units each.

Both buildings blend in nicely with neighboring houses and while people who do not need or cannot afford a three bedroom house to live in a desirable, trend accessible neighborhood. Neither building provides parking for its residents. If they were built today under current parking rules, each would be forced to provide multiple off-street parking spaces.

It would make no sense to build an underground garage for such small buildings and it certainly makes no sense to build a surface parking lot in such a dense neighborhood. Indeed, the surface parking
lots that exist in my neighborhood are terrible eyesores that detract considerably from this otherwise fantastic urban fabric.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of the Office of Planning's very sensible and much needed draft parking recommendations.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Colleagues, any questions? Chair Miller?

MS. MILLER: Mr. Petorsa, when you say that every dwelling should have one parking spot either on their property or on the street, how do you envision the on-site parking spot? I mean, the parking spot on the street that they could rent it from the city and it would be reserved for them or what do you mean?

MR. PETORSA: I would -- what I mean is that they would have a zone parking permit and they would be able to park somewhere in the neighborhood. It wouldn't be a dedicated spot. Does that answer your
question?

MS. MILLER: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions? Okay. I want to thank this panel. Okay. Next proponent, Alice Speck, Jeff Speck, Ken Archer and Abby Hall. We're going to begin with Alice Speck. Oh, okay. And you know what, I have to apologize. I should have called you earlier, actually before the Council Members. I have to apologize. I really do.

MS. SPECK: Can I start?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Begin.

MS. SPECK: Okay. My name is Alice Speck. I am a D.C. Ward 1 resident and a new mom who finds it more convenient not owning a car. I have nothing against cars, car ownership or car owners. But it so happens that life in the city, at least in my neighborhood, is easier without the cost of a car, the cost of car ownership and the other burdens that it presents.
My husband, Jeff, and I live in
the U Street neighborhood, which is well-
served by both buses and Metro. For more
distant trips and major grocery shopping
outings, I use Zipcar, which is truly a
Godsend and eliminates any excuse I would have
to go out and buy my own vehicle.

We literally have 20 Zipcars
within a 10 minute walk of our house. We
thought that having a baby might change our
feelings about the need for car ownership, but
it has only resulted in a little more Zipcar
use. We have chosen doctors, pharmacies and
other services based on their accessibility
via Metro.

If you multiply our situation by
the number of families in the District, you
can see how encouraging transit use and
walking over driving and parking results and
residents spending more time, more of their
money locally to benefit D.C.'s businesses and
tax base.
And of course, not owning a car has allowed us to invest more money in our home, our garden and in the many restaurants and stores in our neighborhood. Other people's car payments are our disposable income. I can speak personally about the burden imposed by D.C.'s current suburban style parking requirements.

When my husband and I designed our house for an empty lot on Florida Avenue, we had to petition the Zoning Board of Appeals to waive the requirement that we provide an off-street parking space on our tiny 500 square foot building lot. This lot was in a block of two dozen historic homes, not one of which has an off-street parking space.

The existing City Code required us to remove a historic granite curb and eliminate public on-street parking space in order to create our own private parking space. You can understand that we didn't want to do this. Luckily our petition was successful,
but our decision to go before the Board, the Board of Zoning Appeals, delayed the construction of our new house by nine months.

Not all people who want to build houses in the city have the patience, resources or the desire to wait nine months to waive this anti-urban, anti-transit and anti-pedestrian on-site parking requirement.

Our neighborhood has its share of new houses that following the rules have blighted the historic streetscape of driveways -- with driveways and garage doors. We can argue about whether such incompatible construction should be legal. All I'm saying is that it shouldn't be required. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much, Mrs. Speck. Jeff Speck?

MR. SPECK: It's a tough act to follow. Good evening, Commissioners, I'm Jeff Speck. I also live at 990 Florida Avenue in the District. I'm a certified city planner at AICP. I have spoken before this Commission
before a few years ago when I was an expert
witness on the topic of Foreign Based Codes, a concept that I am encouraged to see has become more popular in recent years, thanks in no small part to the enlightened leadership of Harriet Tregoning in the Planning Department.

I was until a year ago the Director of Design at the National Endowment for the Arts where I oversaw the Mayor's Institute on City Design and I spent a lot of time talking to Mayors about this very issue, among many others.

Currently, I am a private city planner. My clients include the cities of Charleston, South Carolina and Grand Rapids. And I also work for private developers who, believe me, know enough to ask for the parking that they require.

As someone who does this for a living, it's actually rare for me to do this as a citizen in my own community. I found that most clients typically value planner's
advice in direct proportion to how much they pay for it and I'm hoping that is not the case tonight.

I'm hoping to talk big picture to you. You know the details. Many other people can speak to these issues better than I can. The specifics of the issues. The studies have been done. The experts have weighed in. Your own professional staff has made its proposals and now you are being asked to act.

As I used to do with many of the big city Mayors I have advised, I find it's always useful to return to fundamental principles of planning. These are principles tested and proven over time.

So in one minute, here are some planning principles. Most of you already know these, but it's a convenient time to repeat them. The more parking you provide or require to be provided, the less residents will choose to walk. The more parking you provide or require to be provided, the less residents
will choose to take transit.

The more parking you require, the more you will, in fact, devalue investments you have made in transit. The more parking you require, the dirtier air you will have and the more asthma your citizens will have. The more parking you require, the more child obesity and early onset diabetes you will have.

The more parking you require, the more difficult it will be to build affordable and attainable housing at a cost where it can be afforded by its target audience. The more parking you require, the more difficult you would make it for the city to meet its obligations regarding limiting contributions to climate change and dependence on foreign oil.

I could go on and on and tell you more things you already know, more facts. I will take the liberty of ending with a more personal statement. World class cities, the
cities that people choose to visit on vacation when they can be anywhere in the planet, these world class cities do not have minimum parking requirements.

It is remarkable that Washington, D.C. has become the great success and the great destination that it is in spite of its suburban style, distinctly not world class parking requirements. It is with great excitement and even joy as a D.C. citizen, D.C. resident and D.C. worker to imagine how great this city could be if this body has the courage to enact this measure and others like it. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you both. And let me stop and ask my colleagues now, do we have any questions of Alice and Jeff Speck?

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Other than just how's the house?

MR. SPECK: It's great. You have to come see it.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah, I
pass it all the time. I'm your neighbor.

MR. SPECK: Knock on the door and
we'll give you a tour.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any --

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: A question.

Thanks and I always knew parking was the root
of all evil. The -- no, the question I had
was you used the term world class cities
which, by the way, I hate the term, but I get
the idea. So what other cities are you
talking about that don't have minimums?

MR. SPECK: Well, Venice doesn't
even have a Gondola parking minimum.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you very
much.

MR. SPECK: But I was thinking of
cities like Rome and Florence and I know Italy
well, New York, of course. I know that -- and
frankly, my -- I have worked in even cities
like Jersey City that have eliminated their
parking requirements and replaced them with parking maximums. I think Harriet can probably name others.

COMMISSIONER MAY: That would be useful to know.

MR. SPECK: The -- is it submitted in the -- it has been submitted in the report.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All right. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good. And we're not trying to get you out of here, but I know you may want to go on home a little earlier. Again, we apologize for that oversight earlier. Thank you both.

Okay. Next, Mr. Archer, and I appreciate your indulgence. Ken Archer.

MR. ARCHER: I would like to express my strong support for the proposed Parking Regulations. I have chosen to live in Georgetown, because it is attractive, walkable and it is possible to make all of our trips without driving.
My wife and I walk or ride the bus for all of our shopping and entertainment and take the bus to work. In this October when our first child is born, we will bring him home on the D6 Bus from Sibley Hospital to Georgetown.

We're not alone in this. Georgetown is increasingly made up of young families looking for the attractive and walkable character that is, unfortunately, only available to those who can afford to live in one of the few neighborhoods built before parking minimums were imposed in 1958.

Since the 1958 parking minimums effectively made neighborhoods like Georgetown illegal, newer neighborhoods developed since then have been unable to provide the benefits that draw people to this city, ensure long commitment to neighborhoods and thus ensure the stable property values we enjoy in Georgetown.

Given the many benefits that my
neighborhood offers, because our space is not consumed by large amounts of parking, I wholeheartedly support the proposals to remove parking minimum requirements from residential and most forms of commercial development and enact parking maximums.

1958 parking minimums not only turned people away from the city by making future Georgetowns, Dupont Circles and Kaloramas illegal, they turn away even more people from the city because of contribution of residential parking minimums to the lack of affordable housing in D.C.

D.C.'s one parking spot for apartment or condo policy adds 10 to 20 percent to the cost of housing. Such artificial rent inflation and mortgage inflation hits the people who need to save money by living in non-car dependent neighborhoods the most.

There are few actions that would show the commitment of the D.C. Government to
affordable housing more than by rejecting residential parking minimums and enacting residential parking maximums.

Continuation of the 1958 parking minimums will not only continue to make walkable attractive neighborhoods illegal and out of reach to most residents, it would also lead to the erosion of the historic neighborhoods that we have left in D.C. by forcing infill of surface parking into our neighborhoods.

My wife and I plan on taking our children on long walks throughout Georgetown and neighboring areas as we have done for 10 years in this city. If D.C. policies increasingly turn those walks into walks across curb cuts and surface parking lots requiring even more dodging of cars and crosswalks, then we will see that D.C. doesn't want our family and others like us here.

Some residents and some of my Georgetown neighbors are worried that adoption
of the parking recommendations of the Office of Planning will move more parking into our neighborhoods. This is a reasonable concern, but ultimately an unnecessary one, because free or cheap parking always leads to more traffic not less.

Furthermore, not addressed in this recommendation is the need for parking meters in the neighborhoods, exempt for zone residents, so that neighborhood parking is no longer free. I fully support meters on my street one block off Wisconsin Avenue and many of my neighbors would as well.

Eliminating parking minimums is not about privileging walkers, bikers and transit riders over cars. It's about privileging people by allowing the largest number of people possible to enjoy attractive residential and commercial options that one only finds in the city.

How people choose to access our city neighborhoods is a choice not a given.
Increasingly, of course, we see people choosing to take forms of transportation other than driving.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much.

MR. ARCHER: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good timing. Abby Hall?

MS. HALL: Thank you. My name is Abby Hall. I'm a resident of Ward 4. I want to thank the Commission for the opportunity to share my thoughts on why I'm in support of the recommended changes to the Zoning Code.

There are a lot of reasons. I'll just talk about a few here. One right off the top, a lot of people have already talked about implications for traffic reduction. I work downtown and I bike 4 miles every day to work. And for that personal reason, I would be happy to see fewer cars on the road that we know would be correlated with fewer spaces for those cars to park in.
But beyond that, just sort of discouraging auto dependence and incentivising the use of our existing wonderful transit system and the investments that the city has already made is an important part of these recommendations.

In addition to all of the forms of transportation demand management, like shared parking and things that companies and businesses can already do, like providing transit subsidies to reduce the incentive basically to drive a car. As a lot of people have talked about, people have the choice. And we have wonderful transit in this city and we should make that a better choice for people by making parking a harder choice or by driving a harder choice.

The recommendations, I think, also have great implications to make this a more walkable and pedestrian friendly city, recommendations about alley access to parking, providing that in the rear and the side, I
think, are important and I appreciate the
thoughtfulness of the Office of Planning in
including those details in the
recommendations.

    Again, I'm a biker. I don't have
a car. I think the bus is sort of slow from
my house and it's often full, which is a good
thing, but parking is the most efficient and
certainly the cheapest way for me to get
around the city. So I especially appreciate
the bike parking recommendations.

    A lot of people I work with and I
know think I'm either crazy for biking or they
are somewhat envious that I do bike every day,
but say that they would never do it. One,
because the find that it is unsafe. And they
also think in the hot summer, you know, they
want to shower, they don't want to bike around
and it's sort of disgusting.

    So some of these -- you know,
people need intangible incentives to bike.
And Government requirements really help get at
that. And bike parking is big part of it.

There are a lot of ads around D.C. I have noticed recently in the bus stalls for biking. And I think that these changes to the parking requirements will sort of go in concert with the recommendations that the Government is already making that people get on a bike.

And one last issue that was mentioned briefly earlier are the implications of these changes for the health of our rivers. There are clear links between impervious surfaces and storm water runoff. By limiting the number of new surface parking spaces that we add to the city will decrease imperviousness, which will result in less runoff and less combined sewer overflows and improved water quality overall for the Anacostia River, Potomac River and Rock Creek.

I suggest the sustainability work group seriously consider inclusion of standards for landscaping and parking lots
that be functional storm water management landscaping features as well as considerations for pervious parking or pervious pavement materials.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HALL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you both.

Let's see if we have any questions for you. Okay. Thank you both for your testimony.

Okay. Lindsley Williams and Mr. Sher is a little different from Mr. Crews. He is on the proponent side with a few opposites, so I'm going to call Mr. Sher.

You've been around a while, Mr. Sher, so you knew which side to get on, so you can come forward. Paul Tummonds and Christopher Zieman. We could start with Lindsley Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, good evening, Ms. Miller, good evening to the Office of Planning, Department of...
Transportation, leaders, all OZ staff. I'm here tonight to testify on the parking requirements that are the subject of this evening's discussion.

I have reviewed both the concept report and the Notice of Hearing. I came down in part to give you my views, but also to listen to views that others were expressing. This leads to a comment I have about the process, but I want to pause at this point to just say how much I appreciated the opening remarks of both Ms. Tregoning and Ricks to sort of set the context for why we are here and what we are trying to achieve.

You have me correctly noted as being a person that is in support of this process and where it is heading. And I offer that sort of endorsement. At the same time, if we thought of this as a racetrack, I'm going to be waiving a yellow flag. And the reason is that I think it is heading in the right direction, but I have some serious
concerns which I have tried to identify in the
remarks that I have provided to you.

Now, my process suggestion, so
that I don't have to run out of time is, Mr.
Chairman, that you ask OP and DDOT to provide
you with their further calibrations they
talked about, some adjustments in their
recommendations, in a defined time frame. And
I'm hoping that defined time frame will
loosely coincide to what staff can tell you
will be the time it takes to produce the
transcript for the hearing that can be posted
on the website.

Then what I would like to do is to
be given the opportunity, and I think many of
the others here would like it, to be able to
offer further comments that could come into
you in writing only, so that we can basically
all have the benefit of the entire width of
the conversation and provide you an additional
set of views.

I hope that that could be done. I
don't know what the exact timing would be, but
I think it means keeping the record open for
a month or so.

Now, as to the context of the
case, it flows out of the existing '58
Amendment Regulation, those were amended in
'84. I had something to do with that when I
was in another capacity. We have the Comp
Plan Amendments of 2006 and the Zoning Update
process.

I see the goals and directions as
ones being provided by the Comp Plan partly
mentioned by Ms. Tregoning and Mr. Parker, but
I summarize as location, location, location,
use, use and use, density, intensity,
propensity or the obverse of that and form,
form and form, high and thick, low and thin
and in between.

Parking and loading that turn out
to be need by that, not required, needed are
byproducts of what is or comes to be
established in that form in the context of
what is going on in the city around it. How big, how much communication, capacity is how much transportation capacity, what is the presence or availability of Zipcars, sidewalks, the absence of them, all these kinds of things.

Parking to me should flow out of what is decided for the overall urban form that is to be taken by the decisions of other parts of this and it should be then studied and flow. Essentially --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Williams, we have your testimony, believe me. We have your testimony.

MR. WILLIAMS: Bingo.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Mr. Sher?

MR. SHER: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, Ms. Miller, my name is Steven E. Sher, the Director of Zoning and Land Use Services with the Law Firm of Holland and Knight. I'm good and I'm fast, but I
can't get it all in in five minutes, so I'm going to ask you, please, to look at what I have submitted to you.

What you have before you is annotated in colors, color copy award today. And what is in red are essentially the comments that I have made on the proposal that you have before you as enunciated by, principally by, the Office of Planning in its July report, but also as is set forth in the Notice of Hearing, which goes back to June.

I would like to hit some very specific points and then jump to the conclusions at the end. We are generally supportive of letting the market determine how much parking is provided. Parking is generally expensive to provide and most of it was more than what they need to build, but they also have to be able to build enough to satisfy what they perceive the market demand to be.

A point that I don't think has
been brought up before, changing the parking for non-residential uses in residential areas to a square footage based standard from number of seats, number of teachers, or other unit of measurement is something that I don't believe has been adequately studied.

I don't know whether that means you are going to wind up with more parking or less parking. You had the example of the Sibley Hospital thing which suggested it be a lot less parking required than what was otherwise provided, but I think you need to look at that in terms of square footage versus other unit of measurement.

It's impossible to evaluate the maximum question without knowing what areas are going to be subject and what the maximums are. If I'm allowed one space or a million spaces, it makes a big -- a great deal of difference and I can't sit here and tell you how I feel about that until I know what the specific proposal is.
The question or the proposal to require Zipcar, car-sharing spaces in parking areas of a certain size, you want to exempt residential parking garages or parking areas from that limitation. You have had any number of cases where we have talked about the security concerns of having a secure garage in the basement of an apartment house and requiring them to put a Zipcar space in there and that's a problem.

In terms of one thing that appears in a couple of places, you really ought to look at making sure that the regulations do not preclude the use of mechanical or other types of parking arrangements, lifts, elevators or what have you. I don't think the regulations have made it clear as to, for example, accessibility or size of spaces.

We had one case where the system—the pallet that the car went on wasn't 19 feet long. It was 18.5 feet long. We had to come in and get relief for that. So you just need
to think about that in the overall scheme.

Even though I know the number is going down to
18, what if it's 17.5?

The question of parking for
bicycles. One other thought that you should
be -- have in your mind here is that the
Council has enacted legislation earlier this
year, effective February 2008, requiring
bicycle parking. And you need to look at that
set of requirements versus the set of
requirements that you have got here. I think
these are generally more restrictive, but
you've got two different sets of requirements
and God help us, I don't want to talk about
height, but why do we have to have two
different sets of requirements?

In terms of conclusions, the
details of much of what is proposed aren't
known, so it's therefore hard for us to
comment on the specifics of some of these
things. There are a lot of changes proposed
in the Notice of Hearing which we have been
told is not the focus of this hearing. You're talking conceptual, not detail, but you've got to give that closer scrutiny and attention when you ultimately get to trying to figure out how the rubber meets the road. Probably a bad analogy, given the subject.

The changes which decrease requirements and add greater flexibility to go out and provide less parking or to it in more creative ways are generally good things. The reverse is also true. Changes which increase requirements and provide less flexibility are generally not good things.

The delegation of authority to DDOT without guidance or standards is problematic. If delegation is retained, the Zoning Amendment should not take effect until DDOT has adopted rules that may clear to the public how the Zoning Regulations are going to be applied to the extent that DDOT is going to apply them.

The notion of not fixing things
which are not broken should be adhered to.
There are things which are not justified and
which seem to be changed for the sake of
change or perhaps because other jurisdictions
do them and therefore the District should
also. And I'm a little bit concerned about
that.

And lastly, the reliance upon best
practices studies needs to be tempered by
whether these are truly best practices or
whether they are predominant practices which
may or may not be better than what we have in
our current regulations now.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr.
Sher.

MR. SHER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

MR. SHER: Well, that was pretty
good.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr.

Tummonds? Paul Tummonds?

MR. TUMMONDS: Good evening, Mr.
Chairman, Members of the Commission,

Chairperson Miller, I'm Paul Tummonds a Zoning and Land Use attorney with Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman.

I'm also here this evening in my capacity as DCBIA's representative on the Comprehensive Zoning Regulations Rewrite Task Force. DCBIA supports the general policies of removing minimum parking requirements, encouraging shared parking, the creation of in loop fees related to provision of parking spaces, establishing clearly articulated bicycle parking requirements and incorporation of parking spaces for car-sharing companies within new developments.

As noted in the Office of Planning's report and discussed here this evening, the maximum limits on the amount of parking spaces that may be provided in a project will be discussed during each of the working group processes for the various individual land use categories.
The Zoning Commission will need to provide a great amount of scrutiny to the recommendations of these working groups in order to help ensure that all of the developments are able to provide an appropriate amount of parking spaces to satisfy market demand as well as achieve the goals of creating truly transit-oriented developments.

In regard to specific proposals in the OP report, we agree with OP's proposal to change the calculation for minimum parking requirements to a square footage basis, rather than one based on number of employees, staff or some other measurement -- means of measurement.

On the Task Force, we continually talk about how we are seeking to satisfy the Comprehensive Plan's goals of creating Zoning Regulations that provide greater clarity and ease of understanding and interpretation. Calculation of a minimum parking requirement
based solely on the square footage of that
use, whatever that use may be, will help
achieve those goals.

We also believe that the amount of
parking spaces that are required for colleges
and universities should be addressed solely
through the Campus Plan process. This is a
process that we are discussing in the current
institutional working group. The Campus Plan
process is better suited to address issues
related to parking provided on campus and
related impacts on the surrounding
neighborhoods.

In fact, the Zoning Commission's
ability to have that flexibility to review
parking requirements right now for campus as
a whole has allowed the Zoning Commission to
adopt some of the policies sought through this
revised Zoning Requirement we're talking about
now, mainly a maximum number of parking
spaces.

The Georgetown University Campus
Plan currently has a parking cap. And I think that it does work to address off-campus parking-related issues in the Georgetown neighborhood.

That's it. Thank you for the opportunity to listen to my issues and I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Zieman?

MR. ZIEMAN: Thank you. My name is Christopher Zieman. I am a resident of the Parkview neighborhood and, just by the way, I also bike and use transit and don't own a car.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Where is the Parkview neighborhood?

MR. ZIEMAN: Parkview neighborhood? It's in Ward 1 next to the Armed Forces Retirement Home between the Armed Forces Retirement Home and Georgia Avenue. Okay. And I support OP's recommendations on the parking revisions.

Now, listening to everybody before
me, I was trying to come up with things that	nobody else had said before, which is rather
difficult. But a few things that kind of came
to my mind is that parking price and parking
supply, everybody attributes to parking, but
it's actually the most important factor in
whether or not somebody will choose to drive
or take transit or some other mode.

Now, that being said, our region
is growing and D.C. is, obviously,
geographically restricted by Maryland and
Virginia, so we need to think about how we are
going to use space and how people are going to
get around. Now, with the average car
ridership being 1.1 persons, cars, obviously,
take up a lot of space per person.

Now, when we think of our region
growing, a lot of these new residents are
going to want to drive, but a lot of them also
won't want to drive. Now, D.C. has the
advantage of being an authentic urban city and
having an authentic urban feel, based on the
density of walking, and this advantage will
attract and does attract many of those who
wish to live without having to drive, as you
have already heard tonight.

Now, in addition, I think a topic
that has escaped this debate is other impacts
of parking. For example, environmental. In
D.C. there is very little industry. For
example, this is, obviously, no Gary, Indiana.
But we are still at a non-attainment zone for
-- non-attainment for ozone. Now, air
pollution might improve with better fuel
efficiency of cars, but this hasn't happened
yet compared to the 1950s.

It also ignores other effects like
water pollution. For example, all the
pollution that drifts off of engines and tires
that gets washed into our rivers without
filtration. It also ignores the 26 pedestrian
fatalities last year. It ignores the impact
on neighborhoods where developers have to
sacrifice building amenities to construct the
parking that is required, that they don't necessarily need.

It also ignores the space that is taken up for extra lanes on roads instead of creating outdoor seating or parks.

So revising the Zoning Code has OP and DDOT recommend, obviously, won't solve these problems overnight, but it will set us up to prevent us from making the same mistakes that we have been making for the past 50 years. And by the way, a few other cities in America that have already chosen to eliminate parking minimums are San Francisco, Portland, Oregon, New York City, obviously, and downtown Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. Colleagues, any questions?

MS. MILLER: I have one.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Chair Miller?

MS. MILLER: For Mr. Tummonds. I want to know why you think it's preferable to calculate minimum parking requirements to
square footage rather than number of employees/staff or other means of measurement?

MR. TUMMONDS: Right. You know, you as the Chairperson of the BZA have seen many cases that come through and mostly they are the cases that are school cases where parking is based on, you know, two spaces for every three teachers or if you have a gymnasium of X number of seats. That -- I think, a lot of the we hear from the community is like I don't know what you are -- how many parking spaces you are supposed to have, because I don't know how many teachers you have.

I don't know how many seats you have in your gymnasium. You know, once we establish what is an appropriate amount for a school, you have to provide X number of spaces for a school of 100,000 square feet, I think that that provides the measure of clarity, ease of understanding that will allow the school to determine what that is, so then they
don't have to go through the basis of well, I had -- is it full-time teachers? Is it part-time teachers? They don't overlap.

And then the community can say I know how many parking spaces you are supposed to have and you either have it or you don't have it.

MS. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just wanted to add that I think that Mr. Williams brought up some points and I'll ask staff and Office of Planning to be thinking about this towards the end and we're going to probably try to see what next steps and how we're going to move once we get the text. But we need to come up with a time frame. We need to ask that, how long until we get a transcript and how long we're going to leave the record open.

I'm sure my colleagues have had questions all night we have not to some degree asked and there's some other stuff that we need to flesh out. But we need to figure out
and I just want both sides to be thinking that
as we move forward, because I'm sure -- I
don't know if we need another hearing, whether
we do it as a meeting.

Those are the things that I want
us to nail down once we hear from the public.
Okay. Any other questions of this panel?
Thank you very much for your testimony.

Steven Jones, Sam Feldman, Heather
Whitlow and Glen Harrison. Okay. Do we have
Steven Jones at the table? Okay. Mr. Jones,
you may begin.

MR. JONES: Good evening, Chair
Hood, Chair Miller and the Members of the
Commission. Thank you for this opportunity to
testify on this important issue. My name is
Steve Jones and I think I'm the only one so
far that has identified themselves as a native
Washingtonian. So I was born here and lived
here all my life.

I currently live in Foggy Bottom/
West End. And I'm speaking tonight in an
individual capacity, but it reflects years of experience working with developers and financiers of real estate, as well as a member of the Comprehensive Plan Task Force.

Recently, I have been working with a group to help develop underwriting standards on -- to value the effect of green building practices. A lot of people have spoken to some of the things I wanted to mention tonight, but primarily I wanted to speak about the elimination of the parking minimums.

I think they are an efficient and an effective way of determining parking requirements. I think the market will do a much better job of determining what the minimum parking needs are. A developer will have problems getting financing if he does not meet, he or she, the parking demand, because it represents both an enhancement for tenants and potential buyers, but also could represent a source of revenue for the project.

So I think the market will do a
very good job of determining what minimum parking requirements there are.

In terms of the effectiveness of minimum standards, I think one of the things that minimum parking requirements don't take into account is the conversion of the use of a space. So for example, in a neighborhood like Mount Pleasant, you have people who have garages that have been converted to storage space or accessory apartments or work shops and their cars are sitting on the streets.

So the spill over effect that we were trying to deal with is also impacted by how people who have met the requirements are using the space. So the standards address the creation of space. They don't address the use of the space.

So therefore, I am supporting the elimination of the minimum parking requirements.

The other thing I would like to say is that with regard to that, I personally
had to deal with unbundled and bundled parking spaces. And when I was presented with a $45,000 price for a parking space in downtown D.C., I did a lot of thinking about my need for a parking space. Whereas, when it was bundled into the purchase price of the condominium, there was less thought on my part around whether or not I needed a parking space.

And finally, in some ways I don't think the Office of Planning has gone far enough. For the last 50 years, we have been pretty aggressive about supporting automobile use and subsidizing its use. I think we can be equally as aggressive in supporting transit access.

In talking with a senior executive at a major brokerage firm, he has identified that his investors are really very interested in public -- access to public transit in the buildings they are investing and purchasing.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

If you can just hold your seat, we may have some questions. Sam Feldman? Sam Feldman? Okay. That's who is not here. Okay. Heather Whitlow?

MS. WHITLOW: Okay. Good evening, Members of the Commission. My name is Heather Whitlow. I'm the Director of Planning and Design at Casey Trees, a nonprofit here in the District to restore, enhance and protect the tree canopy. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

According to data compiled by the D.C. Office of the Chief Technology Officer, there are more than 8,100 surface parking lots in the District. Together these lots occupy 2,100 acres or 5 percent of the land area of the city.

While parking is a necessary aspect of the urban environment, surface parking lots generate over 2 billion gallons of storm water runoff every year, exacerbate
the urban heat island phenomenon, contribute to poor air quality and add little to the fabric of our communities.

Recommendations to eliminate parking minimums and establish parking maximums will help ensure that we do not overbuild these surface parking lots. Particularly in areas where we have made the investment in alternative forms of transportation.

We applaud the Office of Planning and the parking working groups' decision to take this important step. But a necessary and complimentary piece of creating livable and sustainable neighborhoods is changing how surface parking lots are designed. As we all know, land is at a premium in the District, so we need to promote site designs that are functional, attractive and environmentally sound.

To this end, the D.C. Comprehensive Plan specifically recommends
encouraging the use of shade trees and landscaping in surface parking lots. Currently, Zoning Regulations require that landscaping with trees and shrubs cover a minimum of 5 percent of the total area of the parking lot.

The regulations do not specifically require trees nor do they provide guidance to ensure that the trees planted will survive and thrive. The result is that only 7 percent of our 2,100 acres of surface parking are shaded by trees.

Trees and greenery are key components of safe walkable neighborhoods that we strive to create. Trees shade, add beauty, provide habitat, increase the value of properties and businesses and clean our air and water. Trees in parking lots serve to mitigate some of the negative effects of the paved surface.

In the summer surface temperatures on unshaded asphalt can reach over 120 degrees
fahrenheit. The hot pavement transfers heat to the air that flows over it causing air temperatures in and around parking lots to be 20 degrees fahrenheit hotter than surrounding areas.

Trees can reduce this effect by providing shade and cooling the air through evapotranspiration. Reducing parking lot surface temperatures also has the added benefit of prolonging the life of the pavement which reduces maintenance costs.

Air quality also suffers as a result of the heat buildup from our parking lots. On warm days, gasoline evaporates from cars parked in the sun and these vapors combined with other air pollutants produce ozone or smog, the pollutant that has been responsible for 10 code orange days and three code red days so far this summer.

Not only do trees reduce temperatures, which helps to limit the formation of smog, but they also directly
remove pollution from the air. Tree canopy

overhanging parking lots also slows and captures rainfall reducing the amount of runoff that contributes to flooding and carries pollutants like oil, sewage and trash into our rivers.

Trees can also be included in areas of vegetation that are specifically designed to manage storm water, like the bioretention areas at the old Convention Center site downtown.

Casey Trees applauds the Office of Planning's efforts to update the parking lot landscape regulations to include a requirement for trees, including the regulations on par with those of cities like Chicago, Atlanta, Sacramento and Portland.

Atlanta requires one tree for every eight parking spaces. Portland requires one large tree for every four. Sacramento requires 30 to 50 percent of the lot to be shaded by tree canopy, depending on the lot
We are committed to working with the Office of Planning and with the Zoning Commission to determine a reasonable tree requirement for Washington, D.C. The parking policy recommendations include much needed provisions to ensure that trees have adequate protection to survive the harsh conditions found in parking lots.

These include requiring a minimum size for newly planted trees and providing a minimum setback from curbs and wheel stops to reduce damage from vehicles. The recommendations also set a minimum volume of soil required for each tree. This helps ensure that trees can endure the heat and will yield larger healthier trees because the ultimate size and longevity of trees is directly dependent on the amount of soil that tree roots can access.

Again, I just wanted to reiterate that Casey Trees is committed to working with
the Office of Planning and the Zoning Commission to develop Parking Regulations that include a reasonable tree requirement and ensure the trees have adequate space and protection to grow.

It will be important to draft Tree and Landscape Regulations that compliment one another and fit well with the District Department of Environment's new Storm Water Regulations that are forthcoming.

We also recognize that requiring too much landscape could result in an increase in the amount of land necessary to accommodate parking, so a balance must be struck.

Thank you for your time and I have copies of my testimony and a handout with pictures that has a lot of the stuff that I just gave.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. Glen Harrison?

MR. HARRISON: Thank you, Members of the Commission for allowing me to give my
testimony this evening. My name is Glen Harrison. I'm the Safety Education Coordinator with the Washington Area Bicyclist Association. And we represent thousands of bicyclists in D.C. and also thousands of bicyclists in Virginia and Maryland that bike to work to D.C. work places.

I would personally like to thank Ms. Tregoning for setting the example and giving up her parking space for bike parking.

We -- I come here tonight to support better bike parking through the efforts of the D.C. Zoning Commission. You are now considering updates to D.C.'s Parking Regulations. These changes will ensure our city grows to be even more bikable, walkable and green.

You may recall, as has already been mentioned this evening, that the D.C. Council passed legislation that would dramatically improve bike parking at commercial and residential developments
throughout the city. This legislation must now be incorporated into the Zoning Code.

Among the changes being proposed are doubling the amount of bike parking required in commercial garages, requiring bike parking in new residential buildings and mandate bike parking at schools, recreation centers, transit centers and houses of worship.

While most of these proposed changes are good, we feel that a few things have been left out. So the Washington Area Bicyclist Association is also recommending that bike parking should be added to libraries and outdoor recreation centers, car-sharing lots that have bike parking and car-sharing poles should have hoop racks included.

The number of bike racks per classroom at schools should be doubled. Building managers of commercial spaces should not be allowed to ban bikes from offices, if the office manager approves. Bike parking
spaces in commercial buildings should be tied
to square footage if car parking requirements
are reduced.

And we would also like to see the
enforcement of bike parking requirements. For
example, at DCUSA we would like to see where
our tax dollars are spent that bike parking is
also included and if bike parking is not
visible from the facility, that signage be
included to direct users to that benefit.

At the same time, the Zoning
Commission is also considering a significant
revision to the vehicle parking requirements.
These could have positive impacts on
bicycling. These changes would make our city
more pedestrian and bicyclist friendly by
reducing the number of parking lots and
driveways, which give particular hazards to
bicyclists.

This would also require more bike
parking and car-sharing spaces. And this
would stop city resources and money from being
diverted to parking. Often underground spots are very expensive. This would also make some housing more affordable by not requiring developers to build a minimum amount of parking.

The location and amount of parking has a big effect on driving habits, traffic, air quality and the urban fabric of our city. The D.C.'s current Parking Regulations have resulted in huge parking lots and garages that encourage more driving and traffic. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you very much. Colleagues, any questions? Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I had a question for Ms. Whitlow. What were those statistics at the very beginning of your testimony again?

MS. WHITLOW: 8,100 surface parking lots that occupy 2,100 acres, which is 5 percent of the land area. And that comes
from DCOCTO, the GIS Department.

    COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

    MS. WHITLOW: They have parking lots as a separate layer.

    COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, for a minute I thought you said 8,100 parking spaces.

    MS. WHITLOW: No.

    COMMISSIONER MAY: I was like no, that's not right. Okay. Thanks.

    MS. WHITLOW: Right.

    VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Mr. Harrison, are you going to provide us your written testimony?

    MR. HARRISON: I have submitted written testimony here, but I have extra copies.

    VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Oh, okay.

    COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Harrison, when you were talking about the schools and bikes for schools, you talked about doubling?
MR. HARRISON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, it just seems strange. In the Office of Planning report, when they talk about bikes, and I'm looking at their little chart. It says for schools whether it is K through 5 or 6 through 12, they are talking about one for each classroom?

MR. HARRISON: That's right. And that --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: One bike space for each classroom?

MR. HARRISON: One bike space for each classroom, which --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So you are saying two?

MR. HARRISON: Two for each classroom at least.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Doesn't that still seem kind of low for kids to ride their bike?

MR. HARRISON: It is. It's a
minimum.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I mean, two -- I mean, what do you do, fight in the school yard as to who gets to ride their bike?

MR. HARRISON: Well, I think we have to -- we do have to consider two, you know, maybe different grade level school versus elementary may have a lower ridership, where middle schools may have a very higher -- high ridership. And so as a bare minimum, we would recommend two.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: God, I can remember riding to school. There was probably 25, 50 bikes involved.

MR. HARRISON: Unfortunately, it's not that case today, but we hope that it will be.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, that's definitely not the case today. The bike rack at my son's school is --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Are you
considered a nerd if you ride your bike or is that --

MR. HARRISON: Absolutely not.
COMMISSIONER MAY: No.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: A kid, a kid, I'm not talk -- I mean, is it -- is there a stereo -- is there some kind of an image of riding a bike to school as not cool any more or what?
MR. HARRISON: I don't think it's that common any more. It's certainly not within the city.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah.
MR. HARRISON: But the racks that are provided at the school are definitely much less than what is needed and it becoming more and more of an issue, I think.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
MR. HARRISON: Because more --
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: There's not enough racks.
MR. HARRISON: Right, there are
not enough racks at the schools.

      COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

      Thank you.

      MR. HARRISON: I mean, maybe at

some of them there are, but the ones that I'm
familiar with, they are not. And there is
also a federal program currently being
implemented in D.C. called "Safe Routes to
School" which encourages more biking and
walking to school to curb early onset obesity
rates and also to improve air quality and also
to reduce congestion.

      COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I didn't
mean to make a big point out of it. It just
sounded -- like when I see the Office of
Planning report and I see one and you say it
ought to be doubled and that's two, it just
struck me as kind of humorous.

      VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I mean, I
would have to say -- what could be more
important, I mean, to start training young
people to -- the whole notion of using
bicycles. I mean, I think it's a very important thing, so I'm looking forward to your written testimony.

MR. HARRISON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions? I want to thank you all for your testimony. Okay. Moving right along, we're getting near the end of proponents. Matthew Yglesias, Drew Pusateri, hopefully I pronounced it correctly or you can correct me when you come forward, Brian O'Looney and Ellice Perez. Did I call five or did I -- oh, one is helping, okay.

All right. Let's go with Matthew Yglesias. Anyway, help me pronounce it. I could think of three ways I could pronounce it.

MR. YGLESIAS: Yglesias.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yglesias.

MR. YGLESIAS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I was close then, wasn't I? I was in the ball --
MR. YGLESIAS: Yes. The first time you had it right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I was in the ballpark?

MR. YGLESIAS: Yeah, totally.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. I will listen to you as opposed to my colleague to my right, Mr. Etherly. You may begin.

MR. YGLESIAS: Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to talk here. I know it is late, so I don't want to just repeat things that other proponents have said. And I wanted to address specifically the question of creating buffers around -- you know, buffer zones that would have exemptions from the minimums, because I think that I strongly support the spirit of the recommendations and I want to urge the Commission to adopt them and to depart as little as possible from the idea of eliminating minimums.
The concern, of course, is with spill over parking. But I would hope the Commissioners would also consider the spill over consequences of parking minimums. I'm living without a car in a row house neighborhood, but near to the commercial corridors on 14th Street and on U Street.

Not having a car, I depend heavily on the availability of businesses I can walk to on those corridors. Of course, it is possible for me to go outside the neighborhood to take the Metro, to take the bus, but it's very advantageous to me when stores open near to my house and I can go buy things there.

And so I want to be able to come in and to open businesses there. And when you say that well, to open a business you need to build a parking garage or to own a business you need to buy a very expensive lot next door to your business and put a parking lot there, that discourages people from opening these things.
And it says that a lot of our valuable land where we need grocery stores, for example, or places where people can buy clothing are instead being used up as parking spaces. And it has severe consequences for the quality of life for people who are living without cars, which I believe is the majority of the people in that neighborhood.

So I don't think that, you know, in the name of protecting people who live near retail corridors we should be, in fact, trying to harm the interests of many of us who want to see businesses and services come in there. There are ways to manage demand for on-street parking through modifying the residential parking system.

And as we have seen in the area around the stadium, there has been an enormous amount of success with doing that. The spill over consequences of a baseball stadium are potentially enormous, but the Department of Transportation seems to be well-able to deal
with those kinds of things.

   And I think that's all I'll say.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Pusateri?

MR. PUSATERI: It's Pusateri.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Pusateri?

MR. PUSATERI: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

MR. PUSATERI: I would like to thank the Members of the Commission for allowing me to speak tonight. I'm probably the newest member of the District of Columbia here tonight. I just moved here at the beginning of the summer from Ohio, but I do plan on being here for a while. I wanted to be able to come out here tonight and speak my peace as it were.

I live near the convention center.

I'm not in possession of a car. I live with my partner. She is in possession of a car.

We both went our separate routes in terms of
that and are now living with the consequences.

You know, Zoning Boards and Planning Boards, such as yourselves, have the really difficult, I guess, job of trying to nudge cities like this in a specific direction by providing incentive or disincentive to do certain things or in this case to own certain things. And I don't think there is any denying that.

Having minimum parking standards is an incentive for car ownership. Having outside -- having on-street parking is actually subsidization of car ownership. And it is not a particularly fair one at that, but, you know, we're talking about parking minimums today.

I think it would -- I don't think we need that incentive. As Ms. Tregoning had said earlier, there are pretty specific and unique, I guess, energy and environmental challenges that face us going forward. And so again, you guys have the, I guess, decision to
make of whether to encourage car ownership.

   And by making this decision, by
eliminating minimums, you are not discouraging

   car ownership in any meaningful way. And I'm
sure there are people in this room that would
like to see that happen, would like to see
maybe a tax on all parking spaces and, you
know, that's again not up for discussion
tonight, but maybe we could stop incentivising
car ownership by making the changes that are
proposed in this.

   And I would strongly encourage
that. There may well be spill over effects.
They won't be negative effects, ancillary
negative effects from the elimination of
minimums, but those do need to be weighed
against where, you know, we want to go as both
the city and the nation in terms of
environmental and energy challenges.

   My very last point would be that
in terms of the car-sharing and this is a more
specific point. In terms of the car-sharing
section of the plan, I just would like to say, I guess, a very tight and concise definition of what car-sharing entities are just from the fear that that could potentially be abused by people that were saying, you know, me and her are sharing a car and I want to be able to park, you know, using those spaces.

So thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. Brian O'Looney?

MR. O'LOONEY: Hello. My name is Brian O'Looney. I'm a partner with Torti Gallas and Partners and I have spoken on the issue of parking before the -- a few times. I ask your permission to show this PowerPoint today.

In it, I am showing some of the buildings I have personally worked on and actually the last time I was here before this Board was to get these buildings entitled. I hope you are happy with what the result was in Columbia Heights.
The unintended consequences of parking requirements, minimum requirements are set to provide excess spaces even when parking is free. Parking is then provided for free at most destinations as cost hidden. Bundling of the cost of parking causes higher prices for everything else and skews challenge choices towards driving, as said before.

Two mistakes in parking policy, keeping curb parking free or cheap and requiring lots of off-street parking. We all know this.

I'm going to talk a little bit about our lessons from Columbia Heights. You know, the lack of knowledge related to TOD parking is a problem. There are no definitive TOD parking ratios that exist out there. There is no information. There is no definitive understandings that exist of market-rate parking. Almost all the info is on suburban free parking and even that is not reliable data.
The only data that is reliable according to Mary Smith who wrote *Shared Parking* is office, not even retail for suburban free parking locations.

So lenders tend to require, out of concern and caution, conventional parking ratios and TODs. Developers tend to build TODs as conventional parking ratios. This causes higher development costs and parking costs are a major cause of housing and affordability.

This is the hole we dug for Kenyon in Columbia Heights. This is what we had to do. The Metro Tunnels are below that little bit there. If we fail with parking maximums and under supply parking, the solution is simply to raise prices and build more potentially.

But if we fail with parking minimums and over supply parking, as we have at Columbia Heights, the result is greater risk and financial stress for the people
willing to invest in the District of Columbia.

Why throw more money into useless holes in the ground? There is 500 to 700 spaces that aren't being used in this project. That's $20 million that could be spent on something else.

So these are the costs of parking from our experience and if you would like, I'll be happy to go over this more in depth later, but I won't bother the numbers. But this is roughly what you pay for when you are building a space of parking, depending on the type of construction you use.

I won't go into this slide either, unless you ask, if you want more information on this. But this simply describes that the most expensive component in housing costs is parking. Particularly in the District when you are building a lot of it underground. Kitchens cost $15,000 to $20,000. A bathroom is $7,000. A parking space in the District is $35,000 to $50,000. Okay. It's too much.
It's causing our housing to be unaffordable. We also should not just think about parking costs in terms of housing. It also adds cost to our commercial properties. This is downtown Bellevue Washington where they require building owners to include parking costs as a separate line item in leases.

Because it is unbundled, as the gentleman said before, people think twice about spending the money that makes the parking usage more efficient and if you unbundle the parking from leases, you will get more efficient usage of the parking that you provide. And you can learn a little bit more about that from that.

The results in Bellevue Washington is that the drive alone commute rate fell by 30 percent from 81 percent driving alone go 57 percent when they implemented this simple policy.

And you asked about precedents
earlier related to jurisdictions that abolish minimum parking requirements and here is the list. Coral Gables, Florida; Eugene, Oregon; Fort Myers, Florida; Fort Pierce, Florida; the entire nation of Great Britain; Los Angeles; Milwaukee; Olympia, Washington; Portland, Oregon; San Francisco, California; Stuart, Florida; Seattle and Spokane, Washington.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. Yeah, I think before we forget, we want to get copies of that presentation.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes, give us a copy.

MR. O'LOONEY: Yes, some of it is already in the --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's already in.

Okay.

MR. O'LOONEY: -- report, but there is a couple of the pages that aren't, but we'll make sure you get it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ellice
MS. PEREZ: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Ellice Perez. I'm the General Manager for Zipcar here in D.C. If you become a Zipcar member, we will be sharing a car.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES:

Excellent.

MS. PEREZ: Zipcar came to D.C. in 2001 and we had a couple thousand members and about 50 cars. And today we have over 32,000 members and 750 cars. Earlier today you were hearing that there is a ratio, a normal ratio of 1.1 people to 1 car. We have a ratio of 43 people to one Zipcar. I was very pleased and very honored to hear all the wonderful anecdotes and the stories of all the many Zipcar members you hear tonight, but allow me to combine all of the stories and give you the combined impact that everyone has.

So believe it or not, we have been able to change everyone's behavior. They may
not know it. They are Zipcar members, but we have. Zipcar members drive an average of 2,500 less miles a year after joining Zipcar. That's 100 less gallons a gas a year and a national impact today all over the United States is 215,000 tons less or carbon emissions in the United States.

Zipcar members from all of our surveys and this is both internally managed surveys and externally as well are using -- 46 percent of our members report an increased use of public transportation, that obviously for here in D.C. is an increase in earnings for WMATA, but it's also increased savings for our members.

People ask how Zipcar, a car-sharing company can reduce congestion, but it is because of the statistics you heard earlier. For every one Zipcar, we take 15 cars off the road. It's actually 14.9, but we can round it up.

So that is because this 20 percent
of our members sell their personally owned vehicles and 40 percent of our members postpone or halt a purchasing decision for either their primary or secondary car. So you can understand that these are some amazing statistics and that while I very much am moved by the stories that I heard tonight, and I love to hear them, and I can tell you my own, I -- you can very much appreciate the combined impact that all of our car-sharing members have here.

Zipcar is very much in support of the proposed regulations here tonight, because it encourages citizens to rethink car ownership and that's what we do.

And we have a couple different situations where we do this on a very open facing way. Last November and then this March, we encouraged a car donation campaign. So there were over -- almost 70 cars were donated within a couple of months. And we give free Zipcar memberships and hundreds of
dollars in driving credit.

We work with WABA as well, so you get a free membership with WABA. And currently, today, we are in the middle of a low car diet, so we encouraged 30 people to sign up and lose 2,000 pounds for the duration of a month and learn how to live without a car. And it's pretty amazing how you can help people cross that threshold of going low-car or car-free.

So it's very interesting actually all the different statistics as well as the impact on the financial of the developers, because we have a lot of developers calling me today asking if I can put a Zipcar in their building, because it's a tenant amenity and they recognize that it is a way to distinguish their building from another one.

There is also a developer that I'm working with right now that is -- that has pulled together an analysis. They realize that they can build less parking and bring in
Zipcars and that will save them thousands and thousands of dollars, all in support of the numbers that you showed tonight.

So back in 2003, which is shortly after we started, we had about an average of 100 people joining per month, rethinking car ownership. But today in 2008, we have over 1,000 members joining per month. And you will -- I'm sure you will be one of them starting tomorrow.

So this is all possible because of the many different aspects of the transportation options here. We wouldn't be so successful if it weren't for our partners at WMATA and the Metrorail, Metrobus, the biking options and the lanes around here as well and the fact that it's such a walkable city.

So we are very much in support of this forward thinking regulation, because it really encourages people to rethink car ownership. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. Colleagues, any questions?

MS. MILLER: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Chair Miller?

MS. MILLER: I just wanted to ask you about Zipcar in residential garages.

MS. PEREZ: Um-hum.

MS. MILLER: Because I think that somebody, a witness, before you said that that was a security concern.

MS. PEREZ: Um-hum.

MS. MILLER: And I have heard that said at the BZA when we have talked about that kind of condition or something. And you seem to characterize it as an amenity instead. And so I'm wondering if you could address just whether there is a security concern or whether that can be addressed?

MS. PEREZ: Sure. We work with each of our properties, so that we are working with the preferences that they have. A lot of the different properties have parking spaces
within their garage. And so the Zipcar member if they have a reservation on a car will have to show their Zipcard and then access the car. And they may have to go through the concierge to then be able to go into the garage.

So it's also, depending on the garage, if you have a key code on the card, on the key pad, and something that -- the information that we would provide on the reservation information. We are also working on technology, so that you can actually just scan in your Zipcard. That would open the garage door and then you would be able to access the Zipcar inside.

So there is a lot of different ways that we can work with the property, so that it suits their needs.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

MS. PEREZ: Sure.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think I had a question for you, but I think it was answered. I'm going to ask Chair Miller what was said,
because I don't want to be redundant. I had an issue about security and I think that was what you were addressing.

MS. PEREZ: But if --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Was -- I don't want to be redundant.

MS. PEREZ: -- you would like me to --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because time is of the essence.

MS. PEREZ: Sure.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But let me ask you then, the -- we have heard in the past the developer is not able to do the Zipcar, especially when it's in a garage, because of security issues. And I heard you mention, you don't have to talk on any specific developer, that the developers are coming after you -- coming to ask you to do Zipcar.

MS. PEREZ: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Have you ever experienced issues about Zipcar with security
problems being in the garage?

MS. PEREZ: No, not to my knowledge.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it's doable?

MS. PEREZ: Security problems with related to?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, access.

MS. PEREZ: The one challenge is that it needs to be -- the garage needs to have 24/7 access. And so some -- there are some garages and some of our parking vendors we are not able to put cars in their garages, because they don't have 24/7 access. So they may not have the concierge at the desk after hours or they may not have the key code.

So that's something that actually is, one of our parking vendors, working on. And we are working on the technology, so that we can provide that opening when there is a limitation.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And that would not be to the community at large. It
would just be those who are in the building?

MS. PEREZ: Exactly. No, no, no, no. It is for all Zipcar members. So even a Zipcar member who is in New York that comes down and has a reservation on any car, you can use a Zipcar in any of our Zipcar safe --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, but, I mean, if it's in a building, a private building, you know, a residential building and I don't live in that building, so I would not have access to the Zipcar?

MS. PEREZ: No. All Zipcar members can access all Zipcars.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. PEREZ: So that --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, yeah, I understand that. But I'm saying if it's -- if we are in a private residential building and we go into that building and the Zipcar is in a controlled garage --

MS. PEREZ: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- and I live in
the neighborhood and I want to come down and
use the Zipcar, have you experienced where
that has been an issue or a problem?

MS. PEREZ: No, not to my
knowledge.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. PEREZ: But to clarify, so
there -- if there -- a property did want to
have a dedicated car just for their building,
they can do that, but it costs more money.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think the
point that may not be getting across is that
we have run into that in several cases where
developers of residential buildings that are
not going to have retail parking or any other
public access to their building are saying
that they can't do Zipcar, because it means
that just any old Zipcar person can come in
and go into their garage.

But you haven't --

MS. PEREZ: We have never
experienced any problems with that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's for all of us to --

COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I'm not trying to --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- mix up my question.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I wouldn't go exactly where you were going, but you are exactly right.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So next time we hear that, we have to --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Exactly. That's--

COMMISSIONER MAY: Where I was going.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- the question.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well,
ma'am, you heard it tonight. I mean, you
heard one of the attorneys representing --

COMMISSIONER MAY: I believe it
was Steve Sher.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I
didn't want to say his name, but --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I did. I
thought I would just clarify that.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But
anyway, but you heard his comment.

MS. PEREZ: Yes, I did.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes.

MS. PEREZ: And that's not unlike
some that I have heard before, but the reality
is that we have never had any problems with
that in residential or secured garages,
because we work with it, the building or the
property to work with what their preferences
are. So and --

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And if
they are not keeping it 24/7, then it's more
costly. I mean, what percentage of your
customers or your clients, you know, have a
secure dedicated spot in a garage that does
not have 24/7 access?

MS. PEREZ: Um, less than half a
percent.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay,
okay.

MS. PEREZ: And those are more in
outlying areas.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sure all of us
will await to hear that again. Okay. Thank
you very much.

MS. PEREZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. The last
two people I have on the proponent list are
Lance Brown and Patrick Lynch. Is there
anyone else? You can come forward. Anyone
else? Okay. Next we will go right to the
proponent -- I mean, the opponents. And we
will begin with Lance Brown.

It looks like, colleagues, we are
going to be able to ask a few questions on the
back end with the Office of Planning, so we
are running a little ahead of time. It's not
12:00 yet.

MR. BROWN: I'm representing
myself.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Brown, okay,
Lance Brown.

MR. BROWN: Good evening, Members
of the Commission. I'm glad I got the
opportunity to say something here. I will be
brief. Most of the points that I would like
to make have been made.

I am a Sierra Club member. I am a
resident of Ward 6. And I own a car. I
bicycle. I use mass transit. And I do have
the choice whether to use my car or not and I
do use it. But I didn't come to D.C. so that
I could drive wherever I wanted to go.

What this community has to offer
is options that are close by and can be
accessed by other means. I support the
eliminating minimums. And like I said, everybody has covered that, so I'll skip over that, but make the point that I am very much in support of the main tenant of this change.

One thing I wanted to touch on that hasn't been covered much is the in lieu fees, as I'll call them, where you can pay a fee when your situation does not accommodate providing the parking that is required in the places that there are minimums.

This has been characterized as something like a bribe and I don't think that's a fair characterization. And maybe that's because clarification is required in the regulations. It needs to be put back into the very geographically constrained area that it came from, not into a general fund that can be applied 10 miles away within the District. It needs to be an amenity. It needs to drive amenities, be they city run parking garages or lots or litter pick up, sidewalk improvement, whatever. It needs to be geographically
constrained to where it was assessed.

    I also support having the in lieu
fees be used for, 100 percent as opposed to up
to 50 percent, small properties, so that you
are not dropping someone's requirement from
two spaces to one space and they still have to
accommodate a driveway or some other means of
accessing that small space.

    Finally, I support car-sharing. I
am a Zipcar member, but I am an infrequent
user, because there is ample parking in so
many of the places I want to go. And I would
be perfectly all right with there being a
little more scarcity of parking or having to
pay a fee to use parking when I truly need to
drive.

    But right now, there is a lot of
free parking wherever I want to go and in a
lot of cases I can drive my own vehicle for
free practically. Thank you.

    CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
much. Patrick Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Good evening. My name is Patrick Lynch. I'm a resident of Washington, D.C. and hold a master's degree in city planning. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the Commission today, because I know that Parking Regulations are an important issue, not only to drivers, but also to the 37 percent of D.C. households who do not own a car.

Parking Regulations are not just a tool to control the supply of parking. They also have deep influences on the look and feel of the neighborhoods, the way people get around and the cost of goods and services. Decisions by the Zoning Commission on this issue will have a profound impact on the future of the city.

Now, I wholeheartedly support the Office of Planning's proposal. I'll skip some of my testimony, because it repeats some of what has already been said. But what I would like to address is the idea that minimum
parking requirements deal with spill over parking.

I don't think that's an accurate characterization. Minimum requirements demand the construction of off-street parking. But since off-street parking in the city is usually in a garage, it is more expensive than curb side parking. That means people will always look for curb side spaces first, even if they are far away.

The point is shoppers and commuters do not park in residential neighborhoods, because there is not enough off-street parking. They park in residential neighborhoods because it is cheaper. Building more off-street parking as minimum requirements require will not solve the problem.

The only thing that will solve the problem is better management and pricing of curb side spaces.

And to sum up sort of the
arguments that everyone has made tonight, I hope the Zoning Commission understands what is at stake. That if the current parking regulations make it difficult, if not downright illegal to build walkable environmentally friendly neighborhoods.

They encourage more people to own and drive cars in the city making congestion inclusion worse and they force new development to waste money and space on asphalt and garages, even when parking is unnecessary.

Minimum parking requirements have inflicted this harm on our city for over 50 years, even though they are a terrible solution to the problem they are intended to solve. D.C.'s parking policy needs reform. As a resident who wants walkable, affordable and environmentally friendly neighborhoods that remain livable, no matter how high gas prices rise, I urge the Members of the Zoning Commission to accept the Office of Planning's proposal. And thank you for listening.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Sir, you can identify yourself and begin.

MR. ANDRES: Yes, good evening, Members of the Commission. My name is Erwin Andres and I'm a District resident and I'm also a principal with Gorove/Slade Associates. We are a transportation, planning and consulting firm.

We, as a firm, have worked with many developers, institutions, federal agencies and also major destinations, so with respect to the projects that we have worked on, they range from small projects to much larger projects.

It has been our -- like I said, it has been based on our review of the Office of Planning's recommendations, we are in support of them. They are very innovative. They are very progressive and they are also in line with some of the transportation demand management measures that we are implementing in our development projects and that we are
coordinating with the District Department of Transportation.

So we see that these recommendations are headed in the right direction. What we would like -- what I would like to do this evening is confirm our support of the recommendations, but also provide some caveats or some comments with respect to some of the recommendations that have been identified.

With respect to parking maximums and parking minimums, we believe that the removal parking minimums is a good thing. One thing that we would like some more clarification on at some point in time is that when you relook at parking requirements for retail, we have run into situations where different types of retail require different types of parking demand.

So if there is a way we can identify maybe more categories for retail, for example, home improvements stores that were --
where you require a vehicle to transport 2 x
4s as opposed to your local grocery store. So
that's one item.

Another item that we want to bring
up is with respect to identifying actual
maximums. This program of identifying
maximums and maximum parking requirements, we
would like them to be based on local
experiences. This model has some similarities
to what New York City is doing and what San
Francisco is doing and to what other
jurisdictions are doing.

Their densities are different.
Their transit services are different. So you
know, I think if we are going to set maximums
or if maximums are going to be set for the
District, they should be -- they should
correspond to what the District is granting to
this.

Some of the other comments I have
is with respect to parking in general.
Automated parking is what -- is potentially a
new innovation that should also be taken into account. The concept of shared parking we wholly support. It's one of the concepts that we have incorporated in making sure that the Verizon Center is as successful as it is today.

The concept with respect to increasing some of the landscaping. We agree with the concept, we just want to make sure that there are provisions that allow for reducing some of the landscaping and to allow for clearer sight lines. Obviously, some circulation within some of the parking lots might be obstructed by some of the additional landscaping. So if there are provisions to protect that, we're okay with that.

And the last comment I want to make is that there was recommendations with respect to access to parking lots. Whether there be access by -- on the frontage or secondary streets or from the alleys, if they are to be accessed by the alleys, we just want
to make sure that there are effective circulation methods to get to those alleys.

   If you are visiting a retail establishment and there -- and if their access to parking is in the alley and you don't know that, what will result is that you will have unnecessarily -- unnecessary circulation in the neighborhood that you might want to cut down on.

   But other than that, in my conclusion, we do support the recommendations and we look forward to the future development of that. Thank you.

   CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Colleagues, any questions? Anybody have any questions of this panel? Thank you very much for your testimony.

   Okay. Next, we're going to opponents. And I have just four, so I'm going to call all four that I have and then those who are not on the list can come up after this first panel. George Clark, Federation of
Citizens Associations, Marilyn Simon, Friendship Neighborhood Association, Barbara Zartman, Committee of 100, and Bill Crews.
Okay. He is in support some, but he is on the opponent side.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question for you. If I say I'm with the Department of Public Policy Control --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Why don't you get on the microphone? Why don't you wait until you get on the microphone and then when we get to you, we'll adjust it if you are a representative of an organization. Okay. Let's -- Mr. Clark?

MR. CLARK: Chairman Hood, Chairman Miller, Members of the Commission, I'm George Clark pleased to testify here before you as President of the Federation of the Citizens Associations. I'm also pleased to be a member of the Task Force, as a number of people in this room. And so some of my observations are made from inside the Task
Force process.

But I want to divert a little from my text, based upon some things that have and haven't been said tonight. And the thing that really hasn't been said at all has to do with the assumption that things will be hunkey-dorey for everybody in the city as a result of eliminating and changing the parking requirements.

And I tee off of the Committee for Smart Growth's dismissive statement in it's report that even if people don't live near a Metro, they probably live within a quarter mile of a bus line. That's offensive on a number of grounds, especially to members of my associations.

As is well known, poor and minority neighborhoods are under-served by Metro and most rely in city neighborhoods on surface transportation.

Secondly, the statement cavalierly consigns large swaths of the city to a half
mile hike, irrespective of considerations of age, health and safety associated with the time of commuting, people coming home late from shift work might not to walk -- might not want to walk that quarter mile.

That's before you get to stopping on the way home for groceries and picking up the kids at daycare. And perhaps most offensive is the adverb probably. While they put in a lot of support about what they think is important to them, they wave their hand to consign certain areas to their fate without even a backward glance.

The other thing that I have been amazed at tonight and Ms. Tregoning's presentation really teed it up was we are the second most walkable city in the country. We are No. 7 out of 40 on how friendly we are environmentally. And we have many people, new residents, old residents in the city who have testified here tonight about a way -- the way they are able to live in this city, the
lifestyle they want and they are doing it well.

And somehow they have managed to do that in the face of these onerous parking minimums. I am shocked. We have heard testimony from many, many people in this room about how they are able to live in this city and the way they want. And that's in the face of parking minimums. Can you believe that? I can't.

And it really gets to the heart of the Office of Planning's proposal here. And I do want to say that we endorse the comments you will hear from the Committee of 100. We endorse the comments you will hear from Marilyn Simon, from the Friendship Neighborhood Association. She will talk about the elimination of parking minimums and where that is really happened and where it hasn't.

But the other odd thing I find about the Office of Planning proposal here is that, you know, they really say a couple of
different things here that are contradictory.

The first and most glaring contradiction is that OP says we need to eliminate minimums, because it will be good for the city. It will eliminate cars and traffic. Environmental concerns are important. I have a hybrid. I with David Bardene imposed impervious surfaces for parking lots and for parking spaces. We understand that that's what is going on here.

But what I don't understand is how then OP says don't worry about this, because eliminating parking minimums won't matter, because developers will build enough spaces anyway. So we are to under grow this great process, this great experiment to eliminate minimum parking, which hasn't been done in any city in the United States except in small areas, any city of our stature or size and we are going to do that why?

I don't understand why. We are saying don't worry about it. We're going to
have minimums anyway.

The other thing that I have heard here tonight is that, you know, we should be on the cutting edge and eliminate parking which nobody -- minimums which nobody else has done, because it's really a good idea. And you know, we need to be on the cutting edge.

Well, I don't think we need to be on the bleeding edge. And I really think another thing we have kind of heard here tonight is that some people think that we ought to eliminate parking minimums, because somehow that means we are going to have more people bike and that's a good thing.

And you know, my daughter lived for nine years in New York City. She didn't own a car. She biked everywhere. She biked across the Brooklyn Bridge every day to work. Do I not like bikers? No, that's not the issue. But what I don't understand is what we really seem to have here is social engineering.
We are saying people ought to do this. They ought to bike more. They ought to do that. I mean, we ought to do a lot of things. Maybe we ought to eat only organic food. Is that what zoning is for? And that is really a point that I want this Commission to consider.

And I do think that my time is up and so I will stop now.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much, Mr. Clark. Ms. Simon, Marilyn Simon.

MS. SIMON: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Simon and I will be speaking on behalf of the Friendship Neighborhood Association.

The Office of Planning is recommending sweeping changes in the Parking Regulations, but in recommending the elimination of most minimum parking requirements, OP has ignored the basis for minimum parking requirements to protect the District's neighborhood from spill over parking.

However, the issue of spill over
parking cannot be ignored. OP's proposal will
eliminate entirely D.C.'s already low minimum
parking requirements and this will affect a
very large number of D.C. neighborhoods and a
very large number of households.

I have submitted this map, which
you should have, which shows the low and
moderate density neighborhoods that will be
affected by OP's elimination of minimum
parking requirements. The area shown in pink
are those areas. This actually under
represents the percentage of households
affected since the density in these areas
tends to be higher than the density in the
rest of the low or moderate density zones
which is shown in the sand color on the map.

This will impact a large number of
households and we cannot, as OP suggests,
simply eliminate the minimum parking
requirements now and then address the spill
over problems later that we cause. Existing
spill over issues are very well documented.
They are shown in D.C. studies and it was a recurrent theme in the 2006 comprehensive plan.

OP has provided no basis for eliminating the minimum parking requirements. They called their recommendation progressive or best practices, but a review of the Parking Regulations in the other jurisdictions cited in OP's study, including some of the cities you heard about tonight, like Portland, San Francisco and Milwaukee shows that those jurisdictions have at most eliminated only some of the minimum parking requirements and only in very limited geographic areas. Usually only in the downtown employment zone.

Most of those jurisdictions have minimum parking requirements that are equal to or exceed D.C.'s very low current minimum parking requirements. In fact, for Arlington, Virginia, there is a minimum parking requirement of one space for every residential unit, even in the residential buildings right
by the Metro Stations.

Arlington's minimum parking requirement is 2 to 4 times the District's minimum parking requirement. My July 28th letter shows a chart and a table that compares D.C.'s minimum parking requirements for residential uses with those in the other jurisdictions cited by OP.

Since none of the cities have adopted OP's recommendations, it is very difficult to see how this could be considered best practices. Also, to the extent that these cities have even adopted these recommendations in very limited areas, OP has not presented any evaluation of those programs to show that they had any of the desired effects.

To justify the elimination of minimum parking requirements, OP also pointed to other jurisdictions that might have used poor methodology to set their minimum parking requirements and come up with minimum parking
requirements that were too high. But OP did no analysis of D.C.'s very low minimum parking requirements.

Certainly an observation that some jurisdictions might have used the wrong data to set their minimum parking requirements would not justify a recommendation to throw out all of our minimum parking requirements. In fact, four residential uses, D.C. current minimums are set well below the current level of D.C. vehicle ownership.

OP did not include information on vehicle ownership per household in their report, only the total number of vehicles. There is a chart in my report comparing vehicle ownership with the minimum parking requirements in D.C.

Most importantly, OP seems to assume that if developers do not include adequate off-street parking in new development, the residents will own fewer vehicles rather than relying on off-street
parking. A critical underlying assumption is that our city has a robust transportation system that can meet most of the needs of D.C. households.

However, our transportation system is largely a commuter system. It is very efficient at bringing commuters from some residential areas into downtowns employment core, but it is less effective as a substitute for private vehicles for many purposes for many households. It's absurd to assume that families living a quarter of a mile from a bus stop will find it sufficient to take their children to their activities, shop or visit relatives in the metropolitan area.

For many D.C. households, access to a private vehicle will be desirable and we have not seen any evidence that --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Simon.

MS. SIMON: -- will be less.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
much.

MS. SIMON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have your submittals.

MS. SIMON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We have so many submittals, I have lost my sign in sheet. Let's see, okay, Ms. Zartman.

MS. ZARTMAN: Thank you and good evening, Mr. Chairman and Members of the panel and staff. I'll skip through some of the prepared text in light of the hour and the level of fatigue that I'm sure you must all be feeling. It's always tough to be the closing hitters in this kind of a line up.

First, I would like to convey the committee's clear sense that they hope you don't take a vote tonight on the proposals that have been sent to you in the Public Hearing Notice. The language of the Public Hearing Notice says if you support this, they will be authorized to codify the Commission's
determination into legally sufficient form. That doesn't give an awful lot of room for changing the policy between now and the only additional meeting we are aware of, which is when this has been codified into regulatory language.

And I think there is an awful lot that needs to be resolved between now and that time, including sharing more fully with the people with the consequences that these actions might be.

I too have worked with the work groups and with -- I am a member of the Task Force. But I have to say that I come away with a sense that the objective in this parking exercise is in part the laudatory one of improving the environment of eliminating traffic jams, but there is a consistent thread as has been said earlier, that there is a desire to make ownership an operation of a private motor vehicle more difficult.

And that's something that I think
has no place in zoning or, quite honestly, in public policy. We were talking before about some social engineering and I think it comes closer to that than it does to zoning.

The Committee of 100 opposes elimination of minimums. If somebody would just ask me a question at the end of this, I will cite you chapter and verse of illustrations of how this can be handled very badly and have terrible consequences.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Can you get a little closer to the mike? Thank you.

MS. ZARTMAN: Normally, people don't have trouble hearing me. I'll try that then. Perhaps the most troubling part overall is the lack of discussion of Historic Districts. It was briefly mentioned by Mr. Petorsa, but this is critically important and it is limited to a place saver in this Public Hearing Notice.

Historic Districts are critically important. They also offer you a metaphor for
what you -- for what happens when you
eliminate parking minimums. There are no
parking minimums in Historic Districts for
historic buildings. So you have got your
experiment on the streets. You see what
happens when you don't require any minimum
parking.

There is spill over parking. My
word, it's a lot more than spill over. It is
saturation parking. It is cars circling
blocks and blocks and blocks looking for a
street space. Sometimes those are the cars of
the property owners trying to get back from
doing their grocery shopping, but there are no
requirements.

Somebody spoke earlier of all the
new curb cuts in Georgetown. I have attended
every old Georgetown Board Design meeting,
save a handful, for a dozen years. There has
been one new curb cut authorized. And that
one was done over the objection of the old
Georgetown Board.
So we are not seeing huge impacts of parking in terms of the walkability of our neighborhoods, people are not throwing up huge numbers of curb cuts. It's critically important and I can't imagine how it hasn't been treated in what is being proposed to you and to the public in this Public Hearing Notice.

And there are some particular language concerns I have in the Public Hearing Notice itself. The P.1 is very loose language in terms of new construction. What about rehabilitation, additions, renovations? The application requirements of P.1.1 and beyond do not make clear that these provisions apply to anything but new buildings.

What about mixed-use projects? What about PUDs? What about the existing regs with regard to museums and CBRFs unaddressed so far? I have touched on the problem with the Historic Districts. We, too, question the consistency of saying variation from
prescribed standards of parking is wrong, but if you want to do it anyhow, you can just pay some extra money and it will be right.

We will avoid commenting further in light of the time on many of these aspects. We would simply ask that you give careful attention to the work done by Friendship Neighborhood Association. There are really important questions asked in that analysis and I would think none of you would want to go forward without comprehending what that analysis translated into for the people of the District.

Now, if somebody wanted to ask me that question, I would be happy to --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much, Ms. Zartman. If you can hold your seat, somebody just may ask a question. Now, Bill Crews, you mentioned that you were representing?

MR. CREWS: Well, I just find it curious that if you have a website, even
though you are an individual, that you get
five minutes or if you are a professional
corporation, that you get five minutes, but I
do come here speaking for myself, so I don't
want to -- although I do have a blog, I don't
want to, you know, be overindulgent at all,
but I just find that curious in terms of --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So now you're down
to 2 minutes. You used a minute. All right.
You get 3 minutes. You know the regs. You
know the regulations.

MR. CREWS: Well, I just find it
curious.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MR. CREWS: But thank you for this
opportunity, Chairman Hood, Chairman Miller
and Members of the Zoning Commission and the
staff. I do -- I have previously provided my
written testimony and hopefully you have it
in front of you and I will, in light of the
time, in many ways skip over what I do have.

Again, my name is Bill Crews. I'm
a resident of the Capitol Hill neighborhood in
the District and a former Advisory
Neighborhood Commissioner for Single Member
District 6C07, as well as a former Zoning
Administrator for the District of Columbia,
and I am a member of the Task Force for the
zoning revision.

This hearing tonight is the first
of many, perhaps as many as 20 in -- on
various subject areas as defined by the Office
of Planning. And I appreciate your
willingness to start this journey. I urge you
to be realistic in the effort and time that
will be required to successfully complete the
journey.

Zoning Regulations are designed to
provide both orderly growth and protection or
private property values. For many residents
of the District, our home values represent the
bulk of our personal assets. The D.C. Code
section 6-641.02 states that the purpose of
Zoning Regulation is among other purposes to
create conditions favorable to safety,
protection of property and with a view to
encourage stability of Districts and of land
values therein.

People do depend upon Zoning
Regulations to control development uses and
impacts that negatively reflect upon their own
property values. Good zoning provides some
certainty and limits external forces and uses
on residents' property. Good zoning helps
protect property values and quality of life
within our neighborhoods.

And while there is little
disagreement on the need to revise the current
Zoning Regulations, they are internally
inconsistent, hard to administer and in many
ways outdated, the revision is an extremely
important action that needs thoughtful
consideration, because it threatens that
certainty and those limits.

Having said that, I do commend the
Office of Planning staff for the job it is
attempting to do and I also commend the Office of Zoning for the work it is also doing to improve the functionality of the process.

Zoning, under my experience in three different jurisdictions, creates tensions. It creates tensions between developers and neighbors. D.C. has become an even greater city in the past few years and does not need to subsidize development and certainly should not allow developers to get away with not paying the full price for their impacts of their development on their neighbors.

Time and time again the developers make the money and the neighbors suffer the consequences. I am sensitive to the need to reduce vehicular use, especially commuter traffic and I believe in so-called Smart Growth and the changes in the lifestyle that that growth will require. But these changes cannot happen overnight or with the simple passage of new Zoning Regulations.
Transitions, especially for families needing private vehicle use must be developed to reduce the burdens to be fair. I'll let you look at the rest of my testimony, especially the part that, and I appreciate Ms. Ricks being here, the coordination between the private property and the public space.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. Colleagues, any questions of this panel?

MS. MILLER: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Chair Miller?

MS. MILLER: I'll ask Ms. Zartman a question. For people who are listening, I think everyone heard two different perspectives about the lack of minimum parking in Historic Districts. Mr. Petorsa said it was not a problem on Capitol Hill. And you said it's a huge problem in Georgetown.

My question is could the problem in Georgetown be more related to the proximity to retail and the lack of Metro more than the
Historic District?

MS. ZARTMAN: There is a lack of Metro, that's a fixed reality. We are, however, served with a highly uneven amount of bus parking. We've got the circulator, which everybody loves. You've got the little blue bus which another group of people like. You've got slow moving Metro buses that the students at Ellington and elsewhere take in their cross city commutes back home. And some people take downtown to work every morning.

The problems are certainly with the intense commercial development along Water Street, along Wisconsin and along M, but it is beyond that. Take the place I live, it has 132 townhouses on what used to be property of the Visitation Convent. Those 132 townhouses were built with parking for two cars, one way or another available for every unit.

Imagine what that would have been like had there been no minimum requirement. In this case, the market was at a good point
and the parking was provided and the units
could be sold. But you take that, you take
the development of the Pepco site down on
Water Street, the incinerator building, which
is mixed-use and not clearly addressed in
these proposed regs, these are huge impacts.

It's not an infill house here or
there. These are major undertakings for which
sites are still available, though I won't show
anybody my list.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other
questions? Mr. Clark, you were going down a
road of the question I would either ask
tonight or later, but you talked about doable
for, I'm not sure exactly, because I can't
find your testimony, but I wrote it on your
testimony, but you talked about being germane
and doable for all areas.

Because one of the issues, you
said did it fit? Could you elaborate a little
more? You were going into -- and I think your
time had expired.

MR. CLARK: What I'm talking about
is that there are certain parts of the city
that are not well-served either by bus line or
by Metro. And where the public transit
alternative is not really a good one. I mean,
I'm talking primarily about Ward 7 and 8,
because that's where I have heard about it
from.

And I think that that is an issue
and I think that if we have, as we have been
lucky to have, continued development in so
many spots in that part of the city, and if
what we decide is that we don't need any
parking minimums and we hear that gee whiz,
it's, you know, a good idea if we can lower
the prices on all houses if we eliminate
parking, and if we are going to leave it
totally up to the market, where does that
leave us in terms of things?

And the other thing is that's for
new development. But we are talking about
people who are living there right now. And that's really part of what we are talking about. And we're saying well, you know, too bad. And that's really, I didn't see any analysis on this subject from the Office of Planning.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MR. CLARK: And I think it deserves some analysis.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I will concur and hopefully while I can remember, we will make sure we ask for that as we move forward. So we'll ask the Office of Planning, if it has not already been done, I will tell you it may be in here, I may have missed it, but I would agree wholeheartedly on that. Thank you.

Any other questions for this panel?

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I have just a question for Mr. Clark. I mean, obviously, a lot of the commentary tonight was around sort of a market driven approach to
providing, you know, off-street parking. So in cases of Ward 7 and 8, particularly for new construction, I mean, wouldn't the market sort of dictate?

I mean, if someone is moving to Ward 7 and clearly sees that they are half a block -- half a mile away from a Metro and you have a development there, I mean, obviously, a developer putting up a building that does not have parking is probably not going to be able to sell those units.

I guess I'm trying to understand what the --

MR. CLARK: I'm not sure that that is right. I mean, what we have heard is that okay, we want to have -- we have heard this decoupling idea. We have heard the decoupling idea and we have heard that if we -- parking is very expensive to build. And if we say you don't have to build it, I'm not quite sure that the developers are in the eleemosynary spirit here of saying okay, well, I'm going to
provide you parking anyway, even though it costs me more money.

   I think I could ask both Marilyn Simon and Bill Crews to talk about developments where, in fact, with lower -- where developers that said hey, I don't want to build any parking, even with the minimums we have. So this is not a hypothetical or theoretical idea. It is happening in the city right now.

   VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah, I just -- you know, it's interesting. And I'm very sensitive to the fact of the population that has shown up here tonight and that there is probably other populations that will feel very differently about, you know, what we are talking about here.

   And I do know some of the population that they are moving to Ward 7 and 8. I think they are going to want parking in a new development. I mean, you know, that's just -- so it -- I just -- and they are going
-- and they are not going to be interested in buying.

My suspicion is that they are not going to be interested in buying something that does not provide that. So I guess my point is, I guess, I'm just trying to get you to, you know, walk with me around this whole business of, you know, having it market-driven.

MR. CLARK: Well, let me talk about one other thing here.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

MR. CLARK: And that is Ms. Zartman referred to it a little bit in her testimony, and that is because of what I finally call the one brick rule. She calls it the three brick rule in D.C., that when we have renovation what is the answer going to be?

What's the answer going to be in those circumstances when we already may not have parking available in some circumstances.
What's the situation going to be? Is that --
I mean, the odd thing I find here is that the
Office of Planning says let's have it market
driven for minimums, but when it comes to
maximums, man, those developers will pave
every square inch of this city if we let them,
so we've got to have a maximum.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: It's just
that, you know, I have been on this Commission
for going on five years and I've just seen
many wards, like Ward 5 and Ward 7 and Ward 8,
come here and they are not so much in favor,
I mean, some of the people, about, you know,
we see developments that I feel are over
parked.

And we comment here, you know, I
think you have over parked, even though there
is a minimum. One per one space -- unit. But
I guess what I'm saying is that there are
wards -- I mean, people come here and they are
not so much in favor of, you know, someone
looking to take care -- take away their car.
So I guess what I'm saying is the market seems -- I'm getting the sense the market is going to dictate. If you are in Columbia Heights or Shaw or Dupont Circle and the market is going to dictate sort of how those developers develop their buildings.

But in other wards, I mean from where I sit, it seems as if again it's going to still be market driven. Those people in those neighborhoods are going to really dictate, you know, how the developers really deliver a particular project.

And what you are saying is that you don't think that's the case?

MR. CLARK: Well, I have heard from people in those wards and that's why I said what I said.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay, okay.

MS. SIMON: I can also give examples of buildings where developers were knowingly going to provide less parking than
the number of cars that they think that the residents are going to have, because they have said that well, if the residents have more cars, they could just park on the neighborhood streets.

So you could have a building, for example, one that is being proposed for Harrison and Wisconsin Avenue which is going to have a .7 parking ratio. It is higher than the .5 that is required, but less than a .9 that the residents will probably have. And when asked if the residents will be willing not to have resident parking permits, the developer said no way. These residents are going to park in the R-2 neighborhood on the streets.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I am very sensitive of the spill over --

MS. SIMON: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: -- issue that you have brought up. I think we have seen that up here.
MS. SIMON: We also had a major commercial project which they proposed having -- this is Linens and Things, Borders, Maggiano's and Eddy Bauer, they didn't want to provide any parking spaces.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah.

Just this month alone, we have seen cases. So I appreciate your testimony.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Any other questions of this panel? I want to thank this panel. We appreciate your testimony. Is there anyone else who would like to testify in opposition of what is proposed here tonight?

Okay. All right. What I would like to do, colleagues -- Commissioner Grant, wanted to get up and say a few words to us.

MS. GRANT: I got 3 minutes?

Okay. Good evening, Chairman Hood and Chairwoman Miller and everyone else on the Commission. Briefly, my name is Janee Grant. I am an Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner in
the Woodridge Area for 5A11 and did have a
discussion on this matter of parking with my
constituents.

And interestingly enough, it
wasn't so much about the minimums or maximums
as much as it was more about spill over. And
while I'm not trying to imply that one size
fits all, having a cookie cutter solution
which is somewhat -- which tends to be so much
driven by market rate is of aid. Note that
I'm not giving carte blanche to developers to
use market rates as a scapegoat.

That being said, it's about
strengthening and improving the infrastructure
and administrative stuff to be able to use
what OP has provided. I was on the -- I did
serve with the working group for parking.

And that being said, my comments
are probably now more so with the side that
are in favor, but the reason for that is
because everyone who spoke up here actually
gave their hardships, which they felt existed.
And so, therefore, I'm hoping that OP will
take into consideration those things that were
given.

I definitely sided very much with,
I think, Mr. Sher and even the other gentleman
from -- Mr. Andres, so I'm definitely very
much in line with that.

That being said, it's again, about
the infrastructure and it's about the
administrative stuff. The P.3.2 the
transportation fund, how does that get
enforced and how is that administered? Does
the highest bidder get to dictate what -- as
it relates to their forgiveness for parking or
more or less?

P.3.5, having DDOT give their
great weight. I'm not necessarily -- I have
not really seen where DDOT provided an
independent study, so that would not -- that
would definitely need to be taken into
consideration about their ruling.

That being said, I do think that
it would be beneficial to have developers come back to the community, if market changes are an issue, and when they get a decision from the Board to actually go forward with their project, so therefore a preliminary, but then to come back to us, because things change and we need to know if parking is going to be available provided what we agree to.

P.7 that -- P.7.113 green spaces is well-intended, but it's a parking lot, not meant to be a park. So with all of the, I came in a little bit late, last minute changes OP did, I thought 10 percent was extremely, extremely generous and would actually rather have some of that space be allotted to bicyclists racks and motorcycles. I think 10 percent is just over more than what they really need in terms of landscaping.

With the recommendation from the Nelson Nygaard, not in favor of the price gouging as it relates to grandfathering of the RPP permits, so I hope we come up with a
better way of looking at that, because you
don't know if it's going to be by family or
address.

I am in favor of -- and the
community was in favor of shared parking, so
if a commercial business is in a residential
area and they are 9:00 to 5:00 normally, you
know, if there is a nighttime business that we
definitely do have in my Single Member
District, allowing that to be shared and so
then that comes back here again to the
administrative part and the infrastructure of
making that more feasible and how do you do
that to make it more permissible?

While I'm appreciative of the
initiative to lessen emissions, which has
ignited the push to all -- to have more
alternative transportation, I am -- me being
a native of New York, where transportation is
all over, and what I mean by that is you have
transportation for what, every two to three
blocks, and it runs at all hours of the night.
D.C. has a great footprint, but what is needed is more in terms of WMATA and hours. And enforcement is needed by the auto makers dealers. So I don't want to be pinned by saying I'm not pedestrian friendly when I am.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. Colleagues, any questions of Commissioner Grant? All right. Thank you very much.

MS. GRANT: Thank you for allowing me.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We have an option. I'm going to throw this out to my colleagues. We can ask some questions. I originally thought, you know, we can go to 11:50, so we can catch the public transportation home or I have a schedule here that we can go by and we can read and digest some of what we heard tonight.

And I have a schedule of Office of Planning and the Office of Zoning has
graciously written out a schedule for us. But
we will have another opportunity. Actually,
we will have two other, two or three other
opportunities to ask questions on this
particular issue.

So what I wanted to know tonight
is if you wanted to proceed and ask a few
questions or did you want to digest and make
sure we get public transportation home?

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I think
we should end this.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We should what?

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: We should
end this tonight. We have digested quite a
bit.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just want to
understand a little bit more about the process
from here. If you can talk about that --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- before we
go. I agree, ending it is not a bad idea,
because, you know, my list of questions was
going to be too long.

    CHAIRMAN HOOD: You usually don't have many.

    COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, that's right.

    CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, okay. So anyway.

    COMMISSIONER MAY: I haven't asked many so far.

    CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, okay, because we have -- anyway. We would like to have a little fun.

    COMMISSIONER MAY: I'll write them down.

    CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's getting late anyway. Let me tell you what they have worked out, Office of Planning, Office of Zoning. The record will remain open until August the 29th at 3:00 p.m. And then at our September the 8th meeting, the Zoning Commission Members, we could give guidance to the Office of Planning on how we are going to proceed and
ask some of our questions.

And I would also like to invite Chair Miller to either write and submit them or either join us that night. I know you have a BZA the next day, so I don't know how that would work for you, but you could give it to us in writing, that would be great.

And also the Office of Planning will take -- after that, the Office of Planning will take two to three months to draft language and advertise for public comment. And then we will come back at another meeting and do proposed action. And then we -- you know, some proposed rule making, so, of course, the -- it will be published. Is it 30 days or 45?

30 days for further public comment. So by that time, we should really have narrowed exactly what we -- how we see proceeding forward with what we are proposing. And then people -- the public will have another chance to comment before we do final.
VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: That's what I wanted to know. So there will be another opportunity for public comment?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: There will be another opportunity for public comment, yes.

MS. MILLER: Two more.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Two more.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Two more.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It looks like it's two more, yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

Proposed action, I mean, we go about the -- what meetings will there be public comment?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, it won't be at our September 8th meeting. It will be written comment between now and --

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- August the 25th.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Got that.

Got that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Which you know I don't like doing stuff in the summertime, but
that's what we have to do.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And then when we come back after we do proposed action, after we have our conversation and deliberation on September the 8th --

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Where there is no public comment.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, it will be just what we --

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right, right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- would have done here tonight. Then after that, OP will take that and come back. We will provide guidance to the Office of Planning and then they will come back.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And is it, approximately, two to three months for draft language and advertisement to the --

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Public,
okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And there will be public comment again.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: Chairman Hood, if I may? The difference is that normally there is no public comment before you take proposed action after -- you know, other than the hearing. So this way, we felt that the public would have an opportunity to actually comment on the text that OP will come back with after you give them guidance. And then once -- if you take proposed action, then there will be a second opportunity for them to comment once the proposed rule making is actually published.

So they will have actually two more instead of one.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

Commissioner May, did that -- does that help you and Mr. Jeffries and the rest of us?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. You
know, what I'm wondering about on the 8th when we provide this, I guess, what is -- you know, what I'm wondering is what's OP going to do between now and the 8th? And is that just going to be a reaction to comments tonight? Can we encourage some, you know, attempt to address the concerns about things like the spill over and so on?

I mean, you know, I could run through a list of things that I think are -- that I believe are issues that should be fully examined. You know, to some extent they have been already, but I think in some areas there is probably a little bit more that needs to be done. There may be some areas they haven't really thought of.

Not so much giving guidance, just sort of seeking some information. Almost as if this were a, you know, set down discussion, you know.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's do that right quick. So you can run through -- we're
not going to deliberate, but you can run through.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. No, I just wanted to --

MS. SCHELLIN: Chairman Hood, I could also add in our discussion, OP was planning on providing some comments, I believe, from the hearing, what they have heard, some of the questions that have been brought up that you guys asked to be addressed.

So that August 29th, I was including their comments, too.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: But I wanted to say, I mean, we're going to be -- this Commission will be -- is that someone else? I think you have your mike on. My understanding is that September 8th, when we have our discussion, after we have absorbed a lot of the commentary we got tonight, I mean, we're going to give this to the Office of
Planning.

They will have the opportunity. I mean, they were here. They heard a lot of the commentary and so forth. And it would just seem to me that, you know, they have some things to do without us having to give a lot of direction tonight.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner May, can you just -- let me just do this, so we can proceed, because we will be here until --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I could have been done by now.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: You would be done?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay, okay. So it's not a long list, okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: No, no, it's -- I'm going to --

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Which is just long as Office of Planning understands
that the other Commissioners will probably come back on September 8th.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Say that again.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Well, I'll have comments on September 8th.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, I will, too.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: But I'm not going to --

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- stop now.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's move forward. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MAY: The -- no. The issue that -- to me seems to be a very big concern, obviously, is, you know, relying on the market versus trying to establish minimums. And, you know, I think that even with the material we have received so far, I think there is more work that needs to be done and it has to be a bit more comprehensive in
terms of the overall picture, not just what is
affected by zoning.

But the residential parking permit
process is the thing that I have a lot of
questions about and how that ties into -- as
well as the performance parking, which is
referenced repeatedly, but I think needs to be
-- we need to understand that a little bit
better.

The in lieu fees scheme I think
also needs to be fleshed out a little bit
more, specifically how those fees actually get
set. And then the -- you know, what the fees
can actually be used for. And then finally,
what the sort of mechanism is for collecting
and paying that out, because there are
probably some legal authority issues that need
to be clarified there.

Because we want to make sure that
it just doesn't simply become a subject of
negotiation every time around or that the
money is being used for things that benefit,
say, commuter transportation issues as opposed to neighborhood transportation issues or things like that.

So and then there are some planning issues that I think that these tie into. There is an effort to address or align the zoning with DDOT's standard issues with things like curb cuts. And I know that's a big planning issue for laying out new developments and for how those things happen.

I think there are more things that need to be aligned from a planning point of view. And I'm talking about particularly about certain housing types. You can probably guess which one in particular I'm concerned about where it is -- you know, there are no backyards any more. There is only alley and then there is parking underneath the house.

And I think that that ties in somehow. I'm not sure exactly how, but I think that --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's do this,
Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can we kind of speed it along?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'll speed it up. Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's get to the point.

COMMISSIONER MAY: You should have put me on the clock.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Give Commissioner May one minute, please.

COMMISSIONER MAY: And that's about it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Every time. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Commissioner May. Let me do this, any other comments? Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, the only thing out that I would add is that in the submittals that we do have, although we
had a lot of representatives here from neighborhood organizations, community, we did not -- there are several such as the NCPC did not have anybody here. And they are on record with a submittal.

The AIA had comments and so there are several things that they had. So I think there is a lot as Mr. -- as Commissioner May was saying, there is a lot of things to sift through here. And to -- I have a running checklist of how those things sort out. So we're going to need a little bit of time to go through all this.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Exactly. And I want to make sure, because we -- what we were handed tonight when we walked in, there's no way we could have read that and the information we got. So we will enjoy the month of August and we will get parking experts when we come back.

Anything else?

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: That's
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me end. Mr. Parker, you had something you wanted to say?

MR. PARKER: No, I'm fine.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me end by thanking the Director of the Office of Planning, Ms. Tregoning, for all the work they have done. Let me thank, I don't want to say -- I guess Assistant Director Ricks, District Department of Transportation.

MS. RICKS: Associate.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Associate. I'm sorry, Associate Director Ricks. Also the Office of Zoning Staff as always, especially Ms. Sharon Schellin. And also the public and the citizens for providing us this testimony. This is the first of many, many series and we can only improve as we move forward.

So I appreciate everyone's participation tonight. And if I left -- and also, on behalf of the Chair of the Board of Zoning and myself, did you want to end and say
a few words?

MS. MILLER: No.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank everyone for their participation tonight and this hearing is adjourned.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I would just like to add to that --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: -- a special thanks to Chair Miller from BZA, because she also have a BZA hearing, a meeting, special meeting tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh.

MS. MILLER: From 8:30 all day.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. All right.

MS. MILLER: Um-hum. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Good night.

(Whereupon, the Public Hearing was concluded at 10:43 p.m.)