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CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We're going to go ahead and get started. This meeting will please come to order. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the February 22, 2010 Public Meeting of the Zoning Commission.

Joining me are Vice Chairman Keating, Commissioner May, Schlater, and Turnbull.

We are also joined by the Office of Zoning Staff under leadership of Mr. Weinbaum, Office of Attorney General, and Office of Planning Staff under leadership of Ms. Steingasser.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to you and are located in the bin near the door. We do not take any public testimony at our meetings unless the Commission requests someone to come forward.

Please be advised that this
proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room. Please turn off all beepers and cell phones.

Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: If not, let us proceed with the agenda. I have one agenda change. We will be taking correspondence, which is item 7, before the ZRR guidance. And we will end with the ZRR guidance which was item 6; that will be the next to the last thing we will take up in this meeting.

Let's go right into final action, Zoning Commission Case No. 05-15B. This is the RIK DC Investments, LLC, Two-Year PUD Time Extension at Square 775.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. As you stated,
this is a request for a two-year time extension. And staff has nothing further to add.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioners, let's open it up. As it's stated in the Office of Planning report as well as the submittal from the applicant, basically it talks about the reason for this request is to allow adequate time for a new property owner to study the highest and best use of the property. And I believe, going off the top of my head, I think they acquired the property like five months ago; I think this is the one, about five months ago.

Also, the applicant would like to report that it has removed the razor wire from the fence, and it has signed an Assessment Management Contract with the Ideal Realty Group. So that shows some sign of progress.

Also, when we look at the good cause on page 4, it talks about the applicant seeks an extension pursuant to 2408.11 because
there is a condition, circumstance, or factor beyond the applicant's reasonable control. The applicant acquired the property just five months ago, and thus has had very limited amount of time to study the property and apply for a building permit before the PUD expires.

Let me open up for any comments. Any questions, any problems?

Not hearing anything, I would move that we approve time extension on Zoning Commission Order No. 05-15 and 05-15A for the property located at 318 I Street NE, and ask for a second.

VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any opposition, so staff, would you record the vote?

MS. SCHELLIN: The staff records
the vote 5-0-0 to approve Zoning Commission Case No. 05-15B. Commissioner Hood moving; Commissioner Keating seconding; Commissioners May, Schlater, and Turnbull in support.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next, let's move to Zoning Commission Case No. 07-13B, Trustees of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, two-year PUD time extension at Square 643S.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: This, too, is a request for a two-year PUD time extension. And staff has nothing further to add.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Again, Commissioners, we have Exhibit 1 which is previous orders. Also, we have the supplemental extension request or Office of Planning Report which comments on the request of the extension.

Let me open it up for discussion.

Any questions, comments, concerns, issues?

Commissioner Schlater?
COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr. Chairman, I would just note that we do have a letter from the ANC as well. They passed a resolution. I think to summarize, what they're asking for is that we try to put some more teeth into the order with respect to some of the conditions. My sense is that the order stands on its own. We didn't put conditions on the timing at that point for the provision of the applied amenities. And I don't think just because we're approving a time extension tonight that means we should be changing the order and the conditions within the order.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anybody else? I would probably go to Mr. Bergstein and ask legally, are we in the right area? But I will tell you that I think the order, as I reviewed it, I think they captured most if not all of some of the requests. I might not have saw all of them but some of the ones I reviewed and looked at I thought were captured in the order.
And again, the applicant is still the Corcoran. So I think they still are bound by the agreement, and I know that the order points to that agreement.

But let me go to Mr. Bergstein and ask.

MR. BERGSTEIN: Well, the point is that there's been no material change that the ANC has pointed to. The order indicated, as part of its public benefits, that certain amenities would be provided that were included within this agreement. The agreement was signed by Corcoran; Corcoran is still the owner. And so nothing has changed that would warrant the Commission taking any action to modify the original PUD order.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And although they have stated on page 3, it says they're looking for a new partner and they may revise it through the modification process.

MR. BERGSTEIN: Well, if they came and said: Our new partner doesn't want to
provide this public amenity anymore, even though it wasn't put in the condition; it was something that the Commission relied upon in granting the PUD relief. In other words, it was put in as part of the number of public benefits that were proffered and as a rationale for the grant of the zoning flexibility.

So if the Corcoran Gallery were to come in and say those remaining public benefits aren't going to be provided, I would think that they would have to come up with a PUD modification to provide a substitute benefit of equal value. But that has not happened yet. And I think that's the point, that the ANC's concerns seem to be preemptory in nature and not yet ripe.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much, Mr. Bergstein and my colleagues. And I'm glad Commissioner Turnbull mentioned page 3 because I think page 3, at least the way I read it, it really makes the case for me.
Okay. Any other comments, questions?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I move that we approve final action for Case No. 07-13B, Trustees of Corcoran Gallery of Art for a two-year PUD time extension at Square 643S.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Mr. Turnbull has moved; can I get a second?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any opposition, Ms.
MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records the vote 5-0-0 to approve final action in Zoning Commission Case No. 07-13B. Commissioner Turnbull moving; Commissioner May seconding; Commissioners Hood, Keating, and Schlater in support.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to proposed action, Zoning Commission Case No. 09-10. This is the Office of Planning Text Amendment regarding the Water Tower at St. Elizabeth's Campus.

Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. If you'll recall, the Zoning Commission had deferred proposed action on this case to allow OP to
come back with some text that would allow the Zoning Commission design review of the proposed WASA water tower.

And the Office of Planning has provided a second supplemental report that you have before you, along with a letter from WASA.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much, Ms. Schellin.

And I just wanted to commend the Office of Planning. Some of the requests we have, they've been very creative.

I thought this was one of the ones that I had asked for, but I think that will be coming real soon, Mr. Lawson.

But let's open it up for any comments, any concerns.

The submissions we have are also Exhibit 11 from WASA, the updated letter from WASA which also has support for the reason. Design review application will be accompanied by a request for a minor modification of PUD
boundaries to exclude the site of the water
tower which comprises approximately 5 percent
of the PUD site area. And I think adequately
this has been fully addressed, at least some
of the concerns that we have raised throughout
this process.

But let me open it up, especially
to some of my colleagues who may have raised
some of those issues.

Commissioner Schlater?

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I'm happy
with the way the text is written now. I think the Office of Planning has been very
responsive and they've worked together with WASA to get the text tight. And I think it's
ready to go tonight.

So I move that we approve Zoning Case No. 09-10, Office of Planning Text Amendment regarding the Water Tower at St. Elizabeth's Campus.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved.
Can we get a second?

VICE CHAIRMAN KEATING: Second.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's moved and properly seconded. Any further discussion?

All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, could you record the vote, not hearing any opposition?

MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry, I was helping OP out and I didn't -- I heard Commissioner Schlater moved it --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner Schlater moved it, Vice Chairman Keating seconded.

MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All of us voted in affirmative.

MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote 5-0-0 to approve proposed action in Zoning Commission Case No. 09-10.

Commissioner Schlater moving; Commissioner
Keating seconding; Commissioners Hood, May, and Turnbull in support.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. Again, hearing action, we will not be taking up hearing action tonight.

Let me switch. I want to go to correspondence, Zoning Commission Case No. 06-11 and 06-12, George Washington University. We have a letter from Hitchcock Law Firm, also a letter from Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman.

Let me acknowledge that we have the correspondence. The order has been issued addressing the correspondence and it will be served tomorrow.

All right. Let's move right along with the ZRR Guidance. Zoning Commission Case No. 08-06-11. We have a worksheet. Are the worksheets to the left? The worksheets are to my left on the wall bin.

And we will turn it over to Mr. Parker. Or no -- yes, you know what? It's been so long since we did a ZRR. We will turn
it over to Mr. Parker and we can kind of go through it quickly. Isn't that the way we usually do? Okay. Let's do that. Some people are saying yes and Mr. Parker is saying no. So let's do it that way.

I think we did start doing that as opposed to me doing it, because you were able to expedite some time.

MR. PARKER: Sure. Good evening, I'm Travis Parker with the Office of Planning. Yes, I'm happy to give a short recap of each recommendation, if you'd like, and then run through the different options.

Recommendation one regarding PUDs in waterfront zones. Right now, with the exception of W-1, there is no additional density or height available in PUDs in waterfront zones. The recommendation from the Waterfront Working Group from OP was to allow additional height through waterfront PUDs but not additional density. So PUDs could allow height up to the Height Act based on Zoning
Commission review, but not additional density.

Option two would be allow additional height and density in these zones through the PUD process.

Option three would be to not change the existing regulations and not allow either height or density.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Parker.

Commissioners, let's start right off with our worksheet, which is Exhibit 10. Any comments on any one of the options? Option one is Office of Planning's recommendation. Any comments?

Looks like we are all going to accept option one. We will take the Office of Planning's recommendation.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I just have one question. NCPC had a comment about maintaining existing height limits for matter-of-right. Did you see that?

MR. PARKER: Yes. We aren't
proposing changing matter-of-right height limits or anything to do with the Height Act. All parties would still be limited by the Height Act even with a PUD, and matter-of-right limits wouldn't change at all.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you for bringing that up, Mr. Turnbull.
And I do need to acknowledge we also have some correspondence. I think we had asked for Ms. Barbera Zartman's testimony, Committee of 100 on the Federal City. So tonight we have both of those in front of us.
Okay. So we're going with option one.
Can we go to two, Mr. Parker?
MR. PARKER: Certainly. The second one also has to do with PUDs. Right now there's really no distinction in PUDs between waterfront zone and other zones. Really there are no PUDs in the waterfront zone. But based on allowing PUDs in the waterfront zone, we
also thought it would be appropriate to have the Zoning Commission review waterfront specific issues in reviewing projects in the waterfront zones. So criteria including public access, connectivity, mixed-use, visual access, open space, environmental considerations, and surface parking would be listed as criteria of PUDs in the waterfront zone under our recommendation.

The other option is to just not add any new criteria to waterfront zones.

A third option could be to amend the criteria that we've recommended.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Parker.

And I was looking here also at Ms. Zartman. The Committee of 100 strongly opposed recommendations one and two. But, anyway. And it doesn't really say why, at least I'm not clear why.

Colleagues, again, option one for me would be the option I would like to see.
Because we do want to have some kind of review, especially when you start getting near the waterfront, I believe, if it's a PUD in that area.

So anything, anybody? Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I vote for option one.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That's kind of what I was waiting for. Okay. So we will go with option one.

Mr. Parker, we can keep moving.

MR. PARKER: Fair enough. Option three has to do with surface parking. Right now there are a few limited restrictions on surface parking in the w-zones. This recommendation would make basically a blanket limitation on new surface parking lots in the waterfront zone. It would make new surface parking only allowable through special exception by the BZA. And likely, in the text this will also include a time limit on new surface parking lots in the w-zones.
Option two is clearly to just not accept this recommendation and leave things as they are now.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr. Parker, I can't recall from the hearing, but are these limitations similar to what's existing in the CG overlay, or is that a different construct altogether?

MR. PARKER: I believe it's a little different. It's similar to what's happening in the DD.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: In the DD?

MR. PARKER: In the downtown. There's limitations similar to this on surface parking. The CG has location specific rules. This would not be location specific. I think that's the main difference here. But certain locations in the CG, this would be the same process where you apply to the BZA and you can get maybe a five-year permit to do a surface parking lot.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Okay.
Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support option one.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Any other comments?

If that's the case, Mr. Parker and OP, we will go with option one.

MR. PARKER: Okay. Recommendation four has to do with light industrial uses. If you'll recall, light industrial uses are allowed through a special exception in the w-zones. We had a similar recommendation in the Industrial Zone Working Group and in the industrial zone recommendations to update our standards for industrial uses. So we'd likely use the same text that we use in the industrial uses to update the standards for industrial uses and try to encourage green technologies, and especially here, marine industrial uses. So updating those special exception criteria for marine uses specifically and for green technologies.
Option two is just not to make any changes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much, Mr. Parker.

Colleagues, I would encourage us, especially with this light industrial, that we would definitely take option one.

All right. Thank you, Mr. Parker.

We can move right on.

MR. PARKER: Recommendation five has to do with visual access. And again, all of these recommendations three through six are dealing with matter-of-right projects. PUDs would be negotiated and would be reviewed for their specific conditions. But for matter-of-right projects in the waterfront zones, we'd establish visual access requirements where existing street grid would be protected. So existing streets that don't extend to the waterfront, that visual access would have to be maintained. New buildings could not build across that visual access.
Where that existing street grid does not exist, places like Boat House Row and Poplar Point, the limitation that we recommended in our report was maximum building within 500 feet, to sort of replicate that visual access. There was a lot of discussion in the hearing about whether a different standard than 500 feet was appropriate. New York uses 300.

We haven't made an additional recommendation, but option two is for you to say we like the idea, but we suggest a smaller number.

Option three is we don't like this recommendation and we shouldn't limit the building limits.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's have a discussion on that.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Parker, what would the space between the buildings be?

MR. PARKER: Well, in those areas where there is an existing visual corridor,
the space between the buildings would have to be equivalent to the right of way that we're protecting.

That's an interesting question for the areas where there's not that space. I'd look back to our best practices in New York and Norfolk, and some other places that do that, and we can give you some suggestions.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I was trying to see if I could go through the whole meeting and do nothing but vote and make motions and second motions. But I have to say something here, which is that I'm not comfortable with 500 feet as a maximum. And I think we should be looking seriously at lower numbers; 300 sounds pretty good to me. But I'm not sure that we necessarily need to make that judgment tonight. I just think we should be looking at
something lower.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Commissioner May.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. And I guess since that's already been said, I was going to ask again how did we get the 500?

MR. PARKER: The 500 was based on our survey of existing street grid in the Southeast and Southwest. We had a wide range of existing square widths, anywhere from like 250 on the very small end up to well over 500. There's a few, two or three, that are well over 500. The vast majority, 90 percent, were 500 or less. And that's why we went with that number, is that it was a number that made matter-of-right development basically on any existing square where we had an existing street grid. Some of our best practice studies did have widths that were less than 500. So I think that's certainly appropriate, and we'd be willing to look at that and make you a different suggestion.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think we are going with option two.

MR. PARKER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Pretty much. And that way you can come back. If you come back with 500 and come back and say this is it, or this is what we've come up with, but we just ask you to relook at it. And I think option two allows you to be able to do that.

MR. PARKER: We'll look at a lower standard. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Number six?

MR. PARKER: Finally, number six. This has to do with a required open space setback from the waterfront. Right now in Southeast Federal Center we have a 100 foot setback in the CG was havea 75 foot setback. We have recommended a 75 foot setback, with 25 feet of that reserved for future trail connections.

Keep in mind again that this is just for matter-of-right projects. Projects
that come in for review under PUD could negotiate this and provide that connectivity in some other way. But for matter-of-right projects we felt that we needed to have a standard applicable to get that open space and that connectivity. So our recommendation is a 75 foot.

Option two is to establish a minimum setback of greater or lesser width.

And option three is not to have a minimum setback.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's open it up for discussion. Any comments?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would recommend one.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the minimum 25 feet setback for rail connections. I think that's important that there's connectivity along the waterfront and that there's the ability to put the trails along the water, and
that the public have access to the water. All
of that's important.

I'm not sure that a 75 foot setback
for matter-of-right projects is actually going
to benefit development along the waterfront.
I think it can create a pretty large buffer
between the buildings and the water, and can
actually serve to reduce animation of the
waterfront. And so I'm just a little hesitant
to say that 75 feet is the right number.

I actually think there's a lot of
great waterfronts around the world where the
buildings come up pretty close to the
waterfront, right next to the trails.

And I agree with what Mr. Parker
said. It's great that there's flexibility in
the PUD standards where you could bring those
buildings closer up. But I think you're
setting yourself up for, you know, if the
developer chooses the path of least resistance
and does matter-of-right projects, that you're
going to end up with buildings 75 feet away
from the water. And I'm not sure that that's a good thing.

There's so little of the waterfront in the District that actually is developable. Most of it is either federally owned or open space.

My feeling is that we should bring those buildings closer to the water. I may be in the minority on that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I would say I'm pretty comfortable with 75 feet. I mean, 75 feet isn't that big; it's not that much bigger than the width of this room, the long way of this room. From here to the back wall is 30-35 feet. It's really not a huge space and it's, I think, easy enough to activate something on that scale.

The street right-of-way that I live on is, I don't know, probably 90 feet, something like that. So the water would be
closer than my neighbor's door across the street. That's pretty close in my book. And I think as a minimum, I'm comfortable with 75. I agree that there are great waterfronts where the buildings are right there upon the water. But I'm not sure that when we're talking about something that is still to be created, whether we are looking for that sort of almost medieval relationship between buildings and water, or whether we can do something that's a little bit more wide open, a little bit more spacious. And we're still only talking about 75 feet. It just doesn't feel that big to me. But I might be in the minority.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would -- here is my suggestion, because I actually thought 75 feet was great. But I want to be considerate of all my colleagues. And I think the out for me tonight is to go to B, option two.

And again, we'll do like we did previously. We'll ask you to just -- I know
you've probably looked at it a million times; you're probably going to come back with 75 feet. But with the comments that Commissioner Schlater has mentioned, if you could just look at it.

I'm actually in agreeance with option one, too. But I would think so we can -- and I think it's three, I'm not sure -- option one. But we're going to be nice. I would hope my colleagues would join me; we're going to be real nice to you tonight. We're going to ask that even though the majority of us agree with option one, if we could just look at seeing if there are other setbacks. But you're keying up, so you must already have done that.

MR. PARKER: Well, can you give me a little more. We have a lot of examples of other cities that have, you know, no setback or large setbacks. What criteria would you -- what would you like us to bring you back? Just a list of best practices and how they
have materialized on the water? What would you like to see?

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I'd like to know what's going to be going on between the 25 foot boardwalk and the building face, for one.

MR. PARKER: What would be permitted in that space?

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I was imagining, like, we often see street sections that show us the sort of layers of what's happening between building face and street. Something like that for the waterfront, I think, dioramatically would be helpful. I think examples would be helpful, too.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Also, I would like to see examples of green space between the building and the water that are considered successful in terms of animating the waterfront.

MR. PARKER: So maybe looking at
cities that have a 75 foot or equivalent requirement, and see what they've done in that space?

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Yes.

MR. PARKER: Perfect.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: I think that would be great. And with those examples I could certainly be convinced.

MR. PARKER: And of course, regardless of this, we could always and would be certainly willing to have a special exception release valve for any requirement like this, too.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Was that helpful? We're good?

MR. PARKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I guess I'm trying to think of -- I look at some cities. I mean, San Antonio is kind of on its own. It's a rich urban river and all the development along it. But I look at Chicago where they've built up right to it and
it's devastating for a lot of it. There's parts that are opened up that are nice, but there's other parts where just buildings line the river. New York, I guess, has got a little bit of both; you've got development that's open and along it.

And looking back what we got out of, I think they have a new name now, what was Florida Rock. And we had that plaza all the way along. Which I think after many, many revisions with them, they finally got that as an animated, and it's a pathway and fountains and things along it.

So I guess the Anacostia, I guess you've got to look at the whole thing. And what can you really do? I don't know how tight you can make it without a connection across the river. And will anybody really -- how do you feel that? Is it too wide to have them too close? I don't know. In certain instances, it works. I mean, San Antonio, it's great. But it's a little different
relationship; the river's not that wide.

The Anacostia is pretty wide along there. Maybe there's areas that you -- I guess I'm just trying to -- and you're the ones that are going to be the ones looking at this. I was looking at rivers and widths and what seems to work in different areas.

MR. PARKER: Yes. We're happy to -- I think we can come up with a number of examples of places, both rivers and oceanfront, that have a 50-100 foot setbacks pretty consistently. And we can both diagram and show some examples of what happens in that space.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I mean, I'm looking at -- getting back to Chicago, the river doesn't work at all. But the lakefront is great.

MR. PARKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But it's a whole different kind of feeling.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other comments,
questions? Okay.

Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think regardless, the minimum 25 feet for the trail connections ought to be preserved. So it's not like we're jumping straight to option two.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we are all in agreeance? Great. Okay. Let's move right along.

Thank you, Mr. Parker.

Do we have an OP status report?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next, we've come to our election of officers.

Colleagues, I'll open it up and see what your pleasure is.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr. Chairman, I feel like things are working quite well. And I would be hesitant to upset our good momentum. I think for now it's a good idea to maintain you as Chairman and Commissioner Keating as Vice Chairman.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Any other comments or questions? Okay.

Thank you very much, Commissioner Schlater.

Unless someone objects, I don't think we need to make a vote. That's the way we'll leave it for now. All right. Thank you all.

Let me just say this before I adjourn. I really want to thank the staff. The staff does an excellent job in helping us to make sure we make the -- and I always probably say this a lot, but I don't think I can say it enough. Under leadership of Director Weinbaum, the way they help make sure that we're prepared. They really do go above and beyond the call of making sure that we have all the information and resources we need so we can come out and make an informed decision for the best interests of the city.

And that goes to Ms. Schellin, Ms. Hanousek, and Ms. Bushman. And Office of
Attorney General's Mr. Ritting -- I like to call names -- Mr. Ritting and Mr. Bergstein. Also Office of Planning who gives us the information so we can make those informed decisions, under the leadership of Ms. Steingasser. And tonight we have Mr. Parker and Mr. Lawson. And everybody, you all do a great job; I can't say it enough and I'm sure my colleagues would agree. And we appreciate all the hard work that you do.

And if anybody is coming to any of those oversight hearings and they're watching this webcast live, come down and say what good service you get from Office of Planning, Office of Attorney General, and of course the Office of Zoning.

So with that, I will adjourn this meeting. Good night. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 7:11 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)