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

(6:06 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, we're going to go ahead and get started. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia for Tuesday, November the 12th, 2013.

My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chair Cohen, Commissioner Miller, Commissioner May and Commissioner Turnbull.

We're also joined by the Office of Zoning Staff, our Director Ms. Sara Bardin, Sharon Schellin, and Ms. Zee Hill. Ms. Sara, let me apologize for calling you Bardeen the other night. Forgive me.

Also the Office of Planning, Ms. Steingasser, Mr. Lawson, Ms. Vitale. District Department of Transportation, Mr. Zimbabwe and Mr. Jonathan Rogers.

This proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and it's also webcast.
live. Accordingly we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room including the display of signs or objects.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case Number 08-06A. This is a request by the Office of Planning for comprehensive revisions and amendments to the Zoning Regulations Title 11 DCMR. The specific subject of tonight's hearing is proposed new Subtitle C.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register on September 20 of 2013, and copies of that announcement are available to my left on the wall near the door.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with provisions of 11 DCMR 3021 as follows: preliminary matters, presentation by the Office of Planning, presentation by the Department of Transportation and testimony from the public.
The following time constraints will be maintained in this hearing: Office of Planning and DDOT up to 60 minutes, organizations 5 minutes, individuals 3 minutes.

The Commission intends to adhere to the time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time.

The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations if necessary and no time shall be ceded.

As noted in the Notice of Public Hearing, I will be calling witnesses in the order in which the Office of Zoning received a notice of intent to testify.

I will not be calling any other witnesses to testify once we have gone through the list. Anyone else who would like to testify on Subtitle C may do so on the overflow night scheduled, which is November the 19th.
Again, the overflow night is November the 19th. Please see staff to sign up for that night if you have not already done so.

So, again, I will not ask tonight if there's anyone else who would like to testify after everyone who's signed up has finished. We will do that on November the 19th, so I don't want that to be a surprise when we get later on in the evening.

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 speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right before taking a seat at the table.

When presenting information to the Commission, please turn on and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address.
When you are finished speaking, please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

The decision of the Commission in this case must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Commission requests that persons present not engage the members of the Commission in conversation during any recess or at any time.

In addition, there should be no direct contact whatsoever with the Commissioner concerning this matter, be it written, electronic or by telephone. Any material received directly by a Commissioner will be discarded without being read and any calls will be ignored.

The staff will be available throughout the hearing to discuss procedural questions.

As noted, testimony this evening
will be limited to the proposed new Subtitle C.

If you have testimony on subtitles and cannot come back on the scheduled hearing nights for those subtitles, again, you may hand in your written testimony or submit it before the hearing date. We will read it.

I would also ask that you not repeat testimony that has already been given. Rather than repeating the same comments, I would suggest that you state that you agree with testimony that has already been given and add any additional comments that we have not heard.

Please turn off the beepers and cell phones at this time so 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. I do have one preliminary matter. The Commission was saddened to learn of the passing or the murder or killing, I believe, of Mr. Ron Kirby who was COG's long-time director of transportation and planning, and I want to thank Commissioner Miller for sending me that information.

So we want to keep his family in our prayers and we'd like to send out our sympathy, condolences to their family, and I'd like for us to do a moment of silence. Commissioner Miller, would you like to add something to that?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So if we can just do a moment of silence.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Okay, we will go to the Office of Planning and then after the Office of Planning we will hear the
District Department of Transportation and then we'll go to the public.

Ms. Steingasser, good evening.

MS. STEINGASSER: Chairman Hood, Commissioners, thank you very much. Tonight's hearing is on Subtitle C.

Subtitle C establishes the general rules and regulations for measurement calculations that are applicable to all other subtitles and zone districts unless otherwise stated.

The Commission has had quite a bit of hearings and guidance that has fed into this subtitle. This is just kind of a brief summary of them.

They've already heard sustainability. Green area ratio you've already taken final action on and is already existing in the current regulations. That's been brought forward into these regulations.

Height we've discussed through other subtitles and the Commission has
already taken final action to incorporate that into the existing regulations.

Arts and culture, Commission provided us guidance in October of 2008 on how to proceed with preferred arts credits and bonus credits.

For parking, the Commission took proposed action on general guidance on parking, on some general rules and regulations in 2008 followed with final action, which was taken in April of 2011.

Again, these were general regulations and the action was not incorporated into the new regulations but was advertised as a notice of opinion.

Parking, bike parking and loading, same except that with bike parking and loading the Commission did take final action on specifics.

Those direct specifics have been translated directly into the current regulations that were set down 9-9-13. We've
made no changes.

The final order that the Commission acted on was attached to the OP report and there were some highlighted sections on -- basically they were the intent statements that needed to be incorporated into the new regs. Other than that, the standards and requirements were all the same. Same with loading.

Also then administration, enforcement and procedures, the Commission also took guidance hearings on.

I'm not going to go through every bit of guidance that those dates and actions represent. In general, it had to do with non-conformities.

You asked us to reorganize the information, to deal with non-conforming uses and non-conforming structures separately. Right now they're kind of melded together and it takes a little bit of puzzle solving to figure them out.
You agreed that we should look at allowing additions to non-conforming structures, providing the addition conforms to the use and structure requirements and does not increase any existing non-conforming.

We've done that and we've discussed that in some of the previous subtitles by the way we've dealt with extending existing side yards and rear yards and lot occupancy so that the non-conformity would be actually considered conforming and the building could expand.

The change of use from one non-conforming use to another by special exception is currently in the code. We've also continued that in the new code.

Allow for the continuation of non-expandable, non-conforming uses and we've done that.

Theoretical lot subdivisions, this has been an issue that the BZA's been
faced with when a theoretical lot subdivision involves multiple buildings, row houses especially, and one row house wants to put an addition on that may not conform with the plan submitted for the theoretical lot subdivision.

The entire representation has to come back so that the one individual could not expand, even though they may be conforming to lot area and building standards if they were an individual lot, so we've brought that forward.

FAR calculations we've discussed.

Arts uses, again the template for providing for existing and future arts districts. And then the arts uses, the bonus density and the preferred uses and the height rules, which we've discussed also.

So I'm just going to touch on the few changes we've made to all but parking, which we'll deal with in a second.

We had some clarifications in the
subdivision theoretical lots and private streets. It's the "and private streets." I think we need a little bit more clarifying language based on the Commission's action about no longer counting private streets in the denominator of FAR. We need to make sure that's more clearly stated and possibly dealing separately for campus plans.

Heightened roof structures, we talked about that in Subtitle D as well as E and F, clarifying the different heights for the building type, single-family homes versus institutional buildings.

Dwelling unit density, we need to clarify a little bit of language, again, based on what we've heard since the setdown about accessory apartments and how that could be misconstrued in the flat zones to allow accessory apartments within the flats, and that's not what we were intending.

The inclusionary zoning, there'll be some amendments that we're currently
reviewing and that may be brought back to the Commission separate from this zoning action and that would be an amendment to the current code so you may be seeing that in December or January.

Loading and bicycle, as we've talked about, the Commission has already taken action on that and unless advised otherwise OP will continue to include the language as adopted in April of 2011.

The bike parking, the basic changes were that we based it on building area instead of the number of car spaces. So as we've discussed earlier, once the number of car spaces go down, the parking for bikes also went down. It was an inverse relationship that made no sense.

Add a requirement for multifamily use. Again, that's for bike parking. It aligned with the DDOT and the City Council direction of one space per three units.

And then we required both long-
term and short-term bike parking, short-term being for guests and visitors to the building. It would be closer to the entrance of the building, possibly on the street or adjacent to the building or immediately inside the garage.

Long-term parking could be farther down in the garage or up in the building, but it would be a much more secured type of facility.

So parking, that's the biggest issue of debate that I think the ZRR experience has gone through.

The Comprehensive Plan gives us a lot of policy statements on not so much how we should proceed but that we should proceed, that we should de-emphasize auto-oriented uses and surface parking.

Again, this is language that's in the OP report and is in several of the guidance reports. We felt it was important to put up there. It talks about transit-
oriented and corridor developments, part of the land use chapter.

The central employment area also has some language that talks about encouraging creative management of parking around transit stations, balancing the needs of transit/pedestrian/bicycle travel and generally set standards behind or beneath buildings and geared toward short-term users rather than all-day commuters.

Also in the land use chapter of the parking regulations, there's one that directly relates to the revision of the zoning regulations.

I'm not going to read the whole thing but it does instruct us to ensure that the parking requirements are responsive to the demand, that they should be accommodated in a manner that maintains an attractive environment.

They should minimize their interference with traffic flow and they
should be considered where transportation demand management measures are implemented and a reduction in demand can be demonstrated.

Also, in addition to the Comprehensive Plan, the Sustainability Plan, the Sustainable DC Plan that the mayor rolled out this year also has several very specific, very focused transportation action items. We think some of our measures actually feed into that.

Streetcar networks obviously is not zoning but our parking tries to support the streetcar design transit systems to be resilient to extreme weather, expand the Capital Bikeshare program, expand car-sharing programs, expand electric vehicle charging infrastructures. We tried to accommodate those wherever possible within the zoning regulations.

Additionally, through the Sustainable DC Plan, they talk about the
Greenhouse Gas Inventory and this is just a piece of data that shows the community-wide emissions have gone down from 2006 to 2011 even though our population has gone up.

Our accessibility to Metro, we thought this was just also kind of an interesting piece of background that weighed into some of our decision making as part of our overall data fact-finding.

Twenty-eight percent of the region’s real estate value is within a half mile of the Metro but only represents four percent of the land area.

And 84 percent of the regional office space under construction is within one quarter mile of a Metro station, which is very, very significant. They obviously are merging towards that Metro station as a way to deal with their competitiveness.

So we get to the luxury of choices and you've heard this a lot if you've been to any of our director's presentations.
82.4 percent of the District households are what we call car-lite. That's one car or less. Thirty-eight and a half percent of the households own no vehicle.

And, again, that's not individuals. That's households so that's a couple, that's a family, that's an individual, the household itself. That's very, very significant.

Also our research show that 46 percent of all trips are made by foot, by bike or by transit. That does not include a vehicle. 51.5 percent of all of our commuting trips again are by bike, foot or transit.

We also looked at the cost of vehicles. There's a lot of discussion through the Zoning Review Workshop, through our community outreach, through meetings with communities on the cost of owning and operating a vehicle and the impact that cost has on home ownership and the cost to an
individual as well as the cost to the
construction of the vehicle.

These figures are from AAA. They
are on their website and they show an
increasing expense to an individual for
owning and operating an automobile since 2004
when they readjusted what they call their,
I've forgotten, their realistic ownership
rates and those are the items that they
include on the side there.

But the value and expense to an
individual of owning a vehicle has gone up
significantly in the last nine years.

Also when it gets to cost, we've
also done some research through both direct
interviews with developers, builders and
parking providers as well as research online.

RSMeans has a very interesting, I
guess you'd call it a spreadsheet where you
enter in the city, you enter in the type of
construction, the height of that type of
construction and it gives you the general
cost of what it costs per square foot.

And it has some for parking structures and it's very Washington-centric. It distinguishes between Virginia, Silver Spring and Washington D.C.

And based on the levels of parking, it went anywhere between $15,000 per space to $40,000 per space and that was pretty consistent with what we're hearing from developers, that that's the cost that they incur when they provide a parking space at each level as it goes down.

It goes down about $15,000 per parking space and that doesn't really account for issues of flood plain and topographical changes. That's just digging and pouring.

So our summary proposal, basically in the residential areas, the low-density residential areas, what we think of as the single-family detach, the single-family semi-detached and the row house zones, we're proposing to retain that existing one space
per lot minimum, except where there is no
alley access.

And this picture here, what it
shows on the right, this is Glover Park
basically and you can see where the row
houses line the street.

Even on an infill situation to
have to require some kind of parking slab or
driveway be cut through would completely
alter the streetscape, the landscape and the
way that is historically built.

And then on the left side is the
back of that block and you can see where
there's an alley. They were able to pull the
parking in from the alley.

So wherever there's an alley
that's improved with alley access, we're
saying, okay, that's where you would have a
parking requirement. If you don't have an
alley, then there would be no parking
requirement.

In the multifamily zones, we've
standardized the parking requirements and here you see on the left and in the middle the variation of parking requirements based on zone. We're proposing that that be standardized to one space per three units after the fourth unit.

It's a much more unified approach and it's a lot easier. If there's a rezoning, a building doesn't suddenly become non-conforming to its parking and then get thrown into a variance situation.

The commercial uses, we've somewhat standardized those parking requirements.

We've brought them down from several hundred to a couple dozen, again allowing for use category rather than zone so that a private school, regardless of its residential zone, has the same retail, has the same whether it's in the equivalent of a C-2-A or a C-3-C.

Again, allows for a clear
understanding, much more predictability and, again, if there's any kind of rezoning or redevelopment that the Comp Plan would call for in the future, it doesn't create a situation of unnecessary variances and non-conformities.

What we're not proposing, we are no longer proposing transit zones. That was a very contentious issue. We met a lot with the communities, with interested advocates.

What we've done instead is we are proposing a by-right reduction for sites that are located close to transit of 50 percent.

So areas that would be outside a half mile from the Metro station would have a standard X. If you're within a half mile you would have half of that.

We did some investigation on that half mile to make sure that that was still relevant. The Federal Highway Administration still recommends it.

George Mason University,
University of California, University of Texas at Dallas all recommend it as still being relevant.

There was a graduate study performed at the California Institute of Transportation through University of California that just last year tested that number again to see if it was still relevant. And they actually found that depending on the quality of the fixed rail, the higher quality the rail, the farther people were willing to walk. So we're very comfortable with that half mile from a Metro station.

A quarter mile would be from the streetcar line or from the WMATA bus routes that are identified as a priority corridor network.

Further reduction to go below that 50 percent would be by special exception and it would have some transportation demand management measures associated with it.
Examining the TDM measures for proposals providing significantly more than the required amount of parking means if a developer provides over twice the amount of parking that is established as a minimum we'd like to see transportation demand management.

We at one point proposed maximums. We pulled away from that requirement and felt that a transportation demand management program when parking becomes excessive was a much more proactive way to go.

So these are some of the existing transit provisions. As you know, right now in the zoning regulations there is a reduction of 25 percent that's permitted if you're within 800 feet of a Metro station, you're not residentially zoned and you're not within 800 feet of the R-1 through R-4 zones.

So those purple areas right now are where you could get a 25 percent parking reduction.
We think that comes from 1978 when the Metro first opened and it was a way to try to recognize the investment made in the Metro at that time.

These purple areas are where that 50 percent reduction would apply now. You'll notice the bulk of that is in the downtown areas, some of what we're calling the Southwest/near Southeast areas down by the stadium, Southwest waterfront. Those are the high-density areas identified on the Comprehensive Plan map and they're very, very transit rich.

Other than the big bulks of downtown, you'll also notice that they tend to follow the commercial corridors which have the heaviest bus lines. Make sure I didn't miss anything on that, okay.

So in the downtown area, we are proposing that there be no parking requirements whatsoever. Right now there is an exemption from the parking standards for
office buildings.

We're proposing that it be for all uses, again, within the downtown as defined by the high-density areas as we'll be discussing Thursday night in the new downtown subtitle.

What this graph represents is all of the dark bars that do not have a light gray bar do not have a parking requirement near downtown.

Most of them in that list there, there's a few more in there, Austin, Oklahoma City, but only the light gray bars have any downtown parking requirement.

And some of those, which it's hard to make out, have, I think there's four or five of them that have a little zero. It means that they have areas of the downtown that have no parking requirements and some that have a very minor parking requirement.

So we're not leading in this situation but we are amongst what we think to
be a good crowd.

So in the downtown again, we're proposing no parking be required for any use. In the industrial zones, we're proposing that the parking standards stay fairly similar.

Right now they're actually the highest standards in the city at one space per 600. They're considered any other use except for warehouses and we're proposing no change to the warehouse standard.

We're proposing that that parking standard stay at one space per 3,000 and the other uses be refined to match more of the, not the general retail but kind of the specialized retail. It's basically 1.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet I believe.

Private schools was also a big issue as we dealt with a lot of the communities and you'll probably hear a lot about this tonight.

Right now it's based on some
really difficult-to-control standards, two
spaces for three teachers or other employees
for the elementary and junior high schools.

For the high schools it's two
spaces for three teachers or other employees,
one for 20 classroom seats. There's ten
seats for a largest auditorium or gymnasium.

The problem we've had with that
is it's very confining to a school. It
doesn't allow the programs to adjust.

If a program adjusts and perhaps
they change and they don't have an auditorium
and they want to use it for something else,
they're now forced to come back into the BZA,
back into neighborhood negotiations, where
what we're proposing is that it be based on
square footage so that there's predictability
on how many spaces will always be on site
regardless of program, whether that program
expands or contracts, and that the
neighborhood will always have assurance of
how many spaces are going to be there and how
they're going to be used.

We're proposing 1.25 spaces per 1,000 square feet. At the back of our report we attached a survey that we did based on the BZA orders of all the private schools that had a BZA order, the number of spaces required, the number that they actually have provided and then what the difference would be with the new square-footage standard as opposed to an employee-based standard.

They vary wildly. There's no real predictability between the current standard of employees and auditorium and what's actually provided on site.

The schools, because they are private schools, they don't always have a bus so they tend to over-park so we don't think this is completely inappropriate to have it based on square footage.

Places of worship, we've also gone from the one for each ten seats of occupancy capacity in the sanctuary. We
found that to be a very difficult standard for predicting how many people would actually come to the facility.

    There's the occupancy capacity, which could be based on fire code. There could also be alterations to the building that would reduce that capacity.

    Then there's the folding wall issue and then it goes on to issues of when the seats aren't fixed, you know, you need 18 inches of a bench or a pew.

    It's really a difficult type of standard. It's hard for the zoning administrator, it's hard for the neighborhoods and it's basically hard for the church to really predict.

    So again, we went with a square footage. We found that to be a common standard used around in our best-practice surveys.

    We also have then allowed for flexibility and in this area we think this is
very important. We're proposing to allow sharing of parking spaces so that sites can partner together with existing sites that may be over-parked.

We've done some surveying with quite a few of the larger apartment buildings and office providers.

We've also met with several of the parking companies, and they park to the site. So if they're going down four floors, they're parking all four of them because they got the space.

Well, that provides an opportunity for smaller buildings in the area to come in and share that parking as opposed to both sites over-parking. So we're proposing that where those areas are, they can be allowed to share. That's currently not allowed in the code.

We're also allowing that that would be outside the downtown in areas where there are also parking requirements.
We're allowing a greater number of small car spaces. I think we've talked about this before. The compact car spaces in the zoning regulations right now are old. We'll just say they're old and archaic.

If you don't have five compact spaces, you can't have any. It's a very odd trigger. We're allowing for the car spaces to count toward required parking.

And we're also allowing for the facilitation of mechanical or automated parking systems to increase the efficiency and allow also for car-share spaces to count towards required spaces and also to encourage the provision of electric-car outlets.

The parking lot standards, most of the parking lot standards we've achieved already through our pervious surface landscape and GAR standards that the Commission already adopted in December.

Again, it limits the size of the parking spaces, after which a special
exception has to be applied for and it establishes a greater canopy as well as landscaping requirements.

I think that brings us up to tonight's hearing.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms. Steingasser. We'll go right into the District Department of Transportation, Mr. Zimbabwe.

Before we do that, let me acknowledge Ms. Bushman. I think I omitted her, from Office of Zoning, and Ms. Hill from the Office of Zoning. Thank you. Mr. Zimbabwe, we're ready to hear from you.

MR. ZIMBABWE: All right. I will excerpt from our report to you tonight just to read parts of it into the record. Hopefully I don't go on too long.

"The District Department of Transportation, DDOT, is established to improve the District's economic competitiveness and quality of life by
planning, coordinating and operating the transportation system and managing and maintaining the transportation infrastructure to ensure the safe, efficient movement of people, goods and information along public rights-of-way.

"Although DDOT does not have direct responsibility for transportation infrastructure in the private space of the District, Subtitle C of the Zoning Regulations Review text contains several areas closely linked with DDOT's responsibilities.

"It's DDOT's mission to develop and maintain a cohesive sustainable transportation system that delivers safe, affordable and convenient ways to move people and goods, while protecting and enhancing the natural, environmental and cultural resources of the District and central to this mission is a robust and multimodal transportation system."
"DDOT finds that the Zoning Regulations Review text Subtitle C as drafted supports the fulfillment of DDOT's transportation mission while at the same time preserving flexibility that is sensitive to existing context.

"DDOT continues to work with multiple stakeholders to provide a world-class transportation system with easily accessible transportation options throughout the District.

"At the same time the demands on the transportation system from residents and visitors alike are evolving and flexibility will be required to meet these evolving demands.

"Private development has a substantial role in shaping the transportation demands on the public rights of way and these demands should be addressed without impeding the rights of private property owners in the District.
"The District owns and operates a large and complex transportation system providing for many modes of travel that serve 632,000 residents and 800,000 employees.

"In peak travel periods, the current transportation network experiences an extensive delay on arterials and freeways resulting in long and unreliable travel times in vehicles and on surface transit.

"Delay is so extensive that the peak period of travel has extended from an hour to multiple hours and it is not uncommon to find congested conditions between the hours of 7:00 and 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 and 7:00 p.m.

"Transit service is currently strained as well. Several Metro rail lines experience congestion during rush hour and buses are subject to delays caused by congestion on the roadways.

"The District is projected to experience substantial growth in the future.
It is expected that the District will add more than 140,000 residents and 180,000 jobs by 2040.

"This growth must also be viewed within the context of a metropolitan region that is projected to add 2 million people and over 1.6 million jobs by 2040.

"With this growth comes the need to ensure safe, efficient and sustainable transportation options for the District's residents, employees and millions of visitors that pass through the District's borders each year.

"The District's transportation network is largely built out and large-scale expansion of the District's roadway network is not possible to accommodate significantly more vehicles.

"In light of these constraints and challenges, DDOT and other public and private stakeholders are working to increase transportation options throughout the
District in order to address existing and future needs.

"DDOT and its partner stakeholders have been working towards promoting a multimodal transportation network for many years and much progress has been made towards increasing transportation options.

"However, much work remains, especially in light of future growth projections, and the process of providing a transportation network that meets future needs is an ongoing process that will continue to evolve in response to population and employment changes, technological advances and changing preferences.

"Given current and anticipated challenges caused by population growth, the District has adopted a transportation policy to promote a multimodal transportation network.

"The transportation element of
the Comprehensive Plan and the transportation component of the Sustainable DC Plan established a broad vision for the District's transportation future.

"The two documents recognize the predicted growth in the District and anticipate the associated transportation challenges.

"The transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan addresses the importance of multimodalism and acknowledges the important relationship between transportation and land use as a means to meet the District's current and future transportation needs.

"Similarly the transportation component of the Sustainable DC Plan calls for the encouragement of non-automobile transportation, while reducing dependence on private vehicles.

"In pursuit of this vision, the plan establishes the following targets for
commute modes splits by 2032, 50 percent transit, 25 percent biking and walking and 25 percent auto.

"DDOT is in the midst of leading moveDC, a collaborative effort to develop a bold and implementation-focused vision that responds to the anticipated transportation challenges facing the District and will guide strategic investments for bicycles, pedestrians, vehicles and transit in the District's transportation system for the next 25 years and beyond.

"These investments are likely to include identifying new multimodal transportation options and supportive policies to encourage the use of transportation options.

"DDOT and the District are investing in improvements to the transportation system including Streetcar, Circulator, Capital Bikeshare, bike facilities, Metrorail and Metrobus to enhance
the multimodal nature of the city.

"On-street parking is in high demand in many areas of the District and the management of this resource is an ongoing and iterative process.

"High demand is found in long-established neighborhoods and emerging ones as well as areas around attractive uses like university campuses and Metrorail stations.

"Demand comes from immediate residents, other residents of the District of Columbia and non-District residents.

"In recent years DDOT has evolved parking management processes to respond to changing demands including the introduction of performance parking districts around the Nationals Stadium, in Columbia Heights and along H Street, Northeast.

"Working with the City Council, DDOT will continue to update and make changes to parking programs, some of which have remained largely unchanged for nearly 40
years.

"The private sector is contributing to the quantity and quality of transportation options available in the District.

"Taxis, which have been providing a valuable, on-demand transportation service for decades, are now being augmented by new car services including Uber and uberTAXI.

"Car sharing, which provides members with access to a fleet of automobiles, is an increasingly popular alternative to auto ownership.

"Car sharing has been proven to lower demand for driving and parking and reduce transportation costs. Zipcar, Enterprise, Hertz and Car2Go provide commercial car-sharing services within the district.

"Technology is also playing a key role in expanding transportation options and making them more convenient.
"Numerous web-based applications are designed to provide real-time transit information, which decreases wait time and promotes automobile use.

"Although DDOT and other public and private stakeholders are working to increase the supply of non-auto transportation options, this is only a part of the effort necessary to develop a more complete multimodal transportation network.

"The zoning regulations, too, should facilitate a multimodal network by providing the flexibility for developers to deliver a built environment that is consistent with a no-car or car-lite lifestyle.

"Private land development, in particular vehicle parking provision, greatly impacts people's transportation choices and subsequently affects the District's transportation network.

"Projects in dense walkable
neighborhoods with good transit access tend
to produce many more non-auto trips than
projects located in lower density
neighborhoods farther from transit.

"Building characteristics,
particularly parking provision, are also
highly predictive of a building's
transportation impact.

"The current zoning regulations
make it difficult to provide fewer parking
spaces than required, thereby creating a
parking floor that may be higher than actual
demand.

"A more market-based approach to
parking provision is a key element in
promoting a multimodal transportation
network.

"More flexibility in the vehicle
parking requirements is increasingly
important in light of changing demographics
and housing preferences.

"The current zoning regulations
make it difficult for developers to deliver a low parking product type to market without navigating through a variance process.

"This has resulted in a constrained supply of residential buildings with a level of parking provision consistent with demand.

"Other proposed changes in the zoning regulations, including permitting some corner store uses and accessory dwelling units, although not in Subtitle C, will also serve to attract individuals seeking car-free or car-lite lifestyles and promote non-auto transportation options.

"The Zoning Regulations Review Subtitle C text recognizes the projected growth and associated transportation challenges as well as the macro-level shifts in transportation supply and demand and attempts to align land development requirements with these realities.

"DDOT supports the proposed
changes as integral elements in promoting a multimodal transportation network.

"ZRR calls for eliminating parking requirements in downtown and reducing the vehicle parking requirements in areas with excellent, high-quality transit service while not changing requirements in much of the city where transportation options are less plentiful.

"Reduced vehicle parking minimums will provide greater flexibility for developers to provide a level of parking they believe is necessary for a successful real estate product.

"And the developer would have the choice still to provide the minimum vehicular parking spaces required or provide vehicle parking spaces in excess of the minimum requirements.

"This ability to more easily provide lower levels of parking than currently required would allow developers to
better target segments of the population that do not own cars.

"As a reviewer of parking variance requests, DDOT is almost always able to support these requests because projects with fewer vehicle parking spaces generate fewer auto trips.

"Under the proposed changes, developers would be permitted to target these demographics as a matter of right, thereby reducing costs and increasing the real estate industry's ability to deliver a product type that is increasingly in high demand.

"Further, by allowing development by right that supports these demographics in a manner that is more consistent with their lower levels of auto ownership, demand on the transportation system is reduced.

"Instead of being pushed towards vehicle travel through higher levels of required parking, this demographic can travel by transit or bicycle, both of which have a
more marginal impact on travel conditions.

"The ZRR text also establishes mitigation efforts that must accompany parking provision for projects that seek to provide more parking than required.

"Tying the over-provision of parking and, thus, trip generation with mitigations is important in encouraging the use of non-auto modes and ensuring continued functionality of the transportation network.

"DDOT supports this approach to provide some additional certainty to the review and approval process, and this is an area where DDOT would expect the specific items to evolve as this approach moves forward.

"Moving on to bicycle parking, the ZRR text considers that lower rates of single-occupancy vehicles will require that people make more trips by bicycle and provides for robust bicycle parking minimums.

"Proposed minimums facilitate a
mode split that is consistent with DDOT's vision as described in the Sustainable DC Plan as well as District code.

"DDOT believes that the standard is sufficient but has recently seen some demand exceeding this level proposed in the zoning. This is an area that continues to evolve and DDOT encourages the Commission to explore this issue during its deliberations.

"For other uses, the ZRR text adopts standards to facilitate a robust bicycle mode split consistent with the mode split goals established in the Sustainable DC Plan.

"In conclusion, DDOT supports Subtitle C of the Zoning Regulations Review. The proposal provides flexibility for the provision of vehicle parking in areas where such provision is appropriate, requires a robust level of bicycle parking and imposes TDM requirements on projects that have the greatest potential to impact the
transportation system.

"When taken together, the ZRR supports a robust, multimodal transportation network that serves the needs of residents, guests and employees of the District.

"DDOT also notes that the ZRR text would impact new development only. The zoning regulations would not change the parking provision of existing buildings and, therefore, the zoning regulation changes are expected to cause incremental, albeit important, changes to ensure the continued functionality of the transportation network in the long term."

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank you both for your presentations, Office of Planning and DDOT. Oh, that's right. Commission is going to hold their questions until possibly, from what I've been looking at, I think it's going to be the third night.

We're going to hear from the public first. Again, as I stated earlier, I
have a witness list here of 48 who are present on this list.

If you are not on this list and you want to testify, I think we're going to hear the second part in all fairness to those who had to wait and come down next Tuesday, I believe it is, in all fairness to them.

On the back end of that, I will call for those who have not signed up for either night to come up and testify, but I'm sure everybody who's waited here this long, his name is on this list.

So I'm going to begin with it. I'm going to call your name and forgive me if I mispronounce it. When you come forward, you can correct me.

Okay, Patty Rose, David Alpert, Abigail Zenner. Now, I practiced this one in the back and I'm probably going to mess it up now, Rahul Mereand-Sinha. Last name is spelled S-I-N-H-A. I've called that name three times. I hope the person shows up so
they can correct me. Joseph Kakesh.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Kakesh.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Kakesh, Kakesh.

Some of my colleagues will help me mess these names up, so just don't blame it all on me. Corey Holman. And I know I'm going to mess the last name up, Lilly Shoup. Ms. Shoup, did we pronounce your last name correct?

(Off microphone discussion)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Vice Chair, I appreciate that. Shoup, okay. Carol Wayman. I guess I need two more people. Alex Posorske, Alex, okay. And Eric Fidler. Is Eric Fidler? Okay.

All right, we have eight and we're going to start. We're actually going to start with you on my right and we're going to go from my right to my left. You may begin. Make sure the light is lit up.

MR. POSORSKE: There we go, thank you. Good evening. My name is Alex Posorske and I work for the Coalition for Smarter
Growth, but this testimony is my own and not on behalf of the organization.

I am testifying tonight in favor of lowering the off-street parking minimum requirements.

To let you know why, please allow me a quick second to give you some background. Last year I moved into a house with my girlfriend, Leslie, in Trinidad.

It's been a great first year. The neighborhood is a wonderful mix of long-time residents and new arrivals, with the vibrant culture at next door Gallaudet added to the mix. We love it and are planning to stay for the long run.

In our more optimistic moments, we can imagine ourselves decades from now, like Mrs. Johnson two doors down. She introduced herself to us as a resident of 40-plus years who keeps an eye on the houses while her neighbors are at work.

Neither of us own or want to own...
a car and that's another reason we love the neighborhood. It has easy access to major
crosstown buses as well as vibrant corridors like H Street, Northeast, to nearby grocery
stores that make it possible to live very conveniently without a car.

But I'm worried. I know what's happened to real estate prices in my neighborhood in just the year we've been there, with some property shooting up in value almost three times.

That's beyond the reach of many of my neighbors if they were looking to buy today as well as many of my long-time friends. With both me and my girlfriend working at non-profits, it would actually most likely be beyond the reach of us as well today even though she only bought the house a year ago.

That's the major reason why I support this update to our zoning code, because I see the possibility of a D.C. that
only the very rich can afford and it scares me to think what we might lose.

There are lots of good reasons overall to support it, reasons like modernizing the city to be consistent with the undeniable trend towards car-lite living and encouraging a better way for our city to grow without the rest of us either stuck in traffic or stuck with the growing air pollution from everyone who is stuck in traffic.

But when adding a parking space to a new apartment building can add up to $50,000 to the cost of a unit and many of those parking spaces are going unused and the price of housing is soaring beyond the reach of many, something needs to be fixed.

I want to speak up for the hundreds of thousands of current residents who hope they can afford to stay in their home city, hundreds of thousands of future residents who hope to add their talents and
passions to our diverse, exciting and welcoming city. I want to make sure that they are able to live here and keep contributing to our future.

This compromise proposal before you, a product of five years of dialogue between Office of Planning and residents from every ward and neighborhood of the city, will help to do that. It is an important part of ensuring a vibrant and inclusive city in the years to come.

And I thank you for your time tonight as well as the many other long hours you put in on behalf of the District and all of us.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just put something in the park, and I thank you, but let me just put something in the park.

Now, I forgot to make the announcement, when you hear the first beep, you have exactly one minute left. When you hear the second beep, you need to stop, okay,
because we want to make sure we get everybody in and this subtitle has a lot of interest.

And if you could, if you could let us know what ward you live in. I think you live in 5, right?

MR. POSORSKE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So before you start, we're kind of seeing where participation's coming from. So before you begin, introduce yourself. You can give us the ward you live in.

But please help me. When you hear the first beep, on the second beep, know that you need to kind of wind it up. The second beep then just stop. Stop dead in your tracks, okay? Thank you. Okay, you may begin.

MS. WAYMAN: Thank you, Chairman Hood and Vice Chairman Cohen and the members of the Commission, and I really want to congratulate you on this proposal. I am testifying in support of the compromise
proposal.

My name is Carol Wayman. I live in Ward 6 right now but I've been a D.C. resident since 1992 and I've lived in Wards 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.

I am one of the 84 percent who live in a car-lite household. My wife owns a car. I used to own a car when I lived on U Street.

I actually owned an off-street parking place that I bought a condo there in 1996, and as soon as Zipcar came in the neighborhood, I was so glad to get rid of my car. I only drove it to get inspected.

And I just love living in a transit-rich environment like the U Street corridor with lots of places and I lived in a condo with 12 units. We had six parking spaces and only four of them were used.

Most of us didn't have cars who lived there but we had a big demand for bike parking and as condo president for 14 years I
made sure that we put in a lot more bike parking.

And now that I live in Ward 6, I'm thrilled to see some development around that Pennsylvania corridor. When you come over the Sousa Bridge, we have used car lots. We have big Domino Pizza lots. We have things that really don't contribute that much to the community.

And there's been a big discussion about building some more transit. We're very close to transit. We're right on the 30 lines, the B2 lines, the M lines and right by the Potomac Metro. It would be really great to build some 85 unit of affordable housing or units of just apartments.

I work for a member of Congress on Capitol Hill and every few months there's new people coming in from all over the country to work on Capitol Hill.

They want to live on Capitol Hill. They want to live in D.C. But, as
Alex said, it's too expensive and it's really hard to find a place on Capitol Hill. There's not enough units to meet the demand.

And none of them have cars. They move here without cars. They want to ride their bikes. They want to do Zipcar or Car2Go.

In fact, in my office we get three parking passes and we only use two of them because nobody has a car and one person only drives so he can drive my boss around when he's in town.

So I really think this is just a wonderful proposal. It's a compromise. I think we don't need as much parking as we think we do, and I think the goals of having more than half of trips be transit or bike or on foot are a wonderful goal, and I thank you for your work.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MS. SHOUP: Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to testify.
tonight. While my remarks tonight will be directed in support of the parking provisions specifically, I also want to voice my overall support for this zoning code update. I think it's really necessary.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Can you identify yourself?

MS. SHOUP: Oh, my name is Lilly Shoup. I live in Ward 1 in the Adams Morgan neighborhood, but I've lived in D.C. for nearly ten years now in a variety of neighborhoods around town. I love the fact that each of the D.C. neighborhoods I've lived in has been unique and has its own character.

At the same time, part of the appeal of living here for so long is that many of the neighborhoods are constantly changing. They have a mix of households, young people in group homes next door to older folks, next door to apartment buildings and it's this chaotic mix that creates such a
lively, homey place to settle down.

I've thought a lot about putting down roots lately as I recently bought a house in the Adams Morgan neighborhood. I never actually considered not living in the District. I've lived here for so long and this is my home.

But I consider myself truly fortunate for having been able to have the financial means and resources to do so. For most of my friends, this simply is not an option and that is why this zoning code update is just so important.

We need to reduce the bureaucratic hurdles, particularly the minimum parking standards, that are raising housing prices across the District.

Minimum parking standards increase building costs, which are then passed down to renters and homeowners, raising prices for everyone.

While I think they should be
eliminated entirely, I think this compromise is a big step towards increasing the supply of housing in the D.C. area and reducing prices for people like me.

I work at the U.S. Department of Transportation in the Navy Yard so both my house and my job are located in neighborhoods rich with transportation options.

Like many D.C. residents, I do not own a car. I haven't owned one in, like, eight or nine years now and I frequently take advantage of all the options that D.C. has to offer. I ride my own bike. I use a Bikeshare, Metro, Car2Go, Zipcar, walking, you name it, I pretty much do it.

But I support this zoning code update because it makes it easier for all types of people to live here, people like me, people who lived here a long time, the people who are going to be moving here in the next 20 years.

And as a transportation engineer
that work in this field, I think these parking requirements are sensible, make sense and comport with a lot of the other cities that I'm aware of across the country.

So to conclude, I think it just makes sense. I support this work and I am happy to be here today, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MS. ZENNER: Thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening. My name is Abigail Zenner. I live in Glover Park in Ward 3 of D.C.

And despite the picture that you saw earlier, I actually live in a higher density section of Glover Park in West Glover Park. My husband and I have lived there for nine years and we love our neighborhood. It's the only place we've lived in D.C.

It is a neighborhood, again, with a mix of young people and senior citizens, long-time residents, students and young families.
There's a mix of row houses, apartments, condos and we even have a community garden that dates back to World War II.

A block from my 1930s-era building is a mid-century high-rise surrounded by a surface parking lot. The lot is half used most of the time since it is only for residents of that building.

It always makes me sad that our current zoning code requires so much parking, which has only made it more expensive to build and has marred our city with half-empty lots.

We would love to stay in our neighborhood for a long time but worry that we will never be able to afford a bigger place. Parking plays a role in both the livability of our neighborhood and the affordability of new development.

The Office of Planning proposal would go a long way towards correcting this
kind of construction, but it would also make it easier for new buildings to share existing lots like the one near my apartment instead of a one-size-fits-all minimum that does not take into account the people who may move into that neighborhood.

Requiring too much parking means the cost is passed on to tenants and buyers whether or not they own a car. It encourages car use even in areas that are well-served by transit.

Even in Glover Park, fewer residents are moving in with a car, which we hope will spur better bus service and a more walkable community.

As new development comes along, we don't need more parking spaces. We need more spaces for homes.

Allowing for this flexibility provides variety and options for people to move where they want or stay in their neighborhoods. It makes finding a home to
buy less expensive since building parking
adds such a high cost to a building.

   It's time to move forward and
support a zoning code that reflects a growing
and changing city. The District should be
accessible and affordable for all residents
and not just the very rich.

   We should embrace all residents
whether they are young or old, have cars or
do not and should not dictate to property
owners how much parking they should build.

   I hope that you will support
those of us who would like to stay in the
District for many years to come and create a
new city not just for us but for our children
and grandchildren.

   Thank you for your work on this
issue. I appreciate having the chance to
speak today.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MR. ALPERT: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.
I am David Alpert, a resident of Dupont Circle in Ward 2.

So far the folks that we have heard from are in support of this proposal and I, too, am in support of this proposal, though I think that the Office of Planning would have been even better to have made some of the more aggressive parking minimum reductions that you, yourselves, actually approved, in concept at least, so many years ago now.

But I wanted to mainly take my time to speak to some of the things I believe you're likely to hear about later on in this hearing when you hear from some opponents, just to ensure that we focus this debate on the actual most important issues.

There will probably be a lot of discussion about how much parking the typical building and the typical neighborhood needs, and that is not a bad thing to talk about.

But by and large, it's not
relevant to this particular issue because, as we've found with so many development projects that we have seen recently, property owners voluntarily choose in almost all cases to build more parking than the minimum demands.

That means that the market is in most cases working well without needing the artificial force of a zoning rule.

People will decide whether the residents of their buildings need some parking or don't need parking, and if they do need parking, they will build that parking there, not simply all seeking to not put any in at all.

But there are many places where the zoning code is demanding parking that is not necessary and it is in those specific situations that is most important.

Those are the situations where people are building in transit-rich areas where the property owners are finding their garages go empty.
And that is, therefore, forcing up the cost of the construction and the housing as you've heard from a lot of the people very recently and so I simply ask you to focus on these cases.

If someone is going to come and say that in their neighborhood there is a building and it has a garage and that garage needs to be there and people use it, that is great.

But if you go ahead with the Office of Planning's proposal, that does not at all mean that building will or a building like it will suddenly not have any parking at all.

In addition, there will probably be a lot of talk about the difficulty or non-difficulty of on-street parking. Parking minimum changes, we have found, are not actually very closely tied to the difficulty of parking on the street.

In a lot of neighborhoods, like I
have a cousin who lives in Ward 4 who they all have garages in those houses in her neighborhood and almost everybody uses those garages for storage and parks their cars on the street because it's easy to park on the street.

In a lot of other neighborhoods, we've found that people will park on the street when it's easy enough to do so and maybe they'll rent out those spaces to somebody instead.

In general, people choose to park off street if they feel that they don't want to deal with the general hassle of having to move a car for street sweeping and so forth. They will park on the street if it is easy enough to do so.

The Department of Transportation needs to come up with a solution to our on-street parking problems, many of which are real in many neighborhoods.

There are problems with parking
on the street, but we are not going to solve that problem by requiring excessive amounts of parking off street.

One way we know this is that we already require excessive amounts of parking off street in many cases and we haven't solved that problem.

So continuing to require something that's not solving a problem is not going to make the problem go away. Rather, we need to actually solve the problem directly instead of with this indirect method that is not working.

Very quickly also, I know you have received letters from Council members Cheh and Evans asking for some sort of delay in this process.

As I said, these two aren't really connected, which is one reason why I implore you not to delay this change simply to wait for DDOT to fix the other problems. That is because we have been talking about
this change for so many years now and it is a very important change to make.

And it's important change to make now so that we don't continue to drive up the cost of housing now and also because not solving the problem, as I said, not solving one problem is not going to solve a different problem.

Therefore, please go ahead with this change while also asking DDOT to get its act together on dealing with the on-street parking issues.

The Office of Planning has compromised their initial recommendations and those that you approved in 2008 many, many times. They feel that it's politically necessary. I think they feel they're responding to a lot of constituent feedback.

I disagree that it is necessary or that it is the best policy but you are not necessarily even bound by that and could go ahead and even ask them to stick with the
more aggressive changes that you actually approved yourselves.

However, if you don't want to do that, I also urge you, please, not to feel any obligation to compromise further. This has already been compromised so much. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MS. ROSE: Good evening. I'm Patty Rose. I'm the executive director of Greenspace. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is your light lit up?

MS. ROSE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. ROSE: Can you hear me now?

(No response)

MS. ROSE: I'm Patty Rose. I'm the executive director of Greenspace so I'm speaking on behalf of the organization, which is a D.C.-based nonprofit with the mission of making real estate, economic and community
development green in the District for the past ten years.

I have also been a mayoral appointee for the past seven years to the District's Green Building Advisory Council, and I'm here today to express my support for reducing or eliminating the parking minimums.

The 2006 Green Building Act is one of the foundational laws of the District's transformation to a greener, healthier community.

And since 2006, we have enacted legislation and policies that target reducing our energy consumption and increasing the use of clean and renewable energy sources, adopted stringent stormwater management requirements that will clean our rivers and make them swimmable and fishable and reduced trash by encouraging use of reusable bags and making recycling common practice. Reducing parking minimums belongs in this category.

Greenspace's original mission was
to make affordable housing in its neighborhoods green or sustainable.

I have worked with real estate development professionals to improve the performance of the District's affordable housing design, construction, finance and the operations.

While we also worked with commercial and retail development professionals, it is the affordable housing residents that will, I think, benefit most from the significant reduction of minimum parking requirements for high-density, mixed-use areas that are well served by transit.

Riding public transportation, walking and biking are not only healthier for one's body but also for one's pocketbook since not owning a car saves, on average, about $10,000 a year.

Most residents of affordable units don't own cars and cannot afford to or prefer not to have to pay for parking they
don't need.

Parking requirements unnecessarily increase housing costs, as we've heard many times, and also parking requirements subsidize car ownership, causing more people to own cars than they would if they were making a tradeoff between the full cost of different transportation choices.

Reforming parking mandates recognizes that more than half of all renters in the city don't own a car.

The District's zoning policy should support those households that don't own cars and developers and property owners should not be forced to go through a Board of Zoning Adjustment process to reduce their parking requirements.

Fact, the cost of off-street parking is almost never paid for by the user but, instead, is subsidized by everyone in the building because the market price is below the actual cost. This is unfair to the
people who want to live without a car.

One U Street developer estimated that the cost of a parking space is about $480 per month per space. The market price, however, is on average $221 per month. The huge gap in cost is made up in higher housing costs for everyone.

We are all better off as D.C. residents if new housing can right-size the parking supply to meet the demands of residents rather than build to a government-mandated minimum.

Rather than subsidizing parking and driving, we should let the market build parking for those who want to pay for it.

There is a growing realization that the dysfunction caused by poorly conceived parking policies is a major impediment to creating an effective and balanced urban transportation system.

We don't want the District to be designed around parking. Let's leverage our
city's parking policy to affect positive environmental objectives and productive economic outcomes. Thanks for your time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Next.

MR. HOLMAN: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Corey Holman and I'm a resident of the 900 block of 14th Street, Southeast, in Ward 6, newly minted homeowner.

Originally I was going to discuss the need for long-term thinking and praise the flexibility that reducing minimums brings to downtown transit-rich corridors on the residential side.

Instead, tonight I want to share just a quick story about why the parking minimums and transit zones needs to be reduced in the first place.

As I was walking to dinner this weekend, my wife and I passed a large building being renovated on the southeast
corner of 13th and Pennsylvania Avenue, Southeast.

This building was a deteriorating commercial office space until it was recently purchased by a developer with plans of a mixed retail and commercial space.

However, the developer recently announced that the building will remain fully commercial office space because the property doesn't have the required parking available on site for retail uses.

This site is one block from the Potomac Avenue Metro, it's on the 30s line, it's a block away from the V7,8,9, it's on the Skyland-Potomac Avenue Circulator, it shares a block with a Bikeshare station and it's near many on-street, car-sharing spots. It's basically the definition of a transit-rich zone.

As any resident of lower Pennsylvania Avenue can tell you, the vast majority of existing commercial space along
the road is underutilized and the addition of neighborhood-serving retail would be welcome.

For residents to lose out on that opportunity of a new retail space due to parking restrictions on by-right development in a transit-rich area of town is a shame.

We all know the developer could go to the BZA and likely win but that adds cost to development, and as much as I wish it weren't true, development in my area and many other areas of town currently is a marginal proposition financially and additional cost often makes redevelopment untenable.

In the proposed regulations, I believe the building likely would have enough parking spaces by-right. It has about five or six in the rear.

I also want to note specifically in Chapter 19-03.2, Subsection E, which makes special exemptions to minimums available if there isn't the demand required for the minimum amount of parking.
I think that's a very important point to get in the regulations now. Who knows if it's going to take another 50 years to get another zoning rewrite done. With that, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You were actually at first bell. Remember when you need to stop. The first bell is just that you need to wind up. You had another minute.

MR. HOLMAN: Oh, I know, yes.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next.

MR. FIDLER: Good evening. My name is Eric Fidler and I'm a resident of 439 Elm Street, Northwest, in LeDroit Park. That's Ward 1. I am here tonight to express my support for OP's update to the zoning code.

I'm originally from this area but when I was looking to buy a home a few years ago I only looked at D.C. for numerous
reasons, but especially because of its walkability which few jurisdictions around here can match. I wanted to live in a place where I could walk to a coffee shop, a restaurant, a grocery store and a Metro station.

We are blessed to have many neighborhoods in our city which provide these features, largely because much of our city was built before parking requirements.

Since I first testified on this case, the original 08-06 three years ago, I've had more time to think and study parking requirements.

Opposition to lowering parking requirements always seems to stem from fear that residents in the new buildings will do exactly what opponents are doing, they'll park on the street.

After all, the D.C. government basically gives away parking permits for $35 a year. That's about $3 a month and with the
high cost of free parking, UCLA economics professor Donald Shoup, no relation to the witness, proves the subtle damages caused by ample parking.

The most interesting mistake he notes is one you will see over and over again tonight. In economics you cannot talk about supply and demand without talking about price.

Many opponents tonight will argue that D.C. doesn't have enough parking, but they will neglect to say anything about price.

When people say there's not enough parking on the street, what they really mean is that there's not enough parking at $3 a month. Once we start discussing price, we start to see price is the main culprit, not supply.

In fact, in neighborhoods where curbside parking is scarce, not a single person in this room, unless there's a Council
member here, can fix that.

We can set parking ratios at ten spaces per unit, require the parking go ten stories down into the bowels of the earth, but that'll barely have an effect on the availability of street parking because the price differences are so stark.

Constructing and maintaining human-habitable space underground is expensive. It can range from $30 to $60 grand per space built, never mind the cost of running elevators, pumping water, running fans.

If rented at a break-even point, many spaces will remain empty because free parking is just so cheap compared to this.

But it gets worse. These losses are simply passed on to tenants embedded in their rent whether they drive or not, whether or not they own a car.

Shoup makes a great observation that parking requirements are a policy of
affordable housing for cars. Unfortunately it comes at the cost of housing affordability for people.

Furthermore, when the government requires parking, it puts its finger on the scales and tips them in favor of driving by forcing people to pay for it whether or not they use it.

Driving is premised on parking and more parking will mean more driving, which damages air quality, generates more traffic and encourages the creation of pedestrian-hostile built environments, which itself then begets more driving in a vicious circle.

I wish OP would have stuck with the original idea of eliminating rather than having these requirements, but OP, through countless meetings over several years, has struck a good balance, I would say, between residents' opposing views. I strongly urge the Commission to approve OP's draft without
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. We appreciate it. Commissioners, any questions of this panel? Vice Chair Cohen.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Question for Ms. Zenner. Do you have any idea of how seniors get around in your neighborhood?

MS. ZENNER: It really depends on the person. A lot of them take the bus. Some of them do drive. A lot of people do drive in my neighborhood and many of them have off-street parking near the buildings already.

Mostly I was telling the story about the building that is about a block away from me that is really half empty even late at night.

Usually, in my neighborhood, on-street parking is plentiful during the day. At night it kind of fills up but, again, as I think others have mentioned, I think that's
an issue for DDOT to take up as an issue of parking management and not about dictating what should be built.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you. Ms. Rose, you quoted a number of specific numbers. Can you tell me where they came from? The cost of a parking space per month and the market price, where did those numbers derive?

MS. ROSE: They derived from several reports which I am happy to include in an addendum to my testimony.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I'd appreciate that.

MS. ROSE: Sure.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you. And then lastly, Mr. Fidler.

MR. FIDLER: Fidler.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes. Eric, can you also give us a copy of your testimony? Be very helpful.

MR. FIDLER: Oh, sure.
(Off microphone discussion)

VICE CHAIR COHEN: We do have it?

(Off microphone discussion)

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Oh yes, we do.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioners, any other -- Commissioner Miller.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any questions but I just wanted to thank each of you for your thoughtful testimony and for your commitment to the city.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would echo Commissioner Miller's comments. I just wanted to confirm, Ms. Shoup, you're not related to Professor Shoup, right?

MS. SHOUP: No. I've been asked that all my life but, no, I'm not.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, no other
questions? Ms. Shoup, you mentioned that the -- I'm not picking on you. I think it was you -- Shoup? I'm sorry. Actually I've heard it pronounced many different ways, but Ms. Shoup. Ms. Shoup, I think in your testimony you said young folks living next door to older folks, right?

MS. SHOUP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And let me ask you something because here's my problem, what I'm grappling with. I understand the reality of what we're asking for, Mr. Alpert and others who we see every night, which is very applaudable. I want to say that to you too.

But let me just say this. Balancing this is where it all lies down for me. So, again, going back to the Vice Chair's question, how do older folks get around? Because here's the thing. All of us in this room may be getting around pretty good right now and being more mobile.

But I can tell you, I love to
play basketball. My wife retired me about a year ago because it takes me three days to recoup from one game of basketball where I used to bounce back in seconds.

COMMISSIONER MAY: You should try volleyball. You know, you play in the sand. A lot easier.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I see. Commissioner May wants to start it tonight. But again, I mean, I hear that now. I hear - -

COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, volleyball's starting in just a few minutes from now.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good. That's why we have you here. Maybe your team will win tonight.

But I'm saying as far as balancing that, I mean, you know, now we're walking very well and we're riding bicycles and we're doing a lot of the transit-rich areas. I understand all that.
But at some point in time, we're going to need some assistance and we may not be there yet but if we keep living we're going to get there, except for the Vice Chair. She says she will be well.

But, anyway, help me to balance that because you mentioned in your testimony young folks and old folks. Now I'm going to be quiet. Help me balance that.

MS. SHOUP: Well, I have two anecdotes. The first one is that I used to live on Florida Avenue and 14th Street, Northwest, you know, right on the 14th Street corridor.

And there was an old used car lot on the corner called Latino Auto Sales and it was empty, vacant, for 15 years. Guys would hang out there. Homeless men would sleep there. It was pretty terrible. I lived right around the corner from it.

And a developer bought the site and wanted to redevelop it into something
useful and put housing on it. With the inclusionary zoning law, it was going to have 20 percent affordable. It was a great development.

But the developer was required to put in an underground parking garage and that was going to drive up the prices of the market rate units way beyond where the regular folks could afford.

And there was a couple on my street that owned a row house and they'd owned it for 30 years and they couldn't get up and down the stairs anymore.

And they were so excited that development was going to go in because they could stay on that block and they could live in that apartment.

And because of the parking requirement, they couldn't afford the units anymore and so they were not sure what they were going to do after that. So they wanted to stay in the neighborhood but they couldn't
and they were sort of struggling with what to do next.

The second story I'll say is now I live in a co-op building in Adams Morgan and 75 percent of my building is retired probably at this point.

But they live about a block from Safeway and a couple blocks from Harris Teeter and there's a grocery store across the street.

And they're all really happy to stay there as long as they possibly can because they don't need a car and that's part of the reason that they live there and they're going to live there as long as they possibly can.

Some of their friends who, you know, live in other neighborhoods or outside the District need a car to get around and they're really struggling now with how they're going to get groceries because they've driven their whole lives and now they
can't drive anymore and they're not sure what they're going to be able to do. They can't afford the neighborhoods that they live in now and they can't afford to drive anymore.

So I think that these parking requirements are really going to keep D.C. affordable for the elderly to continue to live in these neighborhoods.

I don't know if that answers your question totally, but from my experience that's what I see.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I appreciate your comments. Mr. Alpert, you wanted to comment?

MR. ALPERT: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I mean I think that your concern for seniors and balancing is a very good one.

But, you know, in addition to agreeing with what Ms. Shoup said, for example, my immediate next door neighbor is a senior. He's lived in his house for multiple decades. Told me all about what the house we
own now was like in the 1950s and '60s and who lived there at various times. It was fascinating.

He's actually one of the people in the immediate vicinity who has no car. He walks. He sits in his parking space actually every afternoon and talks to the neighbors as they go by.

And he walks to the grocery store and he walks to all of these things. So one thing is that some of our walkable places are the best for seniors.

But certainly understanding that many seniors also live in parts of the city that are more car dependent and that will continue. Hopefully they'll be able to manage when, you know, deteriorating abilities make it difficult to drive.

But I think the important point is that parking is not going to go away. There are a lot of parts of our city that are more car oriented and they have parking and
all that parking is going to remain and that will continue to exist.

We're going to continue to be a city that has people who drive and people who don't, areas with a lot of parking and areas with a little parking.

And the Office of Planning is not proposing that we wholesale convert to a no driving/no parking city. Far from it.

They are saying, though, that there are areas where there's new growth and there are many new residents who don't want to drive and we're not accommodating them with our zoning.

But established areas I think won't change, shouldn't, and it's good that there will continue to be options for people to have cars and park or not have cars and not park.

And finally I think your concern about balancing is very good and I would just ask you to keep in mind that, in my view, the
Office of Planning has bent over backwards to balance and they've balanced a lot.

They had a proposal first and then they water it down a little bit and then they change it a little bit, they listened, they backed off a little bit and so on.

So I hope you will ultimately conclude that between maybe the initial OP proposal and the status quo we have a place in the middle and that place in the middle is what OP is proposing right now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right, thank you all very much. I want to thank you all, as my colleagues already mentioned, for your testimony. It was very helpful. Thank you, appreciate it.

Okay. Jason Broehm, Elizabeth Borkowski, Jim Schulman, that's a name from the past, Moira McCauley, Jeffrey Norman, Geoffrey Hatchard, Erica Flock, Lane McFadden. Okay, I think that should be eight.
Okay, so since the other three are coming to join us, we're going to start from my right again and work our way to the left. We're going to start from my right and work our way to the left. You may begin. Could you make sure your light is lit up? It's a little --

MR. BROEHM: Yes, there it is.

Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to testify. I am Jason Broehm and I live in Columbia Heights at 3542 10th Street, Northwest, which is in Ward 1.

I support the proposed update to the D.C. zoning code, particularly the changes that would modernize outdated parking requirements.

And I strongly urge the Zoning Commission to revise D.C.'s 1950s-era zoning regulations to encourage continued progress toward making D.C. an even more vibrant city where it is easy to get around by foot, bicycle and transit.
Nearly 14 years ago I sold my car and moved to D.C. to start my career. Over this time, I have chosen to live in walkable neighborhoods that are well served by transit, Adams Morgan, Dupont Circle and now in Columbia Heights.

I love this city and I've spent my free time advocating to make it better. I spent a decade as a local Sierra Club leader in which I advocated for more environmentally friendly transportation policies including leading a campaign to encourage D.C. government to build the 37-mile streetcar network.

And for the last three and a half years I've served on the D.C. Pedestrian Advisory Council seeking to help the D.C. government make it safer and easier to walk across D.C. and all parts of our city.

During my time living in D.C., I've witnessed significant progress but we can and must do more.
Our 1950s-era zoning code is a product of a much different era, one in which the car was king, gas prices were low, the suburbs were growing and roads were being built to support transportation in and out of cities.

A lot has changed in the last 50 years and D.C. zoning code is long overdue for an update to reflect the 21st-century realities we face.

Our population is growing again after decades of decline. We now have a Metro system. 38.5 percent of D.C. households do not own a car as the Office of Planning pointed out earlier.

Gas prices are expected to continue to rise in the years to come and we must become more sustainable to address climate change.

When former Mayor Anthony Williams set a goal of increasing D.C.'s population by 100,000, a fellow advocate
reframed it to me and others in transportation terms as achieving that population goal without the nightmare of 100,000 more cars entering our city.

As D.C.'s population has increased, fortunately our leaders have supported better walking and biking infrastructure, car sharing, bike sharing, transit expansion to promote mobility without the need to own a car.

Residents in many neighborhoods and across the city now live car-free or car-lite lifestyles.

Unfortunately existing zoning regulations create incentives to provide more parking for more cars than may be necessary or desirable and if you build the parking spaces you're likely to attract more cars.

This also entails a cost to homeowners and renters as others have pointed out.

The Office of Planning's proposal
to decrease parking minimums on sites located near transit, remove minimum parking requirements downtown and encourage car sharing and bike sharing in some instances constitutes an important step forward and I encourage you to support it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. Next.

MS. BORKOWSKI: Thank you for the opportunity to testify tonight in favor of updating parking requirements as part of the District zoning code updates.

My name is Liz Borkowski and I have been a non-car-owning resident of the District for the past 14 years living in Ward 1.

I support the Zoning Commission's proposals to remove and relax parking minimums because doing so will help make housing more affordable and contribute to creation of the well-balanced and multimodal transportation system called for in the D.C.
Comprehensive Plan.

As a resident of Columbia Heights, and before that Adams Morgan, I appreciate the many investments D.C. has made in bus service, bike lanes and pedestrian infrastructure.

I appreciate being able to walk to stores, restaurants, the gym and my friends' homes, and this walkability is one of the main reasons my husband and I chose to buy a home in the District.

In purchasing a home, however, we experienced higher costs that I believe were due to parking minimums that are no longer appropriate for D.C.

We purchased our condo from the building's developer three years after its construction. We did not want to purchase a parking spot in the building's underground garage because we do not own a car and prefer to spend our money on other priorities.

However, the developer had
evidently been unable to sell many of the building's parking spaces and made our purchase of the unit contingent on us buying two parking spaces at a total cost of $30,000.

In the end, we were able to purchase one space rather than two, but we are still paying for a space that we use only infrequently.

My husband and I are fortunate that we can afford to pay for a parking space we rarely use but many are not so fortunate. Requiring the construction of parking spaces in excess of those residents want and can pay for increases housing costs unnecessarily.

As housing becomes less affordable, lower-income residents struggle to stay in the city. Removing and relaxing parking minimums can help this become a welcoming city for people of all income levels.

I understand that many people
need to drive cars and I might myself fall into that category one day. But the District has for too long privileged driving above other transportation modes and relaxing parking minimums is an important step in ongoing efforts to improve the balance.

As a public health researcher, I have watched evidence accumulate regarding the environmental and health benefits of human-powered and public transportation, benefits for individuals and for communities as a whole.

When parking spots are readily available, people who could easily use other modes are more likely to default to driving.

Removing parking minimums will allow those who prefer to use alternative transportation modes the opportunity to use them and not pay for parking.

As more people walk, bike and take transit, we can invest more in improving these transportation modes.
In short, removing and reducing parking minimums will help achieve a healthier and more equitable future for the District of Columbia. I support this update to the zoning code.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Next.

MS. MCCAULEY: Hello. My name is Moira McCauley and I also want to thank the Commission for taking on this zoning update.

I was in support of the earlier version that would impose some parking maximums in transit zones, but I am still for this update.

I've lived in the District for nine years. I owned a car when I moved here but I got rid of it after a year because it was more of a hassle than a benefit.

I think, as Mr. Zimbabwe made clear, there are many ways of getting around the city and probably in the next 50 years even more are going to be invented as, you
know, we wouldn't have known about car sharing when this current zoning code was put into place.

I live in Ward 2 right now. I live in an apartment building, a rental building, with about 20 units and residents are, there are many people, young people at the beginning of their careers.

We're all studio apartments and that includes a family of three, an immigrant family of three, and, until he passed away recently, an elderly minister.

All of us are living there because of the low price of our housing for our neighborhood, and many of us would like to buy and are concerned that we won't be able to buy homes in the District because of the high prices and I believe that those prices are because of the parking requirements.

I want to address the issue of age that Mr. Hood brought up because I have
parents who are in their 70s and they live in rural Maryland.

And they both watched their mothers lose their ability to drive with age and so they're starting to plan for their late life and they're deciding that they don't want to live somewhere like they live now where they're not going to be able to get around once they're not able to drive.

And so I think about that a lot when I think about parking in this city and driving in the city. I think that we have many ways for people to get around after they lose the ability to drive, if they do, in their older age.

And I also have in my family two wheelchair users and they also live in transit-rich areas where they don't need cars to get around.

And so I think that right now the city is doing a really good job of providing opportunities for people to get around
without cars.

So I'm for the minimization of parking requirements because I think we have a great city with a lot of other ways of getting around. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Great, thank you.

Next.

MR. NORMAN: Hi. My name is Jeffrey Norman. I live on Connecticut Avenue in Ward 3 and you have my prepared testimony but rather than reading that I just wanted to add a few additional remarks.

I support the Office of Planning’s proposals to sharply reduce the parking requirements for new apartment buildings near good public transportation.

In most cases these buildings are also located on major streets, like Connecticut Avenue, within walking distance of many stores.

There are many D.C. residents like me who live in these buildings who do
not have cars and who have no difficulty living in D.C. and who do not need parking spaces.

This is why the parking requirements for such buildings should not be the same as those required for single-family homes or other buildings in the more suburban-like areas of the city that are not within walking distance of good public transportation.

And I'd also like to make a comment concerning some of the elderly. Many of them actually get to the point where they cannot drive because of things like poor eyesight and for other reasons so it's not something that necessarily is going to help them, by having the parking space.

There are a number of elderly people from my building who walk to the grocery store all the time with no difficulty. And if the packages are too heavy to carry, they take shopping carts with
them which you can buy in any drugstore like CVS and you see them all the time in my neighborhood so that's not a problem. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MR. SCHULMAN: Good evening, Chairman Hood, Zoning Commissioners and staff. My name is Jim Schulman. I'm a registered architect and a sustainability advocate and I live and work in Ward 6. I am pleased to be able to comment upon some of the many proposed changes to the D.C. zoning code.

With respect to the proposed changes in Subtitle C, I generally concur with reducing or eliminating minimum parking requirements.

Although the reduction in parking minimums does not go as far as is needed for the long-term health and well-being of the District of Columbia and the metropolitan region, they do represent a significant
improvement from the current zoning code.

Reducing the heavy impacts of
car-centric transportation planning and
lifestyles is something with which our
government leaders and agencies are actively
grappling and it is much to their credit.

Ultimately we need to turn an
already quite walkable municipality into one
where uses are so mixed that 90 percent of
all residents, jobs, housing, services,
recreation and amenities are met within one
half mile. This is possible. When that
happens, less public and private money will
need to be spent on transportation.

As a townhouse resident on
Capitol Hill, I recognize that the proper way
to address the high demand for street parking
on residential streets is through reform of
the residential parking permit rules and
prices, not necessarily via zoning.

With greater restrictions on
access to RPPs, however, it seems that
zoning-wise we could reduce primary household parking minimums to below one per principal dwelling that has alley access.

On Page C-63 of the proposal, I noticed that off-site parking is stipulated at a maximum distance of 400 feet from the use or structure.

Prince George's County allows off-site parking to be within 500 feet. Are the residents of Prince George's County able to walk farther than D.C. residents? I think not.

And I urge the off-site parking distance to err on the side of liberality. We want to encourage folks to walk a little bit farther.

Inclusionary zoning is among the most important improvements to our zoning code in recent times and even it has not yet had the opportunity to be proven in a thriving economy.

In the proposal we're discussing
tonight, I see that inclusionary zoning is not applied to all zoning districts. Perhaps there are functional reasons for these exclusions.

In any case, I would like the reasons for such exclusions to be clearly stated in the text of the zoning code or otherwise be eliminated.

My primary interest is to see that the zoning map and comprehensive plans delineate our human settlement patterns as an organism with fully integrated but differentiated uses and functions.

The zoning code, even as proposed, is still very much about segregating rather than integrating uses, and this is essentially why it protects vested property interests pretty much as they existed in the 1940s.

But this criticism pertains more to the map than it does to the code.

Changing the name of existing commercial
zones to mixed-use zones is a toe in the water.

Preserving by-right and encouraging more locally owned corner stores providing fresh food and other health-supported products and services in residential areas in the zoning code is also a welcome move.

It does not, however, significantly move the full spectrum of community services into residential neighborhoods, except along overly long commercial corridors that could have more flourishing nodes of mixed-use activity through careful zoning or even form-based zoning as has been used successfully along Columbia Pike in Arlington County.

If I still have time left, I also note that land owned by the federal or District governments as of 1990 is exempted entirely from zoning on Page A-10.

If our region is to have a chance
of integrating its land-use functions, green infrastructure and human activity, all land, regardless of ownership, should be zoned.

If the federal government bristles at having to comply with local laws, please urge the NCPC to develop its own federal interest zoning rules or otherwise abide by those developed by and for the citizens who reside in the federal district.

I thank you for this opportunity to share my views and I would be happy to attempt to answer any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.

Next.

MR. HATCHARD: Commissioners, good evening. My name is Geoffrey Hatchard and I'm a homeowner in the Trinidad neighborhood in the 1200 block of Oates Street, Northeast.

I come before you today to state my strong support for the proposed changes to the D.C. zoning code, particularly regarding
parking requirements.

This is not the first time I've been before the Commission to discuss this issue. Nearly three years ago to the day, November 15th, 2010, I was here to discuss parking requirements.

I think it's possible to view the past three years of growth in this city as a kind of teaching laboratory. It's showed us that an increase in population and density can occur without the need for a parallel increase in the amount of space we reserve for the storage of automobiles.

Thankfully developers have learned their lessons and seen the importance of a well-designed, truly urban neighborhood.

Places like the Babe's Billiards site in Tenleytown or future condos on Church Street near Logan Circle are foregoing parking in new construction, realizing there's a strong market out there that can't afford to absorb the cost of owning space to
store an automobile.

D.C. is lucky in that it has many neighborhoods that were designed for people during a period of time when walking was the primary way to get from their homes to work to shop to worship and to socialize.

Those neighborhoods have retained their popularity and desirability for more than a century in some instances. Their basic layout has stood the test of time but would, in some ways, be impossible to build in today's D.C. due to outmoded parking requirements.

I'm excited to see that the ability to share parking between adjacent sites with differing uses has been retained in the current proposal.

This is a common-sense idea that everyone in the city can surely support. Why build parking that sits unused most of the time when multiple businesses, churches or community organizations can team up and share
spaces? It's efficient, elegant and a brilliant idea.

I was attracted to live in D.C. for many reasons, with one of the biggest being that I knew that I would be able to live without a car.

As I've testified before, I grew up in Michigan where the thought of an existence without a car is entirely foreign.

But once I saw that I could save money and live a healthier lifestyle using transit, a bicycle and walking, I knew I wanted the opportunity to try that. No place looked more likely to give me that chance in this area than right here in D.C.

My wife and I found our home in Trinidad, which is an amazing, friendly, welcoming community. We're on the edge of the L'Enfant City, close to many of the benefits of a walkable city that I spoke of earlier, and we can see the new development sprouting up all around us. It's heartening
to see this growth happening in a way that leverages the advantages of our city in a smart way.

        I encourage adoption of these changes to the zoning regulations and thank you for the opportunity to testify this evening.

        CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.

        Next.

        MR. MCFADDEN: Good evening. My name is Lane McFadden and I live with my family on the 300 block of 14th Street, Northeast, in Ward 6. Previously we lived in Ward 1 and before that in Ward 2.

        I'm also here tonight to express my strong support for the proposed update to the city's zoning code.

        I'm sure that eventually you're going to hear some concerns about the proposals. Presumably people are going to wonder whether they'll have a harder time parking their own cars as a result.
I've lived in D.C. for a little over a decade now and I've repeatedly encountered situations where these concerns were expressed at great length and turned out to be unnecessary.

The first home that my wife and I owned in D.C. was a condominium in Columbia Heights. It had 12 units in the building and there were six deeded surface parking spots behind the building.

Each unit that had a parking space accompanying it sold for a $30,000 to $35,000 premium, which in that building was about a 10 percent bump in the cost of the unit, which back then was a down payment.

That's a lot of buyers that were priced out for the parking spaces and I was lucky to get a unit that didn't have one.

My neighbors that did buy a parking space didn't use it either and they tried renting it on Craig's List to local neighbors. The local neighbors didn't need...
off-site parking so they rented it to commuters from Maryland.

This is one of the most densely populated zip codes in the city. I believe at the time it might have been the most densely populated zip code, and instead of building more housing on that land, we just had empty blacktop that no one wanted and that our neighbors and us weren't using.

I have now moved across town to Northeast D.C. where my daughter now attends a public charter school that we're very happy with.

But it almost didn't open because when they were proposing the charter school nearby residents were concerned about traffic and about parking concerns.

Bear in mind this is a preschool with 3- and 4-year-olds so the students weren't driving but there were, of course, teachers.

And fortunately the school did
eventually open and the parking and traffic aren't problems because many of the parents whose children attend the school don't drive cars and neither do my daughter's teachers. They take Metro even though we're located a good mile from the nearest Metro stop.

I, myself, bike to school most mornings, my daughter on the back of the bike. It makes us happier and healthier. We enjoy that ride. She makes motorcycle sounds on our way to school.

And it just makes me sad to think that these imaginary parking concerns almost kept the school from opening entirely because, I mean, we live in a school boundary where there's a long wait list for preschool. We didn't get in. Many of our neighbors didn't get in.

There are more kids than there are preschool seats and to keep a school from opening because of a handful of parking spaces I think would have been a serious, it
would have been very shortsighted and I'm glad to see that didn't happen.

And the fact is, for decades, the zoning code and other policies in D.C. have prioritized cars and parking and even with those priorities written into the law you still have a city where nearly 40 percent of the households don't own a car. I think we should have a zoning code that supports those residents and the generations that are coming after them.

And I agree with previous statements that if the concern is about street parking and where you're going to put your car in public space, the appropriate people to answer that question is the District Department of Transportation.

And we should manage street parking more effectively. We shouldn't use the blunt instrument of a zoning code to do that but we should, instead, deal with it directly. I think that will solve that
problem.

And let's have a zoning code that makes housing and space more affordable for people, rather than cars.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MS. FLOCK: Hi. My name is Erica Flock. I live in Ward 3 in Tenleytown. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment on the proposed updates.

When I moved to D.C. from Reston, Virginia in early 2012, I brought my car with me. It was a blue Pontiac Vibe. I really liked that car.

As a daughter of Southeast Michigan, I have another Michigander on the panel here, a place where the Big Three are revered, my first new car was a kind of milestone.

I had a lot of family members who worked in the auto industry. My great-grandfather worked in the first Ford assembly plant, so this is kind of, you know, it's in
But as soon as I parked that Vibe behind my shared house in Tenleytown, it started collecting dust so to speak. It was more pleasant and less hassle to bike along the Capital Crescent Trail to my job in Bethesda, to take the bus and Metro to visit friends around the city.

I realized I was paying hundreds of dollars in insurance a year to keep a rapidly depreciating and unused piece of metal in the back lot and decided to sell it.

This month actually marks the first anniversary of my car-free life and I wouldn't have it any other way. Now the parking space behind our house has a picnic table sitting on it. My two housemates don't have cars either.

D.C. is a special city. There are precious few places in this country where one can commute and run errands without a car. Sixty-three percent of D.C. residents
my age get to work without a car.

The things that make the city so wonderful, its walkable neighborhoods, its robust transit network, its vibrant street life, are things that aren't served by a zoning code conceived in the era of the automobile.

That's why I'm here to support the proposed updates to the zoning code, particularly the exemptions from parking minimums.

I was surprised to learn recently that the parking structure under DC USA in Columbia Heights regularly has a full level of parking that goes unused. The developers in Brookland don't expect the parking spaces they built to be filled.

Why do we demand that developers spend significant amounts of money constructing parking spaces if they know people won't use them? D.C. residents end up shouldering the burden of these parking
minimums in higher living costs.

I wasn't born here but I love this city and I have no plans to leave. I love the festivity of neighborhood days and block parties. I love that I'm constantly running into friends by accident, that the city's special character invites wandering, sometimes for miles.

This quality of life, this sense of a community shouldn't be accessible only to the wealthy. Please make D.C. a more affordable and pedestrian-friendly place to live by approving the proposed updates. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank this panel. We appreciate your testimony. Let's see if we have any questions. Any questions? Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I just want to ask Mr. Schulman something. You made the statement about federal properties not being subject to zoning.
So, first of all, District properties, generally speaking, are subject to zoning and I think that was, what, 1995 that the Council passed the -- 1991. So District properties are subject to zoning.

MR. SCHULMAN: That's good. I wasn't aware of that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, right. And then when it comes to the federal properties, there's a sovereignty thing that you have to deal with there.

But that, I mean the idea of having those sorts of controls, I guess what I'm wondering is do you find that there's actually, are there concrete examples of federal properties sort of being erected in complete defiance of what's happening locally? Because I don't have that sense but then again I don't live everywhere or see the whole city all the time.

MR. SCHULMAN: I wasn't including that in my testimony because of a specific
example but more of the longer range goal of trying to integrate land uses. And if government and governance is sort of the biggest business in town, we'd be foolish not to try to integrate it better.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I mean I serve on NCPC, as does Commissioner Miller, and so there's often talk of the sort of in lieu of zoning authority when it comes to federal properties.

And I guess if there was a sense that somehow their exercise of that authority, and it's not as explicit as the zoning code is here but, you know, it does sort of guide their thinking.

And I think they're very conscious of the city zoning regulations because they do weigh in on certain zoning cases. So I would be very interested to know if, in fact, that process was somehow falling down.

I don't know that it's going to
help us in the zoning reg rewrite because we're certainly not going to be able to zone federal properties but it would help, I think, NCPC to know if there were some shortcomings to their in lieu of zoning authority.

MR. SCHULMAN: I'll put my thinking cap on for you.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And I guess that, I mean that kind of goes to anybody, if there are thoughts about that. I mean, you know, I'd be interested in hearing that, again, not necessarily for this process but for, you know, when I'm putting on another hat.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions or comments? Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Flock, you state in your testimony that "63 percent of D.C. residents my age get to work without a car." Without being specific, can you tell me the range of
your age as well as where you got the 63 percent?

MS. FLOCK: Yes, that was actually Washington Post did a recent series on millennial generation and I think that was a statistic in the article. I can send that to you if you'd like.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: No, that's fine. Thank you.

MS. FLOCK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions? Commissioner Miller.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had no specific questions. I thank each of you for your very thoughtful testimony.

And regarding Commissioner May's question to Mr. Schulman, I would say that, well, we can get to that and we can talk offline about that.

But I would think that to the extent the Zoning Commission makes certain
changes, parking for example tonight, that
the NCPC staff probably would look at their
parking requirements in downtown or near
Metro and try to maybe, I think they do that.
I think they've done that in the past.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I don't
know whether there's an actual comparison of
zoning regs but, of course, it's based on
number of workers as opposed to square
footage as the zoning code would. So I mean
that's why I'm just wondering if --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Something
is wrong.

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- there is
some, you know, misalignment because it's
certainly never come up at NCPC to my
recollection. So I'd just be interested in
people knowing.

MR. SCHULMAN: There is a
misalignment in terms of the laws that could
have gone into effect, like the Clean Air
Compliance Fee that I'm going to be
testifying at the Tax Revision Commission later tonight.

That's an example actually where we could have been approving a federal law to tax parking for federal workers and we lost out on that opportunity. Even Eleanor Holmes Norton voted against that one, but hopefully we'll come back to it.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. I will ask the Office of Planning when we get to the questions next week sometime about the 400 foot versus 500 foot, if we're going to allow shared spaces at off site, what the rationale is for certain feet. So I appreciate bringing that up. Thank you all for your testimony.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions? Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I would just echo the comments of the other Commissioners and thank you for coming here.
tonight and sharing your thoughts on this. And I think the federal dichotomy, it's a very difficult issue. If you look at the beginning, I mean this city started as the federal capital of the country and from that it blossomed into a civilian center of population and there's going to be this dichotomy that's going to exist.

And I know up on Capitol Hill the Architect of the Capitol meets with the community, tries to, but, again, there's the other issues of security. It's difficult. It's a complex issue.

And I think Commissioner May talked about sovereignty and I think when you start raising that bar up you're going to get into a lot of issues that aren't really going to be solved by the zoning regs, at least not at this go-round anyways. But I really thank you for your comments.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I, too, want to thank each of you for comments. But I
have a question. By no means is this question any prerequisite of how we're moving along, but with the exception of maybe Mr. Schulman, do any one of you belong to Greater Greater Washington or the Smart Growth group?

(Off microphone discussion)

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sorry? I mean or a member of? And my reason is, or subscribe to it, depending whether there's a blog, whatever.

And my rationale is because we've been having a lot of testimony from Greater Greater Washington and the Smart Growth group and, again, any decision making, and there's a silent majority that don't show up at our hearings.

And we're trying to reach everyone because at the end of the day when we make this decision I want to make sure we have vetted it city-wide. That's our goal.

Office of Planning has been out
to many, many. So when people come down and say we haven't heard from the Office of Planning, it's kind of rough because I think they've been to every ward and spent hours in every ward on a number of occasions.

And I'm just trying to figure out how do we reach the masses? And I can just tell you that it looks like Greater Greater Washington and the Smart Growth group are doing a good job.

And I said this the other night with Ms. Cort, who may be in the audience tonight, maybe we need to ask them how do we get to the masses because, you know, there's a lesson to be learned and it really is and we're still trying to figure out how do we get to people outside of those particular groups? So, anyway, that's enough said on that. Any other comments, issues?

MR. BROEHM: I would just add that, you know, I think that Greater Greater Washington and Coalition for Smarter Growth
give voice to a lot of people who share the
views you've heard, the first 16 of tonight,
and I think it's really important.

And, you know, I think until
Greater Greater Washington came around there
really wasn't anyone sort of covering that
set of issues. The Washington Post has
really not covered local issues very well,
you know, some neighborhood papers.

But I think it's a really
important voice that has brought a lot of
people to the table, not just at this table
but before the D.C. Council and other
commissions and boards, so I just would like
to say that.

I think it's very important and I
think the fact that people may subscribe or,
you know, agree with those views shouldn't
diminish it in any way.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I actually
think you bring up a good point because, you
know, I don't look at a lot of listservs
because some of them we're on.

    But I think the discussions often is had and a lot of times when you go to community meetings, there are discussions out of there, people are very well informed, like you all are today, on the particular issues, whether it be in front of the Zoning Commission, the ABC Board, your ANC meeting, your civic association, your citizen association, whatever.

    I think that's a way of getting information and people exchanging ideas and getting that information vetted, especially with the listservs. I think that's a positive note.

    I'm just trying to make sure we try to get to as many people as possible. But I appreciate you all coming down and providing testimony. Thank you so much.

    Okay. Yes, I'm actually going to get this name without any help because I'm going to pronounce this one correctly on my
own, Matthew Yglesias. Did I get that right, Yglesias? They're telling me --

(Off microphone discussion)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't get it right? Yglesias, okay. Oh, we called you already?

(Off microphone discussion)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh. Oh, so now the audience is correcting me, okay. But anyway, I think, Commissioner May, you can put one down. You finally got one right.

Okay, Michael Forster, Neha Bhatt, Peter Mason, Stephen Crim, Ryan Crowley, Matt Malinowski. Do I have eight? No. Allen Greenberg, Aimee Custis.

Okay, I saw my Triple A friend. Is he on our agenda for tonight? What's your name? I want to make sure we hear from you.

(Off microphone discussion)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, you're on the agenda?

(Off microphone discussion)
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, okay, okay, good.

MR. FORSTER: Hello. My name is Michael Forster.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You thought we were going to start to my right? Since you started off, why don't you go right ahead.

MR. FORSTER: My name is Michael Forster. I live in the 14th N R in Ward 2. I'm the third member of the Michigan expat community that's shown up today. We come out in droves. I don't know what it is about us. I guess there's no proselytizer like a convert.

Anyway, I am here to talk about my experience. First, I'll talk about my grandmother's experience. She lives in Toledo, Ohio, which has no transit options and so she, unfortunately, can no longer drive herself so she has to get driven everywhere.

So still, for her, the transit-
rich neighborhood would be a big plus and I feel really bad that she doesn't have that. It really restricts her independence.

But I'm going to talk about my experience. My wife and I moved to D.C. in Dupont Circle in 2011.

My wife had a lease on a car and she immediately, after trying to park in Georgetown, decided to turn in the lease and take, like, an $800 hit because we figured that saving the money on parking, it was actually better to pay a dealership to take her Toyota car than to keep it for another two years.

We lived in Dupont for two years and in spite of being just graduated from law school, having loans, not having a large savings account, we were able to save up enough for a down payment on a condo.

I think a lot of that was having to do with neither of having a car so we were able to just have our rent be our main
expense and that was a real benefit and I
don't even think you could build Dupont
Circle anymore with the zoning code that's in
place.

We bought a condo in 14th N R and
I was elected condo president so I saw
immediately, it was a 31-unit building, how
many people immediately wanted to lease out
their space. They didn't want to use their
space.

And someone even recently emailed
the board wanting to convert it to a storage
unit because he didn't want to use it for a
car. And I believe those units were just
built because of the parking minimums.

Also the bike parking hadn't been
finished by the developer yet and I had been
here almost weekly about how where's my bike
parking? And the 14th N R Bikeshare dock
empties out quicker than you'd believe. So,
anyway, that's just my anecdotal views.

I think the parking minimums,
they really sort of subsidize and make cheaper something that's really not that good for us. I think it's like, you know, having minimums of having a minimum amount of French fries with your meal. It doesn't seem to make sense to me.

I mean maybe my perspective as a millennial, as someone who does read Greater Greater Washington -- I mean I'm not a member of a group. I just started reading the articles because it was the smart views that I had never heard before and it's kind of brought me here today. Anyway, thanks for letting me speak.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Next. Turn on your mic.

MR. MASON: I apologize. Good evening, Chairman Hood and other members of the Commission. My name is Peter Mason. I live in Ward 2, actually just a few blocks from here, with my wife and infant daughter.

I'm testifying tonight in support
of lowering the on-street minimum parking requirements as proposed.

I moved here to D.C. in the spring of 2009. Previously I have lived in Houston, New York City, and Minneapolis, and having seen firsthand, especially in Houston, how high off-street parking requirements can affect not only the residents of an area but also small businesses, I believe the proposed changes to the zoning code regarding these off-street parking minimums is a good start to making D.C. an even greater city.

The years of planning, dialogue and meetings that the Office of Planning has put into this zoning change is a good compromise.

Eliminating parking minimums downtown as well as reducing them in areas well served by transit will not only help keep apartments more affordable, but it will also attract a wider variety of small businesses to D.C.
Eliminating minimum parking requirements downtown will not eliminate parking availability. Instead, it will allow developers to decide, based on market conditions, how much to provide for any particular project. Thus, parking will not necessarily be bundled with dwelling units or office space unless a purchaser wants it.

Eliminating minimums will allow for more choice by allowing developers to unbundle these parking spaces and reduce the cost of any unit for somebody that wishes to purchase and not be required to have a parking space included if they do.

In Houston, where I came from prior to being here in D.C., one small business, in response to a proposed code change that they were doing there to increase parking minimums from already high levels in that city, lobbied the City Council to instead reduce or eliminate them, noting how the proposed changes had been in effect when
they first opened they would not have ever been able to open at all, and also noting that the rental cost for parking exceeded their business costs for their business itself by 20 percent. This was due to parking minimums.

For local independent stores and restaurants, this can be a complete, though unnecessary, bar to entering a city.

Thankfully the proposed changes will, instead, help small businesses by not requiring, though still allowing, as much parking as the business wishes.

This will attract a wider variety of businesses, especially independent, not necessarily chain businesses, that D.C. has come to love.

These are just a few reasons I support the proposed changes, and I thank you all for your dedication to this city and for listening to me and the other members of the community tonight.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to present tonight. My name is Matt Malinowski and I live in the Truxton Circle neighborhood in Ward 5 in Northwest. My wife and I are expecting a son.

I would like to speak in favor of the proposed revisions and in particular in favor of eliminating parking minimums downtown and minimizing parking requirements elsewhere, especially near frequent transit.

The current off-street parking requirements for general office use most of downtown, as you know, is one space for every 1,800 square feet in excess of the initial 2,000.

What's interesting is this rule seems very precise and I am sure that there are parties here tonight who will speak in favor of the precision, but is it right?

Many cities across the United
States either have or have had parking minimums, so there seems to be a precedent to maintaining it.

But what is interesting is that each city has a different minimum, with Baltimore requiring more than D.C. and Philadelphia less. How can each city in its own rules be right, or are all cities and the idea of having minimums wrong?

One explanation for the variability is that each city is built differently, the urban form of each city demands a different amount of parking and, sure enough, even within D.C. the minimums vary by zone with less dense zones, like C-1, C-2-A, C-3, requiring one parking space for every 600 feet of floor space.

But what happens then, in effect, crossing the street can triple the parking requirement. Does the urban fabric change so much that three times as many people will now be expected to drive to work?
Also the current system breaks down not just at the boundaries but also within zones.

In Truxton Circle, there are three schools within a block of each other, the newly rebuilt Dunbar High School, a charter school and another charter school in planning.

According to the neighbors, cars are overflowing at the parking lot at Dunbar, while the existing Community Academy Public Charter School, CAPCS, has recently built a parking lot for 140 cars.

Meanwhile, the forthcoming Mundo Verde Public Charter School is seeking a variance to give up 36 of its 53 required parking spaces and build the gardens in their place. Staff are expected to ride bikes, so there are 20 bike parking spots instead, and the Metro is a ten-minute walk away.

So even for the same uses and the same location, one-size-fits-all parking
requirements do not apply, and rather than
develop even finer zone boundaries or new
zone definitions, how about a simpler
solution, eliminating or minimizing parking
requirements wherever possible, that means
downtown, in other higher density zones and
near high-frequency transit.

So rather than perpetuating the
current set of arbitrary requirements based
on unknowable ratios of drivers to occupants,
please focus on what we do know. Land in
D.C. is expensive and driving is
unsustainable and causes congestion for
everyone.

Eliminating or minimizing the
parking requirement allows for the market to
provide parking to those who truly need it,
while making it clear that free parking is
not a right and that D.C. values its
residents and natural environment over cars.

Thank you for your time and for your
service.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MS. BHATT: Hi, everyone. My name is Neha Bhatt. I live in Ward 7, Capitol View neighborhood, about 10-minute walk from the Benning Road Metro.

And I just want to say I am not now, nor have ever been, a card-carrying member of either of the two organizations that were named earlier.

So with all of that, I'm here to talk about the parking proposal. I am for it. It's a step in the right direction, it's the right thing to do and it's long overdue.

I am one of the people who served on the parking task force of public citizens about four and a half, five years ago.

And we went through weeks and weeks and weeks, I want to say something like six to eight weeks, of regular weekly meetings where we were asked to investigate what other cities around the country are doing on their parking zoning code.
We were asked to look at what the results have been and try to figure out which of those approaches best aligns with what our goals are and how our city is constructed.

And after just an insane amount of deliberation, it was a lot of commitment on a lot of public citizens' part, after just a lot of effort and time, we recommended, the vast majority of us recommended to the Office of Planning it's time to get rid of the parking mandate albatross around the city. It's weighing us down in our land development.

I also testified at the parking zoning hearing that was a few years back and, again, you know, testified along the same lines.

And I'm one of the people who, you know, after serving on that task force thought we are ready now, now being five years ago, we're ready to sort of let go of the mandated parking minimums and just let
the market decide.

Five years later we're even more ready. We're so well positioned to do that and cities that are not even close to as well positioned as we are, like Cincinnati, Redwood City, California, they're starting to let go of their parking minimum mandates.

However, having said that, the proposal that's on the table is a good one. We are definitely ready to step forward with this.

Not doing this would be a real missed opportunity in the evolution of the city. Our city is changing. Our city is a national leader. We're recognized over and over again. We're even internationally recognized for some of the stuff that we're doing.

So after five years of deliberation, failing to move forward in a positive direction would be very unfortunate.

And, frankly, the seniors moving
back to age in place who someday soon will need to or want to stop driving, the millennials, which are well represented here, who are choosing to own fewer private cars and the families who make less than $100,000 --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Bhatt, thank you. Thank you very much.

MS. BHATT: I was just going to finish my sentence, but I will stop.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Bhatt, thank you very much. But I'm actually, and I'm going to take this point. I'm glad that you're from Ward 7 because the many nights we've been here we have not had anyone here from Ward 7, so you're the first one. Thank you. But I do have a question for you. We'll come back to you. Next.

MR. CROWLEY: Hello. My name is Ryan Crowley. I live at 1 Scott Circle, Northwest, in Ward 2. I also serve as the chair of the Washington, D.C., Sierra Club's
Smart Growth Committee.

I'm here today to testify in support of the proposal in Subtitle C to reform parking mandates, although I also strongly support provisions in the zoning code update that seek to encourage use of accessory dwellings and corner stores.

My experience is typical of Sierra Club's membership. I've been a resident of Washington, D.C., since 2002. In my dozen years as a District resident, I've explored all the city has to offer by bike, by foot, by bus and rail.

I ride my bike to go fishing at Potomac Park in the summer. In the fall I ride to Fort Dupont Park to navigate the mountain bike trails. I take the S bus to Rock Creek Park and hike Valley Trail circuit and I ride Metro's Red line to visit my family. Throughout the year, I commute to work by bike.

The District offers a wealth of
transportation options that connect neighborhoods and communities, preserve the environment and improve the health of the city's residents.

I am testifying in support of the Office of Planning's proposal to reform parking minimums because I believe the District can do even more to encourage use of its leading transit system and enable car-free and car-lite lifestyles.

We're not opposed to cars. I often rent cars when traveling out of town and use Zipcar when the need arises. However, because the District offers residents so many transportation options, the need to own a vehicle to get around town is greatly diminished.

In fact, nearly 40 percent of District residents do not own a car, a proportion that may be higher in areas that are well served by transit.

Washington is also experiencing
immense growth and, with it, higher demands
for affordable housing.

Structured parking can add tens
of thousands of dollars to the cost of an
apartment, an expense that may make it more
difficult for families to fulfill the dream
of home ownership in our nation's capital.

By requiring more parking, we
create a perverse incentive to drive, which
leads to more traffic congestion and air
pollution. The supply of parking should be
tied to what the market demands, not
arbitrary requirements.

This proposal will help set our
city on a path towards greater
sustainability, a healthy environment and
stronger communities.

I urge the Zoning Commission to
adopt a progressive zoning update that
reforms parking minimums to help make
Washington an even better city for future
generations. Thank you for this opportunity
to testify.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.

Next.

MR. GREENBERG: Hi. My name's Alan Greenberg. I'm a resident of Ward 2. Like others who have testified before me, I'm urging the Zoning Commission to bring balance to the transportation system in this metropolitan area by prioritizing transit, bicycling, walking, over single-occupancy vehicle travel in order to avert gridlock.

Today the Zoning Commission has a rare opportunity to revise the zoning regulations to allow the construction of new developments that are transit accessible, walkable, well-functioning and charming as many of the District's historic developments that were built before today's off-street parking plans made their construction illegal.

Here are the recommendations. I urge the Zoning Commission to move in the
direction proposed by the Office of Planning to reduce onerous minimum parking requirements, especially in transit-proximate developments.

The Zoning Commission, however, should go beyond OP's recommendations by eliminating parking minimums entirely in such areas and even throughout the city.

Providing more parking than market conditions warrant, which is the only purpose that minimum parking requirements serve, cause housing and retail development to be less compact and less transit accessible and significantly more expensive than they otherwise would be.

Requiring the development to be oriented to accommodate automobile parking presents hazards to pedestrians and bicycles and delays bus riders in traffic queues caused primarily by SOVs.

While, as stated above, parking minimums should be abolished city-wide, OP is
correct in recommending that alley access be a pre-condition for retaining parking requirements in single-family dwellings.

Alley access should also be a precondition for minimum parking requirements applying to other uses, especially if only a few parking spaces would otherwise be required.

The detrimental impacts on community design of having to accommodate parking for a de minimis number of spaces, such as four or fewer, would clearly exceed any perceived benefits, especially with curb cuts eliminating on-street parking and endangering pedestrians and pavement to allow parking access typically entailing more space than the parking itself requires destroying green space.

For off-street parking provided by developer choice or otherwise still required, good parking design schemes can somewhat reduce the negative impact of car
parking.

Similarly bike parking requirements encourage cycling. For this reason, I support both of those recommendations on the part of the Office of Planning.

Why is curtailing parking minimums so important? Well, off-street requirements prohibit adaptive reuse of all the buildings and are 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 exceeding the entire housing budget of many District workers.

So then the question is why are we doing this? We're doing this because we don't think that DDOT can manage off-street parking, rather, on-street parking effectively.
But in the one case that was most important that dwarfs in terms of the challenge that we have today, the baseball stadium, they did it very well.

We're using market pricing today in the baseball stadium. The neighbors love it and the demand for on-street parking isn't a fraction of that in any other case that was seen in the development. So I urge you--

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Thank you. All right, thank you. Next.

MR. CRIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the other members of the Commission. My name is Stephen Crim and I'm a very happy resident of Ward 2.

And I'm especially happy to see that in this proposal we would see in our neighborhood a decrease in the minimum off-street parking requirements as well as elimination of the parking requirements in the downtown which is, of course, very proximate to my neighborhood.
I would be even happier if we were talking about the original, more progressive version of the revision that was proposed by the Office of Planning earlier. However, I am happy to support the proposal before you from staff tonight.

I am fortunate enough to be able to afford my neighborhood and, God willing, I will be able to in the future. However, every day affordability for me and others is eroding.

There is no silver bullet, obviously, for our affordability crisis but the devil is in the details and I believe that one of the biggest details in our land's development process today is parking.

Though my former testimony colleagues have mentioned reasons and examples of how parking drives up the cost of housing, I will add one more, which is a recent study from the Urban Land Institute and Enterprise Community Partners which you
may know does and supports affordable housing.

In a survey of affordable housing builders around the country, those developers most frequently cited minimum parking requirements as the reason why they were unable to build more units in their projects, which is something that I think is all the more important in a city like ours which has the wonderful attribute of inclusionary zoning.

I will end by asking the question why would you want to listen to me about this topic? I mean I am a young white man with a hipster moustache and the ability to afford living in Logan Circle and, as we've all mentioned, there are all kinds of transportation needs that reflect different demographics in this city.

However, I think what's important to remember is that no single regulation, such as off-street parking requirements, will
improve or hinder the mobility of families, small and large, young and old or seniors or even my own mobility issues. Parking alone will not do that.

However, I believe that this measure before us will allow home builders, business owners and office developers to build the amount of parking that they think is appropriate and lower cost where it needs to be lowered. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MS. CUSTIS: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Aimee Custis and I'm guilty as charged. I work for the Coalition for Smarter Growth and I'm on the editorial team at Greater Greater Washington.

That being said, trust me when I tell you that I'm here on my own behalf because I'm finishing up a course of antibiotics for a double ear infection, don't worry, Stephen, I'm not contagious, and if I were testifying on behalf of either
organization I'd have pawned it off on somebody else tonight.

I live in Ward 2's Dupont Circle at 1727 Massachusetts Avenue, Northwest. I am here, I'm sure you're not surprised, to express my strong support for lowering off-street parking requirements, especially in areas like mine with great transit.

I've lived in the District for five years and hope to make it my lifelong home. I've never owned a car.

My neighborhood, Dupont Circle, has so much to offer, two grocery stores, my favorite bookstore, a locally owned drugstore, my favorite café, which happens to be the same as my favorite bookstore, shopping, two theaters, a dentist's office, if that's your kind of thing, and so much more, and that's all within five minutes of my front door walking.

I'm seconds away from several major bus routes and can easily walk to
Metro's Red, Orange and Blue lines.

My apartment building on Mass Avenue is a mix of younger people and older, long-time residents who've lived in the building for decades.

And as our building is an older one, it wasn't built with very much parking but that's okay because, guess what, most people in my building don't own a car.

Some, like the very nice old lady on the first floor who constantly asks my boyfriend to help her change light bulbs, have lived in our building so long that they've been there since before the current zoning code was written, the same zoning code that brought with it the requirement that buildings include parking.

At some point I would really like to invest even more in our neighborhood and find a home to buy, probably a condo.

But recognizing that I live in one of D.C.'s nicest neighborhoods, I know
that probably won't be feasible for me, at least on my nonprofit salary, for quite some time, if ever.

But I hope I can find a neighborhood like Dupont with its sidewalks, shops, community festivals and more before prices skyrocket across the city.

Affordability, that's the number one reason I support the zoning update. With housing prices soaring across the District, we can't afford to build parking we don't need.

It will price out long-time residents, like my neighbor, and leave people like me, who want to contribute to our city's long-term success, on the outside looking in.

I want a city where I have the flexibility to purchase a house or a condo without having to purchase a parking spot that I have to buy just because the builder had to build it.

I want a city where we have the
right amount of parking we need, rather than having too much parking, which encourages more driving, which encourages more parking.

While some people will always want or need to drive and should be able to, encouraging car ownership through policies like parking minimums has tipped the scales unfairly toward car ownership and away from me.

Now, for the first time in a generation, many people, in fact, 38 percent of households in the District, are choosing an alternative to personal automobiles and our land use and parking policies shouldn't punish people like me for our choices. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.
Again, let me thank each and every one of you for your testimony. See if we have any questions. Vice Chair Cohen.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Bhatt, now that you're an
expert in transportation throughout the United States, my question is the evaluation that you did of parking policies, including probably Portland, how did you then make that transfer to the unique circumstances of Washington, D.C.?

I ask this question because it has been brought up by a couple of Council people and I'd just like to know, from your point of view as you served on the task force and actually did that research, how would you then answer that point, that we are unique so going out to these other cities, how did that help?

MS. BHATT: Right. I think I understand your question. So I won't be able to say too much specifically since it was a few years back.

But essentially our approach was the consulting firm that was hired by Office of Planning to present us with information about the actual zoning codes on parking on
the different cities, they were asked to present us cities of all sizes in all different parts of the country.

And when we looked at the zoning codes, we looked for universals on sort of underlying frames of thinking and patterns.

So, you know, there were times where we, in our discussions and debates, said something like, you know, well, Portland has this but Portland is in a different stage in terms of the way it's been developing, you know, its urban fabric. We may be on that same track but we're not at the same stage.

And sometimes we might look at a place that's very different, like New York City, and we would ask how does this zoning code apply to neighborhoods that are similar to certain neighborhoods in D.C.?

So we looked at neighborhood-to-neighborhood comparisons as opposed to looking at the entire city just as a homogenous place because when you look at it
that way, of course, there is no city that
compares exactly to ours. They're just not
as good.

But when you start looking at
densities of neighborhoods or what the
functionalities of neighborhoods are, when
you start comparing business districts to
business districts, you start being able to
apply the principles and the codes a little
bit better in trying to figure out how could
this work here?

You know, how would this work in
our downtown compared to the downtown of
Philadelphia or some other city? So we
looked for similarities in that regard.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I want to
thank you for, you know, your testimony but I
also want to thank you for, you know, serving
on that task force. I think you contributed
a great deal.

Mr. Greenberg, you indicate that
the cost of parking through extensive
research adds between $52,000 and $117,000 to the price of housing units. How did you come up with that number? What is your source?

MR. GREENBERG: It's actually a peer-reviewed research paper that I wrote and there were multiple sources.

Essentially you have to add up a range of costs that are typically not considered when you're summing up the actual impact of parking requirements, and part of it is the parking itself directly through land costs. Part of it is maintenance costs.

Another part of it is what it does to the, it changes the character of the development. When you have a parking space requirement that's tied to the number of units, the economics essentially require you to build fewer units and build more expensive units. I'd be happy to provide to you a copy of that paper.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

This is a question for just anybody living in
Ward 2.

Can't find a parking space anywhere so, unless you don't have a car, what do other people do, like visitors, company? What is your suggestion to them? Because there is no parking and so there's a lot of frustration.

MS. CUSTIS: Commissioner Cohen, if I can take a stab at that one. I live in probably the densest part of Dupont Circle right on Massachusetts Avenue.

And while I've never owned a car, for the past year I've lived with my boyfriend who does own a car. His business as a videographer carrying equipment requires him to.

And as much as from time to time it is a challenge to find a parking space, let me tell you that finding a parking space, it's impossible is a bit of a mischaracterization in my experience.

Finding a parking space in front
of my building, perhaps a bit more of a challenge because there are four of them in my high-rise.

But finding a parking space that's closer to my building than the Metro station that's less than 1,000 feet away maybe takes five minutes.

I can't tell you the number of times that I've pulled up and, hey, check it, parking space. Isn't that great. And we don't even have groceries in the car so it doesn't even matter.

We throw parties regularly. We throw four or five big parties a year on our roof deck. Because friends live mostly in Virginia, they come from Fairfax.

They either park in meters which are metered in my neighborhood into the evening and they pay, just as they should if that's the transportation choice they're making, or they'll take Metro or a bus or a bike over. It's honestly never been a
problem.

Even when my parents come to visit from Ohio, and my dad likes to say that you will pry four wheels under his butt from him when he is cold and dead, have never had a problem parking their RV, much to my mortification, in our neighborhood.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I live on Church Street so I hope to be invited to your parties.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are they going to serve pizza? Okay. All right, any other comments? Commissioner Miller.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the Chairman said, thank each of you for your very thoughtful testimony.

Let me ask Mr. Forster, oh, I don't have a question for you but you raised the issue about the 14th N R Capital Bikeshare running out just as soon as they
put the bikes there.

    So DDOT is here. They heard that. I'm sure they monitor Capital Bikeshare. We'll ask them about it when we get time for questions.

    Of course, new developments are being required to provide parking as part of the development as well, along that corridor and elsewhere.

    Mr. Malinowski, you raised a point about Dunbar parking overflowing. Were you saying that it has an abundance of unused parking or it has not enough parking and the cars are overflowing into the neighborhood?

    MR. MALINOWSKI: According to the neighbors at last week's Bates Area Civic Association meeting, there are too many cars for the parking space that they built.

    COMMISSIONER MILLER: There are too many cars. So is that having an adverse effect on the neighborhood? Are they parking, then, in the neighborhood?
MR. MALINOWSKI: I'm not quite sure what they're doing, whether they're shoehorning them in somehow in less, you know, narrower spaces than were intended or whether it's going out into the street. I'm not sure. I live kind of on the other edge of the neighborhood so I really don't know, just the neighbors.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay, well, I appreciate your raising that issue and I'm sure the District government is listening and they'll try to figure out how to solve that problem. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions, comments? Ms. Bhatt, let me just ask you. I want to kind of go a little more in line what the Vice Chair asked. I'm going to read a few excerpts from a letter.

It says, "During our discussions, these groups persistently pressed one point. We need to develop parking regulations using District-focused data."
Then it goes on to say, "an analysis that focused solely on the unique circumstances of the District. The District size and proximity," this is key for me, "the District size and proximity to both Maryland and Virginia make for unique parking needs unlike any other city."

So basically what this letter is telling us, and I have to ask it my way. Even though she may have asked it one way, I have to ask it my way so I can understand it.

First of all, whose task force was it? Was this DDOT's or the Council's? I just don't remember.

MS. BHATT: I believe when the idea of the zoning update was introduced, the city organized, I want to say it was something like 15 or so task force for the different areas. Parking was one of them, store fronts was another one, stormwater management was another one.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So the working
groups. So you served on a working group?

Was it a working group?

MS. BHATT: Yes, they were called task force but they're essentially, I'm not sure what the difference is but I think it was called the parking citizen task force or something like that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, okay. Was it formalization, like, did you have to go through Council approval to serve on the task force or you just had to show up that night and you were on the force? I'm just curious how this was put together.

MS. BHATT: I think some people were formally sent over through, you know, like some entity might have appointed someone to join.

But they were also open to the public and if you showed up you were allowed to participate in the discussion and state your opinions about whatever the topic was that night.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: So in those discussions that you participated in, was the equation of being in close proximity to Maryland and Virginia basically included in the equation with the analysis that the group came up with?

MS. BHATT: I'm not sure I'm following.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, what I'm saying is, as it stated in this letter, it says, "The District size and proximity to both" -- first of all, did we use basically data focused for the city? Did you all use any data that was germane just to the District of Columbia as opposed to living in Portland and other areas?

MS. BHATT: Well, yes. I mean there was lots of data about D.C., about the density, the different kinds of neighborhoods, the different residential zoning areas.

So we have some areas,
particularly my neighborhood and the ones around me, they're very low density. They're largely residential. But then you have other neighborhoods that are more mixed use and high density.

So we were presented with things like income data broken down by different sections of the city, car ownership data, things like that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And in that discussion, was it ever mentioned about some of the data factoring in the close proximity to Maryland and Virginia?

MS. BHATT: I don't remember anything about the data being specifically categorized by the terminology close proximity to Maryland and Virginia.

But there was data broken down by Ward and so if you're in Ward 7 or 8 you're close to Maryland. If you're in the other Wards, you're close to Virginia. I don't think anything was specifically categorized
as proximity to the states next door.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I want
to thank you for coming down. You're from
Ward 7. We are now complete. We've now had
somebody from every Ward, so I appreciate
that.

MS. BHATT: Oh, very good.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Custis, let
me say that I am actually on your email list,
even though the email I got from you I
discarded.

This one about the pizza, and I'm
sorry, hopefully when it's not germane to
zoning you all will have pizza and I can show
up and enjoy myself.

MS. CUSTIS: We'll be at happy
hour next week. We'd love to see you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I'll wait
for a little while. But let me ask you, do
you have people other than those who may have
signed up or whatever? Do you all get out to
a crowd? Do you all get to an older crowd?
I guess that's what I'm --

MS. CUSTIS: Are you speaking of the Coalition for Smarter Growth at this point?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. Even though you didn't come down and testify for that I'm just curious.

MS. CUSTIS: Yes, yes, I know.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just notice your name is always on the emails.

MS. CUSTIS: I'm the girl who sends the emails. That's fine.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, okay.

MS. CUSTIS: We do. We did a supporter survey, that I'm hoping my boss in the back of the room doesn't yell at me for giving away all the details on, of our supporters this summer and we do it every year.

And I can't tell you the exact ages but we did ask them if they were willing to give us age-bracketed information, which
demographic pool do you fall into, and over half of them are older than millennials.

If I had my phone with me instead of having left it at my seat, I could tell you the exact percentages, but over half are gen Xers or older.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So do you have basically, is it mostly electronic? And I guess my question, I probably know the answer already, is it mostly electronic? Do you have some people that you communicate with mail or anything?

MS. CUSTIS: Sure, yes, absolutely. So I work mainly in our digital advocacy so I am most apt to be able to tell you about the people who I communicate with via email, folks like you.

But our team also works very hard to get out in the community at community meetings and to hold public forums and otherwise communicate non-electronically to make sure we are reaching the broadest base
we can.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, let me commend you all for making sure folks are getting engaged.

MS. BHATT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Appreciate it.

Okay, any other questions? Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, just a couple quick ones. Mr. Malinowski, I want to follow up on the issue of the school, Dunbar, and you mentioned two others that were charters?

MR. MALINOWSKI: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean has the charter been there a long time or was it recently established? And are they in a regular school building or are they in some other kind of facility that doesn't have the normal parking availability that a school would?

MR. MALINOWSKI: Both the charters are in existing school buildings.
COMMISSIONER MAY: Existing school buildings. So there is some lots around them?

MR. MALINOWSKI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: They're not crammed into, you know, former office buildings or things like that as charters often are?

MR. MALINOWSKI: No. The charter that's currently in planning and will be opening sometime next year is moving from a commercial building, I think near Dupont Circle, to what used to be the J.F. Cook School on P Street.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I see, okay. So, I mean, I'm glad you bring that up because that is one of the concerns that I have about uses that are in or close to residential neighborhoods that are drawing in more cars than can be parked on the site for whatever reason, whether it's part of the, you know, the corporate culture, if you will,
which I think it might be for many schools.

You know, teachers are accustomed, because of their schedules or whatever, to being able to drive and they often wind up parking in neighborhoods and that can be an issue in certain neighborhoods.

But I'm very interested in hearing how, you know, when we first had this, started having hearings on this topic, I was interested then in understanding what DDOT could do or what the city could do in other forms to address parking and spillover parking from uses like this that are adjacent to residential neighborhoods, so I look forward to hearing more from them on that topic.

And this is really not related to the subject at hand but, Ms. Custis, you said your boyfriend has roots in Virginia?

MS. CUSTIS: He does.

COMMISSIONER MAY: And yours are
in Ohio?

MS. CUSTIS: They are.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Not originally in Virginia? Because there's a famous Custis family.

MS. CUSTIS: No. The Custis Trail, well, most of Northern Virginia at one point was owned by my family.

COMMISSIONER MAY: It was.

MS. CUSTIS: Alas, if only that were still true. I would be so much better off and affordable housing would not be an issue for me.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I mean it's nice to have some famous ancestors.

MS. CUSTIS: It is and this is the only part of the country where Custis is a cool last name to have.

COMMISSIONER MAY: For many reasons. I mean, anyway, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions this panel? Commissioner Turnbull.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just wanted to thank the Ward 2 panel, both five and seven, for coming here tonight and talking. I think you have a lot of good comments.

What no one really touched upon I think as far as we talked about parking and Commissioner May was sort of going down the road with the schools, is the OP, the one change for going to square footage on parking.

I don't know if any of you have thought about that or I don't think anybody commented on that and I just wanted to give someone, anybody the opportunity to, if you've seen the schools, the parking, the impact on your neighborhood and what that may or may not have an effect on any of you.

MR. MALINOWSKI: If I may, Commissioner. So I mentioned the two charter schools, one of which is in the planning stages.
And during the neighborhood meeting, there were some questions. Okay, how much parking is required under the code? How big a variance are you seeking?

And the school couldn't really give precise numbers because even though they have drawings, they have site plans, they don't quite know how much staff they will expect.

So I imagine that, you know, whether it's one or two more, either way, I expect a floor area ratio would be, or a floor-dependent parking plan would be clear.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But in your case, the school was actually basing a projected count upon staff, people still?

MR. MALINOWSKI: They were, yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions? Okay, I want to thank you all for your testimony. Very helpful, appreciate it.
Okay. Alex Dodds, John Wheeler, Clark Larson, John B. Townsend II, Steven Beller, John Mangin.

(Off microphone discussion)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Ryan Crowley.

(Off microphone discussion)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, you're on here twice? Oh, you're so good. What did you want to do, come back and do a repeat performance? Thank you. Randy Speck.

Okay, I think I have two more seats or do I have three more seats? Okay, I have two more seats. Where did I stop? Gerald Fittipaldi. I don't see Gerald. Okay. And Matthew Steil. Matthew Steil? Okay. Steil? I'm sorry. Okay, we're going to start with my right and we'll work our way down. You may begin.

MR. WHEELER: My name is John Wheeler. I live in Tenleytown in Ward 3. I have lived in the District of Columbia for
approximately 35 years in Wards 1, 2 and 3.

I'm also what other people here have referred to, an elderly person, and my generation is whatever the generation is called that predates the baby boomers.

I'm in favor of lowering the off-street parking minimum requirements. I've written a letter explaining my position. I will summarize it here.

Since I moved to the District of Columbia, many changes have occurred that has made driving a car much less necessary.

Metro has been developed, the bus system has been greatly improved and, more recently, we've seen the great success of car sharing and bike sharing. Plus businesses, such as grocery stores, have moved back into our neighborhoods.

When I first heard testimony before this Commission about reducing parking requirements, most members of the Commission expressed disbelief that people could live in
D.C. without a car. I think you now understand people can live in D.C. without a car and without hardship.

I expect that you will be hearing people testify about how important parking is to the elderly. Mr. Hood, I think you've kind of alluded to that. As an elderly person, I believe that is not true.

My opinion, which I think is supported by statistics, is that it's primarily the young and the old who are doing without cars, to some extent for different reasons.

If people live long enough, they most likely will lose their ability to drive long before they lose their ability to walk. Therefore, walkability and livability are essential to continue to live in my neighborhood.

But Tenleytown, where I live, it's very walkable but it's really not a livable place for a person who has to deal
with stairs.

I'll tell you a quick personal story. Several years ago I lost my ability to walk due to neurological complications of Lyme disease.

I spent five weeks at the National Rehab Hospital learning to walk again and having to deal with a house that does not have a bathroom on the main level. You know, it's kind of a typical house in D.C. I think.

But there is no really affordable housing in Tenleytown if I want to stay there that's on one level where a person who is less mobile can live. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wheeler. Next.

MS. DODDS: Hi. Good evening, everyone. Thank you so much for your continued attention this evening. My name is Alexandra Dodds. I live on Ontario Road in Lanier Heights and in Ward 1.
And I'm here tonight to express my strong support for the proposed changes in D.C. zoning ordinances including the reduction of minimum parking requirements, easing restrictions on accessory apartments and corner stores and simplifying the overall code.

For what it's worth, I own both a car and a bike. I walked here to this meeting tonight and I took the bus to work today so I'm well versed in a number of transportation options in the city.

I consider myself lucky to live in a neighborhood that I really love. I bought my first home in Lanier Heights last year and it's a condo in a small, newly renovated building on a beautiful, tree-lined street with row homes.

And I consider where I live to be a zoning success story, both the building itself and the neighborhood.

The things I love about where I
live include the social diversity and economic diversity of my block, the parks nearby, the incredible public transportation options that I have access to and a grocery store on the corner which is just feet from my house and is really, really handy when you forget an onion when you're cooking dinner.

But these things, having them all in one place, is really hard to find in D.C. and I think that the proposed changes in the code would make it more possible for places like this to exist across the city.

And I know I've been listening to the Council members throughout the evening and I've heard several concerns about seniors and it made me think of a personal part of my life that is applicable here.

I grew up in the suburbs of New Jersey and my parents still live there and they have come to visit me many times in the years that I've lived in D.C. and always love it so much and love it so much that they want
to move down here and they'd love to live near me and my husband who have made a home here.

But, you know, they're approaching 70 and on fixed incomes and it's really hard for them to find an affordable home that would be walkable in the way that mine is.

And I think that the changes proposed in the zoning codes would help them, you know, help our multi-generational family live closer together.

So, like I said, I strongly support these changes and thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MR. LARSON: Good evening, Chairman, members of the Commission. My name is Clark Larson. I live in Dupont Circle in Ward 2.

I'm here to speak tonight in support of staff's proposed revisions to
Subtitle C of the D.C. zoning regulations, specifically regarding Chapters 19 and 20 on vehicle and parking standards.

I believe that staff's proposed revisions offer a good balance between the basic parking needs for a site and recognition that downtown D.C. and other areas in the District with high-quality transit and bike service can and should support multimodal transportation opportunities for all residents, workers and visitors.

I find that much of the opposition to these parking reforms is based on a fear of a future that's misunderstood.

As staff has reminded us time and again throughout the process, there's a strong trend in the city toward less auto-dependent lifestyles that I believe must be reflected in the city's development standards.

I see these revisions as a means
to help create the conditions for alternative forms of transportation and, therefore, better use of limited space on a site.

I, myself, am a part of this trend away from a car-centric life with a single car that my wife and I must park on the street in our neighborhood because our building has no off-street parking.

We are able to travel to and from work, run errands and otherwise get to where we need to go mostly without our car.

We avoid the high cost of renting off-street parking and live in a building that wouldn't be there if it required even one parking space for every three units.

In fact, we have chosen to live in a more urban section of D.C. specifically because of its walkability, bicycle friendliness and close proximity to the places we need to go.

I believe the proposed revisions to eliminate parking minimums downtown and
by-right allowances to reduce parking requirements by 50 percent in transit-
adjacent areas is a common-sense approach that will lead the city to a built
environment that further supports these conveniences.

As a cyclist, I also support the proposed bicycle parking regulations for short- and long-term parking and shower and changing facilities for more than just the current office buildings and high-density, mixed-use areas as they exist today.

Overall, I see these revisions as a positive step towards greater choice and livability in the city and I ask that you adopt them as proposed. Thank you for your time tonight and for your ongoing service to our community.

And I also have a Bikeshare station that runs out of bikes so if I could put in a request to DDOT as well.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.
MR. LARSON: 16th and T.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.

I'm sure they've taken note of it.

MR. LARSON: You know it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Next.

MR. TOWNSEND: Good afternoon or good evening, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hood. Thank you for the invitation and good evening to the members of the Commission.

I'm John Townsend from AAA Mid-Atlantic. We represent 90,000 members in the District of Columbia.

And we have grave concerns about jettisoning the parking minimums because we think it'll have a deleterious impact, not only on the District and its residents and its businesses and its houses of worship, but its restaurants and its citizens and ultimately it would reframe what we consider to be the national capital area.

Mr. Hood, you asked a moment ago, the previous panel, what is the impact of
persons who come into this city each day from Maryland and Virginia? Well, we have the largest daytime growth in population than any city in the country.

We have 630,000 persons who live in the District of Columbia or in Washington, D.C. proper. But in the daytime hours we have 1.2 million people, a 70 percent growth by 9 o'clock in the morning.

And more than 200,000 cars come into the city each day and that does not include delivery trucks that brings produce and products and supplies and groceries into the city.

You worry about the lack of shopping and, yes, that is making a comeback but you are losing $200 billion a year to shopping marts outside of the District of Columbia because of the lack of stores and the lack of shopping.

You can paint a rosy picture but the fact of the matter is parking is a
perennial concern in the District of Columbia. Look at the numbers. The sheer numbers support this.

The District writes more than, last year 1.8 million parking tickets, the year before, 2 million parking tickets to the tune of $95 million a year.

That's a swing of almost $200 million over a two-year period where you have this hidden tax on people who only want to do one thing, to enjoy the nation's capital, to come here as tourists, to see the sites and the museums and the memorials, to dine here, to live here, to worship here.

I, at one point, was a member of the Metropolitan Baptist Church on 13th and R and one of the great tragedies is this church, founded by slaves 150 years ago, celebrating its sesquicentennial this year, is existing in a schoolhouse because of a process that started eight years ago in Logan Circle when there was such a competitive
atmosphere, combative atmosphere over parking
the church decided to relocate and got caught
in an economic downturn, built a $50 million
structure outside of the city and it went
belly up.

The church is still in the city,
in the schoolhouse, a relic of its former
self, and that's a great tension. With so
many houses of worship leaving the city
because of parking, what quality of life will
we have?

And then there's this whole issue
of affordable housing and this myth that I
can't understand as a former graduate student
in urban studies and urban planning how we
could think that we could subsidize
developers and say, you know, housing would
become all of a sudden more affordable if we
get rid of parking and we jettison parking.
That means I can buy my house for $40,000 to
$50,000 less.

What science, what empirical
evidence, what studies do we have for this? All of this is anecdotal.

This is being driven by market forces and there's this attitude that I see in certain elements in the city that says in substance that parking should be market based. In other words, performance parking. So you should charge $8 an hour to park on the street.

But the fact of the matter is it drives people out of the city. It makes housing more unaffordable and you lose a third of the population that is already under the poverty level that is being etched out and X'ed out of the social fabric and economic vitality and vibrancy of the city.

And most importantly, this is a tourist mecca. We get over 20 million tourists a year.

Of the domestic tourists that come, 60 percent of them drive here and the one big souvenir they take back home with
them is a parking ticket. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MR. BELLER: Hello. Thank you very much for allowing me to --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is your mic on?

MR. BELLER: Oh, I'll turn mine on. Okay. Is that better?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

MR. BELLER: Yes. My name is Steven Beller. I'm a resident of Tenleytown. I live at 4419 Chesapeake Street, Northwest, Ward 3. I've been a resident of Tenleytown for 16 years. I am a member of Ward 3 Vision but I'm here in my capacity as a private citizen.

And by the way, despite what we've just heard, I like my car. I'm a car owner and, indeed, a member of AAA so you're hearing a slightly different approach to responsible car ownership.

I strongly support the Office of
Planning's update to the D.C. zoning code regarding parking minimums.

Washington is a growing city. I'm very happy to see that. An increase in population means that it might create burdens on the infrastructure.

However, I welcome the increase in population and I want to make the most of this growth and the way to do that is by making the city as livable as possible and at the same time minimizing the burden of more people on the city's infrastructure.

And a smart way to do this is to encourage development that does not plug up the city streets with more cars, but rather encourages citizens to use alternative forms of transportation, whether bikes, buses, Metro or just walking because, remember, a car is both something that is parked and also to be used and when it's used it creates traffic, which is one of the main problems of D.C. as we just heard ironically.
The proposed reduction of parking minimums near transit corridors does exactly what I think it ought to do. Bottom line, priority should be given to housing for people, not housing for cars.

The more parking spaces are mandated through parking minimums, the more cars will come to fill those spaces and with the direct result there will be more traffic on the road and yet more pollution and more danger to pedestrians and cyclists.

Meanwhile, incentives for more walkable, people-friendly city environments are neglected in favor of cars.

And, in fact, in D.C. where I live potentially rich urban walkable environments, such as Wisconsin Avenue, are sadly under-realized partly because of the bias towards cars.

We need to think of the long-term future and not only accommodate the present.

We should encourage more Washingtonians to
decide to use and invest in forms of transit other than cars.

I would have preferred the Office of Planning sticking to its original plan of no parking minimums in areas near transit modes, but the current proposed reductions go in the right direction.

And to those who fear that residents of new buildings will take away their parking spots in front of their homes, I would say the street in front of their homes is owned by the city, not them. Many could store their cars on their own property if they wished.

New projects will probably have many more than the minimum slots as developers respond to market signals and the few areas where parking problems for residents arises there are sensible parking management measures that could ensure that residents can park on public streets near their houses. And basically this is a
separate matter of reforming D.C.'s parking -
-
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Thank you very much.

MR. BELLER: All right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We appreciate it. Thank you. Okay, next.

MR. SPECK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Randy Speck and I'm a Commissioner from ANC 3G. I live in Ward 4.

I've lived in the District for about 36 years and I'm in that older cohort I guess and there have been very few of us to speak tonight.

Thank you, first of all, for the opportunity to testify tonight on behalf of the Chevy Chase ANC and the Commission's zoning revisions task force.

Commissioner Thompson has testified previously before you with respect to our recommendations for Subtitles B and D.
And I will address the ANC's previously submitted comments as they relate to some of the height and parking restrictions in Subtitle C.

Our first comments relate to an issue that hasn't been discussed at all tonight I don't think and that is Subsection C 502 and the rules for measuring building heights in residential zones.

Our comments are informed by our recent experience with the as of right permit application for a 260-unit apartment building at the corner of Connecticut and Military Road, which raised a number of questions about the correct measurement for building height.

First, with respect to which side of the building is used for measurement purposes, proposed Section C 502.8 adopts the mix-and-match formula for corner lots, allowing a builder to select one street frontage to generate the height limit but
then to apply that height limit to a different frontage that is selected as the front of the building, thus permitting a height limit that would exceed what would be permitted in either frontage.

Particularly as the District considers revisions to the Height Act, we urge the Commission to adopt a reasonable rule that whatever side is selected to determine the height limit should be the same side where the height limit is applied.

Second, with respect to where on the side of a building the height would be measured, we are concerned that the proposed rule C 502.3 permits a builder to use the middle of the building facade of the principal building that is closest to the street lot line to determine the building's height so that the design placement of the building facades themselves may alter the permissible height.

We urge the Commission to adopt a
more objective, fixed measurement point based on the middle of the lot.

Third, we favor an absolute height limit in Section C 502.5 for residential buildings, not confusing average level requirement for many rooftops which could yield a true height of well over 40 feet and maybe even as high as 50 feet.

Now let me turn to the parking requirements and there's been a lot of good testimony today about that, and despite the fact that I'm not in their cohort, a lot of what the millennials have been saying resonates with me as well.

So the comments that we have are more in the nature of tweaks to the parking requirements.

The first is with regard to Section C 1902.1 which would relax all of the parking requirements in Subsection C 1901.5 by a full 50 percent when WMATA identifies a Priority Corridor Network Metrobus Route.
It is inappropriate, we believe, to let WMATA's decisions determining the parking requirements applicable under the District's zoning regulations to control without review and decision by an agency of the District government.

We recommend eliminating such an alteration by WMATA unless it is pursuant to a process that involves the affected ANC and the Zoning Commission.

Second, with regard to Section C 1907 which addresses mitigation steps for parking that significantly exceeds the minimum requirements and sets the trigger for this mitigation at 1.5 times the minimum level, we would urge you to focus on the market process.

We are sympathetic to the reasons for this mitigation provision as Mr. Zimbabwe suggested, but we are concerned that the level of this trigger may be too low.

Some recent experience suggests
that the current demand for parking spaces in new buildings not in transit corridors may be greater than 1.5 times the minimum levels, indeed about twice the minimum levels.

The proposed trigger for the mitigation measures may not reflect actual market demand for parking and we suggest increasing the trigger level to two times the minimum levels, in other words about the level of the current demand. Thank you for your attention and consideration.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.

I would ask if we can ask this panel to hold tight for a minute.

We're going to take about a four-minute break so the court reporter and I can go to the restroom, okay? I hate to announce that but I want to give him a chance and my colleagues can do that right quick.

We don't want to miss any testimony. This is very important. So if we could take about a four-minute break, if you
can indulge us. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 9:08 p.m. and went back on the record at 9:14 p.m.)

CHAIR HOOD: Okay, we'd like to go back on the record. I appreciate everyone's indulgence. If we can get our panel back and everyone can take his seat, so that we can go ahead and try to finish up.

And I appreciate those at the table who let us take that quick break that was needed. Okay, so if everybody, if we can have your attention in this. Okay, thank you. You may begin.

MR. FITTIPALDI: My name is Gerald Fittipaldi. I live in the Petworth section of Ward 4. I'm here to voice my support of the proposed zoning changes, regarding parking minimums.

And first I'd just like to say I do follow Greater Greater Washington and the Coalition for Smarter Growth. But I actually
first found out about Greater Greater Washington from someone from Ward 8. And I know you said there hasn't been much representation from Ward 8, but anyway as I mentioned, I'm in support of the zoning changes.

I think a big issue here is the affordability of housing, and the housing supply. One of the reasons the housing costs keep skyrocketing in D.C. is we only have so many apartments. And when developers put in new buildings, they often build less than they would have, if it weren't for lower parking zones.

So by reducing the required parking, they can add more units and thus increase the supply of housing, which then lowers the cost of housing.

I use a variety of transportation modes in D.C. I walk and bike quite a lot. And I have a couple comments on the bike parking. Overall I very much approve of it,
and I'm glad to see that they're getting into the details of what types of racks to use and how many, and to support everyone that needs them.

Again if it's too much detail, just let me know. In section 2001.3C the draft proposal states, "racks shall be placed a minimum of 30 inches apart from one another, and any other obstructions."

And I just wanted to say I think that should be increased to 36 inches, and this isn't a whim. Based on the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, they have a parking, a bicycle parking guideline. And they recommend 36 inches between the racks.

And for anyone who has ever been in a car, getting out of a car in a tight spot where you can't open the doors enough. A similar thing with the bicycles, you can get chain grease all over your legs, and not be able to pull your bike out, so similar
idea.

Regarding car sharing, I'm glad to see that D.C. is taking progressive steps toward requiring car share vehicles. I am no expert in car sharing or zoning in general, in reviewing the draft proposal, I stumbled upon a chart that said, one car sharing space per 50 to 149 spaces. And I think that should maybe be increased to two.

I live in a house that had people, one washer and dryer and we always struggled to find, to not overlap, I think a similar thing would apply to car share.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay, thank you very much. Do we have your, well I'll ask you --

MR. STEIL: Dear Commissioners, my name is Matthew Steil. And I live in the Ward 4 neighborhood, as my neighbor in Petworth here. And I'm here to testify on behalf of my family in support of lowering the mandatory off-street parking minimums, as
currently planned by the D.C. Office of Planning.

Now while I wish the reductions in parking minimums would go even further, as they were originally proposed, the current zoning proposal is a significant step in the right direction of allowing for the market to better set the amount of parking though and not the Government.

While there are certainly many instances where government regulations are necessary, obligating off-street minimums as part of any new development is not one of them.

Putting parking spaces where they are not needed adds significant costs to any development. Costs which are then passed on the eventual renter, home owner, and restaurant patron, or office leaser.

Commissioners, I understand that reducing parking minimum requirements is not the same thing as saying that developers will
build zero parking spaces, but rather that
they will build fewer unneeded spaces that
consume value real estate and resources,
costs that are then passed on to you and me,
whether or not we decide to drive to that
destination.

I do not mind paying my fair
share for parking if I decide to drive. But
I sure as heck do not want to have to pay for
unnecessary parking spaces when I arrive,
whether via car or otherwise, through an
extra hidden charge on the pizza or running
shoes that I buy.

In a city where space is
increasingly at a premium and affordable
housing is becoming scarcer by the day, we
need to be doing everything we can to
increase access to housing and not tacking on
additional unnecessary parking charges to
development, that will only succeed in
further raising housing costs.

My wife and I have a combined 15
plus years in D.C., and plan to stay here for
the foreseeable future, raising our family.
For the majority of our time here, we've
lived car free.

While it may not have occurred to
us at the time, we were partially able to
afford living in apartment buildings close to
the Metro, because those buildings were not
built under the now obligatory parking
minimum requirements and thus didn't need to
charge tenants for the additional parking
costs.

Now we have a house and a car.
But most of our trips are still done using
our feet, bikes, Metro, and bus. We love
living in D.C., and we support the policies
such as the ones proposed in the current
zoning update that will help make the city a
healthier and more affordable place to live
for all current and future residents.

Commissioners, the current
proposal to reduce off-street parking
minimums does not mean getting rid of cars in
the city. Nor does it mean getting rid of
parking in the city. Rather it is a common
sense approach to significantly reduce the
burdensome costs of building unneeded	parking. Thank you.

CHAIR HOOD: Thank you very much.

Commissioners, any questions? I figure you
probably have a few. Let's start off in our
normal, Commissioner May, you haven't went
first tonight.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I have
not. Okay, so my first questions are for Mr.
Speck. Where is he? There you are. Okay.

MR. SPECK: So, I'm just confused
because when you cited section C502.8, the
mix and match formula for corner lots, I mean
I went back and reread 502.8, because I
thought that this had been a concern before
that was addressed.

In other words, that if you pick
a side to be the front of the building,
that'll be the side that you measure height from. And that's what 502.8 seems to read. It doesn't seem to allow you to do the mix and match.

MR. SPECK: That wasn't our reading. And we read to say, that you could continue to do the mix and match, which is our understanding has been the interpretation of the Height Act for the last 50 years.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, and well that's come up in a number of cases, and it's rankled.

MR. SPECK: Right.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So I actually, I mean I thought that was something, that we were correcting because it's just not, it doesn't make sense. It makes sense to, you know, measure --

MR. SPECK: We couldn't agree more.

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- use the street width, that the building is actually
fronting on, you pick one and you go with it. And whatever gives you the best result, is fine. But you have to pick one and stick with it. So I guess if that's, if I'm reading it differently --

MR. SPECK: It seemed clear to us. It seemed to us that the mix and match formula was still applying.

COMMISSIONER MAY: All right, so why don't we get that clarified with the Office of Planning? I'm sure they're making note of this discussion. So 502.5, which is the average level for heights, have you seen the Office of Planning's diagram of how that works out?

MR. SPECK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So, do you understand that setting an absolute limit is essentially, would essentially incentivize all flat roofs, up to 40 feet.

MR. SPECK: We don't think so. Because with a 40 foot limit in residential
neighborhoods --

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

MR. SPECK: -- and a limit on the number of stories, only two stories, then you're not going to get homes that are going to be flat roof at 40 feet.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Have you seen some of the pop-up buildings? I mean we had testimony about pop-up buildings, but you've seen some of these tiny little row houses, where they've gone all the way up to 40 feet.

And the top floor has like an 18 foot ceiling. You haven't seen those?

MR. SPECK: No, I haven't seen those.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, well it's happening.

MR. SPECK: It's not happening in our neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Well, and you have a lot of, I imagine you probably have a lot of single family homes. And
they're typically not going to be flat roofs.

MR. SPECK: No, but that we do have a lot of homes that are being knocked down now.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

MR. SPECK: And new McMansions being built in their place.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

MR. SPECK: And we're concerned about some of those, that because of this averaging formula, we'll have, will be maybe 50 feet tall.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So, okay. And you realize that what's happening right now, is that you're measuring 40 feet to the ceiling of the top floor.

MR. SPECK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So it can be whatever it could be under the proposed regulation. It would be a lot worse now.

MR. SPECK: Yes, we understand that.
COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so I mean it seems --

MR. SPECK: Trying to limit that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, so it seems to me, well I mean, regardless of what may happen in a particular neighborhood, in a particular setting, I mean you know, there may not be a lot of incentive to have flat roofs and you know, create giant boxes like that.

The idea of averaging, I think is a sensible approach to measuring height, it may be that what we need in certain neighborhoods, is something lower than 40 feet as the height limit. And that's something that can be done with the customization of zones.

MR. SPECK: That might be reasonable as well.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Okay.

So again, Office of Planning hopefully you're taking note of this conversation and
pursuing that.

So Mr. Townsend, the, I didn't get the relationship between parking tickets and parking minimums.

MR. TOWNSEND: Well the issue is that there are people who say we don't have a parking problem. And counter intuitive to that and the irrefutable proof that, that's not the problem, is that you do have this intractable number of parking tickets being generated every year.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's, again I don't, it doesn't connect for me.

MR. TOWNSEND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So you're saying that if we had ample garage spaces --

MR. TOWNSEND: That's not what we're saying.

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- that we would not have a problem with people having parking tickets?

MR. TOWNSEND: What we're saying
is that we have, we write more parking
tickets in the District of Columbia than any
other states.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand
that, and I understand it's a high volume and
I understand it's big business for District.
I don't understand how it relates to parking
minimums.

MR. TOWNSEND: Well after passing
parking minimums, then finding parking in the
city will become tougher, not easier. And
the fact that, there are people --

COMMISSIONER MAY: So the people
who are getting parking tickets here are all
doing it because they can't find another
place to park? It's not because they're not
willing to pay --

MR. TOWNSEND: It costs you $25
to park.

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- $25 to
park.

MR. TOWNSEND: Yes, that's what
I'm saying, that it's symptomatic of the fact that you have a pernicious parking problem in the city already. That's what it means. These people are not --

COMMISSIONER MAY: I think that you can look at the same set of facts and come to a different conclusion about why people are getting parking tickets.

MR. TOWNSEND: Well.

COMMISSIONER MAY: A lot of times are getting parking tickets because they are not willing to walk an extra block, or they're not willing 25 bucks. I mean isn't that a reasonable explanation?

MR. TOWNSEND: Well the fact of the matter is, that it comes down to whether we perceive that parking is a public good or a private good. And by that I mean, that the city has a role to play in this. And to make parking part of the social and economic fabric of the city. The city has not added any additional parking in --
COMMISSIONER MAY: So, I mean you are essentially advocating for ample free parking for many people to come into residential neighborhoods?

MR. TOWNSEND: The issue, I am not advocating free parking.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, okay.

MR. TOWNSEND: I said --

COMMISSIONER MAY: So then are you advocating for higher cost residential parking permits? So that there will be fewer people parking on the streets, so it's more market based, as some people have argued tonight?

MR. TOWNSEND: I think there should be a market based approach. But I think there's a role for Government to play too, because parking is for the public good also. I mean when we drive up the cost of parking, what that does is to drive people out of the retail shops in the community, drive people out of the restaurants.
COMMISSIONER MAY: So --

MR. TOWNSEND: Let me give you an example. Across the street from my office is Old Ebbitt's Grill. So every night they have valet parking. Now you may come and dine with your family on Thanksgiving night because that's the new mode now. Nobody wants to wash dishes at Thanksgiving, so you eat out.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I wash a lot of dishes on Thanksgiving, but okay.

MR. TOWNSEND: So you have valet parking. Now is that free? And the answer is no, because for every parking space that you may pay $10 for, the Old Ebbitt's Grill or M&S Grill, or The Hamilton is paying $25 for that space in a garage.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So they are subsidizing it, so that they get my business.

MR. TOWNSEND: They are subsidizing it. And that's part of the problem, is that what we -- the reason I
addressed the issue, or approached the issue of the parking tickets, is to talk about this hidden cost of parking in the District of Columbia, which casts a pail on it, or pall on it, depending on it whether you're from Alabama or Mississippi, on the entire social and economic infrastructure in the District.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, I'm still not connecting it, and I don't really understand the Old Ebbitt's example. The fact that certain businesses are subsidizing parking, I mean that actually encourages people to drive when they could be taking other means to get there.

MR. TOWNSEND: Well people are driving, sir.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So I know --

MR. TOWNSEND: Hold on a second, so from the Transportation Planning Board, State of the Commute, from last year. So we've had a subtle change in the number of persons who live inside the District who
commute across town every day to go to work.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

MR. TOWNSEND: A decade ago, it was about 40 percent. It's less than that now. Those persons have moved to transit. The number of persons riding transit in the city has increased by four percent in the last decade.

But outside of the city, it's -- Washington D.C. is not a closed universe. It is the nation's capital. It is the capital of the free world. So in terms of governing and in terms of commerce, and in terms of retail, you have this huge influx of persons that come into the city every day.

We suffer from the worst gridlock in the country. Outside of the District, two thirds of all persons drive to work each day, 61.5 percent. And you have this tremendous influx.

Now the shape and the scope of the commute is changing, and it has changed
in the last decade as more companies or entities move outside of the District. And what's driving this? While companies are coming in, more are going out. And the thing that's shaping this huge debate is and this movement is parking.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so if there are more parking spaces available, and theoretically it's cheaper and easier to get parking, isn't that going to bring more people in, and increase grid lock?

MR. TOWNSEND: The city is growing, and the city will continue to grow. And not only is the city growing, and it's growing by 1100 persons a month, I think is the latest estimate.

But by the year 2030, we'll have an additional 1.2 million persons in this region. And 800,000 new jobs. In the hub of all that, the engine that drives all that is the District of Columbia.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So can you
answer my question?

MR. TOWNSEND: I did answer your question.

COMMISSIONER MAY: No you didn't. I mean I asked whether the availability of parking has an effect on gridlock, and you told me that there's an increase in the number of people living in the District, and the number of jobs.

MR. TOWNSEND: I think it's naive to think that our gridlock problem is caused by parking.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not saying it's caused by parking.

(Simultaneous speaking)

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm just asking you --

MR. TOWNSEND: It's an aspect of it.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm asking you if --

MR. TOWNSEND: If what you see in
the District is the fact that the average person who tries to park in the city spends 20 minutes trying to find a parking spot. And that's from studies from DDI.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right and I'm sure DDI would like to reduce that too, so the people you know, who are driving can find parking quickly. But I think they also want to reduce the number of people who are driving.

MR. TOWNSEND: So let me get this straight. So at this particular time and juncture we have people and we have incessant gridlock. And we think that if we remove parking minimums that, that's going to resolve the gridlock problem?

COMMISSIONER MAY: No, I'm not arguing it one way or another, I'm trying to understand what you're arguing.

MR. TOWNSEND: My argument is that, as I said from my opening statement, that to jettison parking minimums in the
city, where parking is critical, and is a source of increasing frustration in the city, is to worsen the problem, not to lessen the problem.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Well that's simple enough.

MR. TOWNSEND: That's not only true for the businesses in the community, but for residents. Many of whom, as you asked before, where is this silent majority, Mr. Hood? We represent 80,000 persons, and you have people who are part of a list, sir.

But I wonder about those people, and they really don't speak out, but many of them are here two rows over tonight, and you'll hear from them. And they have big investments in the District of Columbia. They came here, or they were born here.

The biggest investment that one has is his home, or her home, and in many neighborhoods the property value has gone up.

And what they fear is that their standard of
living, their life style is being eroded, and
being changed, and they're not being heard.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Well I'm happy
to hear, you know, we'll hear from them
testifying about that. I look forward to
that. I mean we hear from them regularly on
other cases, so we'll hear from them again.

Yes, thanks.

MR. TOWNSEND: Thank you for your
question, Mr. May.

CHAIR HOOD: I think you've got
quite a few more, so we're going to pick on
you. I like to call you Mr. Triple A, so.

MR. TOWNSEND: That's perfectly
all right.

CHAIR HOOD: Vice Chair. Thank
you.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Mr. Townsend,
I had similar confusion over your testimony,
with regard to, I almost felt you were
arguing two sides of the coin. Basically if
we suffer the greatest gridlock in the
country, then it seems to me, you would want to encourage people to use alternative transits.

MR. TOWNSEND: That's true.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: And that the parking issue, the more parking you have, the more you're encouraging people to park in those spaces, within buildings. And I guess that's kind of where I was, you know, as confused, well I was maybe even more confused than Commissioner May, but that's what confused me.

Is that you seem to be saying that we have a problem, and the way to solve that problem is to add parking spaces. And I'm not sure I really followed that.

But the other thing I also want to mention, and I have a lot of respect for people who have studied, you know, urban, undertaken urban studies. That was my major as well, but I'm very confused because I do believe strongly, because I did finance for
20 years, housing throughout the country.

And that parking, especially underground parking does contribute to the cost of housing. And so can you explain how you came to your conclusion that it does not contribute to the cost of housing.

MR. TOWNSEND: No, what I said, excuse me, pardon me, what I said was, where are the real world empirical studies that prove this? That the developers will pass on the cost, the savings if you were to jettison the parking minimums.

Where's the real world economically based, research based, empirically based studies that show, that they will pass on those costs to home owners or persons who purchase homes or condominiums. That was my question. And I am saying that, that in our world view is not a reality.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, we've heard from witnesses who have, who are expert
in this area. And my own experience, which as I mentioned is over 20 years of financing housing, it does happen. It's passed along. So I can't cite a particular study other than the testimony that we've heard tonight, plus my own personal experience in financing housing, and in affordable housing we attempt to reduce the requirements so that they won't be burdened by these costs.

So I guess, you know, we'll agree to disagree there. But anyway unfortunately, I think tourists, they may drive to the city, but I would presume without knowledge of the city, especially our circles, they would probably prefer taking those, you know, trolleys around, so.

MR. TOWNSEND: They do. And but they also drive when they have family members too.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes. Well.

MR. TOWNSEND: And they come
from, according to Destination D.C., over 70, you know I would have thought, and this is what happens when you think one way and then you see the research that shows another, you would think that the bulk of the tourists would come from all across the country because it's the nation's capital. But most of the tourists come from 14 contiguous states, or states in this area.

And so they tend to drive down the I-95 corridor, and we see them every year in Spring break when their kids are on educational tours of the District, and many of them drive.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Well maybe you could share that study with us too.

MR. TOWNSEND: It is, it's on line at the Destination D.C.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: All right. Question, Mr. Speck. In the testimony that the ANC provided, on Page 8, and I'll quote from it. "We believe the Zoning Commission
needs to take into account the realities of how apartment dwellers in many neighborhoods live. They tend to have cars, not idealistic hopes of how policy makers wish they would behave."

Now that you've heard quite a bit of testimony that contradicts this, do you think this is still a valid point?

MR. SPECK: Yes, at least in some neighborhoods in D.C., I think. And particularly in our neighborhood, I think. I think most of the people in our neighborhood live in apartment buildings. Many of them anyway do have cars.

The Cafritz Building at Connecticut and Military is a good example. They have decided to build parking that is twice the minimum in order, because they think there's a market there. They weren't required to do that, but they did.

And so I think they are anticipating that those people are going to
have a lot of cars. So it just depends on the neighborhood. And it depends on access to, we've heard a lot of discussion about transit rich locations. And there are many in this city. And I'm very proud of that.

But there are also a lot of areas in the city that are not so transit rich. And although Connecticut Avenue has a bus line up and down it, it doesn't, the Cafritz Apartment Building for instance, is nearly a mile away from the subway. And so I think there are going to be a lot of people in that building who will have cars.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Well correct me if I'm wrong, are those units larger as well? So they are more family oriented?

MR. TOWNSEND: No. They're actually quite small.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: So your experience is antidotal, or did you actually go to different buildings to check out the availability of parking?
MR. TOWNSEND: One of the members of our task force, who did have experience as a developer, had done a very informal survey, not scientific in any respect, but he did do an informal survey of buildings that had been built within the last four or five years, and looked at the, and in non-transit rich quarters.

And he found that the amount of parking that was built, was about twice the requirement, the minimum requirement. And in those areas, clearly the developers are looking at market forces and deciding, we think we need to have more parking for those facilities.

I think that varies from neighborhood to neighborhood though. And that's why we brought this up in the context of the maximums. And that's where we're a little bit concerned about it.

That if you've set a maximum and
put mitigation requirements that are triggered at that one and a half times the minimum, I think that's going to affect some market based developers who are looking at the kind of people who are going to be living in their apartment buildings and saying, we need more parking spaces there.

So we're really just looking at the market. And trying to make sure that we have reflected that in our zoning regulations.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: And lastly, Mr. Wheeler, I think you are part of the greatest generation.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you, I thought that was the people who served in World War II. I was born during World War II, by eight days, but I didn't serve.


COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank each of you for your
very thoughtful testimony. We really do appreciate it, and we will be, we've read the written comments that you've submitted as well, and those who, I don't know if everybody in this panel submitted written comments, but if you haven't, you should do so. Since you raised your hand, Mr. Fittipaldi.

MR. FITTIPALDI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: So we'll ask DDOT about those, the greater distance between bike racks, and obstructions and other bike racks, and the 30 to 36, and the other issue raised about increasing the car share requirement, that it might be more appropriate. We'll ask them about that.

MR. FITTIPALDI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Commissioner Speck, the last issue that you were just in a dialog with Vice Chair Cohen about, OP has recommended increasing the trigger from one and a half to two times, I
didn't know if you were?

MR. SPECK: We weren't aware of it.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: They have and I'm getting a nod from OP. Yes they've recently, more recently when the proposal went out, they, originally went out, they had to increase the, because I think they heard from people like, you know you, that it needed to be, so that trigger has increased.

MR. SPECK: That's exactly what we wanted. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Great. And we've all, I'll also ask them at the appropriate time, when we have questions about some of your other issues including, you know, having this automatic reference to WMATA priority corridors. We know now what they are, so if we adopted them now, we all know what we're adopting.

But for them to be just automatically changed without a kind of a
public process, we may be able to build in something that'll provide a District process that would have public input.

MR. SPECK: That's what we're concerned about. So, thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: So thank you. And I guess in the interest of full disclosure, Mr. Chairman, I am a member of Triple A. I also am on the list sir, above, the Coalition of Smarter Growth.

Each of these memberships, not memberships, but each of these would predate my experience here on the zoning commission, and I haven't bothered to change any of those memberships. I think I'm on several neighborhood, that serves as well. I've tried to ignore comments that, about the pending case though.

CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Miller since you're a part of some of these groups, could you ask them, when we say comments, could
they tweak the right way?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: No. I'm not interacting with them, is what I'm trying to say. I do receive the --

CHAIR HOOD: Oh, after this is over with --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- and I do pay money to Triple A.

CHAIR HOOD: But after this is over with, make sure they tweak the right stuff. And I actually am a member of Triple A too, so full disclosure. Okay, any other comments? Commissioner Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you. Well gosh, you know, I feel obligated to say I also have Triple A. I mean, I think it's getting to be, yes I know, weird, yes I know. I'd like to echo the folks. Thank the panel for your comments tonight. We really appreciate it.

I guess my, and a lot of my questions have already been asked, but just
getting back to Mr. Townsend on this parking ticket issue. I mean, to me this is a big muddy thing.

I mean, I don't know if you can clearly give answers that are, can be pinpointed to, I mean the scofflaws are going to be Maryland, Virginia and D.C., and it's going to be people that are just wanting to get parking space and not pay for it.

I mean the other issue is people from out of state, the out of states coming from Illinois up to Maine, to the Carolinas, they're coming here as tourists.

Those are mistakes if they're going to get, I mean either they don't know what to do, so I don't know how you separate and you can regionalize where the tickets are coming from.

But I remember hearing on the news that there's a couple of, there's people around here that have like 500, 600 tickets, but they just don't pay them.
MR. TOWNSEND: Almost 275 million dollars in unpaid parking and speeding, and speed camera, and red light camera tickets.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But are those, those are Maryland, Virginia and D.C.

MR. TOWNSEND: Right. Right.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Primarily.

MR. TOWNSEND: Of that number, I hate to say this, I'm not characterizing any states, but about 45 percent will live in Maryland, 15 percent will live in Virginia, and 25 to 30 percent in the District, and then the other ten percent, my math may be off, but from those states, actually out of town tourists as it were, get the smallest number of parking tickets.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.

MR. TOWNSEND: The same thing is true with red light camera tickets and speed camera tickets.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well and
I guess what the parking, I mean we're looking at trying to control parking in the residential areas so we don't over park, and we don't have problems. And I see your point about the commuters.

We have a commuter population that's coming in. But I would think that over the years that people have found places that when they come in, they park and then they take either Metro or buses.

The tourist thing is another, I mean when I, when people, when I get tourists coming in, telling people, I'll either tell them to go to like some place like Union Station, park, then you can get on the trolley, you could take Metro.

I try to get people on public transportation, but there is a point where people are coming in by car from out of state, they need to find a place to park. And you know, you're going to have the people like driving around to all these memorials,
which is crazy. They can easily pay the 20 odd bucks or whatever it is now, to get on the trolley and go around. It's the easiest thing to do, so I'm not sure what your numbers are really getting at. I guess they can be confusing.

MR. TOWNSEND: They can be, and that's the problem with numbers any time you use them, to be candid with you. The fact of the matter is, that for those who live outside of the city, those who are the tourists, you would think that common sense would say they would do the research before coming and to use mass transit.

As a matter of fact, every communication from the city, and every entity in the city including Destination D.C., encourages people not to drive into the city. But it happens, for whatever reason, I don't know. I was just stating that as a reality.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.

MR. TOWNSEND: To show that in
our view, in the view of Triple A, it's not as rosy a picture as we think it is.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well are you talking about, I mean are you, is your concern mainly talking about parking in the downtown area, rather than in the neighborhoods?

MR. TOWNSEND: Parking in the downtown areas, central business district, and also after having a goodly number of conversations with people who live in those residential areas, certain neighborhoods are greatly concerned about the impact that it will have.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay, everyone's testimony has been very helpful, and Mr. Townsend, Triple A, one of the things that your testimony helped me try to visualize, and this is what I'm trying to get, with what we're doing, I understand about being able to
walk and get your onion, and I understand about all that, but what are the unintended consequences?

And I think, not necessary, I'm getting somewhere else with you, what are going to be the unintended consequences, because what about the family that has, and I listen to people saying well, Commissioner Hood, I can do without a car when I do this, and the older people now, they're, but I'm going to take it a step further, yes, the seeing as who can not drive anymore but need to get to the doctor, and their kids have to take them to the doctor, we have people in the city like that.

And they have to take their parents to a doctor, some of them down town or where ever the case may be. You're not going to be out here riding on no bicycle with your parents who're barely able to walk, you're not going to be out here looking for no bus.
Can't nobody tell me, because I've done it. So those are the kind of people that I'm kind of trying to balance this whole situation. Yes, I hear that other argument, but I also know this argument.

And this commission, and believe me Mr. Wheeler, this commission when they first started talking about not having a car, I know some of my colleagues where they are, so I think it's very balanced up here. I don't think you ever came and saw this commission like, oh, we couldn't do without cars.

No, you might have saw me, because that's, I'm a victim of my environment. I know where I live, and that's why I think, and Mr. Townsend this is where I need you to look at 1900. I'm going to give you some homework, because you have a lot of, if you could work with Office of Planning, I don't know, have you had a conversation with the Office of Planning?
MR. TOWNSEND: No, sir. I have not, but I'll be happy to.

CHAIR HOOD: See, I think with your experience and not discounting anyone else up here, because I think everybody brings a lot of value to the table, but with your experience, and knowing what the DMV is about, as well as this city, if you could come up to speed a little bit on 1905. And if you work with Ms. Steingasser, they'll tell you. I'd just like to find out what some of the unintended consequences are, and how do we balance it?

For me, it's all about balance. Yes, I want the people to be able to go get the onion on the corner store. But I also want the person who doesn't come down here to be able to take their parents to the doctor, and not be looking for no bus. And I can tell you right now, that's not going to work and it ain't going to happen.

MR. TOWNSEND: Mr. Hood, I share
your world view for obvious reasons, the fact of the matter is that when I think about the urban planning for the city, you think D.C. did have such a design in the beginning when it formed.

But also from our perspective, you also had Banneker, who surveyed the city. And he was a hero of mine when I was growing up. Because he was a free black man in 1795 and he played an important role in the development of the nation's capital.

But there are a lot of people, that sometimes I think in our rush for this transition, a lot of people will get left behind. And you know, we look at the crisis in the fire department, and the lack of units. And there was a big scandal in the city.

And when you talked to firemen, not people that have a vested interest and one political view, or in trying to protect city hall or the chief. But just say, how
did you get into this situation? They say it is the lack of transportation options in the city.

What you're just talking about, for these people to get to their doctors and their hospitals. That's how they get there.

There are people in this town, the 30 percent, 33 percent of the persons in this town who live below the poverty rate. And I think the unintended consequence of all of this, is those are the voices that have not been heard.

And I think in a lot of ways, we have people who call themselves senior citizens, but I think we're the same age, so I'm a senior citizen too. But the fact of the matter is that a lot of them have not been heard from too.

And as I said before, I, having spent 11 years of my life, as a counselor to a mayor, not in this city, but in Lexington, Kentucky. And we dealt with these urban
issues every day.

And when you're planning and when you're dealing with the planning commission, that if you don't understand the unintended consequences, you have to ask what kind of community are we going to have in ten years? Or in 20 years, and who's going to be left out?

If there are certain elements that are left out, that is the soft underbelly that undermines our future and economic vitality and diversity. Okay, how's these people to come? I can't even bring myself to use the word, right? They feel like they don't have a stake in the city.

And we have to make sure that Banneker's vision is true. And L'Enfant's vision is true, that this is the nation's capital. And it's easy to say this is my neighborhood --

CHAIR HOOD: I going to have to cut you off, because I know there are others
who wanted to --

MR. TOWNSEND: Yes, sir, I understand. Thank you, sir.

CHAIR HOOD: -- get another point of view in -- so I want to get to them. But I'm not finished. You mentioned metropolitan. I was in the room with Preacher Hicks and some of the ministers, Vermont Avenue.

MR. TOWNSEND: Yes, sir.

CHAIR HOOD: When they started talking about the parking issue. I was there at the ASC meeting, representing my church. So I knew then, that there was a balance at issue, that needed to take place. And this was years ago. It didn't just start as you mentioned. This commission heard the case on Metropolitan values. This commission heard that.

So again, it goes back to my point, I would like for you, the homework, get with the Office of Planning, I'm starting
to feel like maybe this is the balance, what
the Office of Planning has here, especially
this Subtitle C, and work with Ms.
Steingasser.

And what your experience and that
unintended consequence may be resolved
already. And that's kind of where I'm trying
to go, and I'm trying to see. Because if
not, for those who are not speaking, this
commissioner is going to do his best to bring
everybody along. That's the goal, okay?

MR. TOWNSEND: I think that
should be the goal.

CHAIR HOOD: I need your
experience.

MR. TOWNSEND: And we'll be there
sir, thank you inviting us.

CHAIR HOOD: I'm going to be
looking for you. I'll be looking for you.

MR. TOWNSEND: I'll be there for
the sake --

CHAIR HOOD: Obviously, they're
going to submit it, then I want to see it, then you know.

MR. TOWNSEND: No, no, I'm not that type of guy. Triple A's not that type of organization. So thank you very much.

CHAIR HOOD: Well I'll keep my membership. Okay.

MR. TOWNSEND: I appreciate that, and you too Mr. Miller and you Mr. Turnbull, thank you.

CHAIR HOOD: We have another, one more question.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Everybody is disclosing their membership in organizations, I just want to tell everybody, I am a member of AARP, have been for over ten years. So now you know.

And so I want to assure everybody that the senior citizen viewpoint does exist within my own brain, and so you know, just rest assured that they are being thought of very carefully.
CHAIR HOOD: And I would agree with that. Commissioner Miller about your points, about the width and everything, and hopefully the audience heard that, and we'll be looking forward to hearing that.

And all of you have brought some very good testimony to us, I appreciate it. So we thank you all for your testimony.

Okay again, let me just thank everyone who has hung in here with us, we're going to keep on moving. Let's go to Michael Farrell, Judy Chesser, Julie Six, Marilyn Simon, Allen Seeber, Benedict Aubrun, let me see, did I call eight? The next, 43 and 44 had to leave, hopefully they left testimony.

Okay, great.

Do I have eight? John Chelen. John, he's not coming, right? Okay, okay. Dorcas Adkins, I may have called more than eight, so forgive me. Let me see. Okay I don't see Dorcas Adkins. Oh, okay, is that eight? One, two, three, four, we need one
more person. Bradley Green, Bradley Green, and I don't see Gary Peterson, he may be behind?

Okay, so that's it for tonight as far as testifying. The other lists will be called, the additional list will be called on, what night is it? Tuesday, a week from tonight and then after that list is called, I think we have 60 some odd people who have signed up to testify, more than tonight.

So let's see how we did tonight, with all the questions that Commissioner May asked. Okay, it's 10:00 o'clock. It's a joke man, I had to pick on you.

So we're going to go probably go much later on Tuesday night if everyone shows up, and again hopefully, we probably won't get to our questions, colleagues on Tuesday night. And I think we'll ask our questions on Wednesday night, of the Office of Planning and DDOT.

So why don't we just say right
now, that the Office of Planning and DDOT, we will ask our questions of you all on Wednesday, November the 20th. Okay, at 6:00 o'clock, that's the goal unless we have a carryover from, no we won't have a carryover, because we're going to, our goal is finish Tuesday.

Now since all of us ride transit, we want to make sure that we leave before the Metro closes. Okay, nobody got that, you know it. No, you all late, it's getting tired, everybody's getting tired.

Okay, we're going to start with Ms. Six, and we're going to go from my right to your left. To right, to my left, okay. Turn the mic on, I got that twisted up on me.

MS. SIX: Good evening, Chairman Hood and Commissioners of D.C. Zoning Commission. Thank you for the opportunity to testify tonight on the D.C. Zoning rewrite. I am here this evening to speak on behalf of Tenleytown Neighbors Association. I'm
president of that organization. I, that's Ward 3 of course.

And the majority of our members are against the principles of the rewrite in Subtitle C. So I've got to present some balance here for you Commissioners. Parking in and around the residential neighborhoods of D.C., was handled in the ZRR in much the same way as OP handled the issue of the Height Act.

There has been a marked pattern of rushing to put through changes without adequate substantiation of facts. Attached is an example of a study that might have been done. And it's attached to the, it's here. It's, it was done in New York City.

In the case of parking, DDOT has as yet to provide the supporting data, see the letters from D.C. Council Members Cheh and Evans. ZRR reduces parking everywhere in the city and it cuts the reduced numbers in half near transit, including Tenley, for
zoning in less than one space for six units.

The residents of Tenleytown are faced with the imminent arrival of the AU Law School, which will lead to an overflow of cars on the already congested residential streets. It does, the AU Law School has had an overflow on the streets around the location where it is today.

And the expected increase in enrollment at the Tenley Campus is greater, without adequate parking for faculty and students, not to mention the thousands of people who attend continuing legal education and other outside activities. This will create overflow parking, as I mentioned, on the residential street.

We are awaiting the construction of the Babe's Building, which we have been told was a one-off-test to see what this would bring to the neighborhood, with no parking for residents, visitors, or patrons. And there was no requirement for affordable
housing in the final order of that development.

It is not just the Tenley residents but also the Tenley business owners who are feeling the brunt of more spaces that are now metered, requiring more money for less time, and longer hours, going later into the evening.

Employees of the retail and restaurant businesses, who travel from afar where mass transit is not available, have difficulty in finding and paying for parking. The meters push parking into adjacent residential streets. The result makes those of us who live and work in Tenleytown, to some extent OP's ideological guinea pigs.

I ask you to consider the consequences of all this when making your decisions on the parking proposals in the ZRR. The ZRR is a one-size-fits-all proposal. Your decision can make all the difference in a neighborhood such as
Tenleytown.

In the second oldest neighborhood in Washington, it's not surprising that many of the homes have neither garage, nor driveway. On-street parking then becomes essential. People who walk to use mass transit, must still have a place to park their cars. We young and old, must retain the option to be multimodal.

DDOT stated as recently as 11-04-2013, and I quote, "a well-balanced and multimodal transportation system is by nature intended to serve a diverse set of users' needs." The ZRR does not reflect this sentence in the, with regard to parking.

We have been told the parking changes are intended to curtail traffic and pollution, however while people circle to find parking, it adds to traffic, and as well as to pollution.

You are here to consider the zoning rewrite, the proposal in the ZRR is to
allow developers to provide only one parking space for every six units. Despite the fact that according to the last census, excuse me, 79 percent of households in Ward 3, owned one or more cars.

The current zoning requirements for parking are currently far below the statistics of car ownership in D.C. Thus the current parking requirements should be retained or raised.


MS. CHESSER: Judy Chesser, Ward 3. I'll do two asides. For many years I've been a lobbyist for urban cities. I was very active in opening the Highway Trust Fund to mass transit. The Highway Trust Fund is predominantly gas tax, paid by car drivers.

The Highway Trust Fund is what helped build the subways, build the highways, build the streets. And six billion dollars of that Highway Trust Fund went to bikes and
hiking trails.

   I merely am mentioning this because there has been a lot of talk about somehow cross subsidizing of cars. Well cars have done their part as well.

   In addition, my husband has a disability and I drive him many places. So you have both seniors, people with disabilities and people with children, that frequently use cars because that's the best way for them to transport themselves.

   Thank you for the opportunity to testify. Please reject the urban myths. For about two years OP told us all that there were fewer cars in D.C. today than ever before. But DMV has reported 267,000 registered vehicles in 2009, 285,000 last year, a three and a half percent increase.

   And that doesn't include diplomats, students, military, and the like who do not register here. We have 500,000 commuters that come to D.C. every day,
approximately 200,000 of them in cars.

Vehicle ownership is .9 cars per household. In Ward 3, 79 percent of the households own at least one vehicle, which apparently is now termed car light.

Please base your decisions on sound data, and statistics, not ideology. The Cheh and Evans letters are asking that we get real data, and real statistics that are based in D.C., and if your decisions are data driven, I'm sure that they will help us all in the future.

And I also ask you, how do you define success? Are you trying to force people out of their cars, or are you trying to look at the cars that are here today, that are projected to be here tomorrow, and trying to figure out how you accommodate the numbers that everybody is projecting.

Because forcing them out of the cars is a whole different thing, if that's what you're trying to do. I love bikes, but
only 9,000 people of the over 600,000 people living in D.C., are riding their bikes to work.

People are intermodal. At the Tenley station, WMATA says that 20 percent of the 7,000 people that come to the Tenley station, or 1300 people, come by car. Some drop off, thank god, and some park.

Shyam Kannan, who I'm sure I've mispronounced, the Managing Director of Planning for WMATA, says 80 percent of Metro riders own cars. Forty seven percent of bus riders, own cars. People are multimodal, they're intermodal.

Let's look at the parking requirements near transit. Tenley today, the requirement for a multi-unit building, would be one space for every two units in a condo building. The zoning rewrite, would change this to one space for every three units. Then because it's near Metro, the zoning rewrite would down scale that to one space
for every six units.

   To give an example, a 200 unit building would have 33 spaces required near Tenleytown. So we'd apply .9 cars per household, which were the stats for D.C., the 200 unit building could be expected to have 180 cars. The 33 spaces would leave 147 cars without parking spaces.

   If the developer wanted to increase the number of spaces provided and increase any number greater than 66 spaces, i.e., double the 33, the developer would have to pay steep penalties, and I gave you the list attached to my testimony, of what the developer would have to pay.

   This is in essence a maximum cap, set at double the allowed spaces. Is this planning, or is this a plan to make it difficult to use a car? The current proposal is not a compromise, it's a Step 2, in a strategy devised by OP.

   OP's original proposal was leave
it to the market. Now they're saying, one for every six near transit. That's not a compromise at all, not when the current regulation is 1., excuse me, one space for every two units.

What would the proposal do? The ZRR would eliminate minimum parking requirements in a dramatically expanded downtown, which I've attached that map to my testimony as well.

It would reduce parking requirements even when not near transit, cut in half the already reduced parking near transit, penalize developers under a maximum cap, and dramatically reduce parking for churches, schools, and the like.

The ZRR is not derived from the Comp plan. The Comp Plan talks about mitigating the impact of new development on surrounding neighborhoods, only reducing parking requirements where it's clearly demonstrated there was a reduction in demand.
And putting parking near Metro stations, either behind or underneath buildings.

It doesn't say anything about eliminating parking, behind or underneath.

In conclusion, please support pro-choice, please support the minimum requirements in today's zoning.

CHAIR HOOD: Thank you, next.

Thank you. Next.

MS. SIMON: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Simon and I'm speaking today on behalf of Friendship Neighborhood Association. FNA has been involved in the zoning rewrite since July 2007, and over the past six years, I have testified before the Zoning Commission on many sections of the proposed code.

We have provided a significant amount of information on parking, included data showing that the proposed minimum parking requirements are inadequate and inconsistent with the Comp Plan. We asked
that our previous testimony on the zoning rewrite be included in the record. I will outline our major concerns.

FNA commented, filed comments in the 2010 NPRM, and in the order the ZC requested, that OP explain how what they were proposing was consistent with the Comp Plan policies identified in our comments.

OP has not provided any explanation, and none is possible in as much as the draft text is inconsistent with those Comp Plan policies.

OP has not provided any data to support their recommendations to reduce minimum parking requirements, and in fact all the data in the record indicates our minimum parking requirements are much lower than the increased parking demand that a project would generate.

When I asked OP for the reports cited in support of the recommendations, Jennifer Steingasser provided me with a
There was no data on parking needs. The report simply compared our parking requirements with those of other jurisdictions. And in fact for the most part, our requirements were significantly lower than all the others in the report.

The DDOT report does not provide any data on parking needs. It cites changing demographics, but provides no data. In fact the DMV data shows that vehicle ownership has been increasing, and census data shows that the number of vehicles per household in D.C. has remained roughly constant for a substantial period of time.

The draft requires less than .167 spaces per housing unit in a large portion of the areas zoned for apartments. Even though vehicle ownership rates are more than five times that amount. This is a recipe for disaster, and is simply not sustainable.
A sustainable parking policy would increase off-street parking supply at approximately the same rate as development is increasing demand for parking. So that the limited supply of on-street parking will not be overwhelmed or further overwhelmed.

The ZC should make no change to reduce minimum parking requirements until there is area based data supporting that reduction. Even the sections where OP is trying to implement a desirable policy, the implementation is faulty.

In my early submission, I described the enforcement and monitoring issues in the text that OP proposed for shared parking and off-site parking, and provided suggested language changes.

But I caution you, that similar issues pervade this thousand page document and this accelerated review process. It seems unlikely that you will be able to locate and correct all the poorly drafted
sections in this time.

    Even though OP is proposing to increase the trigger for assessing the penalty on developers for providing more than the required parking, given the very low minimum parking requirements, far below new parking demand generated, for many projects a responsible developer choosing to simply produce adequate parking for residents, employees, customers, and visitors to the site, will be assessed a penalty.

    This is simply a bad policy and like so many other radical changes in this section, it does not have a basis in the Comp Plan and in fact is inconsistent with the Comp Plan.

    You have heard much testimony tonight about how reducing minimum parking requirements will increase the supply of affordable housing. Our low minimum parking requirements do not increase housing costs for car free residents.
For apartments we generally require less than one space per two units. This low minimum does not force residents without cars to pay for parking. It does not increase housing costs.

I am a former MIT Economics Professor and I reviewed the unpublished study that OP cited to support this claim. It is based on assumptions that simply do not apply to D.C.

We ask that you, as suggested in the letters by Council Members Evans and Cheh, and by former Commissioner John Parsons, defer establishment of the new parking regulations. Thank you.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next.

MR. SEEBER: Mr. Chairman, first of all I was on the task force at ANC 3/4G. I'd like to point out that the last sentence of item number 4 states that, our task force disagrees with the relaxed parking
requirement. It should be a simple rule of one spot for every three units.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Can you tell us what your name is, please.

MR. SEEBER: Sorry, Allen Seeber.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay.

MR. SEEBER: Sorry. I think this, that the data issue is paramount. The Office of Planning, and the District has ignored a study, a statistically substantial vetted study in New York City, a parking study, which contradicts the claims that they regularly make.

With respect to Portland, which they cite, Portland has recognized the error in which they engaged two years ago, and they are backing away from that.

The Metro and bus situation in the city is hardly one that compares with that in New York for example, or in London where you can go from here to there on the underground, or the tube, or the subway. Or
with the excellent bus system.

That is not the case in this city. So if you wish to go downtown, then you can get there. But if you wish to go across town, in some way, to go visit someone or to go someplace, you cannot do it.

In D.C. landlords rent or sell their parking spaces. The cases cited by OP, are suey generous, they're unique. In Columbia Heights, that garage was built as part of a consideration, of a deal with the District.

The situation at Cityline in Tenleytown, is one which involved an historic landmark, which had two separate areas, one of which was a storage facility and is now the subject of discussion in Babe's, which you may recall. That was not a parking area prior. The parking area, the larger one, on top, 160 of those spaces were sold.

Had that building been built today, under what OP proposes, you would have
one fifth the number of spaces, one fifth. When you look at the census data, you find that as you go further up the redline, more people have more cars.

There is one other area that uses cars a great deal, and that's the 8th Ward. Because they can't get out of there, and you need a car to go to work. We can't build a new garage under a building that's already up.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay, thank you. Next.

MR. FARRELL: Hi. Good evening. I'm Mike Farrell, and I think you've met me before. I live in Bloomingdale where I've lived since 2001. And I'm here to speak in support of the Office of Planning's proposals for reducing parking minimums.

And for the same reason I was here last time, I'm concerned about housing affordability. I'm concerned about being forced to pay for a parking spot if I don't
want one. I would like to have the ability to choose a unit that does not have a parking space.

Now I do own a car, which I drive maybe, approximately once every two weeks, mostly to leave the city. And I have for the last ten years, I've left it sitting there gathering rust, you know, on the street for I believe an average of about, cost of about $3 a month.

You know, I think that's something that I could probably live without. I, now people have already covered what parking minimums mean for this city. You know, damage to affordability, encouragement of driving, people are forced to pay for a parking space, it's much more attractive for them to have a car. They're much more likely to use that car.

I would add that it also can harm design, historic preservation. It can be hard to fit a parking into an existing
historic building, and if you have a face of a building that is dominated by parking, that's not particularly interesting.

I do agree with some of my, some of the Tenleytown residents, who just spoke. That I think that free or near free on-street parking close to Metro is likely to be endangered if the Office of Planning's proposal go forward.

I think that those are an incomplete proposal, and we would probably do need to look at ways to increase the cost of parking on-street to equal the cost of parking off-street.

Another issue I would recommend looking at, handicap placard abuse. I have reason to believe not everyone in my neighborhood who has a handicap placard, is actually handicapped. Especially when I see them coming home from the club at three in the morning.

Perhaps and there is a number of
ways that, that could be dealt with. Perhaps
the most reliable way to prevent handicap
fraud, would be to charge for handicap
parking at the same rate, provide
preferential places, but charge at the same
rate that everyone else pays.

There have been a number of ideas
suggested for how we can bring the cost of
street parking up to a level that will
reflect its scarcity. You know, Donald
Shoup's parking benefit districts, whereby
the revenue from residential parking would be
returned to the neighborhood from which it
came. Either in the form of increased
services or abatements against property tax.
And I think that, that sort of thing would
need to be done.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you
very much. Next.

BENEDICT AUBRUN: Good evening
Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. My
name is Benedict Aubrun. I thank you for
your time regarding this important topic.

I have been a home owner in Adams Morgan since 1997. 1901.5 should be changed to keep the current law for parking requirements with at least one per owner occupied dwelling.

Reducing parking so radically impacts lower and middle income residents the most, since it means they cannot have a car, which severely limits their job, unfortunately in and out of the city.

Adams Morgan should be exempt from waiving minimum parking requirement due to the lack of parking space the area is already experiencing. 1902.1 reduces the minimum by 50 percent per units within half mile of a Metro stop or transit corridor.

But the original says that off-site parking must be within 400 feet of a structure. If 400 feet is good enough walking distance for off-site parking, then it's good enough for transit users. Either
reduce the transit requirement to 400 feet,
or increase the off-site parking distance to half a mile, to be consistent.

By the way, the 400 foot rule should be the pedestrian entrance of any building. The comprehensive plan asks that each area be individually analyzed. We don't want one size fits all.

For example, Metro stop residents that have access to few buses and just the Metro going north, south, is different from one that has access to several lines and lots of buses.

Many Metros stops don't always substitute for cars for a large part of the population. And I will say even downtown, one cannot assume that you replace his car for every one of hours of service, lack of frequency, and of course it doesn't go everywhere you need to go to work.

So rather than to just saying pick a different number, I would say that you
cannot define an area where you change the parking requirements without studying the area as required in the Comp Plan, and determining what they actual need for parking is there.

In fact the number of registered vehicles according to DMV, increases every year. The minimum should not be changed, and developers should not be penalized for creating parking spaces in excess of the minimum. There's already a major deficiency in parking and the idea of penalizing a developer for doing a good thing, is very wrong.

Portland is a perfect example of failure in parking policy. Now they are reversing to their former policy on parking. Aging population, American for Disability Act and families must also be taken into consideration. It is just not about the millennials.

Also Metro is cutting off bus
lines, and Metro is at its full capacity. The consequences of lack of parking will entail the following, most of them based on looking at the current situation in Paris.

Still no affordable housing, increasing pollution and congestion on top of what we have now, increase of noise, decrease in pedestrian safety, delay in fire EMS response, loss of income for stores because you know, we are going to go to the suburbs.

Thank you.

CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Next.

MS. ADKINS: My name is Dorcas Adkins, and I'm a senior citizen, a resident of Tenleytown for 30 years, and I think just about everything I wanted to say has been said many times. It's a wonderful neighborhood to live in. I love it. It's extremely easy to get around without a car. I have one, but I drive it only to get out of the city.

I've been a bike commuter for a
long time. So I support the reduction in parking requirements. Mostly because I hope it will lead to more affordable housing. My biggest concern is suburban sprawl.

And no one's mentioned that, but it seems to me that for us living on top of a Metro station, in a city like this, to expect free on-street parking is, it's unreasonable. It's unsustainable. The only way to fight suburban sprawl is to make it possible for the people who work in the city, at least some of them, to live in the city.

And right now, I've seen in my time in Tenleytown, the values going up six fold. I could never buy the house I'm in now. And I don't think people who need to get into town and live there, are able to, in a great degree.

I'd like to stay there as I get old. I'd like to be able to continue to walk and as long as I can, ride my bike to get things. And I'd like it if more of my
neighbors were people who could work for me as I need more services instead of people who have to come in from hours away.

So I think if we can make Tenleytown and communities like it, more affordable, it'll be an improvement. Thank you.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next.

MR. GREEN: Thank you. My name is Bradley Green, and I'm --

CHAIR HOOD: Is your microphone, is it, like lit up?

MR. GREEN: Thank you. My name is Bradley Green and I live in the Takoma, D.C. neighborhood. I've lived in D.C. since moving here from Michigan for a job in 1976. I gave up my car in 1990, which by that time was seeing more action collecting parking tickets than in getting me around town.

Since then I've been happily getting around on foot, bike or Metro. In
fact I regularly bike from Takoma to Dupont Circle in about the same amount of time, as it would take me to drive and find a parking space.

I'm not against cars, by all means drive if that is your preference. I rent cars when I need to, and after Capital Bikeshare, I think Car2Go is about the greatest thing since sliced bread. I just don't want the way we build our infrastructure for cars to effectively limit our ability to get around without one.

Apart from my own decision to not own a car, cities that enable residents to go car free, or car light, are simply more desirable places to live. Opponents of the zoning changes would have you believe that a ready supply of cheap or free parking is one of the neighborhoods most important amenities.

The market however, tells us that walk ability, not park ability is the amenity
that is most in demand. Indeed neighborhoods with the worst parking, are also some of the most sought after.

Why is this? Because there is an energy not to mention a convenience that is only found where businesses, restaurants, and homes open onto sidewalks filled with people rather than lots filled with cars.

These pedestrian and transit friendly neighborhoods are in fact why many of us choose to live in cities like D.C. instead of the suburbs. These alternatives to driving are also healthier, more environmentally friendly, and a lot cheaper.

A key part to making this increasingly expensive city more affordable, is in fact, providing it's residents with more affordable alternatives to cars. What does all this have to do with the proposed zoning changes?

How we build our cities largely determines the choices we have for getting
around in them. It is for these reasons that I support the changes to the zoning code as proposed by the Office of Planning.

These proposed changes are an important step toward making it easier to get around this great city without a car. In fact I wish the proposal did away with parking minimums entirely. As it seems to me that the market is a much better judge of parking demand than the Government.

The proposed easing of the parking minimums however is at least a step in the right direction. Parking spaces add considerably to the cost of the housing development. A cost that is borne by all the residents whether they own a car or not.

It goes without saying therefore, that building more parking than can be absorbed by the market, needlessly makes housing less affordable in a city where affordability is already a major issue.

Thank you.
CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. All right. We appreciate your testimony. Commissioners any questions at this time? Commissioner May.

COMMISSIONER MAY: This is more of a comment than a question. You know, several folks have brought up the issue of, you know, whether the parking minimums are being reduced too far. And I, you know, I assume that this is driven by a concern that insufficient parking minimums are going drive, you know, apartment dwellers, whatever, to park on the streets and take up street parking and there's already not enough of that.

So I'm very interested in, and I'm seeing enough nods, to know that's one of the issues. I mean this is an issue, it's been present for me from the earlier discussions on the parking section.

And I also want to highlight the comment that Mr. Green made, opponents of the
zoning changes would have you believe that a ready supply of cheap or free parking is one of the neighborhoods most important amenities.

I mean I think that's sort of underscores the issue that was raised by others tonight, that the economics of parking, the cost of parking, the cost of the quote, "free" parking or residential parking permits and things like that, I don't think is, you know, all these things play a role in how parking demand is managed and how parking supply is managed.

And I just want, I'm highlighting these things now because I want to plant the notion with the Department of Transportation and with the Office of Planning that I really am looking for a full discussion of how all these things interplay.

If there is going to be reductions for parking requirements, and apartment buildings that are close to
transit, isn't there, doesn't there need to be a disqualification from residential parking permits in order to reduce that impact?

Things like that, so those are the sorts of things that I'm very interested in hearing more about when we move into the next phase of this.

So again, I'm, you know, I don't really have a specific question for the panel, but I just wanted to highlight that I'm concerned about the issue of how reducing the minimums could affect parking supply. But I'm also concerned at how we manage parking supply isn't quite right.

MS. SIX: May I respond to that?
And just to --

COMMISSIONER MAY: If you've got something quick to say, that's --

MS. SIX: Yes,

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- on point.

MS. SIX: I am, I've been at the,
I've been in the District for 25 years and I am a realtor. I do know that there are particularly people who come to Ward 3, are looking for parking. And I'm talking about people who just come to rent, and they've got their car and they want to be able to park it.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't doubt it, I mean that's where the demand is coming from.

MS. SIX: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: It's a question of, I mean it's not representative of everyone, certainly not everybody who comes in --

MS. SIX: No.

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- is going to want car.

(Simultaneous speaking)

COMMISSIONER MAY: But if they're going to be in a building, the building, there should be parking in the building
that's sufficient to cover that demand. And there shouldn't be, I don't think there should be the easy opportunity for people to just start parking on the street in those circumstances.

MS. SIX: We see, and neighborhoods where very often, that you can find parking either in the building, or down the street, it's separate. They don't hesitate, it doesn't, it's not part of the price.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

MS. SIX: It is, it's not necessarily driving up the cost of the property.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes, and that's not really what I was talking about.

MS. SIX: I'm talking about resell.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.

MS. SIX: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: All right.
Thanks.

MS. SIX: You're welcome.

CHAIR HOOD: Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Tenleytown is a very mixed use community. And so I wanted to get a handle on, and Ms. Chesser I'll throw this out to you. Is there a problem in your analysis, with retail as well as residential?

Because I do, you know, take the subway, or I'm sorry, the Metro to shop up in these neighborhoods, Chevy Chase and Friendship Heights. And I always see lots of parking available, you know, in the retail centers. And I was just wondering if you see a difference between residential and retail need?

MS. CHESSER: Well up in Friendship Heights there is a lot of underground parking. In Tenleytown we have three parking spots. We have the Whole Foods, which is almost always completely
booked up. We have the CVS, which is also pretty much completely booked up, and then there's the ACE Hardware, which sometimes has parking, sometimes it is also booked up.

So in Tenleytown, we get an awful lot of people parking, I live like one block off of Tenley Circle. We get a lot of people that park on our block, which only has nine spaces, or around the corner and they go on the Metro, lot of Metro.

Where they've got the RPP, but they live further down the hill. So they drive their car up the hill and they park in my block and get on the Metro. Now sometimes they're coming from a ways, because remember Connecticut Avenue, upper Connecticut doesn't have a Metro stop.

So they come from way over there, they park in front of my house and they get on the Metro. In fact a man today helped me with my garbage can. He said it was the least he could do, because he parked in my
block all the time.

But Tenleytown, I think, I think Tenleytown is a little bit challenged for parking. And so as Julie was saying, we're, now we're going to get the Babe's with no parking.

The AMC cut a deal with the Vet next door to Babe's to do valet parking. But when I asked him where valet was going to put the cars, they said oh, they hadn't thought to ask about that. Because if the valet's going to park them at my house, I don't really care, the valet's parking them there. Or the person with the dog.

So I think Tenleytown it's not totally unlivable, it isn't at this point, but I think that we sort of see it as somewhere in here there might be a tipping point where it will become more difficult.

AU expects a lot of people coming to their outside activities, in the thousands. You know, for their continuing
legal education it's right on the circle, a Law School.

So I mean I just think, we're waiting for that tipping point where it, we really can't get anywhere near our homes anymore.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: All right. Let me ask you, again, you brought up Babe's, and there was a transportation study done, and I don't expect you to recall all of it, because I don't recall all of it. But the survey that was done, indicated availability of spots. Not, you know, off the site.

MS. CHESSER: Right, one of the difficulties, and I'm sorry, I should have --

VICE CHAIR COHEN: No, no go on.

MS. CHESSER: I was going to say one of the difficulties and I think I've actually heard Chairman Hood say this, the transportation studies sort of, the neighbors get a transportation study and the developer gets a transportation study and they always
say the opposite, you know. And so you're always a little bit like, taking it with a bit of a grain of salt.

So I remember on the transportation study, I remember the fellow who did it, and he said that he went to Tenleytown twice, at certain hours and he walked around and he took note of all the cars and stuff.

Well I mean, depending on what hour you are there, and what day you're there, and then I remember we put our slides up and we showed that there were a lot of people parking, you know, all along Fort Reno, along Chesapeake, and dah, dah, dah.

And people said what did you do, pay people to park there? I thought, but that I had that much money to pay a long string of cars to park there, but you know, it just sort of depends on the day, the time, and as I said, right now I think Tenleytown is sort of livable. But I'm not sure it's
going to stay that way if we keep jamming things in with no parking.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: One of the things that I noticed when I am in a car, which is mostly a taxi, it's choked, the roads are choked. And I guess I would like to ask you that, not to be, I mean I don't want to appear anti-car, but it's always choked. How do we deal with that issue?

That makes it very difficult to continue adding cars, whether people want them or not, on that, you know those roads.

MS. CHESSER: Well you mean like during rush hour, it's choked.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: No, I --

MS. CHESSER: All the time is choked?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: As far as I, you know, again I travel through there a lot, and no matter what time of day or night, it's very expensive to take a taxi through Tenleytown.
MS. CHESSER: Okay. I'll give you a ride next time. The, yes, avoid Wisconsin, cut through the residential like everybody else does. The, you're not really supposed to, but everybody does it.

The, I'm not sure there's a direct relationship with, between how many parking spaces there are and the number of cars on the highway. For starters, so many of them are coming in from Maryland and Virginia.

I was just reading, I think it was yesterday or the day before, that Maryland and Virginia are trying, they are going to try to do more, a lot more bus routes.

To bring people, let me guess, to Friendship Heights Metro. They're going to try to feed in from bus lines into the Metro system, which might help some with some of the commuters.

Now I realize, you know, the
Metro's got its own challenges obviously, how many more people can you get on Metro? You could rip the seats out, you could have everybody stand. It's a major undertaking to expand the length of the station platforms, and unless you did that, there's no point in making the trains any longer.

So I mean it's just like, the Metro has a finite capacity. You can keep adding lines, and that I suppose helps get people from there, but you can keep adding bus lines. I'm not sure there's a direct relationship between, if you build it, they will come if you have adequate parking.

I'm going to say adequate, that more people have cars. I think a lot of people leave their cars and go on the Metro, or the bus or whatever now. But one difficulty is mass transit does go everywhere you want it to go.

I mean if you were in Tenleytown, and you want to go to Stoddert, you know, the
school, really the only convenient way to get there would be to drive.

Because our Metro tends to be spokes, we don't have anything that tends to go cross wise. Going from Chevy Chase Circle over to Tenleytown, people drive. They park in front of my house.

So I just think, I'm back to sort of multimodal, intermodal, trying to make it all work as conveniently as possible. Flex hours, I don't even know why the universities are building more and more buildings. Why are we not encouraging a lot more internet learning? You know, why the university is becoming real estate moguls, I mean I've got lots of questions.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: All right, well you did answer my questions. Thank you.

MS. CHESSER: Thank you.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Any other questions? Mr. Miller.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman, I mean I really don't have specific questions. I thank each of you for your thoughtful testimony. Ms. Six, thank you for providing the New York City planning study.

I plan to look at that and see if there is some kind of information in there, that I would feel that I would need to have before we make a decision, so I appreciate you providing an example of that. I will look at that. So thank you all.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay, Mr. Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, mine is mainly a comment. Again I think OP's heard a lot of your comments and those comments earlier in the evening about the data. That the data does not support with the findings. And that we really need more local oriented information that supports some of the conclusions. I think OP's heard that.

And I think the other concern was
that, one size doesn't fit all. So there's neighborhood concerns, and do you need a specific plan for different neighborhoods? And I think that's something that OP has to get into to. So we'll be able to bring that up when we get into our talks with OP. But I think they've heard you on this.

MS. CHESSER: Thank you.

CHAIR HOOD: Let me make sure I understand that the data issue and which we're hearing a lot about. I was saying that I guess OP did not use the correct data, or does not have the correct data. Is the contradiction of what OP is recommending to us, is it found in data from DMV? I'm, somebody may have mentioned that on another panel, maybe I, it just dawned on me, somebody mentioned that.

MS. SIMON: A lot of this has to do with the fact that we have on a city wide basis, on average, .9 vehicles per household. And then putting in a parking requirement of
.3 or .16 spaces per housing unit, and there's a disconnect there.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay, Ms. Simon --

MS. SIMON: That's one issue.

CHAIR HOOD: -- let me just ask this, where did you get that data from?

MS. SIMON: The .9?

CHAIR HOOD: Yes.

MS. SIMON: It's from the census.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

MS. SIMON: Now of course every neighborhood's --

CHAIR HOOD: It wasn't the Washington Post or anything like that? It was, okay.

MS. SIMON: -- different. In my neighborhood it's closer to 1.2. Certainly downtown neighborhoods it might be lower. But there's probably no neighborhood where it's .167.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

MS. SIMON: But at any rate, they
need to match what the requirement is somewhat closer to what the reality is.

CHAIR HOOD: And let me ask this, well I don't ask this of you, but I'm just going to, anyone, but I'm just going to mention to the DDOT, I really want to know, is RPP working?

And if people come down in cases and tell us they're going to apply for our RPP, what circumstances can they apply, I mean opt out? When do they opt out? And how many years is it before everybody forgets and moves to another job, and they opt back in?

Those are some of the questions that I want to talk about when we do start having that discussion with you guys. So hopefully you'll have that answer for us, I think it's Wednesday, hopefully it's Wednesday.

MS. SIMON: I just wanted to say it's not just that we have data for residential because we know vehicle ownership
from the census. We haven't seen anything to support their office requirement too, for moving away from having, doctor offices have higher requirements than other types of offices.

There's a whole, all the other requirements need support too. You need it for the schools, you need it for the churches, you need it for the commercial uses. To find out how much parking is this use going to generate, what's appropriate?

You don't want the minimum to be exactly what the average is, but you want it to be something that's realistic. And it's not just residential, it's just that's the data that we're able to collect.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay, I think that the Office of Planning has heard it. I think the other night there was an issue raised, why we're doing certain things that we're doing, and I think they're some of the questions that we'll be proposing to them as
we get to that point. So any other questions of this panel?

All right. I want to thank you all for your testimony. I appreciate your coming in, and appreciate everyone who stuck in here with us at this point. And we'll be back on Tuesday. Michelle, do we have anything else?

MS. STEINGASSER: I think that's, nothing else this evening.

CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I want to thank everyone who's in this room, and those who came out earlier for participating, especially those who stuck with us. This hearing is going to reconvene with other witnesses on, one week from today, good night.

(Whereupon, the hearing in the above-entitled matter was concluded at 10:46 p.m.)