GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

----:

IN THE MATTER OF:

:

TITLE 11, ZONING REGULATIONS : Case No. COMPREHENSIVE TEXT REVISIONS : 08-06A

:

· :-----:

> Wednesday, November 20, 2013

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

The Public Hearing of Case No. 08-06A by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:00 p.m. in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman
MARCIE COHEN, Vice Chair
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA,
Commissioner (AOC)
PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)
ROBERT MILLER, Commissioner

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SARA BENJAMIN BARDIN, Director SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary ESTHER BUSHMAN, General Counsel ZELALEM HILL

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

HARRIET TREGONING, Director

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director,

Development Review & Historic

Preservation

JOEL LAWSON

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STAFF PRESENT:

SAM ZIMBABWE JAMIE HENSON JONATHAN ROGERS

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on November 20, 2013.

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 (5:57 p.m.)3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, we're going 4 to go ahead and get started. Our court reporter has not arrived yet, but I understand that they 5 6 can transcribe it from the webcast live. This 7 is just reconvening our hearings on Subtitle C. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me 8 are Vice Chair Cohen, Commissioner Miller, May 9 10 and Turnbull. We're joined by Office of Zoning Staff Director Bardin, Ms. Sharon Schellin, Ms. 11 Zee Hill and Ms. Esther Bushman, Office of 12 Planning Staff Director Harriet Tregoning, Ms. 13 14 Jennifer Steingasser, Mr. Lawson, District Department of Transportation, Mr. Zimbabwe, Mr. 15 16 Henson and Mr. Rogers. Okay, we're not taking any public 17 testimony tonight, and I'm sure everybody knows 18 19 This is the day for us to just ask our that. 20 questions. So what we will do, let's get right into it. 21

I will ask Mr. Turnbull if he would

1	like to start off with Mr. Turnbull? Okay,
2	thanks.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Sure. Let
4	me scramble through my notes here. Going back
5	
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me I'm sorry
7	for let's, you want to start off with
8	10-minute rounds or 12-minute rounds.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Sure. Ten
LO	is fine.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thanks.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I may come
13	back for some others, by the time I go though my
L4	notes.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, that's fine.
L6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Going
L7	through the I want to thank the Office of
18	Planning again for all their efforts in
L9	spearheading this.
20	I think in spite of some of the
21	comments about not being, communicating with
22	everyone, I think you've done a very tremendous

1	job, and I want to, I appreciate it very much what
2	you've done.
3	Just going through, scrambling
4	through my notes here, the one thing that came
5	up I think several people brought it up, and
6	I think maybe it was on the second night.
7	And we had the one person, Maisie
8	Hughes from Casey Trees brought up about the GAR
9	issue, about the caliper, ignoring getting
10	rid of the caliper and base it upon a, going with
11	giving credit based upon the tree height at
12	maturity.
13	And I was just wondering what you
14	guys thought about that.
15	MS. STEINGASSER: We actually give
16	that a lot of credit, and we're happy to
16 17	that a lot of credit, and we're happy to incorporate it. They contacted us when they saw
17	incorporate it. They contacted us when they saw
17 18	incorporate it. They contacted us when they saw the final order of the GAR, after the Zoning
17 18 19	incorporate it. They contacted us when they saw the final order of the GAR, after the Zoning Commission had had the hearings.

1	rewrite and deal with it then. But we have no
2	problem if the Commission, especially those of
3	you with landscape experience, are comfortable
4	with that recommendation. We find it very
5	credible.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Would you
7	then get rid of the requirement based upon the
8	caliper? Would you, or
9	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes. We would go
10	
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: and just
12	based, go on the height? Okay. That makes
13	sense. I had a couple of people comment, a lot
14	of comments upon the parking requirement for
15	institutions, on the square footage.
16	I think it was Cleveland Park, very
17	much concerned about the amount of schools. And
18	I wonder if you've had a chance to give that some
19	thought, or what your comments are?
20	MS. STEINGASSER: We have
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think
22	you've talked about this before. I think it

1	overlapped in some other sessions too, but
2	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes sir, it did.
3	And we took as part of the original review of
4	the parking standards, we looked at the private
5	schools. We went through all the BZA orders.
6	We recalculated what those
7	equivalents would be on a square foot basis, and
8	tried to find something that would be a little
9	bit more predictable and understandable, so that
10	neighbors could understand how large it was
11	going to be, and a school could then have a
12	parking requirement tied to the building and its
13	capacity rather than the program.
14	Our concern was that if a student
15	enrolls who has special needs, suddenly now
16	they've got two or three special ed teachers who
17	may show up, or a therapist who shows, and now
18	they've violated their parking cap and they've
19	got to come back and get an amendment.
20	However, we are more than happy to
21	work with the school, as you heard from Mr.

Avitabile last night, they're not comfortable

1	with it.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
3	MS. STEINGASSER: So they're going
4	to work with us, and we'll be bringing something
5	back that's more in keeping. And we had
6	surveyed ten different cities to look at how,
7	what metrics they use.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
9	MS. STEINGASSER: And they use
10	everything from students to gross square footage
11	to the number of classrooms, where it's just one
12	to two cars per classroom. So that nationwide
13	is kind of all over the place.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
15	MS. STEINGASSER: There's a range.
16	So but that's what we were trying to do. And
17	we're happy to work with the schools and with the
18	communities, to come up with something that's
19	more acceptable. And if, you know
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I know it's
21	tough to get the metrics to work across the
22	board. And I think part of the problem is we do

1	have some areas that may have more issues than
2	others on this, so okay.
3	I think the I guess one of the
4	questions we had, and I guess it came out last
5	night more than anything else, was about IZ.
6	And we had talk about ADUs, which
7	really doesn't, I mean, it's kind of a separate
8	category, but it comes in and there's a lot of
9	discussion about changing the AMI to make it more
10	locally particular to our city
11	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: and to
13	the residents. And I don't know if we're
14	handcuffed on that with other regulations or
15	MS. STEINGASSER: Well, depending
16	on how it's financed, as Commissioner Cohen
17	explained last night, there are certain
18	handcuffs. We are going to be bringing changes
19	to you for the inclusionary zoning regulations,
20	but they're going to be separate from this.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
22	MS. STEINGASSER: We think they are

1	so complex and they require enough attention,
2	that to wrap them into
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right,
4	yes.
5	MS. STEINGASSER: everything
6	from tree caliper to school parking is just too
7	much. So that'll be coming back to you probably
8	in January.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Now, there
10	was kind of two categories with that. There was
11	the definition of what's included, whether it's
12	80 percent or whatever, and then it was I just
13	lost my train of thought.
14	MS. TREGONING: The other question
15	I noticed was that the number of units that were
16	being provided, there were several
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
18	MS. TREGONING: people who
19	testified. Perhaps that's what you're thinking
20	of.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes. You
22	know, whether it's 8 to 10 percent, though a lot

1	of people were saying, oh maybe it's 18 to 20,
2	which I don't know if that's really feasible as
3	a blanket number, but it's something to and
4	I don't know how we adjust that, and maybe that's
5	something you're going to be looking at.
6	MS. TREGONING: We can definitely
7	look at it. I think that the issue of
8	affordability, we could have different levels of
9	affordability, deeper levels of affordability,
10	irrespective of what the regional AMI is.
11	So if we were providing
12	affordability at the 50 percent level, we could
13	provide it at the 40 percent level, and that
14	would have some of the same effect, right?
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, okay.
16	MS. TREGONING: And we could offer
17	additional bonus density under IZ in order to
18	offset the cost of additional affordable units.
19	And that's something that we can
20	look at, but as you may know, we are constrained
21	in certain parts of the city
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. TREGONING: where our
by-right development envelope is such that there
is no bonus density to give. And so that's also,
that constrains us about where that, where those
IZ units can go.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay,
thank you. I guess the other big thing that came
out of both nights of hearings and I think
people made reference to two council-members'
letters, talking about data not being relevant
to the city.
And I think it was related to
parking, cars, and I think there was a lot of
people that felt that a lot of the OP input really
didn't reflect what's really happening in the
city, whether it's the amount of cars, the
ownership of cars, it didn't really reflect
that.
And I, there was 11 we have two
councilmembers' letters that say that we really
need more specific data related to the city.

Your comments on that?

MS. TREGONING: Well we have data. I mean, we rely on census data for a lot of, you know, of our conclusions about the way the city is trending, in terms of car ownership and car use.

And we have that data, you know, at the ward level, so we know that it varies among different wards, in terms of rates of car ownership and the number of cars owned per ward and even commute patterns and costs.

So, you know, can we get as fine as the block? No, we probably can't. But the data that we use for our parking recommendations is from our city, and from the many things that affect car ownership and car use in our city, including all the other choices that we now have for people to take.

So that, you know, we used to be a city where you were a driver or you did something else. So many people in the city now, sometimes drive, sometimes bike, sometimes walk, sometimes take transit.

NEAL R. GROSS

And it means they have much, much lower transportation expenses. They have much more flexibility in hard times. It's a, you know, in that sense, you know, many, you know, everyone's sort of multi-modal. It's just a question of how often they use different modes.

And we certainly hope that our recommendations for transportation and parking in the city reflect the multi-modal nature of the

recommendations for transportation and parking in the city reflect the multi-modal nature of the city in that we expect everybody to be able to be accommodated, you know, in our city, with the balanced set of proposals which I hope we have provided you.

MR. LAWSON: If I can add to that, we've also looked at other kinds of local data. We've talked to developers about their parking capacity and its utilization rates. We've looked at the PUD cases and looked at how many parking spaces are required and provided.

For larger developments, we've looked at all of our BZA cases, where those are, what the level of parking relief was that they

NEAL R. GROSS

1	asked for, what the size of the property is, why
2	the relief was needed, and why in pretty much
3	every case, that relief was granted by the BZA.
4	So we've definitely tried to do as
5	much diving into the local D.Cbased data as is
6	available.
7	MS. TREGONING: If you would like us
8	to address, you know, specifically, any of the
9	points that were raised, we're happy to do that.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, I
11	think there was just, I think you've got the
12	notes from some of the people who had I think
13	it was either Cleveland Park and Adams Morgan in
14	particular seemed to feel that they were being
15	singled out, that the right
16	I think a lot of you had a lot of
17	people in support, but we had a couple of
18	neighborhoods saying, you really don't
19	understand our parking problems. Adams Morgan,
20	in particular, is really concerned about the
21	issues there.

And I think it was Cleveland Park

1	that had some issues with parking in their
2	neighborhood, that they felt that without any,
3	some kind of guidance on getting some more
4	parking or just getting rid of it, they were
5	afraid they were just going to, it's going to be
6	saturated and they're going to have serious
7	problems.
8	I mean, I think if you could just
9	look at those. I think you've got the comments
10	from them. All right, Mr. Chair.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.
12	Commissioner Miller?
13	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you,
14	Mr. Chairman. I would associate myself with Mr.
15	Turnbull's remarks about the Office of
16	Planning's effort, and DDOT's effort, Office of
17	Planning's effort on the whole ZR.
18	And I had eight issues written down.
19	Mr. Turnbull, you covered four of them, but just
20	to follow up.
21	So on this back to the
22	councilmembers' letters, which Cheh and Evan's

1	letters, they talked about the D.Cbased data,
2	but they also talked about this comprehensive
3	parking management plan that DDOT's been doing
4	forever. What's the status of that?
5	MR. ZIMBABWE: It's a continuous
6	planning exercise. So I think that there we
7	are working on thinking about how to manage
8	parking on the, in the public right-of-way,
9	going forward.
10	I think, from our perspective there
11	are two related but separate issues, about
12	provision of parking in private space and the
13	provision of parking and the management of
14	parking in public space.
15	There obviously is some
16	relationship to them, and I think we're looking
17	to what happens with the zoning update to also
18	inform how we approach parking.
19	You know, we've I like to look
20	back at history, and so two things. I think one
21	is that the residential parking permit program
22	was established in the District, 1974.

About ten months after the District 1 got home rule we established a residential 2 permit parking system, which is basically the 3 4 same as it is, was the same then as it is today. Not much has changed in 40 years. 5 6 Mayor Williams Ten ago, years 7 convened a parking task force, and came up with a lot of recommendations, some of which have been 8 acted Most. of the ones related 9 on. residential parking were not acted on. 10 And so I think that -- and some of 11 the same issues that we see today about areas of 12 the city with a lot of demand for curbside 13 14 parking, a lot of, some places with lower demand are the same today as they were then. 15 16 And some of the same, you know, some of the same trends have been in place for the last 17 But so we see these things as an 18 ten years. ongoing process. 19 20 Where we are specifically, you know, we've been doing a lot of the same type of work 21

that the Office of Planning did in developing the

parking recommendations that we're discussing, looking at how other cities are dealing with their curbside management issues, looking at how our own policies relate to those of others in the region and others nationally, and sort of best practices.

We should have, later this winter, some approaches to parking. I don't think that we're at the point where we're going to have a single set of recommendations, because a lot of what we would propose would likely require either council action or at least regulation to be issued by DDOT.

So we will have some sets of comprehensive ideas later this winter, but probably not a full final plan recommendation until some time in 2014.

And that'll depend a little bit on what the feedback is to some of our ideas, some of which, I think, will generate some of the same types of input on both sides, that you've heard for the past few nights of hearings on this

1 I don't know if that answered your 2 question. COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, I think 3 4 it'd be helpful to get those draft approaches as soon as, out as soon as you're able to. 5 6 I mean, their letter says, wait for 7 them until you do your parking mins. And the timing may work out that we'll have them anyway. 8 But there is the -- that is the 9 10 concern of those who expressed concern about the 11 parking, is the spillover into the and the pricing, 12 neighborhoods, the wrong 13 pricing of the on-street, not dealing with the performance or the demand, as you just alluded 14 15 to. 16 MR. ZIMBABWE: Right. And I think that that's where there's some relationship, and 17 then there's some non-relationship, or there's 18 19 sort of, there's a lot of complexity and challenges in thinking about how off-street 20 parking and on-street parking in our current 21

22

programs work.

1	So right now, as you're probably
2	aware, you know, if you qualify for a residential
3	parking permit, which is done on a
4	block-by-block basis.
5	Blocks have to petition us to enter
6	into the system. And the zones, the areas that
7	those permits are valid are the same as the
8	council wards.
9	So anybody who lives in Ward 3, say,
10	that has our residential parking permits, can
11	park anywhere in Ward 3, as if they were a
12	resident of that particular block.
13	And so that creates some of the
14	scarcity in some highly desirable locations for
15	curbside parking. So we can, you know, some of
16	the recommendations in 2003 were to shrink the
17	zones and create more zones and make that more
18	fine-grained. There's also the
19	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Visitor
20	passes, didn't you do them by ANC?
21	MR. ZIMBABWE: We have done them by
22	ANC now, on the visitor parking passes. And it

works okay. I mean, the --1 2 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I know, because I got one recently. 3 4 MR. ZIMBABWE: Good. So yes, so I mean, and the 2003 report recommended 39 zones. 5 6 I think there's 37 ANCs or something close to 7 that so, you know, roughly ANC level zones. That also creates some challenges 8 9 for those who live, who sort of depend on 10 residential permit parking privileges outside of their ANC, and sort of currently like the 11 system at the ward level. 12 13 So, and I think the same type of 14 thing, as we try to introduce more market-based pricing or demand-responsive parking to --15 16 pricing to the curbside, we get some of the same issues that, I think, you've heard and dealt 17 with, in terms of who gets to access that 18 19 curbside, and what that means about, sort of, who's allowed to park in certain places in the 20

District and what that means about the District

as a whole, so.

21

1	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you.
2	While I've got you, or while I've got DDOT, we
3	heard some testimony about increasing the car-
4	sharing requirement, where parking spaces are,
5	you know, I think 50 to 149 is one minimum, 150
6	to 249 spaces, you get, have to, two minimum to
7	park there.
8	Are you looking at that, or
9	MR. ZIMBABWE: Yes. In general,
10	you know, we see car-sharing, on the whole, as
11	an opportunity for people to have access to cars
12	without feeling the need to own cars.
13	And so we support efforts that help
14	make car-sharing a viable thing for people who
15	choose to do that, and choose not to own a car
16	but still need occasional access to a car. So,
17	you know, we support as written.
18	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. And
19	one issue of parking at the but the issue that
20	Commissioner Turnbull brought up, Ms.
21	Steingasser, we talked about this before, and

you said you're going to be working with

1	Independent Education, which I because
2	they're doing analysis.
3	I think there's some valid point
4	I can see how the square footage-based formula
5	is much simpler and predictable, but I think it
6	does not take into account the needs and the
7	demands that, by students, teachers, staff at
8	the individual schools and the different
9	neighborhoods.
10	So I'm glad you're looking at that.
11	I appreciate that. On the IZ, we said we're
12	going to wait till the January case, or whenever,
13	the separate case on IZ.
14	But isn't there an issue that it's
15	not defined at all right now, the or somehow
16	left out the income, the affordability levels?
17	I thought it was
18	MS. STEINGASSER: The issue of the
19	inconsistent definitions of what constitutes
20	low or moderate?
21	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes.
22	MS. STEINGASSER: That'll all be

1	cleared up within the context of the current
2	code. So that will then translate into the new
3	should we get
4	COMMISSIONER MILLER: So that part
5	will be taken care of now?
6	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes, sir. That
7	will be part of the January case.
8	COMMISSIONER MILLER: And I would
9	be supportive, as I know maybe others would be,
10	of lower percentages, the lower, you know, no
11	more than 60 percent for sure.
12	So in my remaining time, we had some
13	testimony about maybe I asked DDOT about this
14	previously, bike racks being proposed to be,
15	they are currently proposed to be 30 inches apart
16	from either other and other obstructions, and
17	somebody said it needed to be 36.
18	MR. ZIMBABWE: Yes, I mean, so on
19	that issue, 30 inches is our standard, and has
20	been our standard for a long time, both on-
21	street and off-street.
22	You know, there's always a trade-off

1	between the space between racks and the number
2	of racks that are able to be fit in a given area.
3	We feel like 30 inches provides that right
4	balance.
5	But we also work with people as
6	they're planning bike parking in developments to
7	see if there's an opportunity to get wider. And
8	we know that, you know, with people having
9	baskets and cargo bikes and things like that, 30
10	inches can sometimes be a little bit tight.
11	So we like to see you know, this
12	is a, you know, a minimum standard rather than
13	a maximum. And we like to see it 36 inches where
14	we can, but we understand there's a trade-off in
15	terms of the space.
16	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay, thank
17	you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll come back.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Vice Chair,
19	you want to go next?
20	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Actually, I was
21	hoping that I would go last, and I can say all
22	of my items have been taken care of. But I too

want to commend the Office of Planning for the 1 work that they put into this effort. 2 And I'd also like to say that I was 3 4 very pleased to see how many people, residents came out to testify. I think that that 5 6 demonstrates the concerns that people have about 7 their city. And it really, I think, adds to the 8 9 entire process, even though there was a lot of 10 disagreement. But, you know, that's what democracy is. 11 I just will reiterate some of the 12 13 things that have already been said, maybe just coming at it differently. And again, people 14 argue for things like performance parking and 15 16 market demand, and they don't realize. And I was very taken with a few 17 individuals' testimony regarding the price of 18 19 parking, and how, you know, it's really 20 inexpensive to park your car. And everybody in the city who 21 22 doesn't have a car is actually subsidizing that.

And therefore, again, I urge DDOT to evaluate that issue.

And of course, in evaluating it, the

And of course, in evaluating it, the communication of why you're doing something is extraordinarily important, because I think people -- you know, be careful what you ask for, what you wish for, because it may cost you more. And in this case, I believe it will.

The other thing, again, I'd like to also state, I think everybody in this room understands how important I personally believe IZ is, but I also understand that there's a disconnect between the demand and the need in what we're providing under IZ.

And I'm hoping that we can fix that somewhat. I know there's going to be pushback. It's an economic issue. It is not just in the demand but in the supply as well.

And we have to take that into consideration, like the cost of land and the cost of subsidy needed to provide these units in today's economic market.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I was again, there is an
2	impressive amount of individuals who are
3	utilizing multiple forms of transit. And
4	again, the bike issue and more bike parking, I
5	think, is very important.
6	Our streets are clogged, and a lot
7	of it is demand coming into our city that we have
8	no control over. We can't congestion-price or
9	do any of the other possibilities of, you know,
10	getting people to pay to come into the city other
11	than through, you know, maybe parking.
12	So because of that, I really do
13	believe that we need to be very careful when we
14	address minimum parking standards, because we
15	are
16	I mean, I don't drive, but when I'm,
17	I live downtown so I'm constantly aware of the
18	traffic problems, the congestion and the
19	problems that people are facing just getting
20	from Point A to Point B.
21	Accessory apartments, I think I
22	earlier stated that I think the size that's being

1	required to permit accessory apartments may make
2	a number of them, in certain neighborhoods,
3	illegal.
4	And so you need to revisit that,
5	because I even used my own block, that the
6	accessory apartments on that block might end up
7	being illegal. So let's revisit that.
8	MR. LAWSON: We've actually started
9	to re-look at that already. We've started to do
10	some analysis of lot size in different zones and
11	typical sizes of houses, you know, those kinds
12	of things. So we expect to have that analysis
13	completed relatively soon.
14	VICE CHAIR COHEN: And then I know
15	that the width of the alleyway is an issue for
16	the fire department, and yet some people believe
17	that it's not an issue. And so again it's, you
18	know, reconfirming a lot of that.
19	As far as one of the things I
20	wanted to also mention is, I believe the issue
21	and the arguments over data, I mean, I think the

Office of Planning has given us a consistent

1	reference to the American Community Survey.
2	And, you know, every data can be
3	interpreted differently, but I hope that all of
4	these reports are available online for people to
5	review, because I think we all need to be
6	familiar with them in making our decisions.
7	And again, your citing best
8	practices in different cities, I think, again,
9	we don't need to reinvent the wheel. We just
10	need to adapt to our own conditions.
11	Corner groceries, there is, you
12	know, mixed concern in different neighborhoods.
13	Some neighborhoods have had bad experiences.
14	I know you're limiting the
15	percentage of square footage for liquor sales.
16	Again, I in areas where the income limit is
17	increasing, there's better produce.
18	And I think that maybe if it's under
19	the jurisdiction of the Health Department or
20	whomever, you know, they need to get out there
21	more often and make sure that produce is not aged
22	and, you know, things that are being sold are

1	dated, if we decide to move forward on corner
2	groceries.
3	Oh, I've got plenty of time. Let's
4	see. Oh, again, on parking I'm skipping
5	around because there's just a lot of stuff that
6	I was taking notes on.
7	But shared parking, some, and any
8	kind of shared loading, there seems to be some
9	concern by residents in downtown, in Penn
10	Quarter, who can't access the shared loading, at
11	least, for their deliveries.
12	You know, the owners are not
13	allowing deliveries unless it's during business
14	hours, so there needs to be some way of dealing
15	with that problem, again, if we want downtown to
16	be a mixed-use residential area.
17	Oh, and I have, on frequent
18	occasions, talked about encouraging art, and not
19	to be necessarily meeting a requirement by
20	hanging a few paintings in a lobby. That just
21	really doesn't make a vital or vibrant or

aesthetic statement.

1	Many cities, there are best
2	practices of cities that promote and encourage
3	and probably subsidize. I don't know if we're
4	working with the Department of Arts and
5	Humanities or I mean Commission of Arts and
6	Humanities on that issue.
7	But I really think that a city that's
8	being promoted as, you know, City Beautiful,
9	should be able to encourage more actual art on
10	the street level, and make it more available to
11	all people.
12	I do like the idea that we encourage,
13	you know, water features in new developments
14	and, along the waterfront. So that's it for
15	now.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
17	Commissioner May?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you very
19	much. Also I would like to acknowledge the
20	efforts of the Office of Planning. Thank you
21	for all of your hard work, not just preparing all
22	this but, you know, actually just understanding

1 it all.

This is just a massive, massive undertaking. And I do think that the, generally speaking, the public outreach has been very good.

And while there may be a lot of people who feel like there hasn't been enough or they haven't, it hasn't connected thoroughly with them, you know, I don't think that's really for a lack of effort.

It may be for lack of effectiveness.

I'm not sure exactly what's attributable there,

but I would hope that people would get past any

sort of upset over not being fully informed over

it, and get informed now.

And I think that we have enough time for people to get informed and to get involved and, you know, give us the input that they think that they need to give us. All right, enough of that.

I have a whole lot of comments, like I do on the other sections, that I will be

NEAL R. GROSS

submitting some in writing. Some of them are just sort of simple, you know, question and response sorts of things, and those things will be in the record.

Then I have a, you know, I have a few that are more sort of typographical, that you can, you know, I'll share those too, but I don't think those are worthy of any note.

There are a few that I wanted to ask directly today, and this is based on my reading of the regs and not just on the commentary that we heard.

On the issue of setbacks for roof structures, if a building is taller than adjacent buildings' existing or by-right height, that -- you know, I think what we're allowing is existing or by-right height, but there are certainly circumstances where the by-right height is a lot higher than the existing.

And the existing is an historic building, and so we're never, we're always going

NEAL R. GROSS

1	to wind up seeing that extra penthouse. Do we
2	deal with that circumstance somehow? I don't
3	recall.
4	I remember raising the issue before,
5	but I didn't think it was covered in the regs.
6	MS. STEINGASSER: I don't have a
7	memory of it being covered, so I think we'd
8	probably, it probably fell through.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: All right, so
10	I'll
11	MS. STEINGASSER: We'll need to
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: And you may know
13	of it now, but I'll include it in my list of
14	MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. That'll
15	be great.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: written
17	things, and you can respond to that one. The
18	side and rear setbacks, with regard to well,
19	sorry, side and rear setbacks allow retaining
20	walls as defined by the building code, but that
21	does not appear to be consistent with what we
22	were considering in the retaining wall

1	regulation rewrite.
2	So is that just not caught up
3	entirely yet?
4	MS. STEINGASSER: It's not caught
5	up. We were waiting for that case to
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. The
7	Section 1916 drive-throughs, I was surprised to
8	see that we have drive-throughs. Do we really
9	need to permit drive-throughs anymore?
10	I mean, new ones, can they
11	grandfathered under the existing ones? Do we
12	need to permit new ones? I mean, is there a
13	sufficient demand, I mean, I say this because I
14	know that there are some parts of the country
15	where they're not permitted anymore because of
16	the pollution and things like that.
17	So why, I mean, why do we do that?
18	MS. STEINGASSER: You want to give
19	us guidance to scratch it, we can scratch it.
20	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Scratch
21	drive-throughs?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

1	VICE CHAIR COHEN: I would be for
2	that.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: All right, I
4	think we should think about that. I mean, I
5	don't think there's, anybody's ready to decide
6	that right now, but I think you should think
7	about that.
8	MS. STEINGASSER: We can look at
9	that and do some surveying and look at where they
LO	are now, and
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
12	MS. STEINGASSER: it'll be easy
13	enough to map out.
L4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So there
15	were some I was a bit confused about trash,
L6	I don't know why. 2107.3, trash receptacles
L7	appear to be permitted in front yards or in
18	public space under the control of a property
L9	owner, so in that, you know, that front yard
20	space.
21	And I'm not sure that that should be
22	universally permitted, that there might be some

1	sort of control over that, because most of those
2	parking, you know, trash receptacles should be
3	handled out of alleys that are serviceable by
4	DPW.
5	I think there are circumstances
6	where you have homes that are, that don't have
7	alleys, and they're not serviceable by any kind
8	of a walking alley or anything like that, so
9	there's no choice but for the trash to come out
10	front.
11	MS. TREGONING: I would say, on
12	almost every block there's some, there are
13	houses that, because of the way the alley turns,
14	that don't have access. So there are always,
15	like I say, on almost every block, some houses
16	that don't have alley access.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So if it
18	gets too complicated to administer it based on,
19	you know, having exceptions for those
20	circumstances, I mean, it just seems like it's
21	a question that ought to be addressed.

I think some people just put them in

1	the front yard because it's easier. And so I'm
2	not sure what the right solution is there, but
3	it's just some it's one of those picky little
4	things. And I'm just always full of picky
5	little things.
6	MS. STEINGASSER: Can you give us
7	that section number again?
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: 2107.3.
9	MS. STEINGASSER: Got it.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: So on IZ, I
11	appreciate the fact that you want to bring a sort
12	of a completely separate revision. I have
13	spoken separately to Ms. Tregoning about how I
14	think we ought to try to be more aggressive out
15	of it.
16	I mean, I've got that sense of things
17	that if there's room for us to be more aggressive
18	in requirements for IZ, that that would be good.
19	I did have one particular question,
20	which is that I wonder whether the differential
21	between the 8 percent and the 10 percent
22	requirement, which is based on the type of

1	construction, is that incentivizing the wrong
2	solutions in some cases? Is that something that
3	we need to look at?
4	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes it is.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So, and
6	that'll be part of what you do in your rewrite,
7	perfect. So let's talk about parking for a
8	second, just a second.
9	First of all, the letters, I
10	thought, were very interesting. Some of the
11	things that showed up in the letters, not the
12	desire for more extensive data about the
13	District I think that there actually is a fair
14	amount of data to be working from, but more about
15	having to have a comprehensive solution.
16	I mean, that's been one of my themes,
17	I think, from the beginning of our attempt to
18	study parking regulations, because I am very
19	concerned that if we eliminate minimums or
20	reduce them, that we are going to wind up
21	creating a problem in neighborhoods.

And I have also been regularly

raising the issue of RPP participation in, you know, large apartments where, you know, there before us is a PUD or even in a BZA case that, you know, we need to make sure that if you build a large building, that the parking needs are all addressed and that parking on the street does not become an option for residents of those buildings, because that increases the pressure on the buildings.

I also know how, in many cases where you've got commercial areas that are in close proximity to residential areas, there is a problem with people who work in those buildings parking in the neighborhoods.

I will admit that I did that. And I knew where the parking patrols worked and the times, and I knew that if I went out at a certain time of day I could move my car and get away with it.

So you can game the system, and I think people do it. I don't think that's a really huge problem, but it is possible. And I

NEAL R. GROSS

1	think that we have to be wary about that.
2	I am very interested in
3	understanding all of the tools that are being
4	considered by DDOT at this time. I won't ask you
5	to enumerate everything right now.
6	And I'm not I mean, maybe getting
7	the draft of whatever you're looking at would be
8	helpful. But at the very least, I'd like to know
9	what, I mean, what are you doing right now?
10	What are the tools that are going to
11	be available in the future? Are you looking at
12	you know, I mean, at one point we talked about
13	having RPP just cost more, and then cost more for
14	the second car, and cost more for the third car.
15	And I think those are solutions. We
16	can't require that, obviously. But if that's on
17	the table, I mean, that's a council thing, right?
18	So maybe you want to talk about that a little bit.
19	And I will have some other questions, since I'm
20	running out of time.
21	MR. ZIMBABWE: I'll probably go
22	overtime in responding to all those, but I'll try

to keep it quick, and we can come back to it, always.

And there are a couple of things that I think probably each of them warrant some more discussion. So on the first issue of -- well, I don't know which was first, but the issue of, you know, requiring larger, new buildings to not, who do not provide parking on site, to not have RPP.

I think, so we have never, since the inception of the program, looked at whether somebody had off-street parking or not, in determining their eligibility for the RPP program.

So you can have a driveway, you can have a garage, you can have a parking space off-street. You can have a parking space not on-street. And you still are eligible if your block has opted into the program.

In some ways, actually somewhat paradoxically, if you have a building that provides a lot of parking but is eligible for

NEAL R. GROSS

RPP, even if those people all technically park 1 their cars off-street every night, they're still 2 eligible for RPP and may create more strain on 3 4 the system than a building that has no parking and has a few people who end up with vehicles that 5 6 they would enter into the RPP system. 7 So a building that has 300 units with 300 parking spaces off-street would have and 8 might end up having 300 vehicles in the RPP 9 10 program. And a building that has zero parking 11 spaces off-street might end up with 20 parking 12 spaces -- cars in the RPP program. So it's not 13 quite as simple --14 COMMISSIONER MAY: You describe the 15 16 problem very well. So what's the answer. Right. So, well 17 MR. ZIMBABWE: sir, there are several answers. And I think, 18 19 you know, as you said, all of them, most likely all of them will take either council action or 20 some sort of regulatory change, which would 21

require some form of deliberation and perhaps

1	council action at the end of it, too.
2	So, you know, we could charge for
3	initial car, subsequent cars, things like that.
4	Going back to the 1974 legislation, it says very
5	clearly.
6	"The commissioner" at that time
7	the commissioner, now it would be the director,
8	"is authorized to establish by order an annual
9	residential permit parking fee to cover the
10	administrative costs of permits issued pursuant
11	to this section."
12	So unless there is something that
13	administratively is costing more, you know
14	and that's a distinction in District law about
15	administrative fees versus non-administrative
16	fees
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think it's an
18	opportunity for you to seriously expand the
19	staff.
20	MR. ZIMBABWE: Yes, exactly,
21	exactly.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Just kidding,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	just kidding.
2	MR. ZIMBABWE: The you know, so
3	there's a cost element to it. There's, I think,
4	a zone size element to it.
5	You know, if you reduce the size of
6	the zone so it actually is more of a neighborhood
7	and not a ward, that would address some of the
8	spillover effects but would have other ancillary
9	impacts which, you know, would impact some
10	people.
11	You know, what we've ended up doing,
12	in large part right now, is creating more and
13	more restrictions on who can access the street.
14	So we've made, in some of the
15	performance parking areas, by council law in all
16	of Ward 1, what's, you know, some resident-only,
17	some ward-only on one side of the block.
18	Actually, I think legally, we
19	probably couldn't do that on both sides of the
20	block. We would need to leave some access for
21	people who are not on at least one side of the

block.

1 That's somewhat separate, that's been the response. But as there's more 2 -- you know, in dense places, the competition may 3 4 be more with neighbors than it is with non-neighbors, whether they have off-street 5 6 parking or not. 7 And that's I think where, you know, coming back to the question of is this integral 8 to the zoning or is it related and, you know, 9 10 complementary. I would side on the -- I would be 11 the side of saying they're related. They need 12 to, you know, interact with each other but they 13 don't need to go in lock step with each other, 14 15 from my perspective. So we can maybe come back 16 to it. 17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so I've done ten minutes, plus. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I too will follow 20 up, administratively, on the RPP issue. But let me go first to Ms. Tregoning. Well let me say 21

this.

1	I want to echo the comments of all
2	of my colleagues with the work that Office of
3	Planning has done, as well as the work that the
4	Office of Zoning has done, and more than that,
5	the citizens who participated, whether you
6	agreed, disagreed or in between.
7	We appreciate all the comments, all
8	the work and the time that a lot of people have
9	put into this, and actually are going to continue
10	to put in. I see more time that needs to spent.
11	Let me ask Ms. Tregoning, is it fair
12	for me to say that this proposal from the Office
13	of Planning that's in front of us has been
14	balanced with data not just from Cleveland Park,
15	Georgetown and those neighborhoods, as well as
16	we've also looked at Deanwood, we looked at
17	Brookland, we looked at Congress Heights.
18	So the data that this commission has
19	been presented is balanced and it's across the
20	city.
21	MS. TREGONING: I think it is very
22	fair to say that, although I would also go on to

1	say when it comes to specific elements, and
2	parking might be one of those, the idea behind
3	the parking proposal is to allow the parking that
4	is provided to be tailored at that time to the
5	conditions in that neighborhood.
6	Because otherwise what we have is a
7	one-size-fits-all, based on a zoning category,
8	which is indifferent to what the car ownership
9	rate is, or the utilization rate, or many other
10	things that affect how much parking demand there
11	might be in a neighborhood.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm
13	actually glad to hear you say that. And I also
14	was glad to hear you say about the multi-modal
15	issue, giving people options, because basically
16	we're victims of circumstance.
17	The five of us do something
18	different. I learned another word during this
19	process, car light. I think maybe I am car
20	light, except on weekends, okay.
21	II
	So anyway, so the data in the letters

1	have but a few minutes, but the letters that the
2	councilmembers had talked about, basically the
3	letters say where is it provided, and do we have
4	it?
5	Those are the questions. They say,
6	where is it provided, do we have it. And I heard
7	the Vice Chair say it's up on the website. Is
8	there data out there that people can access? Is
9	it on the website?
10	And I'll be honest, other than what
11	you give me, I don't necessarily go to the
12	website.
13	MS. STEINGASSER: The reports are
14	up there, and all the data is referred to in the
15	reports. What might be easier is if we go back
16	through those reports and pull the data out, give
17	it a name and make it it's own place to go, so
18	people can go and see the census information
19	we're using for parking and the
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That may be
21	helpful.
22	MS. STEINGASSER: GIS

1	information we're using for accessory
2	buildings, things like that.
3	MS. TREGONING: Well, while you
4	were talking I did pull up the letter to see kind
5	of what was being referred to, and I think part
6	of it's a little bit unclear, and I can
7	certainly go back to the councilmembers and ask.
8	But part of what we said is that
9	there are cities out there who seem to operate
10	very effectively with standards that require
11	less parking, that require, you know, that are
12	different than our standards.
13	And yet in terms of our levels of car
14	ownership, our use of other modes of
15	transportation, you know, the options that we
16	have in this city, the trend data for the city,
17	that I think what we try to do is say, other
18	cities who have many fewer choices than we do and
19	less favorable data, have successfully
20	implemented some of these changes.
21	So it wasn't to say, oh we're just
22	like this city or that city. In some ways it was

1	to say, we are way ahead of some of these cities
2	in terms of the options that we've offered to
3	people and their uptake of those options, but
4	we're behind a lot of these other cities in terms
5	of what they've done to rationalize the parking
6	requirements.
7	You know, the striking thing, if you
8	go back and look at it, the original basis for
9	the parking requirements that we have is pulled
10	practically out of thin air.
11	It differs from city to city, from
12	place to place to, you know, for any given use,
13	it's different everywhere. And it doesn't seem
14	to, you know, to have had a rational basis.
15	But now, you know, it's enshrined in
16	law. And what, you know, what we're trying to
17	do is to give a rational explanation for the
18	requirements that we have going forward, but
19	also recognizing what are our trends.
20	And, because we don't want to impose
21	costs on anybody, particularly adding to the

costs of housing in this city, you know,

unnecessarily.

We don't want to -- given the fact that we're a growing city, we don't want to send a signal out into the ether, please come and with your car, or two if you can manage it. Bring two cars here and come.

Because that, we'll never be able to accommodate that kind of traffic. So we're trying to both send those signals, but also accommodate every single mode of transportation that exists in the city now and that we might get in the future.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me -no, that's all right. I can bank that four
minutes, three minutes. Okay. Let me ask, let
me get a response from Office of Planning on
this, and I hope I'm getting this right. I wrote
this down from Sue Hemberger.

"If we are serious about affordable housing, let's have a code that allows deeper discounts on housing in exchange for parking."

There may be a legality issue, but can I get a

1	response on that statement?
2	MS. STEINGASSER: Just on a
3	today, so pure economics don't match. A parking
4	space that costs \$40,000 won't begin, even if we
5	took an entire floor, to pay for a condominium
6	or a house that costs \$400,000 just to construct.
7	So the economics are
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it doesn't get us
9	to deeper, like to the 30 percent of the AMI. It
10	doesn't get us there.
11	MS. STEINGASSER: It really
12	doesn't. It really doesn't.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, fine. Let me
14	move fast. AAA, I know that there was some
15	discussion with Mr. Townsend from AAA. He
16	factored in people who visit the city, this, you
17	know, we have a lot of tourist sites. People
18	come to D.C.
19	And some of the things that were
20	requested well let me back up. Who's
21	responsible or whose jurisdiction is it to
22	expand downtown? I think that came from Ms

1	well, anyway, that's the question I have. Whose
2	jurisdiction is to expand downtown?
3	MS. STEINGASSER: Are we talking
4	about the West End Citizen Association concern
5	about
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, not the CF or
7	whatever, I can't remember what the acronyms
8	are, but they no, I'm talking about expanding
9	downtown.
10	There was something that we talked
11	about expanding down, or we increased it, but it
12	wasn't West End. It was with the Committee of
13	100 about how we're expanding downtown.
14	MS. STEINGASSER: Well we're
15	proposing to match what's currently inside the
16	DD overlay, to match those incentives that
17	created the living downtown, the arts
18	incentives, to the high density areas as
19	currently identified on the comp plan. We're
20	not exceeding those, so
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I guess, for me,
22	when I look at areas that expand, like Capitol

1	Hill as far as, or used to expand I don't know
2	if it's still expanding or not, whose authority
3	is it? Who has the authority to expand
4	downtown?
5	Is it Office of Planning? Who is
6	it?
7	MS. STEINGASSER: Well, I'm not
8	sure that it requires an authority as much as
9	it's an organic process, that offices, as
10	there's no more space in what we consider the
11	traditional K and Connecticut, start to move
12	into areas like NoMa.
13	You know, NoMa sat vacant and scary
14	for many, many years, until the market
15	organically went there because that's where the
16	density.
17	So we've identified areas through
18	the DD in the early 90s as part, as being
19	receiving zones for density from the downtown.
20	So that created kind of a ring of high density
21	areas.

And now we're proposing, through

1	this zoning, which is reflective of our comp
2	plan, to connect those, basically, to fill in
3	those.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me just
5	say this. I do want us to try to engage AAA. I
6	think you all are committed to doing that.
7	MS. STEINGASSER: We're happy to
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, you know, I'm
9	not going to just say AAA. Have we engaged AAA?
10	Because some people have. I don't know what the
11	other folks, or like, Allstate has a plan.
12	So have we engaged people like that
13	in the conversation? Because it's very even
14	though some of my colleagues had some concern
15	about presentation, but I think it's important
16	that they be engaged in the discussion.
17	Because, you know, one of the points
18	he made that was a concern to me is people coming
19	into the city, which then puts another burden on
20	those of us who are in the city.
21	MS. STEINGASSER: Absolutely. You
22	know, we're happy to receive whatever data we can

1	get from AAA. We've been to their website.
2	That's where we got the figures that we provided
3	to the commission on the cost of owning an
4	automobile.
5	So we're very interested in dealing
6	with whatever data they want to provide to us,
7	that can help us or lend a factual credibility
8	to what we're doing.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I just want
10	to put in, my last question is, the parking data,
11	this whole discussion about parking spaces.
12	Do we know that well, I know that
13	the accomplishments we're trying to do is
14	improve housing affordability, reduce the
15	government costs, and encourage use of public
16	transportation.
17	I specifically know, when you have
18	a problem parking you definitely encourage use
19	of public transportation. But does parking
20	I didn't really understand or get where parking
21	my time is up, and I'm going to be obedient

to my own rules, and I'll ask that on the next

1	round. Okay, Mr. Turnbull.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay, Mr.
3	Chair. I just wanted to add, although I
4	complimented the Office of Planning at the
5	beginning, I was remiss in mentioning the Office
6	of Zoning, and the three amigos at the end of the
7	day is Mr. Rogers, Mr. Henson and Mr. Zimbabwe.
8	So I want to thank you gentlemen,
9	too, for all your work, and your staff. First
10	thing, getting back to RPP for a minute, it was,
11	I think it was on a PUD, it was established
12	I don't know if Mr. Henson said it, but there's
13	no RPP for a building on a commercial street,
14	that what we defined as a commercial street.
15	Was that it?
16	MR. ZIMBABWE: Typically, so there
17	are eligibility requirements, and if a street is
18	non-residential at all, then it would not
19	generally qualify for a
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So any
21	street, like in the back, behind it, they're not
22	eligible for it, or?

1	MR. ZIMBABWE: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. On
3	the car-sharing, and we had a representative, I
4	forget the gentleman from Zip Car, but we talked
5	about public and private parking.
6	And we had some comments about,
7	worried about Zip Car or shared parking spaces
8	in garages where there might be a security
9	concern.
10	How do you manage giving, I mean, you
11	have they have to buy a space in the public
12	space to have a Zip Car.
13	MR. ZIMBABWE: So we currently have
14	84 spaces, city wide, that are dedicated
15	on-street parking spaces for car-sharing
16	companies, and there's two vendors right now,
17	there's Zip Car and there's Enterprise.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
19	MR. ZIMBABWE: Those were
20	established in, I think, 2005, 2006, through a
21	process where we actually went to the ANCs, got
22	resolutions in support of dedicating those

1	spaces.
2	Most cases we would take out a meter.
3	They're generally not on residential streets.
4	We still have a process where those companies can
5	come to us with other additional spaces, where
6	we would look and see if it's viable.
7	They would get an ANC resolution in
8	support and we could dedicate another space, you
9	know, if it's agreeable to the community to an
10	on-street reserved car-sharing space.
11	Otherwise, we're sort of not
12	beyond those 84, we don't feel the need. You
13	know, we see a lot of car-sharing being provided
14	in off-street spaces.
15	We don't feel the need to expand the
16	public space unless those, it's viable and the
17	community supports it.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Sc
19	you have a process where a company comes before
20	you, you go to the ANC or the neighborhood and
21	then it's vetted and you approve it or whatever?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. ZIMBABWE: Exactly.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I
2	didn't have an issue with the drive-throughs per
3	se except, well I'm thinking of fast food for one
4	thing, but I worry about banks. Some areas of
5	the city, a drive-through for a bank or something
6	might be a valuable asset to the neighborhood.
7	So I don't know whether there should
8	be a special exception in certain areas for like
9	a bank or certain that's the only thing where
10	I see is where it's a convenient, I mean, I love
11	pulling up to an ATM and getting my money. But
12	that's just me.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, it's
14	very easy to pull up to them on a bicycle, too.
15	Just saying.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'll have
17	to well, I walk a lot, and I do it by walking
18	a lot, more. I haven't done it by bike yet,
19	though.
20	The other thing, and I think I
21	mentioned this off line about, we had a Mr.
22	O'Looney from Torti Gallas came, and he was

	talking about the architectural embellishments.
2	And I went back. I'm still looking
3	at this picture that he showed, and the one
4	building down the street looked like the
5	pergolas could have been built as a matter of
6	right, and that's not an issue.
7	The pergola in the middle, if that
8	was PUD, I can see how that could be approved.
9	The ugly thing at the corner with the, what I
10	would call the, it looks like the washing rack
11	that you put out in your back yard, and from the
12	1950s, I don't know how that got approved.
13	But anyways, there was a thing about
14	going above the height act, going above the
15	building height. And we so I think you were
16	going to look at that.
17	And I'm and normally, on a PUD,
18	we've actually acquiesced on some of those
19	issues where we have a main feature on a corner
20	or whatever.
21	MS. STEINGASSER: We'll certainly
22	look at that further, and talk with Mr. O'Looney
	•

1	about what this was.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I don't
3	know what his concern was, yes. I mean, I think
4	it's there. The flexibility is there, but
5	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay, thank
6	you, Mr. Chairman. Back to the IZ, when you look
7	are you, when, as part of your review, are you
8	I assume you're reviewing whether the current
9	IZ-excluded zones, whether they still make
10	sense.
11	I mean, in some cases, it's because
12	they're excluded because you can't get any
13	additional density because it's at the maximum
14	density. And I think that was used in the,
15	that's in some of downtown, that's in some of,
16	it's NoMa and maybe Capitol Gateway.
17	But we had a Capitol Gateway case
18	where I was looking into the regulations
19	recently, and there was actually a 1.0 FAR that
20	was a discretionary on the part of the Zoning
21	Commission, if it met certain criteria.

And it just seemed to me if, wherever

1	there's additional density that's obtained,
2	that's going to be discretionary, it seems that
3	we should be looking at whether the that zone,
4	if it doesn't currently have IZ applied to it,
5	we should consider applying it to.
6	I think Mr. Cochran gave his
7	testimony and the downtown, we heard the
8	expanded downtown, that 5 of the 11, or 6 of the
9	11 zones, of D zones do have inclusionary zoning
10	applied.
11	MS. STEINGASSER: They do. We
12	found what the confusion was, was a typo. We had
13	cut and pasted some sections, and the word not
14	got left in.
15	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Not. I did
16	count it nine
17	MS. STEINGASSER: Exactly.
18	COMMISSIONER MILLER: I did count
19	nine of them, nine of the eleven.
20	MS. STEINGASSER: And we have taken
21	that out.
22	COMMISSIONER MILLER: But it's

1	actually, they do apply in that, about half of
2	the zones.
3	MS. STEINGASSER: At least five.
4	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Five.
5	MR. COCHRAN: Excuse me, record.
б	Steve Cochran, OP. It applies in all areas
7	where IZ now applies. We didn't take any zones
8	to which IZ applies out of these IZ applications
9	area.
10	But it does not apply in the TDR
11	receiving zones, which do comprise a fairly
12	hefty chunk of the expanded area of downtown, and
13	that's simply because within the heights and the
14	densities that are now within those zones, which
15	we didn't increase, you simply can't accommodate
16	any more density after you take into account the
17	receipt of the TDRs.
18	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thanks.
19	MR. COCHRAN: And the same
20	basically applies to the C4. Again, they're
21	just bulk limitations.
22	COMMISSIONER MILLER: But it would

1 be useful to see where, the chart where it is excluded and why, and whether it would still make 3 sense. That would be 4 MS. STEINGASSER: 5 very easy to provide. 6 COMMISSIONER MILLER: I don't know if this is Subtitle C or -- the Consortium of 7 Universities had a number of issues, and some of 8 them are in Subtitle C. Some of them are, might 10 be Subtitle 10. But one of their biggest ones -- I 11 don't know where it was, the interior private 12 13 roads, they were concerned about, that they were, the current draft regulations require 14 15 interior private roads on a campus that serve as 16 access to buildings for circulation be excluded from FAR calculations. 17 And they said this is a significant 18 19 departure from existing practice and it would deprive universities of their existing density 20 You may have addressed this in a 21

22

previous hearing.

1	MS. STEINGASSER: At the yes.
2	Sometime last week or the week before, it did
3	come up, and the Commission was comfortable with
4	extending that exclusion to them. So we will be
5	taking them out of that definition.
6	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. And
7	one of their Subtitle C issues was being able to
8	permit accessory uses on college and university
9	campus, even if the accessory use is not
10	permitted in the underlying zone, so long as the
11	use is determined to be incidental and
12	subordinate to the principal use. Is that it?
13	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes. We are
14	what we've done there is we've proposed a limit
15	on how much, and some evidence, that they have
16	to provide some evidence on how, what the nexus
17	is.
18	But I think there was some concern
19	that they raised about our proposal, that it be
20	internal to the campus. They brought up George
21	Washington specifically.

That's actually a very external,

1	urban university that addresses the street. So
2	we're going to make sure that we cover that
3	concern.
4	COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. So it
5	was a week ago that we had testimony from folks
6	in neighborhoods that said that Capital
7	Bikeshare runs out of bikes at 14th and R, and
8	16th and T.
9	How quickly does it take for you all
10	to it's only been one week since
11	MR. ZIMBABWE: Yes, exactly.
12	COMMISSIONER MILLER: You knew
13	about that already.
14	MR. ZIMBABWE: So, you know, we can
15	no longer say that we have the largest bike-share
16	program in the country, but we still like to say
17	we have the most successful. And that sometimes
18	means that there is scarcity.
19	So and we're constantly looking
20	for places to expand and add stations. Some of
21	
	the so we always look to balance station,

1 towards, like near downtown and, you know, in dense neighborhoods with farther outlying 2 neighborhoods to provide more access. 3 4 Right now there's a four to six month lead time on ordering stations, not that -- you 5 6 know, we've got orders in. We've got stations 7 that we're continuing to expand. But it is a little bit of a supply chain issue. 8 9 also do, have So we we а 10 crowd-sourcing map that's part of the Capital Bikeshare website, where we ask for those types 11 of input. 12 13 And we sort of gather, not just from individual testimony 14 but from the whole universe, places to continue to look to expand. 15 16 But I noted those, and we'll work on those, too. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair? 17 VICE CHAIR COHEN: I think we're 18 19 making this a bit more broad, but I just think 20 it'd be helpful for us to have -- I'm sorry, for OP to develop a roadmap, because there was a lot 21

of Georgetown envy.

1	People really wanted, or seemed to
2	want what Georgetown has. And so if a roadmap
3	of how they can, you know, move ahead, because
4	a lot of the responsibility is on their
5	shoulders, and I think that it would be helpful.
6	And then I want to speak on behalf
7	of the four-legged residents of the District of
8	Columbia. I know they didn't get out here to
9	testify, but again, we need some workable
10	veterinarian space that has boarding for
11	overnight guests.
12	And there are, again, there are ways
13	of dealing with noise and waste.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, Commissioner
15	May?
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, so picking
1 17	
17	up where we left off, the ultimately we're
18	up where we left off, the ultimately we're going to have to come to some piece, I guess,
18	going to have to come to some piece, I guess,
18 19	going to have to come to some piece, I guess, about how we believe spillover parking issues

figured out yet. You don't have everything figured out yet.

And it's not just a zoning issue, per se. It's going to be how zoning meshes with DDOT policies. You know, at the very least, I do think we need the sort of list of tools under consideration.

And some of it are things that are specific to, you know, how you handle the parking itself. But some of it is also how RPP is handled, even within the zoning code.

I mean, so is there, you know -- and this probably goes beyond the zoning code but, you know, are there buildings of a certain size that simply should not be -- you know, if you build a building of a certain size, should it be automatically excluded from RPP?

And I would think that there is an argument that it could be, or should be. You know, as much as we want to say that the market is going to decide, there are always going to be bad players who are just going to throw up a

building and rent it out, and not care about how people park.

You know, I'm not worried about the big, big buildings, because those are generally done by developers who are, you know, who really have a concern about customer service.

But some are thrown up by people who just want to throw them up and make some money and then maybe sell them off or something like that. So I think we need to be, have a coherent plan for that.

So I'm interested in the, sort of, the zoning tools that are available to us, and also then how that is complemented by what DDOT has under consideration, whether or not it's, you know, no matter what the process is to get those, active council or what have you.

It would also be very helpful to me

-- and maybe you've already produced this and

it's a matter of pointing me to it. But I have

a very thick file now and have not memorized

everything.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I have a thick file under that, and
2	then there's the, you know, then there are the
3	regs themselves. A chart that compares the
4	existing parking requirements by the existing
5	zones to, you know, how, you know, existing zone,
6	new zone, parking, in the various forms,
7	something simple like that.
8	I hate to keep making you sort of
9	produce these kind of crosswalks, but
10	MS. STEINGASSER: We have that.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: You have?
12	Good.
13	MS. STEINGASSER: We've already
14	done that.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Excellent. Did
16	you do I have it?
17	MS. STEINGASSER: No, you don't.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, good.
19	Well that would be great to have. I love asking
20	for things you already have. Speaking of which,
21	I need a color copy of the maps that are on your
22	report that we received.

1	I got a black and white, and it looks
2	like you have the best walk scores in the middle
3	of the Potomac, so I don't think that's correct.
4	It's I know it's the opposite.
5	But you can't tell the difference between a dark
6	green and a dark red, so, because they're both
7	gray.
8	MR. LAWSON: We actually handed out
9	separate copies that are 11 by 17
LO	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh good. So we
11	already have that in the other submissions.
L2	(Simultaneous speaking)
13	MR. LAWSON: have that in your
L4	
	package, we'd be happy to distribute it again if
15	you like.
15 16 17	you like.
16	you like. COMMISSIONER MAY: That's even
L6 L7	you like. COMMISSIONER MAY: That's even better. Not only do you have it, I have it.
16 17 18	you like. COMMISSIONER MAY: That's even better. Not only do you have it, I have it. It's
16 17 18	you like. COMMISSIONER MAY: That's even better. Not only do you have it, I have it. It's MR. LAWSON: Yes, the bigger size.

1	First of all, there's a new bike-share station
2	in East Potomac Park by the tennis courts, not
3	too far from my office.
4	So if you have meetings at my office,
5	now you can come by bike-share. It's just, you
6	know, you've got to walk the equivalent of like,
7	two blocks but, you know, it's a really great
8	thing.
9	We're very happy to have it there.
10	I hope it becomes very busy like the other ones
11	that we have in Parkland. And we're hoping to
12	have more in other locations.
13	Second thing about bike parking
14	racks, generally speaking, they're 30 inches
15	apart? Like the ones out front, they're 30
16	inches apart? Yes. I mean, because you put
17	those not you, but Jim Sebastian had those put
18	in, I think before you were
19	MR. ZIMBABWE: That was before me.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: But, because I
21	think that's probably fairly workable. I mean,
22	the only place where I really have problems with

1	the racks being too close together was that zoo
2	over at Union Station when I don't know if it's
3	still there anymore, but it used to be hell
4	parking in that big field of bike parking.
5	And the last thing is, what is this?
6	We got this tonight. Is somebody going to walk
7	us through it?
8	MS. STEINGASSER: We can do that
9	right now.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh excellent.
11	MS. STEINGASSER: We supplied this
12	as a way, in anticipation that you might ask some
13	questions about the parking and how it's
14	distributed.
15	And we wanted you to see that most
16	of the city has parking requirements and will
17	continue to have parking requirements. So on
18	the first page it's low-density zones parking.
19	And this is what we currently have
20	is the R1A, the R1B and the R2, the R3 and the
21	R4. And all of that area in yellow has a one
22	parking space per dwelling unit or one parking

space per row house.

That's not changing. It's what's been on the books since '58 and it's going to continue to stay on the books. So as you can see, people who have parking are going to keep their parking.

And that was really, it was a concern to us because there was so much fear being generated that people were going to lose parking, that the elderly would lose their parking and would be roaming the streets, unable to get to their doctors, unable to get groceries, that mothers with six babies would be stuck at a bus stop.

People with parking will have parking. And no one will lose parking. There'll be no penalty for having parking.

You know, so that's what we just wanted to show, that the overwhelming majority of the city, in all eight wards, both east and west of the river, will retain the same parking standards that they've enjoyed to this day.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	The next map, Map 2 shows low density
2	in the downtown. And this was to show that part,
3	and this is the extended downtown as well as the
4	Capitol Gateway, and the Southeast Federal
5	Center in Orange.
6	And that shows that, it's the
7	downtown where we're proposing that there be no
8	parking minimum at all. It's not a large part
9	of the city.
10	It's we tried to put the metro on
11	it but you couldn't even see it when we put all
12	the metro lines on it. It is so well served by
13	transit. Every site's within three or four
14	blocks of at least one, if not two, three and four
15	metro stations.
16	So we wanted to show that, again, in
17	relation to the overwhelming majority of the
18	low-density resident low density families,
19	the low density community, it's a very, very
20	small portion of the city.
21	And everybody who has parking there

will continue to have parking. The offices will

1	continue to have parking. The hospitals, the
2	grocery stores, everybody who's got parking,
3	again, will continue to keep that parking.
4	On the last page, on Map 3 is when
5	we put it all together. Those orange areas is
6	what we're proposing to be the transit parking
7	reductions.
8	And within those what'd I call it?
9	Orange. In the purple sorry, too many Ps in
10	that sentence, in the purple areas, those are the
11	transit areas that we're proposing only a 50
12	percent reduction.
13	And so that's the real universe of
14	impact, are those small areas. And that
15	includes that's where this concern over
16	spillover would happen.
17	And we've looked very closely at
18	areas within that, who has alleys. You know,
19	there's a lot of talk of people who park on their
20	street.
21	We've been pretty extensive in our
22	mapping in these areas. Most of the residential

1	areas that would be affected first of all,
2	none of the low-density would be affected.
3	So if they're low-density, they
4	would not be eligible to be purple. But they
5	have alley access or they have parking of some
6	sort on their lot, either through an existing
7	garage or a driveway or an alley.
8	So we just felt it was important to
9	put these things in perspective so you could see
10	the relationship of who has parking, who's going
11	to keep parking.
12	You know, none of the parking
13	proposals remove someone's parking. And we
14	just felt that was really important and that we
15	needed to kind of walk through how these three
16	pieces put together.
17	The orange is the by-right, no
18	parking. The downtown, as you can see, it's
19	small. The purple is where we're proposing a 50
20	percent reduction, and then the yellow would
21	maintain its current status.
22	On the back, it just shows the

1	ownership trend changes over the last five
2	years, that this is the data that people were
3	talking about, so we thought well, well let's put
4	it in a graph form.
5	We're just trying to anticipate some
6	of the questions and how you might want to see
7	that data.
8	MR. LAWSON: And I would just note,
9	for the sake of people in the audience who may
10	be watching, we've uploaded these maps onto the
11	IZIS system already, so those are all available
12	for people to view.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
14	all for this update. And that was going to be
15	my first question, Mr. Lawson. Sometimes if you
16	just wait, your question will be answered.
17	Okay, great. I think this was very
18	helpful. I may ask that Page 3 be larger so I
19	can see the exact, see a little more specifics
20	of Page 3. I'm really interested in Page 3.
21	MS. STEINGASSER: We'll get you
22	that page.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And on because it
2	makes sense, starting to come together, but I
3	just want to see it from like, the aerial view,
4	if we can get that. Okay.
5	MR. LAWSON: We can absolutely
6	supply that. We have given you a larger size map
7	
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You have?
9	MR. LAWSON: of a similar map,
10	the map that shows low-density areas and kind of
11	the different kinds of uses as well as areas that
12	would be eligible for the 50 percent reduction.
13	This is kind of an easier map to
14	read, so we'd be happy to supply that as well.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But if I already
16	have it, no sense to
17	MR. LAWSON: This is an easier one
18	to read, so we'll definitely supply that, too.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right,
20	let me go back to my question. I was going to
21	ask about parking and construction costs. I
22	heard a lot of parking and construction.

1	And again, as I stated, I know that
2	the, to help parking, data helps to improve
3	what's been implicated in the data that we've
4	been given, improve housing affordability,
5	reduce development costs, encourage use of
6	public transportation.
7	Do we know that parking is linked to
8	costs? And I heard this at one of the nights
9	that we did this. Do we know that this is linked
10	to the cost of construction?
11	And if we do, you may have already
12	provided that data, but do we know that that's
13	actually a true statement, or is that something
14	that we believe?
15	Or are the developers telling us
16	this? Or who's telling us this, or where did we
17	get it from?
18	MS. TREGONING: You mean what data
19	do we have on the cost to construct a parking
20	space?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: A parking space.
22	Do we have the data on how parking is affecting

1 construction?

MS. TREGONING: Yes. I mean, we have a lot of data, and we've heard a lot of testimony from various people about the cost of parking, and the deeper you go for additional levels of parking, how expensive it is.

And as you know, much of our city is along the river, and so we're actually in the water table, right, of adjacent water bodies.

It becomes really, really expensive.

But yes, we definitely have data on the range of parking costs.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I've heard the discussion, and it may be in this file. I probably saw it. You probably have already provided it to us. But that was one of the things I've heard.

Actually, the way I perceived it -I guess that's why there's five of us, is that
what I've heard, I've heard both sides of it.
And I was just trying to finalize and figure
exactly out, where is it coming from.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Because I hear you hear one side
2	of a story. They say have a need. The other
3	side of the story is saying that they're not tied
4	together.
5	So I'm just trying to figure out,
6	where do we get our data from? And do we have
7	anything for the file to substantiate it? If we
8	already have it, then I'll just go and see it,
9	if we've already had it. If we don't, can we
10	supply it?
11	MS. TREGONING: I mean, we can give
12	you an exhaustive amount of information about
13	the construction costs for parking spaces,
14	depending on whether they're below grade,
15	above-grade structured or surface.
16	And a lot of the testimony I
17	personally heard, for the two days that you've
18	had witness testimony, we also got a lot of data
19	from developers and from others who were very
20	specific, so we can try to compile that for you.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I know, I
22	remember the other night, and I know we had two

1	or three developers who said that, but then I've
2	also heard the other side of the argument.
3	Okay.
4	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Can I just add
5	something?
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, my time. I
7	didn't interrupt you.
8	VICE CHAIR COHEN: I just
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But I'm a nice guy,
10	so I'm going to let you do it.
11	VICE CHAIR COHEN: You are a nice
12	guy, and I'll give you my, a minute.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's why you're
14	doing it, because I'm a nice guy.
15	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Absolutely.
16	And I think that when I say this, you'll even feel
17	more comfortable and sleep well tonight.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You're going to
19	help her answer my question?
20	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because I didn't
22	want you to because that way we can argue later

1	on.
2	VICE CHAIR COHEN: Oh, okay.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But go ahead.
4	VICE CHAIR COHEN: No, I just wanted
5	to tell, you know, mention that for 20 years 1
6	did finance housing throughout the country, much
7	of it affordable housing.
8	And I have witnessed it in pro
9	formas, it really does impact the cost of housing
10	and the affordability. So I think that should
11	help you sleep tonight.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I was probably
13	going to sleep anyway. But thank you, Vice
14	Chair, appreciate it. That's really all I have,
15	but I want to go back any other questions? Do
16	we need to do another round?
17	VICE CHAIR COHEN: No.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you.
19	really want to say that this has I know this
20	has been a major undertaking, and I know that we
21	may not all agree.
22	But one of the things that's really

1 starting to give me a comfort level is the, being tailored to the different neighborhoods. 2 think when we started off I heard that, and I'm 3 4 still hearing that again. So that's giving me 5 some ease. But one of the things I will ask --6 I did have two minutes, so I will continue my two 7 minutes, one of the things I will ask, though, 8 and I had asked Ms. Steingasser, and Ms. 9 10 Tregoning, I'd say it's why you're here. 11 First thing I want say everything we've asked Ms. Steingasser and her 12 team to do, they have done it. And that's very 13 14 appreciative. And I will tell you, I've let the 15 16 Mayor know that. I appreciate that. It means a lot to us, because a lot of times it can be 17 frustrating. 18 19 You work hard on something and you 20 get beat up all the time by everybody, including But it gets frustrating, but I appreciate 21 us.

the way you all have, your stick-to-it-ness, the

1 way you all have helped us. Because at the end of the day, for 2 me, it's about trying to find a balance, and I'm 3 4 sure my colleagues feel the same way. appreciate the Office of Planning as well as the 5 6 Office of Zoning. I think we have a Planning Director 7 who's well respected by her peers. I think we 8 have a Director of the Office of Zoning who's 9 10 well respected by her peers. And I've had the opportunity to hire 11 three directors in the Office of Zoning, and I 12 can tell you, the third time was the charm. 13 third time was definitely the charm. 14 The second was great, but the third 15 16 time was definitely the charm. I didn't -- you know, any time you make a decision, you get beat 17 18 up more. 19 I know that. I've been there, I've 20 done that. So I just want to thank everybody, especially the audience, those who came down, 21

the citizens who live there.

1	Because at the end of the day what
2	does concern me, though is that when it's all
3	said and done and I'm saying this for some of
4	the folks that I see in the store, that may run
5	around with me.
6	And they say, Hood, you all are
7	really messing up the city, especially about
8	Brookland when it's the height. But, you know,
9	it took me some time to get used to it. I like
10	it now, the lofts and stuff at Brookland.
11	So I'm saying, you know, and that's
12	why I want to make sure we do the best we can in
13	balancing this, because some of my friends don't
14	come down here.
15	They won't know I'm saying this
16	about it because they don't watch this. They
17	don't come down here. What they're going to say
18	is Anthony Hood, you all have really messed the
19	city up.
20	And actually we haven't. What
21	we've done, I think, is improved our getting

around and trying to balance it. So enough

1	said, and now I'm not going to lecture.
2	Stay tuned. Let's continue to work
3	hard at it. Anybody have anything else? And
4	again, thank everyone who participated, Office
5	of Zoning, Office of Planning, DDOT.
6	DDOT, let me say, DDOT, we're going
7	to come back to RPP, because we're going to
8	definitely get on that. Because guess what,
9	we've heard something totally different on that
10	RPP, about how people can apply later on.
11	So, and Mr. Henson knows. He's
12	working on that. We'll just give him a little
13	more time. Okay, but you had something you
14	wanted to say?
15	MS. TREGONING: I did, just very
16	briefly. I just wanted to express my
17	appreciation to the Office of Zoning and the
18	staff, and particularly to the Zoning
19	Commission.
20	I think you've been exceedingly
21	thoughtful and deliberate. You've hung in
22	there for it's been five years that we've been

talking about zoning.

Clearly, if it was easy to do, someone else would have done it, right? So it's a big, difficult undertaking, and we really appreciate the leadership that you've shown, and truly how thoughtful and very deliberate and fair you've been in every way.

And I think, you know, we're not doing this together on a lark. We're doing the things that we think are necessary to make our city successful in the future.

This is what planning is, you know. It's about looking to where we're headed, and making sure that we deliver a built environment that will help us have the city that we aspire to be, inclusive, affordable, economically healthy and sustainable. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Director Bardin, you have anything? Let me say this. I made a mistake. The first time was great. The third time was the charm. The second time, I won't comment. Okay, I messed up. I don't want, I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

1	going to make sure it gets right.
2	DIRECTOR BARDIN: No, I just want to
3	also thank the Office of Planning. We've been
4	working really hard on these new regs, and I look
5	forward, in the next couple of months, to move
6	forward.
7	And we are here to help you in any
8	way to get this out to the public. Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: With that, do we
10	make other comments? Okay, with that oh, I
11	want to thank the court reporter. Who else do
12	we need to thank? We want to thank the court
13	reporter.
14	All right, with that, I want to thank
15	everybody. We appreciate everything. This
16	hearing is adjourned.
17	(Whereupon, the meeting in the
18	above-entitled matter was concluded at 7:30
19	p.m.)
20	
21	
22	

1

2

3

4

5

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701