

# Transcript of ANC 3B Meeting of June 12, 2025

Edited for Clarity and Readability

Timestamp	Agenda Items
0:00:00	<a href="#">Call to Order</a>
0:00:00	<a href="#">Approval of Agenda</a>
0:01:35	<a href="#">Police Report</a>
0:09:25	<a href="#">New Business</a>
0:09:25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Ward 3 Councilmember Frumin's Office</a></li></ul>
0:11:57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Discussion and Possible Resolution on Mayor's RFK Stadium Deal</a></li></ul>
0:22:51	<a href="#">Old Business</a>
0:22:51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Discussion with Councilmember Matt Frumin on DC Council Proposal for Closed Meetings</a></li></ul>
1:11:32	<a href="#">New Business</a>
1:11:32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Zoning Request 21308 for Special Exception for 2622 41st Street, NW</a></li></ul>
1:22:13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Zoning Request 21312 for Special Exception for 2200-2212 40th Place, NW</a></li></ul>
1:40:36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Briefing by DC Water on Anticipated Survey and Inspection Work in Glover Archbold Park</a></li></ul>
1:55:31	<a href="#">Updates and Information</a>
1:55:31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Update on Stoddert Elementary School Current Classroom Renovation Project and FY 2026 Cafeteria Addition Project</a></li></ul>
1:55:31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Reminder About Implementation of WMATA Better Bus Network Starting on June 29, 2025</a></li></ul>
	Open Forum
2:02:45	<a href="#">Administrative Matters</a>

## **Call to Order [0:00:00]**

## **Approval of Agenda [0:00:00]**

**Turmail:** Good afternoon, everyone.

**Lane:** They're not here yet.

**Turmail:** Well, I was all excited. Good afternoon, everyone. We're letting people log in, so we're going to give it a half a second or two here before we get started. But if you're here for the ANC 3B meeting for June, you're in the right spot.

**Lane:** Okay. I think everybody's here.

**Turmail:** All right. Well, good afternoon, everyone. Hope everyone's doing well and staying safe. We're here for the June ANC 3B meeting and the first thing we need to do to even be able to kick off the meeting is to approve the agenda. We have prepared an agenda. We did circulate it. You can find it on our ANC website as well. And I would make a motion that we approve the agenda and get started with the meeting.

**Pollock:** Second.

**Lane:** Second.

**Turmail:** All in favor say, "aye." Anyone opposed? All right. We may make one tweak in the order of the agenda. We are expecting Councilmember Frumin. He did indicate that he would be here about 7:15 or so. I don't know if he-- So we're going to go through, and then as soon as Councilmember Frumin is here, we'll pick up his part of the agenda. And then we might switch right after that to the RFK stadium, possible resolution, conversation.

## **Police Report [0:01:35]**

**Turmail:** So with that being said, first on the agenda is a report from our friends at the Second District at the Metropolitan Police Department with Lieutenant Johnson. Lieutenant, you're here. Hope all is well.

**Johnson:** Hello. Hello, everyone. Can you hear me?

**Turmail:** We can hear you loud and clear, Lieutenant.

**Johnson:** Oh, great. Great, great. Sorry I can't turn my camera. I'm getting ready for work. I have to work tonight. It's going to be a busy night. As you know, we still have-- I don't know if you're aware about the situation at American University. We have a guy on the cell phone tower. He's been there for about three days, refusing to come down. Yep. So, we're still dealing with that. Our special operations team is up there negotiating with this guy. So hopefully we get him down swiftly. Do you have a question?

**Turmail:** No, I was just crossing my fingers and second your hope that he gets down safely.

**Johnson:** Yep. Hope he's down safely. ANC 3B, we have five crimes to report. It's been a good month. We had one theft from the CVS at 2226 Wisconsin Avenue. We had two bike thefts. One from Calvert Street, one from Fulton Street. Both those bikes had locks on them, and the locks were broken. We had one motor vehicle theft. That was a scooter that was stolen. Also had a lock on it that was broken. And we had one arrest for ADW gun. It was a family situation where one family member threatened another family member and pulled a gun on them. The police were called, and they were arrested. That happened on May 30th at 2201 Wisconsin Avenue in the Meridian Park apartments. So, we had one arrest, one gun recovery in that situation. Other than that, that's all I have for crime. We also have, as you know, the army anniversary this weekend. I'll send you a list of the traffic closures that we will have in place on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. I'll send it out shortly to everyone.

**Turmail:** Are you expecting some additional, I can't remember the nice phrase that the police department uses, first amendment demonstrations this-- I'm not sure if that's the right phrase, Lieutenant.

**Johnson:** I don't think they have anything scheduled, but we're always expecting something to happen. So we will be prepared. As you know, it's all hands on deck. Everyone's activated for those for Friday, Saturday and I believe Sunday.

**Turmail:** Well, I hope the entire team stays safe. I'll open up for questions from the commissioners for lieutenant. Richard, go ahead.

**Pollock:** A couple of things. First of all, could you explain a little bit more about what's happening at American University?

**Johnson:** Well, American University, there was a gentleman who climbed the cell phone tower that's located on campus. He's way up in the air. The tower is very tall, I don't know if you've seen it before. If you go past Ward Circle, you make the first left on the campus, you go past the bookstores. Back inside the little courtyard back there is a tall tower. If you climb the ladder, he's on a platform and refusing to come down. He didn't say he was suicidal, but something's going on with him. So, they're negotiating with this guy for the last two days trying to get him down. He has a backpack up there with food and he has some, you know, supplies.

**Pollock:** Wow. We hope he'll be safe on that. The CVS theft, what time of day did that happen?

Do you know?

**Johnson:** That happened during the daytime. I believe it was 10:00 a.m. Around 10:00 a.m.

**Pollock:** Do we know what he took? Was it a lot of stuff, or just a couple little petty things?

**Johnson:** It was a theft two, so it was less than \$1,000. I don't know the exact items that he took. Usually they take toiletries and things like that, soaps. But I can't say exactly what it was this time.

**Turmail:** You can thank that person next time you're struggling to get something off the shelf at the CVS.

**Johnson:** Yeah, they keep those things locked up because that's the very situation. Yeah.

**Pollock:** My last thing is I want to just pass on to you to pass on to the traffic enforcement director for the Second District. I was with him on New Mexico Avenue in one hour on a very rainy morning. He had five tickets of people going through the stop sign there. And I hope that I'll be able to go and do a second run with him in the afternoon. But I want to thank you and the force for helping to arrange that.

**Johnson:** Oh, yes. So you were with Officer McElwee. He is the best guy that we have. He's always very professional, very knowledgeable. And he's the best traffic guy in the city, I would say.

**Turmail:** Oh, he's been there a while. Holy cow.

**Johnson:** Yes, McElwee, you know him.

**Pollock:** Yeah, he's been there a while.

**Johnson:** Yeah. He's the best.

**Turmail:** And for the record, I'm sure he's ageless and rather young, so I don't want to get in trouble with him. Anyway, Richard, do you have other questions?

**Pollock:** I'm done. Thank you.

**Turmail:** Any other commissioners, questions for Lieutenant Johnson? Open it up for the community. Any questions for the lieutenant from the community about things going on in the neighborhood? Raise your, I think you can use the control bar to raise your hand. Or where is the raise hand thing? Is it under the react? Hopefully all of us are somewhat familiar with Zoom, but I forget more than I remember at this point about it. I guess, also, you could write a question.

**Lane:** Carol has a question.

**Turmail:** All right, Carol, you're on the air.

**Lane:** You're muted.

**Turmail:** Carol, we can't hear you.

**Vilsack:** Okay, I'm sorry. Sorry about that. Samsung, Android. Lieutenant, my question is, are there any follow-ups on the arrests in the crime that was committed last month? Do we have closure on any of those open cases?

**Johnson:** Well, all the major cases like the ADWs and assaults, those were closed. But you mean the thefts? Are you talking about the thefts, or the stolen autos, or theft from autos?

**Vilsack:** Yeah, things like that.

**Johnson:** Right. Those things, no, we really don't have any closures to those in the last month.

**Vilsack:** Do they just stay open indefinitely, in perpetuity? Or does someone just decide to close it quietly at the station?

**Johnson:** Sometimes, after a certain amount of time, they are closed. Sometimes without resolution.

**Vilsack:** Okay. Thank you, sir.

**Johnson:** All right.

**Turmail:** All right. Thank you, Carol. Any other questions for the lieutenant? All right. Well, Lieutenant, I hope you and the entire team stay safe for what will be a busy weekend. And we hope that everyone involved in that incident up in AU stays safe.

**Johnson:** Yeah. I'll keep you posted. When he comes down, I'll send you a quick email.

**Turmail:** All right, tell him we missed him.

**Johnson:** All right, bye-bye. Be safe, everybody.

**Turmail:** Thank you. I'm assuming-- I don't, maybe I can't see everyone on. Do we have Councilmember Frumin yet with us?

**Lane:** He's not here. He's not here yet.

# New Business [0:09:25]

## Ward 3 Councilmember Frumin's Office [0:09:25]

**Turmail:** Okay. Well, why don't we go ahead to-- I feel like the next step on the list would be to go to the zoning request. Is this you, Melissa?

**Lane:** Yeah. Do you want to go to RFK Stadium first?

**Turmail:** We could do that. What does the group want to do? Do we want to tackle RFK? Bad pun. Tackle RFK first, or get to the zoning request.

**Vilsack:** I do think Senator Frumin's office is online. I see someone from his office online. I don't know if they're--

**Lane:** Yes, the councilmember's staff is here, but the councilmember himself is going to talk about the open meetings issue.

**Turmail:** They're going to let him know about his promotion, too, though.

**Kondabala:** I'm here from the councilmember's staff. I do have two updates from our office if you'd like to hear those at this point.

**Turmail:** Why not? Let's go for it. Trisha, please.

**Kondabala:** Sounds great. Thank you for having me. I'm filling in for Ashley today. So like I said, we only have two updates. The first is that our office's next Workday in the Ward is going to be held at Dolan Uyghur in Cleveland Park. So that's 3518 Connecticut Avenue on Thursday, June 26th, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. So come by and meet the councilmember, meet the staff. And then we will also have some representatives from some agencies who can talk to you about whatever you need. There is more information on our website. So stay tuned for our next newsletter as well, and our social medias will have the final schedule closer to that day. The second update is that we are in the middle of the FY26 budget process. So we're in the middle of agency oversight hearings right now. There is a schedule up of the full budget schedule on the council website, and there is also more information about the budget process on the council website as well. And so the best way to stay updated with all of this is our Instagram, our Bluesky, our X account. And then we do also have our newsletter, so if you want to sign up for that if you haven't already, it's at [mattfruminward3.com](http://mattfruminward3.com). Any questions?

**Turmail:** Any questioners from the commissioners? Does anyone in the community have questions about what Trisha just told us? All right. Thank you, Trisha, very much. Appreciate the updates. And we'll look forward to having the councilmember on when he gets here. And he did, like I said at the beginning, he did tell us he'd be running late and asked if that was okay, and we

said yes. So, he is not being tardy, for the record.

## **Discussion and Possible Resolution on Mayor's RFK Stadium Deal [0:11:57]**

**Turmail:** Why don't we go ahead and, I think, tee up the conversation on the RFK resolution. And I'm not sure who volunteered to lead this conversation. Gupi, you unmuted, so I'm going to volunteer you. Pretty please. Oh, we can't hear you though. All right, hang on. That's the international sign for hang on. Edge of my seat. While we're waiting, hopefully everyone in the community received an alert from DC Water that there is a boil water advisory. It's listed including Glover Park, but there is a map on the [dcwater.com](http://dcwater.com) website that you can find that includes the areas that are covered by the boil water advisory. Obviously, use your discretion. If you live outside of that area and you want to be extra cautious, and if you are inside that designated area in the map, please absolutely boil your water and look at the other instructions on their website. And I think many of us received an update on their phone and/or emails. Gupi, we're going to give it a shot now. Can we hear you?

**Howie:** I don't know. Can you hear me?

**Turmail:** Yes.

**Howie:** Okay. So, I was the one who proposed making a resolution on the RFK stadium deal. Just like in quick summary, the stadium, the whole area complex, is estimated to cost \$3 billion. And DC has, or Mayor Bowser has, negotiated chipping in one-third of that, a billion dollars of DC's money to help fund that. She still needs council's approval for that for it to go through. And I think Councilmember Frumin is still undecided in terms of his support for it. But I wanted to just get our ANC's opinion on the record. Should I just tell people my opinion? Okay.

**Turmail:** Go for it.

**Howie:** So, my opinion is I'm personally for it. Growing up in the area, I remember watching the news and hearing what Gallery Place Chinatown was like. You never heard about the Southwest Waterfront or where Nats Park is because nothing ever happened down there. So I think it's good for the surrounding area. One particular note, the shooting that happened at the Stoddert track meet, or the elementary school citywide track meet was, I think, like two blocks away from where current RFK is. And I think that area would benefit from having development that not only includes a stadium, but parks, real estate around it. That would make that area more populated and more of like a family, just presence that I think would help minimize random drive by shootings. Not to say that it will solve the problem, but I think the more activity that's down there helps minimize things that like happened at the track meet. Ward 7 and Ward 8, the citizens there overwhelmingly support this resolution, or this deal. I know that we don't live down there. This is not really particular to our specific ANC 3B, but the people who live around there also are for it. And I think their opinion should also be given some weight. Yeah. Oh, I would say

one thing I would recommend to the Mayor, maybe if everyone's open to that being in our resolution, however we vote, is if there's going to be public funding in the stadium, maybe DC could negotiate some sort of ownership, percentage of ownership in the stadium. I don't know, whether it's like 5% or some sort of like ownership in the stadium. I think maybe that would help, I don't know, sway people who are against public funding going towards billionaires building stadiums.

**Turmail:** And just to be clear, Gupi, the conversation you want to provoke is, should we embark upon writing a resolution and voting on a resolution at our next meeting? Or what's the vote you're looking for tonight? Or you're just kind of getting the sense of the commission?

**Howie:** Any of those. Sense of the commission. I don't really know. Like, do we have to like talk about it, and then we vote on it the next meeting?

**Turmail:** Well, I think if we wanted to-- We certainly couldn't vote sort of a blank resolution tonight. We'd have to have a resolution to review, but certainly there's no sense, if we don't have a majority of commissioners who would support such a resolution, there's no sense moving forward. And I'm looking to my colleagues for any support here, on the process.

**Howie:** I mean, I kind of polled people beforehand. And we do have a four to two in favor of the deal.

**Rodriguez:** Yeah, I'm also for the deal because I'm very interested in getting the football team back inside DC. I think the mixed-use area is going to benefit the community. And then also the tax revenue that is on the business income is going to provide to the area, is going to outweigh the cost of the stadium. Is the timing bad right now with everything going on? Maybe. But is it necessary? Yes, because in the future it's going to generate a lot more for DC, and do a lot more good, even though it is a pain point right now at the current budget going through the DC city council. But I still think we should push through and recommend that Councilmember Frumin support it.

**Turmail:** Gotcha. Full disclosure, I'm one of the four who's okay with it. in favor of it. I'm just hung up on like what it is we're going to vote on tonight, because we don't have an actual resolution in front of us. But maybe--

**Howie:** I wasn't sure how that works. Do we have to vote on like-- I'll write the resolution. I just wasn't sure--

**Lane:** I think we need a draft resolution to consider, to vote on. I am also for the stadium, but I think we need something, you know, to actually react to.

**Howie:** Okay, I'll write a resolution, then we can talk about it at the July meeting. I just wasn't sure if we-- Do I write two versus four are against it?



**Turmail:** I would write the resolution as you would move it, and then we can take it and amend it if-- Either pass it, reject it, or I assume we could amend it. But that would maybe require me to go back and restudy Robert's Rules of Order.

**Howie:** Fair enough. I will write up a resolution in favor, personally, and then I think we have the votes to pass it. So we can talk about it at the July meeting.

**Turmail:** Fair enough. I don't want to shut down conversation about this, but it probably is good to have something in front of us to vote on. But unless anyone wants to comment-- I don't want to shut anyone down on this.

**Vilsack:** This is Carol Vilsack. Can I just ask, if there is a movement in favor of the stadium, can I just ask if you're adding something about requiring some pro rata equity interest, can you just be very clear about that? Because I'm not aware of any conversation along that line. And so I would just be very clear about that.

**Turmail:** Thank you for your advice, Carol. Appreciate it. All right, we're going to table this one. Oh, David, go ahead. I'm sorry. We'll go ahead and start taking some comments from the community. You had your hand up, David? David White.

**White:** I did. I don't know if you can hear me. I think you can.

**Turmail:** We can hear you loud and clear.

**White:** Okay. Yeah, I think there are a lot of unresolved questions about this so-called deal. And it kind of reminds me of a few months ago when there was a lot of discussion about funding for Metro, and how there was a huge budget gap. And they were talking about cutting and cutting routes and such, and they weren't sure how they were possibly going to fund Metro. And then around that same time, all of a sudden, the Mayor announced, "Oh, I've been meeting with Mr. Leonsis and I now have a deal to present about the Capital Arena. And wow, we found \$750 million," or whatever. It was an enormous sum of money. And she explained that this wasn't part of the budget money. It was something else. And so it just, it's confusing as a resident to hear disparities like that where you have a Metro which needs funding, and then all of a sudden that sort of just goes away. And then there's a Capital Arena where there's a lot of money being spent. And I just would ask, and I have asked the council, to look at what other priorities the city has. Do the schools need funding? You know, I just don't want things to be overlooked that we already know are needing funding. I mean, this is a great thing, RFK, wonderful thing. But, you know, what else? Aren't there other priorities that have already been on the table that are not being funded? Thanks.

**Turmail:** Got it. Appreciate it. Thank you, David, for the comment. And what I would suggest is I think there's a lot of good conversation. Let's get a resolution that we can all react at, or react to. Sorry, I'll get to the proper grammar at some point in my life. But what we can all react to, and then we can have a robust conversation. So, I would suggest that we slide this over to the July

meeting. And Gupi, I'm happy to help with any resolution if you'd like, since I caused trouble by getting bogged down in process today. I don't want to get on Gupi's bad side.

## **Old Business [0:22:51]**

### **Discussion with Councilmember Matt Frumin on DC Council Proposal for Closed Meetings [0:22:51]**

**Lane:** Councilmember Frumin is here.

**Turmail:** Oh, wonderful. All right. Well, we got there. With that being said, let me go ahead and welcome Councilmember Frumin. I don't know how much he needs introduction, but for those of you who don't know, our councilmember for Ward 3 is Matt Frumin. And we invited him to join our meeting tonight. I think the ostensible reason to join is we wanted to have some questions about or some conversations about, you know, whether or not the council would spend some time behind closed door meetings. But I will push my luck and say while he's here, I'm sure, hopefully he would be happy to entertain a couple other questions, time allowing. And Councilmember Frumin, if I've got that wrong, my apologies.

**Frumin:** Absolutely. No, 100% absolutely willing to answer any questions anybody wants to ask.

**Turmail:** Gotcha. Thank you. What I'm going to do is invite my colleague, Commissioner Pollock, to kind of just tee up the conversation since he teed up the conversation last month about the sort of council and secrecy. And then open up the conversation with you about that, and then we'll go from there if that's okay with you, Councilmember.

**Frumin:** Sure thing. Sure thing,

**Turmail:** Commissioner Pollock?

**Pollock:** All right. Thank you very much. There have been a number of resolutions before the city council to permit the council to meet privately, without any notification to the public, without a sense of what the subject matter might be. And also the outcome of the meeting. And this is quite extraordinary. It's the first time that the District has had such a policy. I know that there's been an amendment that has been made recently which I'm going to invite the councilmember to go and talk about where you are within the council about this particular piece of legislation. I will also mention that among the 50 states there is no other state legislature that has the kind of proposal and the kind of bill that has been passed previously about the issue of openness and the legislative process. And I'm fearful, and I'll abuse the authority of speaking first, but I am concerned that those who are opposed to Home Rule, or those who want to go and claim that the District of Columbia is reckless, that this helps their cause. I'm going to shut up at this point and I'm going to turn the entire floor over to the councilmember to explain to us, you know, what

is this bill? What is this proposal? Where are we with respect to it? What will it do, and what won't it do?

**Frumin:** Okay. Thank you very much. Let me start with Genesis. So when the house modified the continuing resolution-- Start with Genesis, not like, "And then there was light." I won't go on for that long.

**Pollock:** I thought you were being biblical, Councilmember.

**Frumin:** My apologies for that. So when the House continuing resolution came out on a Saturday night, late on a Saturday night, and it was treating the District as a federal agency for the first time, which meant that the continuing resolution would require us to revert to FY24 spending levels. Despite the fact that we had an approved FY25 budget that Congress had passively approved, then we were going to have to see a big cut to our spending during the balance of FY25. Folks were in a bit of a tizzy. What do we do? And Zachary Parker on Sunday night was sending texts around saying, "We've got to get together. We've got to figure this out. We've got to respond. We need to show a united front." And that morning, a bunch of us met in Robert White's office to talk about a strategy of what we should do. There was a real, acute sense of urgency. And then we went up to Phil Mendelson's conference room, and the Mayor joined us in Phil Mendelson's conference room, and we talked about what it is that we might do. And one of the twists is the Mayor then left for a variety of reasons, and then Robert and I went down to the Mayor's office and talked with her. But the idea that folks came up with at 10:00 in the morning on that Monday was we needed to do a joint press conference on Capitol Hill, Eleanor Holmes Norton, the council, the Mayor, laying out why this was a wrong thing to do, and laying out the case for the District of Columbia. And when that process started, I will tell you that I was something of a skeptic that we would be able to make that happen. But we actually did. And at 2:00 in the afternoon, we had that press conference. And it was, in a way, a great moment for the District government, because we all got together in the face of a real threat to the District and responded shoulder to shoulder. And that was a very important and a good thing. All of it was one big violation of the open meetings laws. And so we recognize that, you know, we needed to do this, and we may need to do things like this again. And yet it's not consistent with the open meetings laws, and we need to have the flexibility to be able to deal with these situations. So then the idea was to come forward with legislation with modification to the open meetings laws. And Phil Mendleson came forward with legislation to modify the open meetings laws. Some of us felt that Phil went too far, and Charles Allen proposed an amendment to that legislation. And you know, I'll be candid with you. You know, the chairman wields a lot of power and you cross the chairman-- You have to pick your spots for when you're going to cross the chairman. But Charles Allen came forward with an amendment to change the chairman's bill. And I voted for that amendment. Christina Henderson voted for that amendment. Charles voted for the amendment. And Janice Lewis George voted for the amendment. But it lost 8 to 4. And so then we had a vote on the bill itself. And the bill was emergency and temporary legislation. It wasn't permanent legislation. It was a recognition that we were going to need to come back and do permanent legislation. And then it came to a vote on the bill itself, and Christina and I voted for the bill. Charles and Janice voted against it because they were not

satisfied because the amendment hadn't been included. For Christina and I, just like open kimono, we felt like we need to be able to do this in this moment. For temporary and emergency legislation, we can't have the perfect be the enemy of the good. We need to have this ability to deal with this in this kind of situation. And so we both voted for it. Wouldn't have mattered, you know, if we had voted against it. It still would have passed 8 to 4. Then we had a hearing on Chairman Mendelson's legislation, and you testified, and others testified. And I think you'll recall that there were, you know, many of us were exploring what are ways in which we could modify this legislation to better balance the desire for transparency, but also the ability to respond to exigent circumstances. We had the hearing. The next step with the permanent legislation would be a markup. That hasn't happened. That's not going to happen now, because we're in the middle of the budget season, and I mean I hope the chairman doesn't try to do a, you know, 90 mile-an-hour markup and try to get it through very, very quickly. I think at some point the chairman is gonna do a markup of the legislation. I need to figure out, in candor, what are the specific changes that I want to see to that legislation. And I don't know, when you say that there's an amendment, maybe I haven't dialed in on it. But it isn't, in this moment, it isn't the frontburner issue for me because it is what it is under the emergency and temporary. And the permanent I think is a thing that's going to be discussed and debated in the fall. And in the fall I will be looking for ways to modify the legislation that ensures more transparency. I don't think-- I mean, I'm open to some changes to the open meetings law. But I don't want the bill as it stands to be the permanent legislation. I don't know if that helps, if that's responsive to your question.

**Pollock:** Let me ask you, Mr. Councilmember, on all other state legislatures, does any other state legislature have something similar to what is currently before the city council in terms of this kind of legislation?

**Frumin:** Yeah, I don't know. But I'll tell you we're like a state legislature, but we're very, very small as compared to other state legislatures. And the way in which our committees work is, you know, we have five people on a committee. And so if you have three people together you can have a quorum of that committee. And then that get together is subject to the open meetings law, and that is difficult. And that doesn't feel necessary to me, and I don't think, you know, if you said to any other state legislature where there is a gathering of three of you, does that require that it be subject to your open meetings law? I doubt it. So I think we're-- I have not done a canvas, and you've talked about this. And I will, you know, review it with you before we get to a final vote, but I do think that we have a distinction. And one of the ways in which the distinction works is, you know, I am on the Housing Committee, and we wanted to tour the motels on New York Avenue to see what was happening with services there. And in the end, we had to do it in shifts where it was two at a time. And so they did the tour like three times in order to comply with the open meetings law. And I really don't think that should have been necessary. We did it. We made it work. But it's not what you're trying to get at through the open meetings law. And so the idea that there could be some revisions to the open meetings law, I think in the context of our very small legislative body, I'm sympathetic to that idea. It doesn't mean throw the whole idea out the window. I think transparency is important. But getting the mechanics of the law right, I think, is also important.

**Pollock:** Well, my last question is in the United States Senate and in the House, committees, full committees can go into executive session. That is, they can have a conversation without public hearing, either witnesses or a discussion. Most of the time these executive sessions involve national security, but these committees will indicate they're going to an executive session, when they're going, what the subject matter is, if there are witnesses, et cetera. In other words, we all understand that in a Pearl Harbor moment, the city council has to get together sometimes and talk on an emergency basis about something. But shouldn't the public really have a sense about what the agenda is, what the topics are, if there are witnesses, and at the end, some sort of-- There's usually a summary of an executive session in the Senate or House about what happened. Of course, much of it is not transparent. So, what's your thoughts about that, sir?

**Frumin:** Yeah, I think, I mean you may recall at the hearing one of the things that I was exploring was to what extent does a post-hoc summary-- What is lost by having a post-hoc summary as opposed to an upfront notice? And one of the things that was the pushback, and I don't know if it was you, or if it was somebody else, was that you can't-- If it's a post-hoc summary then I or whoever it was who was saying it can't object to the fact that you're doing it and try to keep you from doing it. And, you know, so I'll take that on board, but a post-hoc summary provides a window into what was done and so it's ideas like that. The idea that there would be, "I don't want to have significant meetings of which there is no record and no summary." I'm with you on that. How do you capture that idea in this legislation? I don't have the answer to that. I was raising questions about that at the hearing, but have not, just have had other things that are in front of me, and it's not being driven by a deadline right at the moment. And so the things that are being driven by a deadline are the things that are taking priority.

**Pollock:** Thank you so much. I turn this over to my fellow commissioners. Any comments?

**Turmail:** Thank you. Why don't we just, let's stick to the sort of open meetings conversation first, and then we'll open up more broadly if the councilmember has time. So if any of the commissioners have questions for the councilmember, or comments I guess, about the starting point conversation on the open meetings.

**Rodriguez:** I appreciate the explanation for that. And I get with the current climate, and what we're currently going through with the administration that's in the White House, and what you explained, why we need those type of meetings and why they need to be closed. But I would like to see like an expiration date, and some type of like either preface of what's going into the meeting. Or like Richard said, even like a summary, or just even bullet points of what occurred during the meeting or who is involved in the meeting. But I mean, I totally agree. I'm totally for you guys going forward with some restrictions or some rules surrounding it that just doesn't make, at the whim of a moment, where-- I was kind of concerned this past week when I saw that there was the RFK situation went behind closed doors. And so I thought that was kind of interesting, because I don't think it really kind of fit what the purpose was of the closed door meetings. And so having a little more rule around that, I could see the benefit of putting the community at ease, and the constituents feeling more comfortable with these closed door

meetings.

**Frumin:** So, I hear you and I appreciate it. And you know, part of what I want to do-- There is an expiration date. Emergency legislation lasts for 90 days, and temporary legislation lasts for 270 days. So, it expires until permanent legislation takes over. On the meeting the other day that I was caught on camera. I don't know if you saw it. I mean, I feel like I'm doing a good job, but I am a little bit of a rookie, and I'm also a very polite Midwesterner. And so I walked out of the meeting, and Mark Segraves put a microphone in my face, and the lights were on me. And I was the first one out of the meeting because I was late for a hearing I was chairing, and there was a room full of people waiting for me downstairs. And so I really wanted to get to this room full of people for this hearing. And so I did not-- I feel like I have managed a lot of things well, but I don't think I managed that moment as well as I might have. That meeting, Mark Segraves thought it was about RFK, but it's wasn't really about, or exclusively about RFK. And this goes to the summary that you would like to have, and so to sort of provide it. One of the things, and this will segue a little into budget stuff that might lead into questions about the budget. So, one of the things that we confront this year is this budget is really challenging. And there is a sense, and the advocacy community has said, "You need to stake out what your priorities are before you get to that all-day meeting where you go around the table and everybody talks about their little priorities. You and the council need to figure out what your priorities are and work together to address them." And whether the chairman picked up on that from the advocacy, the fair budget coalition folks, or came to it on his own, I think he felt like that is going to be important. And one reason why that's going to be particularly important this year is usually the budget is based on the February revenue estimate. You know, that's what kicks off the budget process. The CFO comes up with a revenue estimate, and then the Mayor uses that revenue estimate and finalizes her budget and balances it to that February revenue estimate. And then it comes to the council, and the council finishes with it in June. This year, because of all the delays along the process, the Mayor didn't get it to us until later, and we're not going to finish it until July. Well, there's another revenue estimate coming on June 30th. And what's going to happen with that revenue estimate? If the revenue estimate shows that revenues are expected to go up, well, it's happy days and the council has more money to work with than it thought it had to work with. But I don't think that's-- And in the past that's the pattern. But I don't-- I'm worried. Everybody's worried. Is that revenue estimate going to come in lower than the February estimate? And is the council going to have to find some number of millions of dollars of savings in the budget that we pass, which will be an enormous challenge. And so there is this idea that we need to have periodic meetings to talk about the budget generally, and to figure out how we're going to do this. That we can't wait until the end to do it. And the meeting the other day was one of those meetings. Now, one of those meetings was open to the public. And another one that's coming I think is open to the public. That one turned out not to be open to the public. I found out about it on Monday night. And in that meeting part of the conversation was about all of the BSA titles. There's an enormous amount in the BSA, and the budget office has a limited capacity to deal with it. And so I think the chairman was trying to get a sense from people of which things should stay in the BSA, and which things should not be in the BSA and should be dealt with on a different kind of timetable. So it wasn't-- RFK is a BSA title. So RFK came up as part of that conversation, but it wasn't really about that. Now, why he made the choice to not open that

meeting to the public, whereas the first one was open and another one that's coming is open. But it's also part of a process of trying to responsibly deal with this budget. And there is an element-- The other way the chairman could do this is, one by one, to meet with us and ask us and go through the list of what are the things. And that's typically the way that he does it. We all meet with the chairman a number of times in the course of the budget process to tell him what our priorities are, and he takes stock of all of them and then tries to put something together that captures a consensus. In this environment, it would be super hard for him to do that. And so there's an effort to get efficiencies in the way in which the chairman gets input from the councilmembers. And I can see where he's coming from. But, I mean, part of the lesson of it is when people don't know what it is that's going on, they fear the worst. And so that can make it counterproductive. But that's where that meeting came from, and that's the dynamic that was at work.

**Rodriguez:** Right, and I do support it. It's just I think the lack of the situation. I think Mark was very aggressive, but it allowed him to create a narrative that didn't exist.

**Frumin:** Yeah. I mean, yes, I think he created a narrative. But he didn't-- I think I'm gonna say the same thing is he had enough to work with that there was something to what he was doing. And I did think like, "Is he going to use that video? Is he going to be nice to me??" And then I thought he was going to be nice to me, and then-- But, you know. It's time to put my big boy pants on. That happens.

**Rodriguez:** Yeah, I think it was good. But yeah, just what we've been discussing. I think just if the topic would have been pushed out, and the membership of the meeting would have been pushed out, it would have limited his narrative that he could have pushed.

**Frumin:** Fair enough.

**Turmail:** Other questions for the councilmember from the commission? Again, staying with open meetings, but even though the councilmember has kind of invited a broader conversation already? No? If it's okay with you-- Well, anyone from the community have questions about the open meetings conversation? This is not yet the moment to complain about trash pickup. Not suggesting anyone does. Okay. If you have a few more minutes, Councilmember?

**Frumin:** Yeah. Yeah, sure.

**Turmail:** I do think there are a couple questions. Mine's going to be very parochial because it's my one issue that I like coming back to. Our good friends at the National Park Service, and I see someone's here from the National Park Service. I don't know if that's just their day job or happen to be representing, but seem to have a chronic inability to mow their own grass. Even as the person they work for loves to talk about how DC doesn't keep the city beautiful. Anything we should know? Anything that's happening on your end to like get the-- I mean like for example, I think the National Park Service park that's up where Wisconsin and Massachusetts come together looks like an abandoned piece of property. And even Montrose Park, which is a little bit

outside of our area, I drove past it on my way home today, looks like a shambles. What's happening and/or what should people do to like get the Park Service to please, for crying out loud, mow the grass? When DC can do it and they can't, it's kind of embarrassing.

**Frumin** Yeah. So, I mean, you all should email the NPS, but you should also email--

**Turmail:** Oh, they know. I'm on a direct phone call with the commissioner for the Rock Creek unit.

**Frumin:** With Brian Joiner?

**Turmail:** Yes. Who's great, by the way. Brian is not the problem, as far as I can tell.

**Frumin:** No, Brian's not the problem. But staffing is a problem. And also, it's two years in a row where their contract for mowing has either fallen through, or hasn't come as soon as it should. And so, you know, Fort Reno, the grass was 4 feet high. And then they had staff that went out and did mowing, because their contractor wasn't in place yet. And then it rained like Noah's Ark, kind of, to stay with the biblical. We had all those days of rain. And that's one of those things where you fall behind and the grass gets long, and then it's wet, and you're really stuck. I'm on him all the time about this. The ones that you're talking about I wasn't aware of, but you should let me know. And you go straight to him, but let me know so that I can go to him as well. And it's only going to get worse because of the degree to which the Park Service is being defunded. And there is a little bit of folks rubbing sticks together. Particularly, some of those small parks that you're talking about, little triangles here and there. Like, why? Those are not Yosemite, and so why are they-- It's a historical quirk that they're owned by the Park Service. Life would be simpler for many of these small parcels if they were transferred to the District. And the Park Service is not averse to that about a bunch of these small parcels. You get into a different conversation as you get to bigger parcels and things that have some historic significance where, excuse me, the Park Service is more protective of those assets and reluctant to allow increased community usage because of their view of the history, or their view of preservation of open spaces, than many of us would be. And that's a conversation between the city and the Park Service about what we ought to be able to do in different settings. You might have seen the press reports that, you know, Mark Ein has a proposal. Alex Koma has something out that Mark Ein has a proposal for Carter Barron. And I think he's trying to get the Department of Interior to turn it over to the District so he can do a major thing there. Like, I don't know what to make of that. Janice Lewis George is quoted in the story like, "Nobody consulted with the community." But there is a tug of war with the Park Service about what kinds of things should be done in different parks around the city. But those small parks that don't get mowed? Give them to us so we can mow them.

**Turmail:** Yeah. Richard, you had another question?

**Pollock:** I just want to follow up on the same subject. While you're keeping notes, I want you to know that on New Mexico Avenue between 42nd and Garfield, it's a jungle there on the



sidewalk. I mean, literally, you have to duck because there's overhangs, and there's grass all over the place. And I actually reached out to the superintendent today by email. I wanted to give him a couple days to recover from World Pride. But I just want you to know that that's also a little problem area here in our neighborhood.

**Turmail:** And to give credit where credit's due, I will say that I spoke to Superintendent Joiner about the little park down at where 37th and Whitehaven come together, and they have been mowing that one with some frequency, because I mentioned to him that the community uses that. So I don't want this to be pick on Brian, because I actually think he's a good guy.

**Frumin:** No, he's trying.

**Turmail:** Not just because we share a name.

**Frumin:** He's a good guy.

**Turmail:** So anyway, other questions from commissioners for the councilmember? Budget questions?

**Vilsack:** Brian, for the mowing. This is Carol Vilsack. I don't know if this is for Councilmember Frumin, but does the National Park Service have contracts in place for mowing, and they're not showing up?

**Turmail:** I said we have a representative from the Park Service, and the last I understood-- And, Nick, it looks like you're volunteering to be in on this. And I'm sorry, I didn't mean to rope you in. But last time I heard that the contract was held up at the secretary's office until-- And it was only released the day the president issued his Make DC Beautiful executive order, but that delayed the process for some time. But, Nick, you're probably in a better position to know than I am.

**Bartolomeo:** Sure.

**Turmail:** Thank you for being a good sport.

**Bartolomeo:** No, no problem. Happy to explain what's going on. I'm Nick Bartolomeo. I'm the resource manager at Rock Creek Park. So, what has happened is true. We don't have a mowing contract. The mowing contract we expect to be let within the next week. So, the situation is going to improve. In the meantime, we are mowing in-house, and we have about seven different mowers that are doing everything on our 3,000 acres from one end of the city to the other. We started on the east end, right, towards Barnard Hill and Fort Totten. That area we hit first. And so, our crews were today over in Cleveland Park in Kingle, near Kingle Mansion, and doing other work there. They are slowly working their way west. So, hang tight. We will get to everything. It's just going to take a little bit of a while. And then the contractor should be on board. We should be just fine from here on out for the next five years. This contract is a one-year contract with four-year options. So, that means that next year and for the next four

years, we're not going to be in this same situation. So, just give us a little bit more time. We will get to you. And, you know, we'll take care of all this. We know things look a little rough right now, but we'll straighten it out. Okay?

**Turmail:** That's great news. Thank you, Nick. And again, sorry to put you on the spot. I just, you know, since the councilmember was here, but you got roped in. Thank you.

**Bartolomeo:** No worries.

**Turmail:** Just real quick, any other questions for the councilmember? I know we've eaten into your time, and you've been very generous with your time, Councilmember Frumin. We appreciate it.

**Frumin:** More than happy. I don't know if you-- I will say, because I was listening to some of the conversation on RFK, and the discussion about doing a resolution to me. So it was sort of useful for me to hear what folks were saying. And there was some conversation about, "How do we do this when there are budget needs that need to be addressed?" And I don't want to say that there are no trade-offs from doing the Capital One Arena or RFK, and I heard somebody saying like it can get confusing for the public that there's this claim that it's different dollars. But it is. I mean, we have a budget of operating dollars, and we have constraints on our budget for operating dollars. And that's a thing that we are dealing with as a challenge on the council, and that the Mayor was dealing with in her way. Then there are capital dollars, and they're a different entity. And the capital dollars, what we can invest in in capital is capped by the debt cap. And the debt cap is that we cannot spend more than 12% of our overall revenue on debt service. And so we have a capital improvement plan that the Capital One Arena figures into. And that if RFK is done, it will figure into. And the interest on that whole capital improvements plan cannot exceed 12% in any year. Now, where we are, and where we've been for a while, is when you see our full capital improvement plan and you see what the percentage is of revenue that we're going to spend on debt service, when you get to the last year of the capital improvement plan, we're spending 11.98% on debt service. So, we're at the cap. So, the thing where there's a trade-off around the arena or RFK is we're at the cap for our debt, and those are big things that are included. What is not included because those things are in the capital improvement plan? It's not that we don't have enough money for the libraries to operate. That's a different question. And right now we don't have enough money for the libraries to operate the way we all want them to. But those are operating dollars, and that's different. The trade-off around RFK and Capital One Arena is if you're using 1.5 billion dollars for those things, what are the 1.5 billion dollars of other capital projects over the next six years that you're not funding? And I don't think it actually works out quite that way, but it ends up between the two of them being, you know, a billion dollars. And what are the other capital projects that we have not done? And that's the trade-off I think folks should be thinking about here. I hope that doesn't make it clear as mud, that it helps in understanding the trade-offs. In the meantime, I guess while I'm here, on the budget generally, it's a challenge. And, you know, the Mayor and her team are putting the best face on it and talking about all the things that have been added. If I were them that's what I'd be doing as well. I chair, just as an example, I chair the committee on Human Services which happens to

have the libraries under it. The budget for the libraries, if it isn't changed, and I'm going to try to change it, would result in the libraries being closed twice a week, two days a week, and only open from 9:00 to 5:00. Only open 40 hours a week. And that would be a shock to our communities. But that's the implication of the budget. And there's lots of things like that in little ways out there. The schools are actually, you know, funded in a way that I think we can all be pleased about, but there's lots of cuts out there that people will feel. And now we on the council are trying to figure out which ones of those can we try to address. And that's what we're in the middle of right now on the budget.

**Turmail:** I was going to make a joke about did you just announce your run for Mayor? But I'm just teasing. Gupi, I think I saw a hand up, but maybe it's down again. No? Okay.

**Howie:** No, it was up. I just was saying I think Councilmember Frumin kind of summarized it well. It's not that we have miraculously found a billion or 1.5 billion dollars that could actually go to something else. It's about capital improvements in terms of like, "If we do this, then what in the next ten years can we not do?" And I just personally can't think of something that would give a return on investment, in terms of a capital investment, like RFK. I just don't know what else would be out on the horizon that would help that area of the city. So, anyways, that's my take.

**Frumin:** This is, my sense is that the jail, there was 400 million dollars in the capital improvement plan for the jail. And one of the things the Mayor has done is pivoted to suggesting that that should be done through a public-private partnership that would not use those 400 million dollars in the capital budget for the jail. And then there's also the archives that was going to be built at UDC that was slated for 100 million dollars, and that has come out of the capital improvements plan. To the extent that there are big ticket items that look like they were trade-offs in order to make room for RFK, those things look like the big items. And what the Mayor would say is that they think that doing a public-private partnership is a better way to go. And it's not that there won't be a jail, but that it'll be done or financed in a different way. And that the cost of the archives had got-- I would like to have the archives built, and built at UDC. But what she would say is, "It was in the budget for 100 million, and they've decided it would cost 150 million, and they just have to put a pin in it for now."

**Turmail:** Richard, you had a question, and then I do think that-- I got word that our treasurer's phone is about to die and so why don't we take one question from the commission and see if anyone from the community's got one. And then we'll let the councilmember get on with his evening.

**Pollock:** Well, thank you for your generosity. One of the things that one of my commissioners said before you came on, and maybe you were on, was it would be nice if the city perhaps had a 5% or 10% stake in the RFK stadium. But my understanding is that this bill is a take it or leave it, that you can't really amend it, and that you have to pass it by July 24th or it's null and void. Can you address that, sir?

**Frumin:** Yeah. So, this is actually the controversy du jour. Part of what came out of the meeting

the other day is the idea that the BSA provision about the deal would come out, might come out, that the council would leave the money in for the deal, but not ratify the terms of the deal on July 14th or July 28th, whichever is the key date. I think it's probably, the BSA is July 28th. And so the council would not ratify the terms of the deal on July 28th, but the council would continue to do its due diligence, hold a hearing, so got input from the public. And try to put its own stamp on this deal, or reject it. But certainly try to put its own stamp on the deal by some time in the early fall, or in the fall. So, the Mayor doesn't want to see that happen. And the Commanders don't want to see that happen. They want this deal to go straight through. I've had conversations with different folks. I feel like my job is to closely scrutinize this deal and see if there are ways in which it can be improved, and be able to look you in the eye and say, "I voted however I voted based on full knowledge and a close analysis of the deal." And one of the things that we're doing is we've hired the Robert Bob group to do an analysis of the deal, and in comparison to terms in other places, and the council budget office is doing that. We're not going to get those analyses for a couple of weeks, if not deeper into July. I don't feel like I can responsibly do my job by July 28th, that it's going to take longer. The Mayor is very unhappy about that. The Mayor really wants to get this done. She believes it's critical to the future of the city. She feels like her team did a great job in balancing all of the interests, and the council should take a look at it and pass it as quickly as possible. Many of us feel like we just need to take more time with it. And it may be that we would revise it in some ways. Maybe it's ideas like the kind of idea that you're talking about. The idea of equity, one of the reasons one would want equity is that you would want a share of the revenues. But a different way to get at that is to get a share of the revenue. Or to say we need to get a share of the revenues. I don't know exactly where, what are the things the council is going to determine are important modifications to this deal. But we need to have taken the time to have thought about it. And we needed to have taken the time for folks like yourselves to provide input about what it is we should be doing. So it's being presented as take it or leave it, but it's not. Nothing's take it or leave it. Everything is a negotiation. And the question is when will that process end on the council's side? I doubt it's in July. I think it cannot go on for very long. But I think it's-- I'm not comfortable if it has to be done as quickly as all that while all of these other things are happening. Where we're dealing with this budget. Where we're going to get the June 30th revenue estimate. Where we're going to see whatever happens on Capitol Hill through the reconciliation process and think about what's the implications for that as we're working on our budget. Should we, at that same time, push this through? You know, the Commanders-- And I'm sorry, like you're respectful of my time, but I'm not being respectful of your time. I'll stop short soon. The Commanders said they want this to get done quickly. I hope they'll be flexible about this. But they said, "We will work day and night with the chairman between now and the next six weeks to get this done." The chairman has an enormous amount of other things on his plate. He can't work on this day and night for the next six weeks because we have a budget to pass. And we have to deal with the June 30th revenue estimate. So there's just not the bandwidth to do this. I think it's going to take a little bit longer, and I don't think it's take it or leave it. I doubt the deal will change enormously, but it's not, it didn't come, sticking with the biblical references, it did not come down from Mount Sinai.

**Turmail:** With that, I think I'll need to thank the councilmember very much for not only sharing, spending so much time with us, but also for all that you do for our ward and for the District of

Columbia. We very much appreciate it, and it's good to have such a thoughtful leader representing our part of the District. So thank you, Councilmember Frumin.

**Pollock:** Amen.

**Frumin:** Nicely done, Richard. That's the perfect note from my perspective to end. So, thank you all very much.

**Turmail:** Appreciate it. Appreciate it, everyone. Thank you. And I apologize for everyone for having to cut the conversation short, but Kevin's got me nervous now that he's about to die, or his cell phone's about to die.

## **Administrative Matters [1:09:22]**

### **April & May Monthly Financial Reports [1:09:22]**

**Turmail:** So I'm going to ask that we deviate from the agenda and go first to one of the administrative matters we need to cover, which is the April and May monthly financial reports. Kevin, before your phone dies, go ahead.

**Lavezzo:** My apologies. Zoom uses way more battery power than I thought it was going to. So, I'll start with the easy part, which is our May financials, where we had an opening balance of \$40,089.41. We had a closing balance of \$43,074.62. We had \$2,985.21 of deposits. And we also cut checks for a Hardy Middle School grant. And the incoming funds were our allotment. The second part, unfortunately, our fiscal year 2025 quarter 2 financial report had an error. The disbursement from the District of Columbia was not accounted for, so I need to present and we need to vote on an amended fiscal year 2025 quarter 2 financial report. And the information from that is we started with \$44,981.69. We ended with \$45,210.97. We had \$1,210 of grants. We spent \$45.93 on communications. We had two deposits. The first was our allotment of \$1,466.55. And then a grant refund of \$18.66. And does anyone have any questions, concerns, or comments?

**Turmail:** Commissioners? Anyone from the community? Questions about our budget or the quarterly financial report? We don't need to approve the May financial report? Just the quarterly report?

**Lavezzo:** Just the amended quarter two.

**Turmail:** I would make a motion that we vote to approve the amended second quarter budget report for ANC 3B.

**Howie:** I second.

**Turmail:** All in favor say, "aye." Any opposed? All right, it passes. Thank you, Kevin.

**Lavezzo:** Thanks, everyone.

## **New Business [1:11:32]**

### **Zoning Request 21308 for Special Exception for 2622 41st Street, NW [1:11:32]**

**Turmail:** And we're going to pick back up where we are with the agenda. And I'm going to hand things over to Melissa because the next two items are both hers.

**Lane:** Okay. We have a couple of zoning requests. We have Zachary Williams here who is the lawyer for the two properties. The first property is at 2622 41st Street. It's a four-unit building that they would like to expand to six units, and that is what the special exception is for. Zachary, do you want to take it away?

**Williams:** Sure. Thank you, Commissioner Lane. And I am here with the developer as well, Matt Medvene, who's joining me and just signed on. I see him there. We have two projects here. We'll walk through both of them. If it's okay, may I share my screen?

**Lane:** Sure. Let me set that up.

**Williams:** Looks like I have the ability. No, not yet.

**Lane:** Okay.

**Williams:** Make sure I get the right one up here. Great. Hopefully that's working for everyone. So again, my name is Zach Williams. I'm a land use attorney with Venable representing the developer here. Mr. Medvene will be joining me in presenting these two projects. We'll start with 2622 41st Street. These are both BZA cases, both seeking to expand apartment houses that currently exist in the RA-1 zone. The first project here on 41st Street, you can see on the zoning map in the aerial where this project is located. It's an existing apartment house, semi-detached apartment house on 41st Street near the intersection of Edmond Street Northwest. As I said, it's zoned to the RA-1 zone. The lot's about 4,671 square feet. It's a two-story, semi-detached apartment house, as I mentioned. There is alley access in the rear. The survey, this slide here shows the current survey of the lot, and the building on the lot as it currently exists. Here's a couple photos of the current conditions of the house. Very typical two-story brick apartment house in this neighborhood. On this block in particular, there's several of these types of structures, actually, throughout this area of the neighborhood. The proposed project is fairly minimal. It is simply to add two additional units in the cellar. So there won't be any additions to

the structure. There's one parking spot that will remain. There are none required, so there'll be an extra parking spot provided here. That's really all there is to this ask. Same footprint as currently exists. The building will continue to look from the outside exactly as it does today. Anytime you seek to add units in the RA-1 zone, we need to get a special exception from the Board of Zoning Adjustment. And that is exactly what we're doing here. We don't need any other relief. Everything else about this project is by right. This project we believe is in harmony with the zoning regulations. The RA-1 zone is really meant for these types of multi-family projects. Low to moderate density development in this neighborhood. It's also very typical in this area, 41st Street. These projects really line both sides of the street on this block. The next question is whether the special exception would adversely affect neighboring properties. Here we don't believe it would, especially since the building is staying as really exactly as is from the exterior. No additions will be made. And a parking space will be provided even though none are required for this project. So that concludes my presentation on 41st Street. And I can stop there, Commissioner Lane, or I can go into 40th place, however you prefer.

**Lane:** Let's do them one at a time. So basically what you need, you're just going to add two units to the basement, to make it a six-unit building? You're not going to go up?

**Williams:** Correct. And I believe it's going to be a four-unit building. Matt, confirm? I believe it's currently two and will be four.

**Lane:** Oh, I thought it was--

**Medvene:** No, it's-- Sorry. Good evening, everyone. My name is Matt. There is currently four. And the original plan was to have six by making two in the basement. I need to take one for the team on this one with Zach. I thought that had been conveyed, but in speaking with the Office of Planning and everyone else, they supported us putting in a third, partial third floor addition to make a seventh unit. It's what's done in a lot of these other buildings on our street and other neighborhoods, or streets in the neighborhood. They frankly asked us, "Why aren't you doing it?" Which made us actually go back and look at it. So the current plan is to dig out the basement that's existing there. It's a crawl space, partially excavated. And turn two units out of that basement footprint. And then put a partial third floor that would have another unit on the top floor. So it would turn from four into seven.

**Lane:** Okay. And you have spoken to the adjacent neighbors?

**Medvene:** We are the adjacent neighbor as well.

**Lane:** Oh, that makes it easy.

**Medvene:** Yes.

**Turmail:** Presumably you're on board then.

**Medvene:** There is support. Strong support.

**Lane:** Okay. I have no further questions. Do any other commissioners have questions about this one? Does anyone in the audience have questions about this one?

**Vilsack:** I do. Carol Vilsack. So, this isn't a six-unit building? This is going to be a seven-unit building? But there's currently one parking space. So is the BZA to ask for relief because you need three parking spaces now?

**Medvene:** There's currently one parking space in the back, and we are exploring putting a second parking space.

**Turmail:** But by right, are you required to have any parking spaces? Because Zach earlier said that -- if I misunderstood you, forgive me -- that wasn't required.

**Vilsack:** But he was confused. First he said it was four, then he was said it was six. Now Matt says it's seven. So four doesn't need any additional. That's the zoning requirement. The six would need two, the seven would need three. If you have one and you're exploring two, is your relief request asking--

**Medvene:** The seventh would push us over and need the second parking space. We would not need three parking spaces.

**Vilsack:** I think over four then you need to provide off-street parking. So five would be the one spot. I think that's the zoning requirement. But you're saying now that you revised your permitting request and you've developed seven units. Who is the developer, Matt? What is the name of the developer? Who owns the property?

**Medvene:** I'm part of a small ownership team that owns it.

**Vilsack:** I'm sorry?

**Medvene:** I said I am part of a small ownership team that owns it.

**Vilsack:** And the name of your ownership team is what?

**Medvene:** There's not one cohesive name for it. It's 2622 41st Group LLC.

**Vilsack:** It's an LLC, but the LLC is owned-- Who purchased the property from the prior owner?

**Medvene:** Our group, 2622 41st Group LLC. Myself, and I have a few partners with me.

**Vilsack:** So you're not providing any information as to whom the owners are of this partnership?



**Medvene:** At this juncture, I would need to consult the team to make sure that they're comfortable before I just go and disclose their information. Just in terms of respecting their privacy.

**Vilsack:** Well, that doesn't make any sense, but okay.

**Turmail:** I don't know what your timing is here, but given the fact that you've had to make some adjustments, do we need to add you back to the July meeting with amended plans, just so that we're all on the same page? I don't know.

**Medvene:** Yeah, I think that is probably prudent. And I apologize.

**Turmail:** I hate to delay your guys' project at all, but I think it would be best for us to vote on what we're actually going to do.

**Medvene:** No, no. It's our fault, honestly.

**Lane:** Yeah, your zoning hearing is July 16th?

**Medvene:** Yeah. And we can request that gets slid. I mean, this is on us.

**Lane:** Our next meeting is July 10th.

**Medvene:** I mean, this is our issue. And Zack was not, clearly, kept in the loop on our side. So we need to get our affairs in order on that front.

**Lane:** Okay. So we'll delay this one until-- Your hearing is July 16th, so we could do it before that hearing, or you could delay the hearing. Since our meeting is July 10th.

**Turmail:** Sorry to fuss over for you Matt, but we just want to make sure we're crossing the right Ts.

**Lane:** Yeah. We just need to make sure we have the right--

**Medvene:** No, understood. Yeah, that's completely fair, and that's something that we need to get with on our team. So, it's not happened. We've gone before you guys in the past and it's been very smooth, and this has frankly never happened, and I'm pretty embarrassed by it.

**Lane:** It's okay. Stuff happens.

**Turmail:** We'll see you back here in July. It's totally fine. We'll make it work.

**Vilsack:** Well, what about the second one? Should we discuss the second one?

**Turmail:** We got this, Carol. Carol, we got this.

**Lane:** Carol, I'm getting to the second one. Don't worry about it. I'm doing it.

## **Zoning Request 21312 for Special Exception for 2200-2212 40th Place, NW [1:22:13]**

**Lane:** All right. So we will move to the second request, which is a bigger request. This is at the 2200 40th Place to 2212 40th Place. They are two, four-unit buildings connected. There's two sets of buildings and they want to connect these buildings. And the zoning relief is for the parking space in the back, because there is no alley back there, even though it's platted by the city. So, Zach, do you want to do that one, or Matt?

**Williams:** Sure. I'll do that one. And I think on this one we should be good. Matt and I will talk after this. On this one, hopefully everyone can see this. It's very similar in some ways, but also different because as you'll see, this involves four lots that are comprised of two semi-detached apartment houses that look just like the one that we just talked about at 41st Street. And these are where the lots are located, right at the intersection of W. And this is just the survey showing the four semi-detached apartment houses as they currently exist today. They currently have 16 units, so four units in each apartment house. Here's the existing conditions. We'll come back to this. What's really important is that what looks like the alley on the left, top left there, is actually not. It's actually off the property. It's on the adjacent private property, and what is supposed to be the alley is where all that brush is. And it's obviously not the alley. So, you have an unimproved alley here, and we'll get into why that creates issues with parking in a few minutes. Here's the plan. The plan is to combine the four apartment houses into essentially one project. And the reason to do that instead of doing them piecemeal is it's more efficient. And we can get better and bigger units by doing it this way. There will also be IZ units here. The total unit count will be 29. So there'll be 13 new units spread across four separate apartment houses. Three of those will be inclusionary zoning units, all of which will be large, three-bedroom units. And by combining the lots the way we have, we're able to create those larger family-style units that we wouldn't be able to if we were going piecemeal like we have at 41st Street. Here's some elevations of how the new project would look. There's going to be a partial third edition on the combined properties, as combined. And here's one view of it and how they would look on the left side there. And here's some just looking front-on elevations of the project as proposed. So, as I said, it's a partial third addition. And then obviously the units will be connected in the middle, the ones that are not already attached to one another. We will be adding a solar array on the roof. Matt and his team have been doing that on a lot of projects recently. This one will have another one of those that will feature solar panels throughout the entire roof area. And this just shows how those are currently planned. BZA relief is the same as 41st Street with the addition of parking relief. We are required to have three parking spaces for the 13 additional units. We're not able to provide those because we don't have an alley. We have no access to an alley. We don't have an alley. And I'll talk a little bit about why we can't build an alley either, even if we wanted to. We've already walked through why this is in harmony with the RA-1 zone. I mean,

really, this is four different projects just being combined into one, and a total of 13 units spread across those four apartment houses. So you still have the moderate density apartment houses being provided here. And this neighborhood, just like at 41st Street, this block is all apartment houses. So, let's talk about that unimproved alley. Here's the survey of the site as it exists today. And what you can see here is, at the bottom where the payment is that we looked at, and where the alley is supposed to be right here. So that's where the paper alley, if you will, is located, not where the actual alley is, which is off the lot. So we talked to DDOT to try to see if we could get a connection between this alley to these lots to be able to create parking. And DDOT said we cannot. We cannot cross this public land here. This is public land. DDOT has jurisdiction over this land. We do not. This is not our private property. So, we can't cross it. And if we were to try to build out the alley, we'd have to get a new curb cut. And the problem with that is that we've got a big heritage tree right here in the middle of the alley. I believe it's 36 inches in diameter. So, it's over 100 inches of circumference. So, it's over the heritage tree designation in DC, and DDOT is not sure that they would even let us do that even if we wanted to do that, which we don't, that they would even allow it. So, we've got multiple issues here with trying to get parking. We really can't do it. And now we also have some significant grade issues. As you can see, those little lines that are close together show a hill, essentially. And the other issue is that we only have these four lots, and DDOT doesn't just want a partial alley. They would want the whole entire alley built, the whole entire block. That's not something that this project is able to support, just with 13 units. And we've tried. We had those discussions before we filed, and there's just really no way. There's no parking provided now, and we really can't provide it on this site given the circumstances that we have with this non-alley behind the parcels. So apart from the parking, we don't think the project should impact, adversely, surrounding properties. Again, 13 units spread across four lots is not too significant. We've seen that throughout the neighborhood. It's pretty typical. The parking, obviously it is what it is. Three spots that we would be required to provide, we aren't able to provide. There is significant street parking in this area. Particularly on W Street, there's hidden parking if you're familiar with that, and quite a lot of it. I'm not going to sit here today and tell you that we've done an analysis and we can tell you exactly what that could provide, but it's more street parking than you would typically see in DC with that head-in parking all along W. So there is that. And there is the fact that it's only three spaces that we're not able to provide that otherwise would be required. Here's some shadow studies showing there's really pretty limited impact of the third story addition on surrounding properties. And so we don't think this should really have an impact. Again, all of the surrounding properties are also apartment houses, some of which have had additions themselves. So that concludes our presentation, and hopefully the project hasn't changed, Matt, since I gave the presentation. But assuming it hasn't, we're here for questions.

**Turmail:** So let me, if I may, Melissa, ask a question.

**Lane:** Go ahead.

**Turmail:** If I have it right, you've got four units that you want to combine into one larger complex. The four units currently have a total, all combined, of 16 apartments, right?

**Williams:** Correct.

**Turmail:** Did I do my math right? Four times four. Math was never a strong suit for me. And you want to add, or you want to end up with 13 units? So is it--

**Williams:** 13.

**Turmail:** 13 total?

**Williams:** Add 13 to have a total of 29.

**Lane:** 29. No, they want to add add 13--

**Turmail:** Add 13 to your 16.

**Williams:** Correct.

**Turmail:** Okay. That was my question. You've answered it.

**Lane:** And you have, again, talked to the neighbors about-- Do we have input from those adjacent?

**Medvene:** We have spoken with the owners across the street from us. There's two properties there. They are in support of it. They've already developed themselves. We have gone and door knocked and emailed several of the owners in the immediate block. We've reached out to and met with a few of the renters. But beyond that, we have not yet actually spoken to any of the other neighbors further north of us on the street.

**Lane:** But you have spoken to the ones that are closest to you?

**Medvene:** The ones across the street, yes. The ones directly north of us, 2216, I believe, or 2214.

**Lane:** 2216, yeah.

**Medvene:** We have not been able to contact him. We have tried twice. We just went, again, as recently as earlier this week trying to contact him.

**Lane:** Okay. Carol has a question.

**Vilsack:** It goes to Brian's question. Again, if the intent is to create 13 additional units, I think that it's more than just three parking spaces that you're asking for relief for. Four-unit buildings, I think the zoning requirement, and I could be mistaken, but if you're asking for 29 units and you're adding a net new 13, I believe you need to add more parking than what you're

suggesting. And I will also say, I've lived here for 32 years, and parking after 8:00 is quite sketchy. So, I'm sure if you drive by during the day when everyone's at work, there's apparently a lot of potential, but when you start trying to find a spot after 8:00, it's pretty sketchy. So, I do think that the parking is the root cause of this concern that I have. You're adding 13 net new units, but there won't be any parking for 29 new owners.

**Turmail:** And there's currently no parking for the existing 16.

**Lane:** Yeah, there's no parking now. And there won't be parking.

**Vilsack:** Correct.

**Williams:** And, Matt, let me just address that.

**Turmail:** Yeah, please.

**Williams:** So, we have confirmed with the zoning administrator that the requirement is three. Because the existing 16 don't have any, when you do essentially a renovation like this, you're kind of grandfathered in, if you will, for lack of a better word, to the existing situation. And you're only required to provide parking for the additional units, so it's three.

**Vilsack:** But you're adding 13.

**Turmail:** Hold on, Carol. Let me hand things over first to Rob. We have one of the commissioners had a question, and our process here is we'll take questions from the commissioners first.

**Lane:** Oh, sorry, Rob.

**Rodriguez:** Melissa did one of my questions. I was asking if you had letters of support from the people that were directly affected around you. And then if it does become a community issue with the parking, are you open to a parking analysis?

**Williams:** Yeah, I mean, we could do an analysis. We've looked at different things that we could do. So Matt, for example, we've spoken to some of the large apartment buildings in the area to see if they had excess parking that we could use. And, Matt, fill in here if I'm missing the details, but they have not been willing to provide that to us. There are several very large apartment buildings in this area, including right behind us. And we haven't been able to get any takers yet. Matt, fill in if I'm missing anything there.

**Medvene:** That is correct. We've also gone through and had PDRM meetings with DOT, with the city, to explore if there was anything we could do to encourage them to actually build that alley. To which that was a resounding rejection. They said it was not on their plans to do so at any point in the time, in the near term, much less long term. Vice versa, rather. They did say that

they'd be open to getting rid of that paper alley, but that wouldn't resolve our issues, because if we went through that process with them, that would merely just be granting additional lot size. That would not be giving us the ability to make a curb cut or make an alley.

**Rodriguez:** I know you said a couple places have the hidden parking on W Street. If you have an address, because I'd even like to go back and take a look at it, you know, to address Carol's concern, too. If the parking analysis is done or not for the community involvement or community questions, even just commissioners going by, you know, several times during the day after 8:00 p.m. during the week and during the weekend, and kind of seeing what it looks like on there. I think we might be able to calm some concerns that way too. But any other commissioners have any input about whether the parking analysis is needed, or whether we just do a couple drive-bys and see how the parking is in the addresses they give us for the hidden parking?

**Lane:** I'm just not sure what the parking analysis is going to find since I don't know what they would--

**Rodriguez:** If you drive by a few times and see, "Oh, yeah. I agree there's plenty of parking around here," especially for 13 additional units that may have to use street parking. Because I can see with 13 additional units, especially three bedrooms, that there's probably going to be a driver involved in some of those.

**Lane:** Yeah. No, I agree.

**Turmail:** It seems to me the fundamental question for the commission-- And yes, I see Carol, your hand's up. We'll get to you, I promise. Are we comfortable putting our name in support of your variance request? Then it comes down to whether we're okay with additional units without additional parking because they don't have any options.

**Lane:** I would be more comfortable if we had sign off from the people just north of them as well.

**Rodriguez:** The letters of support would help.

**Lane:** The letters of support would help. And if the neighbors are okay with it, then I would be more than happy to support it.

**Rodriguez:** Agree.

**Turmail:** And Matt, to Melissa's point, the one thing that this commission has always looked for is, look, if the neighbors are fine with it, we're fine with it.

**Medvene:** 100%. And as I said, we are anticipating letters of support from the two building owners across the street from us. Those are the only ones we've been able to actually speak with to date. But we will continue to try and get a hold of the homeowners both directly north of us, and then any others that we can try and touch base with. We've kept a log of the attempts at

outreach. We can share that with the committee as well.

**Turmail:** Thank you. Oh, I'm sorry, I interrupted you. Forgive me, Matt.

**Medvene:** I was just saying we'll continue towards that endeavor.

**Turmail:** Would it mess you up on this one if we also said, "Hey, let's just see if we can get them signed off by July?" Since you're going to be back with us anyway.

**Medvene:** This one would. But the question would be if we were able to procure the letters of support before that timing, you know, would there be some kind of a conditional letter of acknowledgement that could be provided to BZA, you know, with the condition that we get that letter of support from the people north of us? That would be the question.

**Lane:** I think we have to do it at a public meeting. So I think we'd still have to do it at the July 10th meeting unless we call a special meeting for this purpose.

**Medvene:** You wouldn't be able to pass a resolution that's conditional to the neighbor's support?

**Lane:** We'd have to have, we'd have to present it at a public meeting.

**Medvene:** Got it.

**Lane:** Which, I mean, we'd have to call a special meeting, which, you know, we can think about doing.

**Williams:** July 10th is prior to our BZA hearing, so that would work.

**Lane:** July 16th is your BZA hearing for both of them, and we meet on July 10th.

**Medvene:** Okay.

**Rodriguez:** I just think we need more people than just across the street, because that needs to be-- The number of units going in, with the number of bedrooms going in, I think it's definitely, it's going to put us at ease if the community, you know, has some push back.

**Medvene:** Understood.

**Turmail:** Why don't we do this. And Carol, we'll take your question a second. But why don't we just say let's give it another month. Let's see if you can get them, and then we'll put, you know, hopefully we can get you taken care of on the 10th of July, assuming you've got the support from the neighbors to the north, and then get you on your way for the 16th.

**Medvene:** All right, I greatly appreciate that.

**Turmail:** Well, let's see what happens over the next month. But I mean, certainly if the neighbors are fine with it, you know, that has typically been our precedent in this commission. Carol, did you have an additional question?

**Vilsack:** I wanted them to drop both of these decks into the chat if that's--

**Turmail:** I believe they're on our ANC website.

**Lane:** I think they're on the website, but Zach, if you've got additional ones, just send them to me and I'll update the website with these.

**Williams:** Sure, I can do that.

**Turmail:** Yeah, particularly ones with the update on the first one we talked about with the seventh unit.

**Lane:** Yeah, especially the first one.

**Turmail:** That'd be great. Please.

**Vilsack:** Okay. Thanks, Melissa.

**Turmail:** All right. Well, sorry Matt and Zach, that we-- But we'll see you in July and we'll keep our fingers crossed with the neighbor to the north and we'll see how it goes.

**Medvene:** No problem. We appreciate the feedback. Thank you everyone for the time.

**Williams:** Appreciate it. Thank you.

**Lane:** Thanks.

**Turmail:** All right. Appreciate it. Thank you guys.

## **Briefing by DC Water on Anticipated Survey and Inspection Work in Glover Archbold Park [1:40:36]**

**Turmail:** All right. the DC Water guys, if you're still here, or maybe you're busy boiling water. But I think we had a team from DC Water who's been very patient, thank you, for a very long meeting tonight. They have an update on anticipated survey and inspection work in Glover Archbold Park. Floor is yours, guys. I'm not sure who's going.

**Kelley:** Thank you for having us. My name is Peter Kelley. I'm the DC Water project lead for this



project, this upcoming project that we have. And we're doing some survey and inspection work in support of it. I'm going to go over a brief background. I know we're short on time, but I'm going to go over some project background. And then I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Pono, who's going to go over sort of the field activities and schedule of what's upcoming. And then we can open up for quick questions and answers. So the project background, this is for the rehabilitation of sewers. This is part of our larger CIP project program, which is to support the rehabilitation and the continual use of our water and sewer assets. This project particular is the rehabilitation of creek beds, sewers and creek beds. The goal of this project specifically is for our sewer storm pipes that have outlived their design life, and rehabilitation of defective manholes. For those of you unaware, we have a large, aging infrastructure in DC. In this area in particular, we have assets that are well over 100 years old. We're here to protect, the project's goal is to protect and eliminate exposed-- Additionally, to protect and eliminate exposed sewer assets to the extent practical. So to do that, part of the project is stream restoration. A number of these projects have a number of stream crossings, where there are assets or the pipe, storm or sewer, run parallel, perpendicular, or intersect the stream bed. And we are also, additionally, we're going to repair and rehabilitation the storm water outfalls in the project area of the creek bed. The locations, there are three locations. Primarily, Glover Archbold Park, sort of the entire length of the park. We're following that that creek bed, or that that stream. As well as Dumbarton Oaks and Normanstone, which is a smaller area of Normanstone in the northeast portion of Normanstone. And those are the areas we'll primarily be focused on. All right, I'm going to turn it over to Pono, and he'll give us--

**Hanson:** Good evening, everyone. My name is Pono Hanson, and I'm the engineering consultant that's working with DC Water for this project. So as Peter mentioned, we're currently conducting and scheduling some field activities. So what I have presented here is our upcoming project schedule as it relates to some of the inspection work and field reconnaissance and survey work. So, we have started what we call manhole inspections. We started that in May, and anticipating wrapping that up in June. What that entails is, you know, crews walking in with handheld equipment to assess and get a visual inspection of the inside of the sewer and storm manholes. Upcoming we will be conducting some pipe inspections. We do anticipate starting that in June, and likely scheduling and wrapping that up in August. What that does entail is it's a variety of different equipment, some that will be handheld and walked in that we will insert in the manhole sewer and storm manholes. And it will float through the linear pipes. In other sections, specifically the north side of Glover Archbold Park, we will be making use of what we call a CCTV crawler. It's essentially a robot with a camera on it. And we will be making use of the existing trails with an ATV to get access and get closer to those manholes so that we can lower that equipment in that. What these pipe inspections and manhole inspections will provide us is, again, those videos and visual observation of what the condition of these sewer and storm assets are. And how we move forward and take that data and information to determine what assets and what pieces of DC Water system needs to be repaired or rehabilitated. Moving forward we will be conducting also stream assessments and surveys. So, that is measuring various parts of the streams that we have identified as having exposed assets. And that, specifically, is what Peter mentioned of pipes or manholes that are perpendicular or exposed. You can see, visually see the pipe or the manhole within the stream. So we'll be getting data

collection at those various locations to help us inform what type of stream restoration needs to be done at those locations. That is scheduled for this summer. And then we will be also conducting topographic and non-intrusive utility designation surveys. So, again, that is also handheld equipment. Get us a lay of the land as we look towards what needs to be rehabilitated and incorporated into that design. With all of this field work, it is dependent on weather. We obviously avoid significant wet weather events like storms. One, it's for safety precaution, but also, you know, being cognizant in minimizing our impact to the park area and not traversing through muddy areas. So a lot of this work we're currently underway, kind of ramping up during the summer into the fall. And then culminating likely early 2026. So some general just safety and awareness. As I mentioned, we'll have various crews out there. They will be working close to the different trail systems in there. So what really that means is they know that this is heavily trafficked trails and parks. But we request, you know, just as park users and nearby residents of the District, just keep your distance because they are working with equipment and we don't want any-- We're practicing good safety measures. We will also be incorporating various signage at different points of the park, specifically the entrances, that will have kind of a QR code that you can scan to get more information about the project. And we'll have that at the end of our presentation as well. We've been working really close with national parks. You see some of them on the call tonight. But we've been working with them to just be cognizant and sensitive of what existing wildlife and vegetation is out there. Our crews are aware of that, and so that is incorporated into our work plan and how we're conducting work out there. And then lastly, kind of culminating is that no equipment will be obstructing the trail so that all of you all, and the different park users and different residents of the District can maintain your regular routine access throughout the park. We do ask, obviously because we have crew and personnel out there, as a reminder dogs should be kept on leashes as part of NPS requirements. And that's for the safety of residents, our crews out there, as well as the various animals in there. We have our project manager Peter Kelley, who you heard from earlier today. And then we also have our DC Water project liaison, Joyce Willis. Here is their contact information. As I mentioned, that is a QR code that you're welcome to scan. It'll redirect you to this project website to learn a little bit more about the project. We will provide a copy of this to the commissioners here and the chair to distribute accordingly. And then I believe we also might have dropped a sign-in form in the Zoom chat here. What we're asking is if you are interested in attending future presentations about the project and learning more, fill out your information so we can collect that, and you'll kind of get added to a listserv here. With that, we will open up with any questions.

**Turmail:** All right, questions from the commissioners for our colleagues at DC Water? Go ahead, Rob.

**Rodriguez:** I'll be quick on this one. So, I live over at Sutton Towers. And Sutton Towers and Sutton Place has direct access to Glover Archbold Park just north of Cathedral. Will there be any noise associated with this? And what are the working hours?

**Hanson:** Working hours are just Monday through Friday. I believe it's like 8:00 to 4:00ish. So just regular business hours. There is no noise, really, at all, because we're not doing any excavating. The equipment will be lowered into the pipe underground. So you shouldn't

anticipate or expect any noise disturbance.

**Rodriguez:** I can give the heads up to the community, give them your QR code so they know if they see people, you know, in the back of the townhouses over Sutton Place down below them working. "What's going on?" So that'll be helpful. And then I do have another issue for another project, but I'll reach out to you via email offline just to ask a quick question to see if you can direct me in the right direction. That's all the questions I have.

**Hanson:** Sure.

**Rodriguez:** Thanks.

**Turmail:** Go ahead, Richard.

**Pollock:** So, aside from walkers on the trails having their dogs on leash, are there any other pieces of advice that you're going to be giving people who will take those trails?

**Hanson:** Not necessarily advice. What we are committed to doing is while our crews, specifically when we are using the ATVs to traverse the trail to get to certain locations, we will have personnel walking in front and behind of the crew and the equipment just to alert, whether it's runners, whether it's walkers, people walking their dogs. Just so that they're aware, "Hey, you're approaching a crew. You might get paused for a second so that we can move aside and you can continue down the trail." Did that answer your question?

**Pollock:** It does. I mean, I'm going to let folks in my area know about what you guys are doing so they'll have some sort of awareness. I just wanted to figure out whether or not there was any other advice to actual people who are on the trails or nearby.

**Hanson:** I think our expectation is that you really won't be impacted very significantly. The work is we're not excavating. We might be staged at certain locations for 30 minutes or an hour depending on, not to get too technical, like how long we're going to inspect the sewer. But, you know, we're mobilizing, coming in each morning, and then leaving at the end of the day. You won't see any equipment left in the park at night. If they're lucky to see our bright yellow PPE, we'll give them a smile and happy to give them a business card to redirect them to our project website. And happy to, you know, talk to them and educate them more about what we're doing there.

**Pollock:** Well, good luck on your work. I know this is important.

**Hanson:** Thank you.

**Turmail:** Any other questions from commissioners or from the community?

**Vilsack:** Can I just ask? Carol Vilsack. At each site, sir, how long are you going to be at? Or is it

just a rolling inspection? You're there for a day or an hour? How long is each of these disparate checks taking?

**Hanson:** It will vary. So we will be starting from the north end at really Mass Ave. So we'll go from Mass Ave. up to Van Ness, and then we'll work our way from Mass Ave. south. But specific to how long we may be staged at a given location, it will vary. And that is really not a great answer, but it will vary because of the different conditions for pipes. And it factors in, you know, the pipe size, the flow within the pipe, how long a given from point to point it takes. As well as, again, as we talk about sensitive vegetation and wildlife, we're being cognizant of where we're entering the park so that we're avoiding that impact. So, I don't, unfortunately I don't have a direct answer and can't tell you, "Okay, at this location we're going to be an hour. This location we're going to be ten minutes." But it will vary based on a lot of different conditions specific to the internal of the pipe.

**Vilsack:** Okay. Then can you just add signs as you move along that you will be in this area for the next few days so that folks can keep their distance, and let you do what you need to do?

**Hanson:** Sure. Yeah. We will, I think that's something we can commit to, obviously so that the public can be informed of where we're going to be located. So if we can circle back with our comms team and how we can work with you all to continue to notify the public, we can do that.

**Turmail:** Sure. Feel free to reach back out to us. Thank you. Anyone else?

**Vilsack:** Thank you, sir.

**Turmail:** All right. Thank you guys. I appreciate you waiting so long to present. Certainly I think we're all in favor of anything we can do to make sure that we understand the status of this very old infrastructure, and presumably this is anticipating updating it, and we look forward to hearing from you in the future when you have a game plan for that.

**Kelley:** Thank you.

**Hanson:** Thank you so much.

**Turmail:** All right. Appreciate it.

## Updates and Information [1:55:31]

## **Update on Stoddert Elementary School Current Classroom Renovation Project and FY 2026 Cafeteria Addition Project [1:55:31]**

## **Reminder About Implementation of WMATA Better Bus Network Starting on June 29, 2025 [1:55:31]**

**Turmail:** Okay. We've got a few more things. Hang tight, guys. We have a quick update on Stoddert Elementary School, current classroom renovation project and the cafeteria addition. Gupi, do we have any updates? We have no updates. Same as last month. See last month's minutes, which we're about to approve on that one. And then I'm not sure if Melissa, or if we have anyone from WMATA. We have just yet another reminder. We've been reminding folks for a while that come June 29th, the whole bus system's changing, including a lot of the stops. Melissa, what am I missing?

**Lane:** Yeah. Yeah, that's what's going to happen. I've updated the website. You can see the new routes. You can see, I can drop that in the chat. There's also a public meeting that's coming up. It's a Zoom meeting on June 23rd, from 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m. And I will also drop that link in the chat, or where that is on the website. So, good luck, everybody. We're going to get through this.

**Turmail:** Cal, you have a question or an update?

**Lane:** Oh yeah, Cal Simone is here, who is going to make it all better.

**Simone:** I was having audio problems before. I don't have a question. I have an announcement and an invitation. Do you want me to wait on that or--

**Turmail:** No, go for it. Let's do it while you're on the spotlight.

**Simone:** All right. So, I'm probably known up here in Chevy Chase as the go-to guy about all the details of the bus plan. And I would say that, you know, aside from ANC 3/4G, your ANC is probably the one that is in Ward 3 that's had the most impact from these changes. And so we are-- I want to announce an event that's coming up. I'll put the information in the chat. On June 24th, from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m., up at Blessed Sacrament, which is at Chevy Chase Circle. And basically, this is a collaborative effort between the Chevy Chase Community Association, Friends of Bus Transit, which is a new group, and WMATA. And so there's going to be different, you know, there's a WMATA piece. And then I'll get up and I'll explain every detail of everything, and there'll be things that I will explain that are not findable anywhere else that I know about, about what's going on. So, we wanted to first of all invite y'all and your community or constituents to that event. I don't know the best way to get that word out.

**Lane:** If you send it to me, I'll put it out on the listserv.

**Simone:** Thank you. Because all that information from WMATA is great, but it's hard to make sense of it in the end, you know, when you're trying to figure out what's going on. And I have a way of presenting it and explaining it that makes a lot more sense. Secondly, Friends of the Bus Transit is planning to go beyond our Chevy Chase little berg up there, and Matt Frumin suggested I reach out, and I was going to do this anyway, to other ANCs to work together with them. I know you don't have any committees. Are there people here on the commission who would want to work with us on transportation issues? Because our work doesn't stop on June 29th. We have a whole bunch of changes that we're going to be pushing for.

**Turmail:** I'm sure the answer is yes. Maybe it's best if you could just, you know, send us a quick email asking us exactly what you want someone to work on, and then we can volunteer/voluntell someone to help out.

**Simone:** Okay. So, I just stuck that stuff in the chat about both the event and my email address. And Melissa, what did you say? You wanted me to send something to you. I don't have your, do I have your email address?

**Lane:** I'll give it to you right now. You were going to, about the event on the 24th, if you send me the details on that. Oh, you've got it right here. I will put it out on the listserv so people know about it.

**Turmail:** So we've got a WMATA meeting on the 23rd. We've got this kind of combo meeting with Cal who's going to explain everything beyond the mysteries of what WMATA has displayed on the 24th. And we're certainly happy to help contribute to the conversation, because we do appreciate that transportation issues are not going to go away on the 28th. They might actually become more interesting.

**Simone:** Yes. And I've been studying these. We moved here just before my 10th birthday. And so I have, in a chest of drawers I have almost the entire set of bus schedules from the late 1960s.

**Turmail:** I was going to say, that puts you in your 20s now, but I guess maybe a little bit older. So anyway, there you go.

**Simone:** Let's see. I was going to say one more thing about it, and now I forgot.

**Turmail:** That predates WMATA.

**Simeon:** Oh yeah, that's right. And the Metro that screwed everything up with the bus network. That's what happened. We had five bus lines running up and down McKinley Street. Now we're barely hanging on to part of one of them. So we will be, yeah, we will be lobbying for changes for this next change cycle. Because this is not going to work for a lot of us.

**Turmail:** All right. Well, we have your information. We'll post it on the listserv and encourage

people to go on the 24th. And like I said, just email us. Probably best via Melissa since you've got her email address, and we'll do the rock paper scissors and get someone engaged.

**Simone:** Yeah. And after I do my presentation, then we'll have a lengthy Q&A where people can ask anything they want to ask.

**Turmail:** Awesome.

**Simone:** Okay. All right.

**Turmail:** All right. Thank you so much. Later we'll have a talk about the 1960s bus service. I may be the only one who's interested, but I am interested.

**Simone:** Well, you've got my email address.

**Turmail:** There you go. I think when I first moved to DC, some of those buses with WMATA paint jobs were still running. But let's see. Real quick, I know it's late, guys. Do we have anything from the community? Any open forum issues? If anyone in the community still left.

**Simone:** I remember what I was going to say. There are 14 people here. There were 35 when I left the first time at 7:30. I'm sad that so few people actually got to hear what I said.

**Turmail:** I'm apparently not that entertaining of a host for the two-hour long meeting. And I'm at peace with that.

**Simone:** Well, actually, I'll say that in most of the other ANCs, the open form is either first, or very early in the agenda, or in the middle somewhere, but not at the end.

**Turmail:** We like to encourage and reward patience here.

## **Administrative Matters [2:02:45]**

**Turmail:** Just real quick, we have one last piece of administrative business, and that is we've got to review, or we've got to approve our May 2025 minutes. Melissa circulated the minutes to all of the commissioners. All of the commissioners have had an opportunity to read, and review, and edit those. And I would make a motion that we approve the minutes.

**Lane:** Second.

**Turmail:** All in favor of the minutes say, "aye."

**Commissioners:** Aye.

**Turmail:** Anyone else can--

**Lane:** Is Kevin gone?

**Turmail:** What's that?

**Lane:** Is Kevin gone?

**Rodriguez:** He is.

**Turmail:** He seems to be gone. We did handle his stuff.

**Lane:** Okay. I just have to get the vote right.

**Turmail:** Okay. And then I will make a motion, speaking of getting the votes right, that we adjourn tonight's meeting.

**Howie:** Second.

**Turmail:** All in favor say, "aye."

**Howie:** Aye.

**Turmail:** Anyone opposed, stick around.

**Lane:** Say what you really think, Gupi.

**Turmail:** Otherwise, everyone have a good night. Be safe. And if you're in the boil water area, I think you've still got to boil your water. All right, bye.

**Rodriguez:** I've got two gallons sitting in there. Thanks everyone. See you next month.

**Turmail:** Thanks, guys. Sorry it went so long.