

Transcript of ANC 3B Meeting of May 8, 2025

Edited for Clarity and Readability

Timestamp	Agenda Items
0:00:00	Call to Order
0:00:00	Approval of Agenda
0:02:20	Old Business
0:02:20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Resolution on the Current Washington Gas Proposal, "District SAFE" (update of Project Pipes)
0:10:56	Police Report
0:20:27	New Business
0:20:27	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion and Resolution in Support of Continuing Streateries on Wisconsin Avenue in Glover Park
0:31:08	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Briefing by Robert Becker, DC Open Government Coalition, on DC Council Proposal for Closed Meetings
0:55:32	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Zoning Request of Special Exception for 2219 Observatory Place, NW
1:08:42	Updates and Information
1:08:42	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on Stoddert Elementary School Current Classroom Renovation Project and FY 2026 Cafeteria Addition Project
1:21:35	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reminder About Implementation of WMATA Better Bus Network Starting on June 29, 2025
1:38:01	Open Forum
1:38:01	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ashlee Mercer, Ward 3 Councilmember Frumin's Office
1:39:47	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mayor's Office of Community Relations and Services (MOCRS)
1:41:33	Administrative Matters

Call to Order [0:00:00]

Approval of Agenda [0:00:00]

Turmail: All right. Good evening, everyone. If you are here for ANC 3B's May meeting, you're in the right spot. And I've said it before, I'll say it again. If you're in the wrong spot, hang out anyway. It should be a good conversation. I'm going to give it like five seconds because I don't do well with long silences. And then we'll go ahead and get started. I don't really do that well with short silences either, for that matter.

Lane: I was going to say, you know.

Howie: The husband of a fourth grade teacher.

Turmail: There you go. The mean one. I'm just kidding, she's not mean. All right, why don't we go ahead and get started? Thank you all for logging in. We've got a robust agenda.

Lane: Richard's here.

Turmail: I'm sorry?

Lane: Richard's here.

Turmail: Wonderful. Fantastic. With that being said, I think we've got a robust agenda. And the first thing we need to do before we even get this thing started is to approve the agenda. Melissa put together an agenda. We do have one amendment or change that we made to the agenda. We've added a conversation about a request for a zoning approval for 2219 Observatory Place Northwest. And we'll cover that in the new business section after we deal with the streateries and hear from the DC Open Government Coalition. So with that being said, I make a motion that we approve the agenda and get started. I see a second. All in favor, either say, "aye," or raise your hand, depending on whether you want to unmute or not.

Howie: Aye.

Turmail: Anyone opposed? You're out of luck. With that, I'm gonna hand things over to I think I saw-- Was Lieutenant Johnson with us?

Lane: I don't see him.

Turmail: Yeah, my email said he signed, he joined in, but I don't see him. Do we have anyone from the Second District with us? Second District of Metropolitan Police Department.

Lane: I don't see him.

Turmail: All right. we're going to table that and see if he logs in, in a bit, and come back to it if everyone's all right with that.

Old Business [0:02:20]

Resolution on the Current Washington Gas Proposal, "District SAFE" (update of Project Pipes) [0:02:20]

Turmail: With that, we do have some old businesses. I can't remember if it was our February ANC meeting. We had a pretty good conversation regarding a request from Washington Gas to move forward with its update to Project Pipes, which they now refer to as District SAFE. We did have a, I thought, a really good conversation both on the pros and cons. And after some deliberation, we did decide that we do want to put forward a resolution. And I'm going to hand things over to Kevin to kind of talk us through the resolution, and then we'll go from there. Please.

Lavezzo: Sure thing. So, we had the Office of People's Counsel, as well as Washington Gas and Light and an interest group on to talk to us about Project Pipes 3, which is now DC SAFE. And the Office of People's Counsel, who represents us in matters of utilities, power, gas, those sorts of things, recommended that we craft a resolution not in support of Washington Gas' new plan. And there were a few reasons for this. The main one was a financial aspect, where Washington Gas and Light was directed by the Public Service Commission to make a new plan to only replace the most leak-prone, highest-risk natural gas pipelines. And do this in line with the District of Columbia's climate laws and goals. The plan that Washington Gas came back with was more expensive than the previous plan, with fewer pipes replaced that are in high need. And they had also shown that Washington Gas and Light has not been managing pipe replacement effectively. They have not met goals. They have not replaced the highest-risk pipes in a comprehensive manner. So for those reasons, the Office of People's Counsel wants Washington Gas and Light to go back, come up with another plan that meets their guidelines of replacing the highest-risk, most leak-prone pipes in accordance with the District of Columbia's climate laws and goals, in a way that protects all of us as residents of the District of Columbia. There's already a fee on everyone's gas bill for the previous Project Pipes that's been on there for a number of years. This new plan, if it were to be approved, would significantly increase that fee. And Washington Gas and Light was not able to provide an end date for project replacement. Under Project Pipes 3, it was something like 2090, all the pipes would be done. And the new one is a completely open-ended thing. So, we made a resolution to basically say that Washington Gas and Light needs to go back to the drawing board and produce a plan to be in line with the requests of the Public Service Commission, and something that everyone can swallow that protects us all. And that's the spirit of this resolution.

Turmail: Thank you, Kevin. I'll first hand it over. Any questions or comments from commissioners about the proposed resolution? It has been circulated among the commissioners, and they've all had a chance to read and review it in advance of this meeting. I'll go ahead and open it up if there's any questions or comments from the community. Melissa, I should remember this by now, but do they just need to virtually raise their hand if they want to chat? Or what's the best way for folks to do that?

Lane: Yes, that's the best way. And I don't see any.

Turmail: All right. With that being said, I will make a motion that we approve. I'm sorry.

Vilsack: I don't know how to raise my hand. This is Carol Vilsack. Can I just ask a quick question, sir? Or Melissa?

Turmail: Oh, gosh. Since you called me, sir, absolutely. Please call me Brian. And yes, you may ask a question, Carol.

Vilsack: Okay, sorry. I don't know how to use the raise the hand thing. I'm good on Teams though, if we want to hold this on Teams.

Turmail: There you go.

Vilsack: Can you please tell me, are we in accord-- I'm completely in agreement with the move, but are there other ANC that feel the same as we? Is there any, you know, people-- Is there anyone, any agency that says, "Yes, let's just move forward with their crazy plan"?

Lavezzo: That's a great question. I don't know. I'm reasonably sure that other ANCs have voted on resolutions to not support the new plan, but I don't know that any have voted on resolutions to support the current plan. I believe Project Pipes 3, of this ANC in its previous iteration, voted to not support that. And I believe that most ANCs that voted on it, if not all ANCs that voted on it, were in line with ANC 3B in not supporting the previous plan. So I would imagine that most ANCs would probably not support the current one, unless there were some major changes with the last election.

Lane: The Ward 3 ANCs by and large have voted against it, yes.

Vilsack: Okay, good. And then it would be left to the council to render the final decision?

Lavezzo: The Public Service Commission would have that responsibility.

Vilsack: Okay. Okay, thank you.

Lavezzo: You're welcome.

Turmail: Richard, it looks like you have a question or a comment. I see the finger. But you're on mute.

Pollock: Sorry about that. First of all, the last time that the Public Service Commission looked at this, they voted two to one in favor of the utility. However, they are going to be holding two more public hearings in June, and members of the public can also participate in that as well. So, I think that they'll come back, the PSC will come back and probably review it, and they'll have another vote as to whether or not they'll support Washington Gas, or they'll oppose it, or they'll mandate different changes in their plan, et cetera.

Turmail: Any other questions or comments? Thank you, guys. And Carol, thank you for the questions.

Vilsack: Sure. I guess my only comment, I don't know if it's a question, but you know, as we all jointly agree that this is not a good plan, Rome is burning. So is there any, I mean, this has been going on for years. Is there any closure to this, or is there any plan B? Or is it just a, "No, you can't do this. Go back to the drawing board"? I just, I'm not aware of the end point. What is the end point?

Turmail: Well, I think that they've been given, they being Washington Gas, some clear guidelines on how at least the Office of People's Counsel wants them to move forward. And so, you know, the challenge is that, to my understanding, I'm not an expert on the issue, Washington Gas hasn't really delivered on its prior promises. So, they've kind of given up on a lot of their credibility. I think everyone is all for, "Let's make sure that the gas lines and our infrastructure are safe, properly functioning, not leaking. We don't need streets blowing up." Not to sound overly dramatic, but that's natural gas. It's a flammable substance. So I think all of us are in support of maintaining the integrity and safety of our pipes, but they are asking for additional money from us, and we want to make sure, I think that it's incumbent upon us to make sure that any requests for additional utility fees come with a plan that has some level of credibility.

Vilsack: Okay, understood. Thank you.

Turmail: Which is my way of signaling that I'm going to vote for the resolution, for what it's worth. And if there aren't other comments, I'll go ahead. I'll stop for a second and see if there's any other comments. Patience, Turmail. I will make a motion that we approve the resolution before us.

Howie: I'll second.

Turmail: All right. I hear some seconds. All in favor, say, "aye."

Commissioners: Aye.

Turmail: Anyone opposed? I don't think it's left for anyone to oppose. Okay, the resolution passes. All right, we're going to move on. Thank you, Kevin, by the way.

Lane: Oh, Brian, Lieutenant Johnson is here.

Turmail: Oh, awesome. We're going to go ahead and we'll revisit an earlier agenda item. Michele, we're almost to you. Don't worry.

Police Report [0:10:56]

Turmail: Lieutenant Johnson with the Metropolitan Police Department's Second District is with us, and thank you for joining us. We'd love to get an update on how things are going with the police and crime trends in our area.

Johnson: Hello, can you hear me?

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

Johnson: Oh, thank you, sir. This is Lieutenant Paul Johnson from the Second District, ANC 3B manager. This month we have three crimes to report. So we're doing very well in the Glover Park area. We have two thefts, and one theft from auto. The theft from auto, there was no damage reported, so the door was unlocked. Person went in and stole some items. That was in front of 2111 Wisconsin Avenue. We had one theft from the Walgreens. They stole some trash bags. That was on New Mexico Avenue. And we had another package theft on 2255 Wisconsin Avenue. An apartment building, but we have camera footage and we have a suspect in mind. But out of those three crimes, we have made no arrests yet. But I think that theft from that apartment building should be closed soon. Anyone have any questions about any crimes or anything going on in Glover Park?

Turmail: I don't know. I feel a little bit underwhelmed that we can't get, you know, someone stealing better things than trash bags. But, no, I don't have a serious question. If someone did, maybe.

Johnson: Yeah, the Walgreens, that was terrible.

Turmail: Go ahead, Gupi.

Howie: Sorry, this is Commissioner Howie. I just have a few quick questions, just of like what I've heard from neighbors. I just wanted to make sure, or get a sense of like what is MPD's cooperation with the federal government, with ICE. And I know that earlier this week Millie's and Chef Geoff's were, I don't want to say raided, but approached by ICE agents. A lot of the nannies here in the neighborhood don't feel comfortable going to Guy Mason right now. Not to

say that they're illegal or not legal, they just don't want to be targeted because of how they appear. What is MPD's involvement or cooperation, or lack of cooperation, with the federal government?

Johnson: Oh, good question. I was on patrol the other day. I was out and about, and I guess a person approached me and asked me if he should register at the police department at our station because he's illegal. He heard that someone told him that all illegals should register at the police department. That is not true. We do not cooperate with the federal government at all as far as DC police, as of yet. And maybe it might change later, but now we don't, we don't cooperate at all. We don't assist them in any kind of raids. We don't give any names, making any arrests about, you know, anybody illegal. If a complainant comes to us and reports a crime and they're illegal, we don't give them their name. We don't ask if they're illegal or not. We don't cooperate at all with immigration at this point. So nothing has changed with our policy with, you know, illegal aliens.

Howie: Okay. Thank you. Great.

Turmail: And it's not just, as I understand it, Lieutenant Johnson, like a casual decision, that there's actually a District of Columbia code that actually prohibits cooperation with federal immigration agencies.

Johnson: Yes, right. That's the way-- That code is still in effect, as far as I know. But things change rapidly in DC these days, but hasn't changed as far as I know. No, no sir.

Howie: Okay, thank you.

Turmail: It does require cooperation if there's a warrant. Correct, Lieutenant Johnson?

Johnson: Yeah, if there's a warrant in the system, it has to come up when we run their names. And that doesn't happen a lot. That's like very seldom that someone comes up that we lock up, and there's an active warrant. We will call and say there's a warrant, and they get them from the courts. But definitely not our station. We don't cooperate as far as our station goes. We'll let them know the person is locked up, and most of the time it's for something serious, like serious crimes. Nothing like misdemeanors. That they're wanted by the federal government, and we'll let them know that we have them. But the court should make the notification, not the police department.

Turmail: Gotcha.

Howie: Thank you, Lieutenant Johnson.

Turmail: Other questions from commissioners or for Lieutenant Johnson? Or comments? We open up to the community. Any questions or concerns to or for Lieutenant Johnson from the community?

Vilsack: I do. I can't raise-- Carol Vilsack.

Turmail: We got you, Carol. Go ahead.

Vilsack: I've asked-- For the MPD, is there any way we can get a weekly update on the prior incidents, as to whether they're still being investigated or closed? And for what reason they were closed, if an arrest was not made?

Turmail: Do you have a specific incident in mind, Carol, or just for general things?

Vilsack: Well, I remember one of our commissioners, and I don't know if they're still a commissioner, but he said his motorcycle was stolen from the corner and it was out near Cathedral, I guess, or Wisconsin. And then it came up a couple times, and I was just shocked that it hadn't been resolved. But I guess, just in general, for neighborhood peace of mind. Because I know there are a lot of people walking through the alleys now looking for unlocked cars. And I just think it would be good. Are there still nightly canvassing and the patrol cars? I'm sure no one's walking, officers are walking around. But are patrol cars routinely driving through Glover Park in the evening, early hours, and maybe down the alleys or no?

Johnson: I'm glad you mentioned the walking, because there's a new initiative by the chief that all officers must walk at least 15 to 20 minutes on their beat.

Vilsack: I did hear that.

Johnson: So that's something that they're starting now. So the canvasses, yes, we do patrol the areas through the alleys at night. I do it myself, and we do walk. We had a community walk not too long ago, on May the 1st. But we do walk routinely in the PSA when we have time and are not out on assignments. That should be, or is done.

Turmail: To Carol's earlier question, is there a spot online where you post the progress of the ongoing cases? I actually have no idea.

Johnson: No, we don't post ongoing cases online, but if you're involved in a theft like the person whose car was stolen, they have CCN numbers, and they can call the station anytime they want and check the status. Those cases are assigned to a detective, and when you call the station, they'll direct you to the detective, and they'll give you a status update on your case. Some cases are closed without being resolved. That doesn't happen a lot, but sometimes they do.

Turmail: And Carol, I'll make an unsolicited plug for another community group. As you may probably be aware, each district of the Metropolitan Police Department has its own Citizen Advisory Council. And there is an active one involved with the Second District. Among other things, it's a level of civilian oversight of the police. They meet on a monthly basis. It doesn't

conflict with this meeting, and it's a great spot for making sure that they are staying on top of any outstanding cases.

Johnson: You can email me directly and I can check the case status.

Turmail: And that's not just for Carol. Anyone who's interested, please feel--

Vilsack: I mean, I don't mean to go sideways--

Turmail: I'm a former chair of that group, and it's a great organization.

Vilsack: I just think for peace of mind, it would be good to know from month to month on these calls, of the prior incidents that were discussed, which were closed, and which continued. And I know some just get closed because there's just nowhere to go. So, okay, thank you so much. I appreciate that.

Johnson: I do try to update you about the major cases like the carjacking and the burglaries. If we make an arrest, I try to email the commissioners about the closures.

Vilsack: Okay, good. Thank you.

Turmail: Thank you. That'd be helpful, Lieutenant. Did you have a comment you wanted to make, Richard? You looked like you were getting ready, you were on the brink of a comment, but maybe--

Pollock: I thought about something, but then I decided to withdraw it.

Turmail: Fair enough. Okay. With that, any other questions or concerns for the lieutenant from the community?

Lane: I don't see anything.

Turmail: Okay, Lieutenant, thank you. You're welcome to hang out. You're also welcome to get back to your 15 minutes of walking time if you haven't had it yet. And I hope all of you, or your colleagues, stay safe out there.

Johnson: All right.

Turmail: Oh, I'm sorry. There's one more comment, Lieutenant, from Richard.

Johnson: You got it.

Pollock: I just thought everyone would like to know that Lieutenant Johnson is going to be addressing the Colonnade condominium on May 20th. He's going to address the residents there

and talk to them about public safety and how they can remain safe. So, I just wanted to let the other commissioners know that this was happening with Lieutenant Johnson.

Johnson: Yes, sir. Thank you very much.

Turmail: Thank you, Lieutenant Johnson. We appreciate your help and your service. All right, we're going to move on.

Johnson: Thank you.

Turmail: You bet.

New Business [0:20:27]

Discussion and Resolution in Support of Continuing Streateries on Wisconsin Avenue in Glover Park [0:20:27]

Turmail: We're going to move on to some new business. The first one, and we do have a guest with us for this topic, is this commission has been asked, I think it's safe to say, by some of the members of the business community on our commercial corridor of Wisconsin Avenue and Glover Park to support efforts to maintain existing and preserve the opportunity to establish new streateries along Wisconsin Avenue. Before we get into the resolution that we are prepared to consider tonight, we do have a guest. Or she was here. Michele, did we lose her?

Keegan: Yeah, I'm here.

Turmail: Oh, hey. Oh, I'm looking right at you. Sorry, I took my glasses off, so all I see is like fuzzy lines now. There you are. Michele Keegan, who is with Rocklands. And I guess let me just kind of sort of set the table for the conversation. Perhaps you could talk to us a little bit about the the streaterie that Rocklands maintains, and both the value to Rocklands of the streaterie, and maybe some of the concerns and how important Streeteries are to the kind of current and very challenging business model for the restaurant industry. So, that's a big title.

Keegan: It is very challenging. My name is Michele Keegan. I'm fairly new to Rocklands. I started in January, but I know that John has talked to many of you, and at length, and he is very concerned about the possibility of having to remove the streaterie that has been so successful, and it's really a big part of the Glover Park store. We really think that it brings a vibrancy right to that stretch of Wisconsin, and we're hoping that more streateries will be opening up to join our streaterie. We take pride in maintaining it, and taking care of it. And it's especially right now, if you walk past Rocklands this time of year, you see every table filled, and it really brings a liveliness to that stretch of Wisconsin. It gives us that outdoor space. It enlarges our restaurant. With this deadline that's been proposed to remove them, which I believe is 7/31, if nothing else

we are hoping-- I mean, that's right in the middle of our busiest season, and it would really greatly affect our business, having to remove it at that time. So if nothing else, you know, in the short term, if we can maybe somehow change that deadline. I know John really wants to, you know, really wants to keep the streateries. It just really has been a big part of the neighborhood. And I mean, I just was there, you know, I'm there every day and I see all these little league players sitting out there. And the teams sitting out there, you know, with their coaches. And it's just, you know, we plant flowers and we make it look really nice. And so we're just really hoping that we will be able to keep it.

Turmail: Gotcha. Thank you, Michele. And maybe you'll hang through with us through the conversation, and the vote on the resolution. But as I understand it -- and I know we've got one of the MOCRS from the Mayor's Office with us who can fill in any details that I inevitably get wrong -- we are anticipating the District Department of Transportation, which regulates streateries, because they're located on streets, to issue new guidance by the end of July. And I think all indications so far is the guidance would be unfavorable to streateries that are established on commuter thoroughfares like Wisconsin Avenue. And if I've got that wrong, or for any details I'm missing there, hop on in.

Cox: Hello. So I actually can't speak on it. DDOT hasn't sent any updates or anything as of yet. So, I guess we'll just have to wait for their determination.

Turmail: Gotcha. When we approached DDOT with our concerns about preserving it, their recommendation is, "Look, we're still finalizing these. It would be incredibly helpful to have a resolution from your commission pushing for the opportunity to continue to allow streateries along the stretch of Wisconsin Avenue in Glover Park." You know, I am not-- I appreciate from some of the prior conversations that we've had on changes in traffic patterns that we have a high percentage of people in the community who are traffic engineers. I am not one of them, but I will say that anecdotally it doesn't appear that traffic is any more worse or bad before the fact that the streateries were there. And I'll defer to Michele and others who are involved in running commercial establishments, but foot traffic seems relatively robust. And certainly I've enjoyed, personally, the streateries. So we have, I have crafted and am offering for consideration tonight a resolution strongly urging the District Department of transportation and the the Mayor Bowser administration to, in whatever final guidance they release, to allow for streateries to continue to exist, and for new ones to have an opportunity to be established in Glover Park along our commercial corridor on Wisconsin Avenue. Uh, and I also learned in the process that streateries is spelled with an A despite the fact there's not an A in street, last time I checked. But someone will have to explain it to me later why that is.

Howie: It's the combination of street with eatery.

Turmail: Ah, all right. There you go. I didn't even think about it. I just thought street and streetery. But there you go. See, Gupi, never-ending surprise.

Howie: It's okay. You have white hair. I understand.

Turmail: Easy now. Okay. You threw me off, threw me off track, Gupi.

Howie: We're voting, we're voting. We're voting.

Turmail: Well, first, are there any questions, or concerns, or comments from the commissioners? Thank you, Gupi.

Lavezzo: I'd just like to say that I think the streateries are great, and we definitely need to maintain them. And I think Michele is right in that it helps add to the ambiance, and foot traffic, and the feeling of community. I think one thing I've read that-- One thing we've lost in the pandemic, and really more broadly, is what's called a third space. And a third space is somewhere away from home that you can go and hang out. And I see that happening on the streateries up and down Wisconsin Avenue. Not just at Rocklands, and other places as well. And losing that would be a huge hit, I think not just to the businesses, but the neighborhoods and the community. So I'm 100% in favor of the resolution and doing anything we can do to help maintain and expand streateries.

Turmail: Gotcha. Thank you. Richard, were you about to say something as well? Thank you, Kevin, by the way.

Pollock: Yes. I think that the streateries actually add an ambiance to the Wisconsin Avenue area, that I'd like to see more of them. I think it gives a sense of a neighborhood community as opposed to just simply another street or commercial district. And so I totally support this resolution. And I just think it adds just, culturally, something to our community.

Turmail: Thank you, Rich. With that, I'll open it up. Are there any comments, questions, or concerns from the community?

Lane: I think you're clear.

Turmail: All right. With that being said, I make a-- I'm assuming I'm allowed to make a resolution in favor of my own submitted resolution, but can we-- I make a motion that we approve the resolution on the streateries.

Howie: Second.

Turmail: All in favor say, "aye," or raise your hand. Anyone opposed? All right, we will get this filed and to the right folks. Thank you. And I will just out myself and say that I think the first dining establishment I visited in the District of Columbia when I moved here in 1995 was Rocklands, and I will continue to be a customer regardless of streateries, but nonetheless.

Keegan: I mean, he started in 1990. He's been there a long, long time.

Turmail: Yes, yes.

Keegan: I think he's kind of an institution, right, especially on that stretch right there. Another point, I mean, just from my own personal experience, like, you know, being so close to Guy Mason right there, and the baseball, and all the kids that are there, and families, it's just, I just think it's such an important part of summer and family time outside at the picnic tables. And, yeah, so I just really hope that it will be able to stay. So, can you just tell me what the next step would be? So, if we pass this resolution, what's the next step?

Turmail: There's a place at the ANC office where we file a resolution. I'll also send it to our contacts at the District Department of Transportation and with Bowser's administration. And then I can, and I don't want to get in trouble with our friend from Mayor Bowser's office, I told John this is the beginning, not the end of the process. I would be thrilled if they came out and gave us what we're asking for, but I just have too much experience with DDOT to think it's going to be that easy.

Keegan: Right, right.

Lane: We'll also post it on the 3B website, and I will file it with the Mayor and the council.

Turmail: Yes.

Vilsack: Is the DDOT-- I'm all for it. I'm not against anything. I just don't understand. Is the DDOT vote to take this off the sidewalks, or out of the street? I mean, if they say, "nothing in the street," can you still put picnic tables on the sidewalk?

Turmail: Well, the challenge, Carol, is as everyone knows, that we have very narrow sidewalks for a commercial corridor relative to any other commercial corridor in the area. I mean, if you go up to, my youngest used to Cookie Crawl Heights, but Cathedral Heights, you'll notice how wide the sidewalks are there, and that allows for additional space in a way that we don't have.

Lane: Right. And it wouldn't permit it in Glover Park because of the narrow sidewalks.

Vilsack: Oh, okay. Understood. Thank you.

Turmail: You bet. All right. So I guess the longer-winded answer, or the short version of my answer, Michele, is for those of you who come to these meetings, expect this to come back up. I do.

Howie: Rosemary says, "I suggest anything we can do to support restaurants in Glover Park is something our community might invest in."

Turmail: 100% agreed. All right.

Briefing by Robert Becker, DC Open Government Coalition, on DC Council Proposal for Closed Meetings [0:31:08]

Turmail: Moving on to the next. I got distracted by memories of the first time I ate at Rocklands. We do have-- And Richard, why don't I let you sort of tee up this conversation regarding the notion of sort of open government and a conversation that we hope to have during this meeting, and in our June meeting.

Pollock: That's right. Thank you very much. First of all, for those of you who don't know me, for six years I worked for Ralph Nader, and openness was really his number one, two, and three priorities. He was the one of the authors of the Freedom of Information Act on the congressional level, or on the federal level I should say. And later many states including the District of Columbia passed their own FOIAs. I think that DC has been known as an innovator and somewhat of a place where openness and democracy, and real, rigorous discussion takes place. And unfortunately earlier this year the city council decided to pass a temporary resolution to have closed door meetings in which the public would not know what the subject was, who said what, what the issues were, et cetera. And so there was now a new resolution before the city council to extend that for 225 days. Importantly, this particular resolution was withdrawn the other day when it was going to be voted upon. I know that Councilmember Matt Frumin, who's going to be talking to us in the June meeting, has himself some reservations about it. He's offered a number of different amendments as well. So I'm very happy to turn the meeting over to Robert Becker, who is an attorney with the DC Open Government Coalition. They have been a very thoughtful organization about this issue. And I'm going to turn this over to you, Mr. Becker, to describe your organization's perspective and what you want to see with respect to this particular legislation. Mr. Becker.

Becker: Yeah, thank you, Richard. First of all, let me tell you just a little bit about me. In a past life I was a newspaper reporter, and then I got lost in law school and went over to the dark side. I then worked for the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press for nine years, and was a solo practitioner in DC doing criminal defense and appellate litigation for over 30 years. I have been a transparency nerd since I was a reporter, so for a very long time. I have a question for you to start with, because transparency of ANC's has been a controversial topic going back at least 25 years. There were ANC commissioners who opposed being included in the Open Meetings Act and the FOI Act when they were enacted. And that you are not included in the Open Meetings Act. You have your own sort of similar open meeting provisions in these enabling legislation that creates ANC's. So I'm a bit curious about where you all stand on being included in the Open Meetings Act, which I think is something that a lot of people who have been dealing with this believe should be the case. I can't see all of you, so I'm not trying to take a vote. But certainly as the conversation goes on we can discuss that a little bit. Most recent event is that the chairman introduced a bill in late March that would have created two very large loopholes. They would have excluded any meeting that was deemed or labeled a field trip, or a retreat, by any government agency from the definition of a meeting. In other words, those

meetings could happen without anybody knowing, in fact, because they wouldn't have to be noticed. They wouldn't have to be open to the public. They would not be recorded. And any government agency could use that. And the Open Government Coalition wrote a letter to the council. The bill appeared on Thursday. It was like the 30th of March. And the hearing on it was April 1st. And I guess it was the 28th. The hearing was on April 1st, so we didn't have a lot of time. We wrote a letter to them explaining that--And the ostensible reason for this is that the council believes that it does not have the ability for councilmembers to discuss issues among themselves, or to discuss issues with the Mayor that are sensitive like development contracts, the Monumental Sports one, Commanders. The current problem with Congress and the White House. And so they were looking for a way to, ostensibly, according to the emergency declaration, create a way for them to accomplish what they needed to accomplish. But the way the bill was written by the chairman, it would have affected agencies, public bodies across the government, not just the council. We have opposed them. We told them that, sorry, let me step back a minute. The way the Open Meetings Act applies to every public body in the executive branch is they have to comply. They have to give notice when they're going to hold meetings. They have to, even if they're going to hold a meeting that's totally going to be closed, they have to come meet in public with an agenda and take a vote to close the meeting. They have to explain what the issue is that they are going into closed session for, and the exemptions that apply. And that does a couple of things. It allows for somebody who knows about the meeting in advance when the agenda is published to challenge the closure saying, "These aren't issues that should be exempt from public discussion." Or, to go to the Office of Open Government and say to the Office of Open Government, "We think you should try and stop this meeting from being closed by issuing an opinion saying that the meeting isn't covering exempt information, and therefore it should be open." And it also creates a record so that if the meeting is closed and it shouldn't have been, then the record is there to tell people what happened in the meeting. So that's an important protection because way back when home rule was started in 1976, the Open Meetings Act was two paragraphs long. It basically was interpreted to say that votes had to be taken in public, but virtually all public body business could be debated in secret, so long as they came out in public and took a vote. The Open Meetings Act finally ended that. And the council has reserved to itself the right to make its own rules for how it complies with the Open Meetings Act. So it has a set of rules that roughly parallel what the requirements are in the statute. And every two years, at the beginning of the council period, it adopts new rules for the council period for covering a whole bunch, all of its operations. Among them, open meetings. And so they adopted rules back in January that cover most of the kinds of meetings that they say they want to have in secret. So they can now have them. There are a couple of things that they do not have clear rules on. One is meeting with the Mayor, particularly on issues like finance and negotiating with Congress. So they could pass a rule that would say, "We reserve for ourselves an exemption that says we can meet with the Mayor to talk about how we're negotiating with Congress and explain to her what we think she should do." And that would fix all of their problems. So we have argued that they do not need to amend the statute at all. All they need to do is change their rules to accommodate the issues they have. And we've tried to demonstrate that to them by taking the examples they gave and discussing the rules that they had. The chairman who opposed the Open Meetings Act when Kathy Patterson tried to get it passed in 2006, and also grudgingly and voted for it in 2010, is now taking steps that would

effectively gut the statute with regard to the council. In other words, it would basically take the council out from under the Open Meetings Act. And it would cause problems across the government because it would create these two amendment loopholes. So that's where things stand. We believe very firmly, and the Office of Open Government agrees with us, that they can handle this for themselves under their rules. And so that's where things stand. When it came up, what happened on April 1st was there was a vote on an emergency measure, emergency bill, that is in effect for 90 days. And the first reading of a temporary bill that would last for 225 days. It was supposed to come up for a vote, the second reading on the temporary, last week, a few days ago. And it was tabled until the next meeting. Because some councilmembers, or at least a majority of them felt that the bill that is before the council at this point is really broader than it should be. And I guess I've said a lot now, so I guess I should open this up for questions, because I'm not sure how much of all of this you guys ever deal with.

Turmail: Questions from commissioners about this? Or, Richard, did you want to start with some questions?

Pollock: Okay, I have two questions. The first is my understanding is that this particular bill is quite unique in terms of other states in the country. Is that right?

Becker: No other state-- Well, first of all, DC is in a very strange position because it's not only a city council, a municipal legislative body. It is a state legislature. Okay? In most places, a municipal, legislative body is fully bound by the Open Meetings Act. It doesn't have the luxury of making its own rules. The act fully applies to it, and the courts can enforce it against the public body. In the District, because the District is the sovereign that created the statute, the courts have separation of powers problems. A court says, "We can't really tell an equal branch of government how to run its business. So we're not going to get involved." And the Office of Open Government can't tell the council what to do, because the Office of Open Government is effectively an executive branch body. So, it can't tell a co-equal branch of government what to do. In about ten states, state constitutions guarantee public access to the state legislature. And in many of those states, they have rules in the legislature that carry that out. The way that DC becomes unique is that for just about every Open Meetings Act, the constitutional provisions, the rules that apply to state legislatures, a meeting is defined as not only taking votes, but all of the debate that leads up to the vote, on the theory that for the people to understand why a vote was taken, they need to hear the debate. And just telling them, "A vote was taken, and this is the way it is," doesn't inspire confidence. What the bill before the council would do is basically say, "The only things that have to be open are our legislative meetings, which are once a month or every two weeks or however often, in which the council votes on things." And committee meetings, in which votes will be taken. So markup sessions are not covered. In fact, taking of testimony isn't really covered because in most cases a hearing to take testimony or a roundtable, no votes are taken. A strong argument can be made. We can have a meeting to take testimony, and if it's a development project, from the developer, and not let the public come to the debate, the discussion. That's what makes this unique across the country, is it would narrow the scope of what must be public for the council, to legislative sessions and meetings where votes are taken.

Pollock: I guess my follow-up question is if this is unique in the country, those who have opposed statehood and home rule for DC, can they use this as a way of saying we're an outlier? We're not grown up enough to be governing ourselves. Can this be used as a big weapon against the District?

Becker: I mean, Mike Lee has already tried to use it to-- As soon as the hearing happened on April 1st, he came out with either a resolution or a bill in Congress to overturn it, basically. But that won't go anywhere. But the point is it's already, the people who oppose home rule and who want to take control over the District are already there.

Pollock: My final question is we've heard so much about the distrust that the public has towards government itself. Will this deepen that kind of distrust, if people feel as if there's lots of stuff that's happening that's beyond their ability to see?

Becker: I believe so. And I think it's going to cause a lot of complaints. Keep in mind, when the Open Meetings Act was enacted in 2010, one member of the DC council, I believe it was the chairman, had been indicted already. And at least two more were indicted and convicted in the next year. Okay? The council's trust among people in the District was in the toilet at that point. And this and the ethics bill that created the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability were the results of work by the council over two years to try and restore public trust. And, you know, taking the steps that the chairman has proposed will do exactly the opposite.

Pollock: No more questions. Turn it back over to you, Mr. Chairman.

Turmail: Thank you. Are there questions from other commissioners? My only-- Thank you, Robert, for being here, by the way, and sharing with us. And I hope we're-- We try and be transparent. I don't know what the answer to your initial question is other than I hope I'm doing it right. That being said, I guess my one question would be what are you asking-- What would you like this commission to do, if anything, regarding the council proposal?

Becker: I would like as many people as possible, commissioners and other people, to say to their representatives on the council, not only their ward representatives, but to the at-large members, that this is unacceptable. That the council can-- I don't argue against the council having the ability to meet with the Mayor. There are issues that I agree shouldn't be discussed in public until they get to the point where they're stable enough to do. A development project often happens. You know, it takes a while to develop, and there are a lot of issues, policy issues and other issues, that come up. And those things probably should not be public. Well, let's put it this way. If a reporter can get them, all the more power to that reporter. But I understand the sensitivity about having those discussions in public. And the council can do those things. It just has to be willing to do them in an organized way that preserves the public's right to understand what's going on. And this bill is quite frankly, as far as I'm concerned, anti-democratic because it has none of the protections that preserves the record, even, for further review later. So, I would ask that everybody, you know, commissioners as well as other people, say to the council, "This

is not acceptable. You can do this by yourself without affecting the rest of the government. And you should do it and be transparent about the process you use to change the rules. But do it in a way that's the least damaging to transparency across the DC government." And so that would be our ask.

Turmail: Yeah. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Becker: Let me just finish one thing. We have said what we can say. If it's just the board of the DC Open Government Coalition, the 16 or so of us saying that, we get nowhere. We're a voice in the wilderness. The only way the council will change its position is if lots of people tell them that this is a problem.

Turmail: Yeah. Thank you, Robert. If you're all right, I'd like to open up to questions from the community to see if anyone's got comments, concerns, questions. Carol, you figured out the hand raising. Go for it.

Vilsack: I don't know how I did that. Mr. Becker, who sponsored this bill? And is there any, I mean, this is the first I'm hearing of this, and I kind of feel like I read a lot. But who sponsored this bill, and where exactly is it being discussed in the council or in the public?

Becker: All 12 members co-sponsored the bill. The bill originated with the chairman. We first became aware of it back in October when his office sent us a draft, and we told them essentially what I've told you. That the council could do what it needed to do through its rules and not affect the rest of the government. And the chairman went ahead with the bill despite that, affecting the whole government. At this point there were four-- I believe Charles Allen proposed a resolution of it that would have very narrowly affected mainly the council on the field trips and retreats issue. And those were the most significant ones. That only got four votes on the council.

Vilsack: Where does chairman-- Where does our Matt Frumin stand on this? Where is his position?

Turmail: I would suggest this, Carol. We've invited, and Councilmember Frumin has accepted our invitation to speak to this issue in June. So, I'm sure Robert is well informed, but I'd rather let the councilmember answer that one on his own.

Vilsack: Oh, okay. Stay tuned. Thank you.

Becker: Right. Okay. And I'd be happy to let him defend himself. But anyhow, it is in the Committee of the Whole, which the chairman did deliberately because he is in control of the Committee of the Whole. And his staff will write the committee report on this bill if it goes forward. The place where open meetings issues generally come up are the judiciary and Public Safety Committee, because that committee has oversight over BEGA, and the Office of Open Government is part of BEGA. So under the normal order, a bill like this would have gone to judiciary for a hearing. Instead the chairman kept it in the Committee of the Whole and held the

hearing on the 22nd of April. The video of the hearing is up on the council's website. It was about over 3 hours long. Mostly with three people. Me, Niquelle Allen, who is the director of the Office of Open Government, and David Catania, a former councilmember who supported, I believe was there at the chairman's request, to support the bill. He was the only one who spoke in favor of it.

Turmail: Any other-- Thank you, Robert. Any other questions or comments from the community? All right. Thank you, Robert, for being with us. We appreciate it. And for your concern and for your advocacy for an open and clean government. As I mentioned, we will be hearing from Councilmember Frumin next month. And, you know, based on timing, needs, and what we hear, we'll decide how to act accordingly. But I think it's a good conversation and I'm feeling good that we've kind of split it up just in the interest of time, because it's a subject that merits, I think, due consideration. So, appreciate it.

Becker: Okay. Thank you. I have just put my email address in the chat. If any of you have questions, want to talk more about it, let me know and I will be happy to talk to you.

Turmail: Much obliged. I appreciate you sharing time with us tonight on a Thursday evening.

Becker: That's okay. Thank you.

Turmail: You bet. Appreciate it.

Zoning Request of Special Exception for 2219 Observatory Place, NW [0:55:32]

Turmail: Okay. The next bit of new business we have on the agenda is a request for-- I can never get the-- I'm going to get the words wrong, but a zoning issue for 22-- I'm going to punt and say a zoning issue for 2219 Observatory Place. With that, I know we've got I believe Brynn and Robert are here to talk to us about their request. So, why don't I hand it over to you guys, and you kind of tell us how we can help you out and we can go from there. Please.

Brynn Kurtzman: Hi, Brian. Thank you so much for having us on the agenda today. I don't know if anyone has had a chance to look at the documents that were provided to the ANC. But they are available on the ANC website, I noticed. Thank you for posting them. Do you typically like us to pull them up on these meetings and share a little bit more about the plans? Or can I just--

Turmail: I'm feeling particularly under the pressure given our prior speaker to maybe, if you could pull them up and show everyone so we could be as transparent as possible. But yes, we do like to put everything up on the website. If you don't mind, it might help everyone be as informed as possible as we move forward with the conversation. If you can figure out the share screen thing.

Brynn Kurtzman: Thank you. Yes, I am--

Turmail: If you are Zoom proficient, that's wonderful.

Brynn Kurtzman: Okay, so let me know. Hopefully you can see this.

Turmail: I can see it, yes.

Brynn Kurtzman: Okay. So, myself and my husband Robert, we live at 2219 Observatory Place, which is on the southern side at W Street, where W Street intersects Observatory, so kind of closer to the south portion. We are working with Wentworth Studios, Bruce Wentworth and his team. We have our architect, Paul Wilson, on the call as well. They have a great reputation in the DC area for the design of, and of existing, I guess, residential improvements, alterations, additions. So we've engaged a skilled professional within the region to take on this project. These are some of the documents that were submitted for the BZA hearing. We have a hearing scheduled for later in June, I think June 24th. Actually, let me double check that. Yeah, June, sorry, June 4th, early June. So our Board of Zoning Adjustment hearing is scheduled for June 4th, and we are hoping to get the support of the ANC for our submission. You can see our existing lot is 947. Our adjacent neighbors, direct adjacent neighbors, are 2217 Observatory Place here, and 2221 up here. And we have a very small public alley. This is our existing plat, and you can see the proposed is here. We have an existing deck on the back of our house, and the footprint of the addition that we're proposing, which is a three-story, basement with first floor and second floor, takes up the space of our existing deck. And you can kind of see this is the demolition plan. So, again, our deck is-- This is our current deck. It would be demoed, and we would be replacing it, in theory, with a three-story addition onto our house. Again, basement, first floor, and second floor. The coverage of the lot remains. It's R-3 zoned. The coverage remains at under 60%, and we still have 20 feet at the rear. So we're not exceeding the zoning requirements for R-3. The special exception in this case is asking to exceed the 10-foot addition minimum. So right now the addition would be 12 foot 6, which is 2-and-1/2 feet over the 10-foot limitation. And you can kind of see some of the existing conditions here. We have solar on our roof. The intent is to expand our house on three levels and get some more space. We've lived at our current house since 2020, so we've been residents of Glover Park for that long. We previously lived in Burleith for a few years. So, we're very committed to the neighborhood and have good relationships with our neighbors. Our son is also a student at Stoddert Elementary, and you can see this is the addition, kind of keeping with traditional architecture. We're not planning anything crazy. Very, you know, very traditional looking. And then in terms of our neighbors, so we have been in touch with our neighbor at 2221 Observatory Place Northwest, and his name is John Golden. He is a single male, only occupant of that residence. He has lived in Glover Park for over 30 years, and he was unable to join this meeting today. He's traveling to the Yucatan, but he had written me an email saying that he was in support of our project as long as we don't disturb his existing fence line and structure for both his foundation and garden. Which we have no intention of doing so. And, you know, are committed to mitigating any disruptions to his yard. You know, he's a very close neighbor of ours and he doesn't really have

any issues. We also have an email-- I shared these emails with Brian, but we also have an email from our other neighbor at 2217 Observatory Place Northwest. She's the neighbor to the south. Our neighbor is actually a rental, a tenant, and lessee of the property. And she has also been a long-term lessee, Reverend Brett Wilson, who is a reverend at a local church down in Georgetown. Her property is owned by a, I think, family foundation, represented by Maria Miller of Chatel Real Estate property management. And the owner, we have recently found out, intends to sell the property. So, she was following up with the owner to see if we could get a statement of approval, but it kind of doesn't matter because the owner will be selling the property to another owner in the near future. So, we have confirmation from the neighbor next door to her, a lessee tenant at 2215 Observatory Place Northwest. Paul and Rose-Helene Spreiregen. They are also long-term residents of Glover Park. They have been in Glover Park more than 30 years as well. No children, just the two of them. And our three houses, ours, the one resided by Brett Wilson, and Rose-Helene and Paul, were built at the same time so they're the exact same architecture. They share existing plans. Paul and Rose-Helene are in support of the submission and while they're not our adjacent neighbors, I did not request a formal letter. But they are happy to provide a statement if requested.

Turmail: Gotcha. Thank you. Questions from commissioners? Comments, concerns? Go ahead, Melissa.

Lane: You said that the special exception is to go from 10 feet to 12 feet. What is the total height of the building? Does it go over the 40-foot limit?

Brynn Kurtzman: It does not. You can see here our-- I'm trying to zoom in. You can see our existing structure is only-- The existing roof is at 20 feet.

Lane: Okay, so nowhere near the 40 foot.

Brynn Kurtzman: Nowhere near the 40 foot. Our front door is on Observatory. Our back door is on the alley. The alley slopes significantly, so the height is based off the front entry door, which is on Observatory, which is why you have the 20 foot 6.

Lane: So you're going to have three floors and it's still only 20 feet?

Brynn Kurtzman: Yes.

Lane: Okay.

Turmail: Because the bottom floor is essentially a basement on the street side.

Brynn Kurtzman: Correct. Correct.

Lane: Thank you.

Turmail: Other questions, Melissa?

Lane: No, I'm good. Thank you.

Turmail: Questions from other commissioners? Carol, I do see your hand is up. I assume that's a new question you have. We'll open it up for the community. Go ahead, Carol.

Vilsack: Great. Thank you. So, my question is, is there-- So, you're essentially moving, you're creating three floors. So, you're pushing the back of your house out towards the alley. Is that correct?

Brynn Kurtzman: That's correct.

Vilsack: Okay, so how far back are you--

Turmail: 12 foot, 3 inches.

Vilsack: Okay, so you're going back. Do you need any underpinning to the building that you're, you know, sharing a party wall with? If you're going to--

Brynn Kurtzman: Yeah, we haven't-- I mean, this is, we haven't gone through the CD phase on the project. And in fact, you know, we don't know when we'd start construction. We're on kind of a hold because of all of the economic uncertainty at this point. so our plan right now is to go through the zoning process, and then maybe sit on it for a little bit until there's more economic certainty around the market, and pricing and everything. But I will say that our existing, because we have an existing deck already in this location, we have a slab on grade built up on-- We have retaining walls and structural support already in place within our lot. And we would be ripping that up and putting in some pile foundations of some sort. Helical piers, potentially. We're looking at several structural options, but none of them would interfere with our neighbors' properties. And like I said, there were already structural interventions made to shore up the landscape that is here because we live on a hill. And we did already have a kind of patio area and deck built in the yard.

Vilsack: Okay, great. Thank you.

Turmail: Any other questions from the community? So, I'm satisfied. I make a motion that we support the zoning request.

Howie: Second.

Turmail: All in favor say, "aye," or raise your hand.

Commissioners: Aye.

Turmail: Anyone opposed?

Vilsack: Good luck.

Brynn Kurtzman: Thank you.

Turmail: Best of luck, yes. We'll get this signed, and I assume there's a process to get it submitted. I can't remember from the last time I served in ANC, but there's something we've got to file with the BZA. You'll send us the number?

Brynn Kurtzman: Oh, the number is 212--

Lane: Can you just email it?

Brynn Kurtzman: Oh, yeah, sure. Sorry.

Turmail: Yeah, please.

Brynn Kurtzman: I will send you an email.

Turmail: Yeah, we don't need it here. We just need it so we can get it on record so that when you're there on the 4th of June, they don't just have to take your word for it that we're okay with this.

Brynn Kurtzman: Okay. Wonderful. I will send you all an email. Thank you.

Turmail: All right. May the uncertainty around so many things be over when you're ready to move forward and you get approval, Brynn.

Brynn Kurtzman: Well, I appreciate your support, and we've been lucky to have such a great team, and have a patient team.

Turmail: There you go. Appreciate it.

Brynn Kurtzman: Thank you.

Turmail: Good luck to you guys.

Brynn Kurtzman: Thank you.

Turmail: You can stop sharing now, by the way.

Brynn Kurtzman: Okay. Um, there we go.

Turmail: Thank you for doing that. Makes me feel like we're-- My tiny little contribution to transparency for the world today.

Brynn Kurtzman: Well, thank you for your time.

Turmail: Of course. Let's see.

Updates and Information [1:08:42]

Update on Stoddert Elementary School Current Classroom Renovation Project and FY 2026 Cafeteria Addition Project [1:08:42]

Turmail: Next up, we've got some updates and information. Gupi, we're going to-- Gupi's got one that's on the agenda, and we're going to add one that wasn't on the agenda about-- One is on the renovation project and the cafeteria at Stoddert, and then related to it kind of an update on what's needed about a sun screen, or sun shade for the pre-k. I'll let you explain it. I almost got there.

Howie: Thanks. Thanks, Brian. They are finishing phase one of the Stoddert addition, the classroom addition on the east side of the building that's set to be delivered August-September 2025. They will then turn their attention to the west side where the cafeteria will be built above the teacher parking lot, and above where the current trailers are. So if, Melissa, if you want to share the schematic for the staging maybe. Yeah. Just so people are aware of what will be happening. They're going to start the staging in June. So I just want people to be aware, especially the people who live on Davis, on the back side of Stoddert, that all that construction will start to shift. They will keep some of the parking on the field for their construction vehicles for the west side. But a lot of the construction workers will be encouraged to park at a parking garage on Wisconsin. So, they are not taking up parking spots on Davis, 39th, 40th Street, so they're not competing with fellow residents. Melissa, do you want me to--

Lane: Sorry. Do you want the second one?

Howie: Oh, no. Just the staging, just so people can see.

Lane: Oh, okay. Can you see it?

Howie: Nope.

Lane: Really? It says I'm sharing it. Okay, hold on.

Howie: Oh, yeah. There we go.

Lane: All right. This is the picture. Do you want the schedule?

Turmail: Gupi, you know you're on mute, right? We can't hear you. Were you saying something?

Howie: Yeah, I was saying a lot. Sorry.

Turmail: Oh, okay. I bet it was profound, too.

Howie: We promise this is not our first time doing this.

Lane: Do you want me to put on the schedule now, or do you want--

Howie: No, no, just leave this. So, the top part where the driveway is, that would be Davis Place. The red fence is where the construction will put up a six-foot perimeter around their site. Then the purple down here would be the ten-foot to keep kids from jumping up into the construction area. I just want people to realize that this is what's going to be happening starting June. And then this will be the entire construction zone for the following year up until August 2026.

Lane: This area where the yellow is, that's the temporary buildings were, and they're going to be taken out in June.

Howie: The temporary buildings were from kind of where the yellow is, all the way to the purple. And all those will be removed, and those classrooms will now be in the new building. And this will be staging for the second addition, and then the cafeteria will be on pylons, with parking underneath. So that will be what they're doing the entire school year of next year. And then if you wanted to put up the timeline, just so people are aware of what's happening when.

Lane: Can you see it?

Howie: Yep. So essentially July 1st is when they will start kind of like the bulk of the work. The majority of the loud stuff that's happening in terms of like breaking down, ripping up the parking lot, loud stuff will be happening in July and August. While the kids are out of school, so that ideally when the kids come back into school, it's just more regular construction noise. And I just wanted neighbors to realize that that will be happening this summer on the back side of Stoddert. If anyone has questions or concerns, we can also ask Adriana, the contact person for this addition, to join our June meeting if people would like, or if they have any concerns. So feel free to voice that. But that's all I have to say about this agenda item.

Pollock: Gupi?

Howie: Yes, Richard?

Pollock: So the neighbors who live around Stoddert, I presume that they've all been informed and briefed about all of this work and, you know, noise, dirt, et cetera, et cetera.

Howie: Yes. I know that when this project first started, the entirety of the project, DCPS and DGS went around and put on flyers on the doors. I think, I'm pretty sure the Stoddert PTO also, or the school, went around and let neighbors know. I don't know if there's a plan to remind them for the second phase, but everybody who's on the blocks adjacent have been made aware.

Pollock: Okay.

Turmail: And I will say for those of you who remember when the ANC met in the Stoddert cafeteria, the current one is a very underutilized space, and they literally have students, some of the specials take place literally in closets. And at one point they were using the space under the stairs, Harry Potter style. So it is a much welcome addition. And not just because Mrs. Turmail actually teaches in one of the demountables that's getting replaced. Other questions from commissioners before we open up to the community about the addition? Carol, you had a question now that you've--

Vilsack: Yes, I'm really getting my money's worth tonight. But on the phasing, I would only ask for the neighbors on Davis Place, if there could be another notification phase, or if this is on a website somewhere and we could publicize this for them. Because if there's going to be lack of parking--

Howie: There should not be any effect on parking because all of the construction workers have been told they need to park on either Wisconsin Avenue or utilize a parking garage, I guess at Safeway or Whole Foods. But I can pass along the message to Adriana that maybe sending out--

Lane: Well, they're also parking in the field. There's that whole area on the field.

Howie: They're going to cut back. The whole thing is not going to be still staged.

Lane: But there's still going to be some of them. I mean, they still have that temporary road into there.

Howie: I know that Lauren and Marie are on the call right now. Marie is the Stoddert PTO president and Lauren is the LSAT chair. Do you know if that road will still be in use?

O'Hara: Yeah, this is Marie. Hi, everyone. They will be continuing to have that road. I don't know if it's the exact same layout, or it'll be anything less. But because the teachers and staff are losing all the parking in the back for the staging for phase two, they will shift some of their parking to the field. And, again, the construction folks are getting bumped. But our staff teachers are losing all their parking. But the good news is when this is completed in a year, we retain all

of the parking, which was as a result of good advocacy work by a number of folks on this call in pushing for change to the plan so that we could put the cafeteria where it's going. As well as be creative in our little postage stamp of a property.

Vilsack: All good. I just worry about the noise for the families that are on Davis. And so I just want to--

Turmail: Why don't we say this? I'm sure that focusing on this will encourage DCPS, DGS and the contractors to do that. Ultimately, we can do this at our meeting, but we can't control, as we've learned in many ways, everything they do. But we'll make that recommendation.

Vilsack: Yay. Thank you.

Turmail: Yep. Any other questions? Oh, go ahead. I'm sorry.

Howie: Any questions from the community about this part of--

Turmail: I'll just add to what Marie said. Yes, there have been a lot of folks who are on with us today who have spent an enormous amount of time on this project and accomplished a tremendous amount. And I'd say this is, you know, if not the best possible plan, as close to it as I think is humanly possible. So, thank you.

O'Hara: Can I add one more thing? Which is that there will be, and we will publicize this on the listserv, but there is a May 28th, they're calling it a community meeting. Where the, I want to get the language right, but basically the folks that are running the show on the DCPS side are talking about the plan for the summer, and phase two. So we don't have a Zoom link yet, and it's usually not Zoom, it's Microsoft Teams, which is atrocious. But when we have it, we will share it on the Glover Park listserv, and if there's any other way, I would love if anybody-- This is always like we never know what we're going to get, but would love for anyone, and to be well publicized about, again, it's a May 28th meeting. And we will make sure that kind of word gets out, because we never get anything in advance. And then they just, you know, talk at you.

Howie: I'll share it with Melissa so that she can also post it to maybe our ANC website.

Lane: Yeah, I can do that.

Turmail: And Carol will be thrilled that it's on Teams since she mentioned earlier tonight that she likes Teams.

O'Hara: Okay. And it is a 5:00 p.m. meeting. I did just double check. So, it's the design build team will provide an update on the addition project, including anticipated summer work. And I know Lauren Welsh dropped in the chat the additions, DCPS facilities expansions additions link. That's where they do, they do a good job of keeping that updated as far as their monthly progress. But the community, I don't know that we've had a community meeting yet. Or we may

have had one in the last year and a half. So would love if anybody who can join to definitely show up.

Turmail: That's a great point. Thank you.

O'Hara: Thank you all.

Reminder About Implementation of WMATA Better Bus Network Starting on June 29, 2025 [1:21:35]

Turmail: Speaking of the fun that is this project. Gupi, you had another update you wanted to add about--

Howie: Yeah, I'm just going to tee up Lauren Welsh, the amazing Lauren Welsh. So, phase one is currently redoing or adding the addition for the classrooms, and making a new pre-K 4 playground that also will be utilized by DPR. And the initial specs were to include a shade because it's now going to be in the front of the school where it just blazes the sun all day. And unfortunately somehow this was left out of funding. So currently there will be no shade, even though it's supposed to be shaded. So I'm gonna let Lauren kind of take the reins with the rest of this.

Welsh: Hi. Thank you. Thank you, Gupi, for that introduction. And thank you to everybody on the ANC for your consistent and continued support for this project. Can you hear me? It's been a long haul just to kind of tee that up, and I'm just tremendously grateful because there's so much that the ANC has done to support this addition happening, between getting the money restored, supporting trying to keep Stoddert intact, and now this most recent phase. And to echo what Brian said, this is really, I think, as great of a design as we could hope for for the school, and will be an enduring one that works for the school and the community. So, thank you to the ANC for all your work on this. As Gupi said, my name is Lauren Welsh. I am a Stoddert, a longtime Stoddert parent. My eldest is currently at Jackson Reed, and he went through all of Stoddert. My youngest is in pre-K. I have been a longtime member of the PTO, the chair of the LSAT, and I'm currently speaking from my capacity as being on the School Improvement Plan for Stoddard, also known as the SIT, which is the organization that advises along, advises the project, and ideally would have an influence with DCPS in kind of shaping how it goes. As they have indicated to us at the beginning, this is not a modernization, but an addition, so our impact is maybe a little bit more limited than it would be in a traditional modernization with a broader project. But that being said, we've been heavily engaged -- myself, Marie, Gupi, and others, and many others -- have been involved throughout this project. The reason why I'm speaking to you today, to follow on what Gupi introduced, is shade. I have submitted a grant request for the ANC to consider to provide shade for this pre-K playground. As Gupi indicated, we were all under the impression, and it had been confirmed by DCPS that this new pre-K playground, which will be located in front of the current pre-K classroom and in front of the school in an area with no naturally occurring shade, no large trees to provide shade, would have a shade structure. We

were told that that was part of every component of DCPS playgrounds, and that it would be included, only to discover that the final plan did not include a shade structure. They indicated that they would be amenable to one being provided, even though that they had not included one in their design for the playground. But that it could only come if it were provided by an ANC, as a PTO is something that would cause-- That not every school in DC has a PTO, but every neighborhood has an ANC. And so they indicated that an ANC, that we could request ANC consideration of whether or not a shade could be provided. So, just to kind of give a brief, for those who aren't maybe as familiar and have not spent every waking moment on Stoddert as I feel that I have sometimes, where the pre-K playground is going to go, right in front of the school. As I mentioned, there's no natural shade. The design indicates that this is going to be one of those rubberized surfaces that you pour, which as you know is common across many of the playgrounds in DC. And those surfaces get extremely hot in the summertime, and spring and fall months. And without having any shade, it really, I think, would be tough to use for Stoddert's youngest students. And this playground is designed for pre-K children. As you may know, next year there's going to be two pre-K classes for Stoddert. And there's also going to be what's called a CES, a Communication, I think, and Education Support, is what it's called for, the classroom next year, which will also include pre-K students, but those who have some special needs. So there's going to be not only pre-K, for the 40 pre-K students who are going to be in the two classrooms, but there's going to be an additional classroom. So, not only are you going to have a large group of children who are going to be using this space, but you're probably going to have students who have some special needs who also would benefit from having shade on a blazing hot day.

Turmail: May I interject just one second? I'm sorry, Lauren. Forgive me if I'm being rude.

Welsh: Sure. No, of course.

Turmail: I don't believe that any of the commissioners have yet seen the grant request, and we've got a little bit of vetting we do.

Welsh: Absolutely.

Howie: This is just more of a--

Turmail: Allow me to make this suggestion. Like, there's a lot of great information. I think that at this point the most important thing is that we're going to have this request coming. We're going to need some paperwork filled out. We're going to run the traps with OANC to make sure -- Office of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission -- to make sure that it's-- They're a little picky about the compliance with the grant rules. Assuming all the answers are yes, let's bring you back and have a more detailed conversation about why this is an important grant so that the commissioners can make that decision when they're voting on the grant request.

Welsh: Absolutely. And I just pulled together a grant request. Sorry to get too much into the weeds. I pulled together the grant request, because we just--

Turmail: All good, and you live in this, and we really appreciate it.

Welsh: No, no, I realize it can be a little weedy, and I'm sorry for that. No, we just were informed that this wouldn't be something that was included with DCPS, that we obviously had been engaged since November operating under the impression that this would be included.

Turmail: We get the cubbies no one wants, and we don't get the shade everyone needs.

Welsh: Yeah. I mean, in my experience there's been no limit to being surprised in this project. So this is in keeping with that experience. The only other thing I wanted to mention, I'm also happy to get into this later when we have more time and you've had an opportunity to review a grant request proposal, and I've been able to make sure all of the paperwork that would be necessary for that has been completed, is that obviously as you know that this also doubles as DPR space. So there's programming all year long including, in the summer with DPR camps, and DPR use of the fields, and DPR use of the gym. And so there are many, many children who would be affected and who would benefit from having shade in this playground. So happy to provide more information and answer questions down the road once you've had an opportunity to review the grant request and make sure that this has all been through the appropriate process.

Turmail: Gotcha. Wonderful. I haven't polled my other commissioners, but I have a hard time seeing that if we get the green light, we wouldn't want to support the school. So, Carol, do you have a question? I do want to table most of this conversation for the grant--

Vilsack: I just have one comment. It is very unfortunate that public schools have not allowed this, but my request is have you asked Casey as well? Yes, I support the shade for the children, but have you also maybe looked at Casey Foundation to donate some shade trees that maybe in five or ten years will also support the necessary shade that you did not get in the DC public school plans?

Welsh: So we haven't looked into that organization specifically, but that being said, the plans do indicate that there should be small trees planted around the exterior part of the playground. According to some of the designs, there's some greenery there and some trees planted. And they have also indicated that because they had to remove trees for the project, that they will be providing some smaller trees in those spaces, where feasible with the landscaping. But again, the possibility of that providing shade for the playground any time in the next 20 years seems to be pretty limited based on what they're showing feasible around that area.

Vilsack: Of course. All right. Good luck.

Turmail: Thank you. Lauren, hopefully we'll be able to get this on the agenda for June and get you guys the funding you need, but we got a couple things, couple T's we've got to cross and I's we've got to dot first.

Welsh: No, I totally understand. And the one thing I just wanted to mention is as Gupi had indicated with the timing for this project, the expectation from DCPS is that the phase one, of which this pre-K playground is the last part, would be completed in time for the new school year. So, we kind of have been left with little runway to execute the approval process, procuring a shade, and getting it in time, if we were to be able to do so. Because they had indicated that their hopes were to begin pouring the playground flooring pretty quickly on a pretty aggressive timeline. Again, there's construction delays and a possibility, or one could hope that we would have a little bit more runway than they've indicated. But it's a pretty quick turnaround request. So, thank you for allowing me to speak to it this evening.

Turmail: Sure. And if we're able to get everything ready for the June one, we'd be happy to.

Welsh: Thank you.

Turmail: Yep. Thank you, Lauren. We appreciate it.

91:26

Turmail: Everyone's favorite subject. Melissa volunteered, even if she didn't know it, to just remind everyone yet again that Metro is changing all of the bus routes, including everyone's longtime favorite, the D2, at the end of June. Melissa, what am I missing?

Lane: Yes, all of the bus route names are changing. Maybe not exactly the routes, but the names are all changing. But the D2 itself, which loops through Glover Park, is going away completely. We will just be a pass through. The D96 will run from Bethesda Metro down to Virginia Avenue. And the southbound, if any bus coming southbound is going to turn onto 39th Street, from Tunlaw, and go to Benton, and then make a left, and then leave the neighborhood. Then any bus that comes through northbound is going to take Benton to 40th Street, to Calvert, to 41st. And then instead of turning right on Edmonds like it has done for decades, it is going to turn left on Edmonds, and right on 42nd, and go out New Mexico. So the D96 will be sort of the replacement, kind of, for the D2. There will also be the C85, which will run from Jackson Reed, basically, to MacArthur High School. And that also will do-- It's the same north-south route. If you take the bus southbound and get on at Calvert and 39th, you're not going to get off there when you come home. You're going to get off somewhere on Calvert and 41st. Also, the end buses that run up Cathedral Avenue, there still will be that route, but they will not be called the N2, N4, and N6 anymore. They will be the D90 buses. Those buses will run down to I think 6th Street. No, they will run down to around the convention center. I would give you as much information as I have. Well, actually, I just did. We're waiting for information from WMATA. I have signed up to be something. So whatever materials they give us, we will get out to the community and we will also post them on the website. I mean, I think there's going to be a little bit of chaos around this on June 29th and June 30th when it takes place, but we're trying to get the word out because I'm not even sure the bus drivers know. Because one of the bus drivers last week told one of my constituents that he didn't know what she was talking about, because the D2 wasn't

going away and nobody had told him a thing. I said, "Oh, okay." So, anyway, there will be some confusion, but we will try to get as much information out when we get it. I'm hoping it comes soon, because we're getting pretty close to the deadline. Ashlee? Oh, Richard, do you have a comment?

Pollock: Do we have any maps that show where the actual--

Lane: All we have is what's on the website. And there are maps there, but they're, you know, it shows what the route is. And it's a long document and you have to root through to find the D90, or the D96, or the C85, but that's all we have. They also put out last week a new Metro trip planner so you can, when it does go into effect, you can put your destination in there and it'll tell you something with the new--

Mercer: Supposedly it's supposed to show you now. I'm sorry to interrupt you, Melissa.

Lane: It's supposed to show you now.

Mercer: Yeah, I did post it and the links in the chat for everybody, how you can sign up for the Better Bus Dispatch. It's a newsletter. And also the trip planner can now show you what the trips will look like with the new bus network.

Lane: Right. And those links are also on the ANC website, right off the homepage. So, we're trying to get word out there.

Lavezzo: If I may real quick, WMATA also released recently a list of 527 bus stops it will be eliminating. And that doesn't seem to reflect the new routes, just the existing routes. But I imagine that will also be reflected in the new routing that's coming into effect in June. And not directly in Ward 3, but there are a few stops on Wisconsin Avenue that are being eliminated. So there won't be any stops between Q and M, at least from what it looks like with the current route. So, we're losing the north and the south stops at I think N and P Street when this takes effect. So you'll have to either get off at Q, or get off on M Street between Jefferson and I think 31st. Because the stop at Jefferson on the south side, and the stop at 30th and the north side are also going away.

Lane: And in Glover Park, we are going to lose the bus stop at 40th and Benton, because they're only going to be using the big buses, and they can't make the turn.

Lavezzo: Yeah.

Lane: And the bus stop on Edmonds will change to-- Right now it's around 39th. Well, that one might stay. It's when you turn right from 41st to Edmonds, it's right on the right hand side. They're going to turn left, so it's going to be moved over to the north side of Edmonds.

Turmail: We'll do our best to keep everyone informed, but you can sense our optimism about

the smoothness of this transition.

Lane: Just a little nervous.

Lavezzo: It's going to be chaotic for sure.

Lane: Yeah, yeah.

Turmail: Let us all hope, in fairness, that it works well and it actually creates what it's advertised to do, even if we have our doubts. Other questions, comments? I'd say more to come. I imagine we'll be discussing buses in June, again. Just so we get everyone informed. With that, we've got-- Was there anything else, Melissa, before I cut you off? I'm sorry.

Lane: No, I'm good.

Turmail: Okay. Anything from the community? Open forum. I know we've covered a lot of ground.

Open Forum [1:38:01]

Ashlee Mercer, Ward 3 Councilmember Frumin's Office [1:38:01]

Turmail: Ashlee, you had something you want to add?

Mercer: Yes, hi. How are you guys?

Turmail: We're doing great. How are you?

Mercer: I'm all right. So, May is National Older Americans Month. Since 2023, the DC Council has annually declared May, Old People Are Cool Month. In DC, Councilmember Frumin was proud to introduce the ceremonial resolution again in 2025 to recognize the Old People Are Cool project's important work to confront ageism and support intergenerational collaboration. In recognition of Old People Are Cool Month, our office created an online resource to provide residents of Ward 3 with information about senior services and neighborhood organizations working directly with older adults, including aging and caregiving resources, as well programming and activities available at the link that I'll post in the chat. I did also post in the chat about, again, the WMATA latest Better Bus Dispatch newsletter, and the Better Bus Network changes coming June 29th. Also, on Tuesday this week the council passed the Emergency Rental Assistance Program Reform Amendment Act of 2025. The bill realigns the policy incentives around ERAP to protect both affordable housing providers and eligible tenants. Councilmember Frumin thanks stakeholders for coming to the table to agree on legislation that can improve the program by both encouraging housing providers to cooperate with ERAP, and

protecting the rights of tenants.

Turmail: Quick question for you Ashlee. If someone feels like they're the victim of ageism, where can they report that? I'm just kidding.

Mercer: That's a good question.

Turmail: No, I'm just kidding.

Howie: That sounds like a personal problem.

Turmail: It most certainly is. Anyway, thank you, Ashlee.

Mercer: Thank you.

Mayor's Office of Community Relations and Services (MOCRS) [1:39:57]

Turmail: Yes. Owen, go ahead.

Cox: Good evening, everyone. My name is William Owen Cox. I'm the Ward 3 liaison for the Mayor's Office of Community Relations and Services. Just a quick announcement, or two. First, I'm in the chat, I'm putting in both my contact information and my manager's, plus a link to a petition for supporting DC Medicaid. This will go to Congress to encourage them to support DC Medicaid to protect it. And then also I want to announce or remind everyone that Saturday, this Saturday, May 10th, we will have a rolloff day for Ward 3 at Turtle Park, so that's the Friendship Recreation Center. You can bring any large trash items and put it in a big dumpster, and we will wheel it away at the end of the day. It starts at 10:00 a.m. It goes until about 2:00 p.m. You can bring anything that you like, aside from oxygen tanks, electronics. We won't offer any paper shredding on site, so we won't do that. If you have shredded paper, feel free to bring that. And if there are any questions or any concerns, if people want to reach out to me, my info or my manager's info is in the chat. I'm happy to answer any questions now if anyone has any. Thank you.

Turmail: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Administrative Matters [1:41:33]

Turmail: Anything else, guys? If not, we've got a little bit of administrative business, and then

we're going to get people on to what's left of their evenings. Melissa prepared and circulated the minutes from the April 2025 ANC meeting. Everyone had a chance to comment and weigh in. Unless there's any comment or concern, I'm going to make a motion that we approve the April 2025 minutes.

Howie: Second.

Turmail: All in favor of the minutes say, "aye" or raise your hand. Aye. Anyone opposed? Anyone opposed should start writing the minutes in the future. No, I'm just kidding. We also do have an April monthly financial report. I can never remember, Kevin, if we need to vote on it, or if we just need to hear about it.

Lavezzo: We do need to vote to approve, yes.

Turmail: Okay.

Lavezzo: For the quarterlies. So this will be the ANC 3B fiscal year 25, quarter 2, quarterly financial report. We had an forwarding balance of \$44,981.69. We did not receive an allotment from the OANC. We are waiting on some grant documentation from a grant we issued late last year. That's taking a little while to come in. We had a deposit of \$18.66, which was a refund from a previous grant for funds not spent. We had total funds available in this quarter of \$45,000.35. We spent \$45.93 on communications. We had one grant for \$1,210, which was a partial grant for Hardy Middle. So, we had a total disbursements of \$1,255.93, with an ending balance of \$43,744.42.

Turmail: Thank you, Kevin. I will make a motion that we approve the fiscal year 2025 second quarter financial report. Unless there are any questions or concerns?

Howie: Carol is asking if the current DC budget issue affects the ANC budget?

Lavezzo: Not yet. I mean, there's a chance that it may, but as of now the disbursements have not changed, as far as I'm aware.

Lane: Yeah, it might affect FY26.

Turmail: Yeah.

Howie: It's a good thing we've saved a lot.

Turmail: There you go. And we're going to need it for Stoddert, if we're allowed to. All right. I'll make a motion that we approve the quarterly budget report.

Howie: Second. All in favor say, "aye." Anyone opposed? And then I'd make a motion that we adjourn tonight's meeting, unless there's any concerns.

Howie: Yes. Second.

Lane: Don't you have to do the April monthly?

Turmail: Oh, I'm sorry. Do we need to do the April monthly, too?

Lavezzo: Still waiting to get that from our bank. They haven't sent it over yet, so we'll do that next month.

Turmail: All right. It's going to be a busy June meeting, too. But that'll be all right. All right. That being said, I'm going to make a motion that we adjourn. Anyone opposed? All right. Wait, wait. I need a second.

Howie: Second.

Turmail: All in favor say, "aye."

Commissioners: Aye.

Turmail: Anyone opposed can stay here.

Howie: Bye.

Turmail: Everyone be safe. Let us know if you need anything, and appreciate you being here.

Pollock: Thank you, Brian.

Lavezzo: Thank you.