

REMAINING DC GRASSROOTS PLANNING ACUTE FRAMEWORK EDITS (besides the FLUM)

EMPHASIZE PARTICIPATION & NOTICE IN PROCESS

p. 38, line 782, at 231.8 – "...focusing on their needs and barriers to *participate and* make informed decisions..."

p. 58, line 1147 at 220.2 – "... Commission, residents, businesses, *city planners and officials*, and other stakeholders *must [e]ncourage* collaborative ..."

p. 58, line 1149 at 220.2 – "... should be clear, open, *direct*, and transparent."
(for example: door to door notices and surveys by OP/ANC/developer)

EQUITABLE DEVELOPMENT & DISPLACEMENT/GENTRIFICATION

p. 18, line 356 at 206.1 – "...critical issues facing the District and the region. *According to recent studies, roughly 40 percent of lower income neighborhoods in the District have experienced gentrification between 2000 and 2013, making the District the city with the greatest intensity of gentrification in the country.* To achieve our goal..."

- Citations:

- National Community Reinvestment Coalition (NCRC) study (March 2019): <https://ncrc.org/the-washington-post-study-d-c-has-had-the-highest-intensity-of-gentrification-of-any-u-s-city/> ("About 40 percent of the District's lower-income neighborhoods experienced gentrification between 2000 and 2013, giving the city the greatest "intensity of gentrification" of any in the country, according to a study released Tuesday by the National Community Reinvestment Coalition.")
- Washington Post article on the study (March 19, 2019): <https://www.washingtonpost.com/transportation/2019/03/19/study-dc-has-had-highest-intensity-gentrification-any-us-city/>

p. 20, line 390 at 206.5 – "Most of the new units were higher-cost *studio, one, and two-bedroom* apartments affordable to households earning at and above income."
(this adds to edits made to 206.8 on p. 21)

p. 56, line 1100, at 219.1 – "segregation, avoid concentrating poverty *or wealth equitably*, and . . ."

p. 70, line 1389 at 224.9 – "*vulnerable nearby and* on-site residents ..."
(impacts adjacent neighbors and onsite neighbors vulnerable to displacement)

p. 98, line 1935 at 227(k) – eliminate: ~~permanent, offsite~~ displacement
(esoteric, no meaning)

IMPACTS

p. 70, line 1382 at 224.8 – remove "relevant and material to the individual case before it"
(This language could cause more back and forth between parties at the Zoning Commission and lead to potential appeals due to disagreements about what is legally "relevant and material." It also negatively precludes long-term, sustainable planning by allowing the Zoning Commission to disregard how individual projects are part of an ecosystem of development that may have larger cumulative impacts on communities.)

Last updated October 6, 2019.

p. 83, line 1638 at 227.2 – “... should not result in *adverse and* unacceptable project impacts ...”
(acceptable or unacceptable to whom?)

SHARING THE FINANCIAL BURDEN OF GROWTH NEEDS (DEVELOPERS & CITY)

p. 100, line 1979 at 229.3 – “... interests *and burdens* are balanced with developers interests *and sharing of the financial responsibilities*.”
(developers should make contributions to support the growth they are benefiting from but which puts a burden on the city’s resources and services)

p. 101, line 1998 at 229.5 – “... expanded capacity to meet the city’s growing needs, *and so the city seeks a sharing of infrastructure and public service costs and burdens with developers benefiting from the growth*.”
(see city’s shortfall in financing the growth needs at line 2047 – 2051)

p. 104, line 2065 at 229.13 – “... collaborations between private sector and District government to *co-fund*, design, build, ...”
(see above)

PROJECT IMPACTS

p. 100, line 1973 at 229.3 – delete “tax increment financing”
(added to the list in error)

PUBLIC HOUSING

p. 19, line 377 at 206.3 – “In general, increased demand has prompted rising rents for older housing units, conversions of rental units to ownership units, and demolition of older buildings for redevelopment. *The District’s public housing stock has also been neglected and substantially demolished in recent years*. The result has been a reduced supply of less expensive housing...”

- Citations:
 - Washington City Paper article on conditions in public housing (Aug. 16, 2018): <https://www.washingtoncitypaper.com/news/housing-complex/article/21018152/for-public-housing-residents-in-dc-fighting-for-better-living-conditions-is-a-fulltime-job>
 - Washington City Paper article on the risks to public housing stock (Dec. 20, 2018): <https://www.washingtoncitypaper.com/news/housing-complex/article/21038117/nearly-onethird-of-the-citys-public-housing-stock-is-at-risk-of-becoming-uninhabitable>
 - DCHA Transformation Plan (Sept. 17, 2019): <https://dcha.us/articles/1/57>

p. 20, line 395-396 at 206.5 – “...declined by approximately 22,000 units, from 72,000 units in 2006 to 50,000 in 2017. *Furthermore, almost 7,000 of the roughly 8,000 public housing units currently in the District are in critical condition or worse, which may lead to a greater reduction in affordable housing stock for lower income households*. At the same time, there was a modest gain...”

- Citations:
 - Washington City Paper article on the risks to public housing stock (Dec. 20, 2018): <https://www.washingtoncitypaper.com/news/housing-complex/article/21038117/nearly-onethird-of-the-citys-public-housing-stock-is-at-risk-of-becoming-uninhabitable>