

July 27, 2011

Mr. Wayne Wilson  
Project Manager  
District Department of Transportation  
55 M Street, SE  
Washington, D.C. 20003

Stephen C. Walter  
Parsons Transportation Group  
100 M Street, SE  
Washington DC 20003

**Re: Comment on the Oregon Avenue Environmental Assessment Report**

Dear Mr. Wilson, Mr. Walter, and other transportation professionals:

Many thanks for your time and commitment to improving Oregon Avenue and our neighborhood. I am writing in my capacity as the ANC Commissioner for the area that covers about 75% of the proposed project area – all of the area from Military Rd. to Nebraska Ave., and about half of the area from Nebraska Ave. to Western Ave. Apart from the views recently submitted by our entire Chevy Chase ANC (in favor of road reconstruction, sidewalks or other walking paths, and other measures), I wanted to take the time to share my own views as an individual Commissioner as well as a long-time resident (two decades) who lives near and travels on Oregon Ave. (and in Rock Creek Park) daily.

**Overall Comments**

I have studied carefully the full Environmental Assessment (EA) Report and other information about the proposed project, have attended two of the three DDOT meetings about the project, have presided over and heard public comment in four ANC meetings regarding the project, and have had numerous email, telephone, and verbal communications with constituents about the matter (some dating back to 2007). As an ANC Commissioner, I also have experience with nearby major road reconstruction projects (from pre-planning through conclusion), such as Nebraska Ave. (Oregon to Utah), Utah Ave. (27<sup>th</sup> to Nebraska), and others.

As an overview, I note that as an ANC Commissioner, my duty is to consider the proposed project *in the best interest of the community as a whole*. Indeed, Commissioners take an oath to view each matter in light of the “best interest of the District of Columbia as a whole.” That is somewhat of an abstract notion, but in my mind it means taking a position that best reflects the views of my constituents with due consideration for broader neighborhood and public interests.

Based upon my substantial communications with constituents about this matter in particular, there is broad public support (as I detail below) for the reconstruction of Oregon Ave., for the addition of curbs & gutters, for the implementation of runoff and erosion controls, and for the addition of a sidewalk along the west side of the avenue (or other walking path surface where necessitated by certain property conditions). There is a vocal group of residents that do not want any action at all or only very limited action to address immediate road deterioration and drainage issues, with clear opposition to any sidewalks or walking paths of any kind (this mostly takes the form of asking for more “delay”). I have carefully considered these views and appreciate why certain homeowners want to end the project from their own particular circumstance. However, on balance, and taking into account the broader public good, ***I sincerely believe the project should proceed, inclusive of road reconstruction, curbs & gutters, runoff and erosion controls, and the addition of a sidewalk along the west side of the avenue.*** Obviously, a great many details have yet to be specified, but the project should proceed to the design phase with these conceptual parameters in mind.

In places, a sidewalk alternative might be appropriate (such as asphalt or gravel) to work around trees or other issues. Retaining walls should be minimized except where necessary. Lighting should not be increased except where necessary for safety improvements.

I also note that the constituencies interested in this matter are various, with no one group of constituents necessarily “more important” than others. I think it is important to hear all views and consider the totality of opinions. In my mind, I consider the views I have heard in four groups: (1) the residents who live immediately along Oregon Ave. (including Knollwood); (2) the residents in the three neighborhoods whose only ingress/egress is from Oregon Ave. – Moreland Place, Oregon Knolls, and Chatsworth; (3) residents that live on streets perpendicular to or nearby Oregon Ave. and who drive or use the avenue on a regular basis; (4) the broader neighborhood and public, including those with disabilities.

For all of the above groups, I believe we need to give especial attention to children and the elderly, especially kids that travel to/from local schools. In my mind, ***any safety enhancement that protects our kids is of the highest value and weighs more importantly than other considerations*** (such as an individual preference that the city not utilize its right of way in a publicly-owned “front” yard space).

The EA Report details four alternatives and a number of options. At this point, the proposed measures are more conceptual than detailed, and even the 35% plans are not yet prepared. So it is difficult to specifically endorse a particular alternative. Thus, it is important that everyone concern recognized that the EA Report is more a conceptual outline to elicit comment and less a detailed plan of any kind as to what will precisely take place at any given location.

## **Why I Support the Proposed Project and Sidewalk/Bike Lane**

There are five main reasons why I support the proposed project, inclusive of sidewalks and a bike lane.

1. **The basic need for road reconstruction with curbs and gutters (combined with the need for new traffic calming measures).** Oregon Avenue is in desperate need of reconstruction from end to end. The EA report details the numerous problems with the road, which is approaching a severe state of deterioration, including small box culverts across various small creeks. The current road is relatively unsafe for cars due to a poor road surface, the lack of curbs, and the prolonged presence of ice and snow in the winter. The addition of curbs and gutters is important for road safety and to control runoff. The plan appears to confirm that the current road configuration, including its width and its curves, will remain as is. As the EA details, a new road should add various traffic calming measures.

2. **The important need to protect Rock Creek Park – trees, creeks, and environment.** Rock Creek Park is our most cherished area and its protection is paramount. The current road condition contributes to significant erosion of the park, the illness and death of trees, and the ruination of small creek beds (with negative effects running all the way down to Rock Creek). In addition to curbs & gutters on the road, the project should include various runoff control measures that would minimize negative effects on the park. The National Park Service is working separately on the installation of regenerative stormwater conveyances at Bingham Run and Milkhouse Run, which will be important to restoring the health of the park in the area along and just east of Oregon Ave. Presently, the wooded area between the avenue and the NPS walking path is in poor shape, with trees becoming more sparse, invasive species proliferating, and erosion issues (and trash, which I routinely collect). The road reconstruction project will unavoidably cause the destruction of some trees immediately along the avenue. Many of these are invasive species or small trees, and some of the overhanging or older trees may need to come down in any event, but the loss of any old growth trees should be minimized to the absolute extent necessary. In any event, the EA report notes that there would be a substantial replanting of trees. Care for trees is a major value in our neighborhood. I think if one steps back and fully considers the status quo and its negative impact on trees deep into the park, and the fact that the project will replace and improve upon the trees along the avenue, there is no comparison – *if one “speaks for the trees,” the project is a significant positive.* The micro-environment of the small creeks is all but destroyed by the current conditions, but hopefully a new road with runoff controls, combined with NPS’s work, will lead to restored small creek life in the long run. Those who seek inaction or delay would cause further irreparable damage to the park.

3. **The need for sidewalks – for kids, pedestrian safety, and the disabled.** The current road is dramatically unsafe for pedestrians. Nonetheless, some folks brave a walk along the west side of the avenue. At least one child has been struck by a car. As this was relayed to me: “He was walking along Oregon Ave. from Oregon Knolls to get to the nearest bus stop in front of Chatsworth. He was badly injured.” The addition of a

sidewalk is an obvious cure for these safety and access issues. In considering the sidewalk issue, one has to take into account kids that need to walk to school, those with disabilities, the elderly, the many workers at Knollwood (who take the bus at Military Rd.) and the greater public good. Those opposed to sidewalks have stated that hardly anybody walks along the avenue so there is no need; but of course there are few that brave the road because there is no sidewalk. Another argument by the opponents of sidewalks are that people can walk on the path within the park. This is not persuasive to me because the park path is far from the road in many places, is unlit, not usable in the winter, and potentially unsafe for regular pedestrian use (while crime is rare on the east-side park path, it has occurred, including one rape).

On other projects, we have seen the use of an asphalt or gravel surface, or a narrower path, where needed to protect old growth trees or accommodate spacing issues. Such alternative pathways likely would be appropriate at various portions of the Avenue. ***We strongly support an ultimate property-by-property assessment, in close conjunction with the property owner. There may be various exceptions to the use of a 5-foot wide concrete sidewalk.*** In addition, we hope that the concrete would be of a porous nature to minimize runoff. However, the need for such exceptions should not be viewed as a reason to oppose sidewalks altogether.

Finally, the road reconstruction would legally require the addition of a sidewalk along the west side, in accordance with the D.C. Sidewalk Assurance Act. The Act prioritizes the addition of sidewalks in various cases that are present here: (1) areas where kids walk to school; (2) access to parks; (3) transit stops; (4) where the absence of a sidewalk creates substantial pedestrian safety risks. The exceptions to the Act are not applicable (the incremental cost of adding the sidewalk is not “unduly expensive” in the context of the 1.7 miles stretch of road; the sidewalk will not go “unused” by pedestrians; DDOT has not and could not certify that the safety of pedestrians and those with disabilities is otherwise satisfied; parkland would not be damaged, but rather, enhanced; and no private property acquisitions or easements are required except for one driveway where it has been agreed or where the sidewalk could be skipped if needed to technically match this exemption).

**4. The need for a bike lane** (which can only be added from Nebraska to Western Ave. for space reasons). This is much closer call, and if one considers only the short term, a bike lane is not warranted. Considering the longer term, the District has been slowly building a “bike infrastructure” throughout the city and engaging in pro-biking messages – for the sake of our larger environment and a healthier city. This is kind of a chicken-and-egg issue, one that cities across the U.S. are balancing at present (with Europe farther ahead). When I step back and think about the long-run public interest, I support what the District is doing across the city in building a better bike infrastructure. On balance, I think the lane should be built now. As noted, this is a close call and this aspect of the project could probably be dropped. Having the lane in the roadway (instead of a shared path) would coincidentally function as a traffic calming measure. While I have heard broad support for a sidewalk, I have heard less immediate support for a bike lane.

**5. Support for Moreland Place and Oregon Knolls.** These are two small cul-de-sac streets off of Oregon Ave. whose only ingress is Oregon Ave. Dozens of kids live there, many of whom walk to nearby schools. These communities are overwhelmingly in support of the project and a sidewalk, for obvious reasons. I do not find it persuasive or respectful to argue that they bought their homes knowing the current condition and so they should just accept it. Oregon Knolls residents do not have a bus stop, and have to walk along Ore. Ave. to the nearest one at Chatsworth. This is not safe.

### Our ANC

I believe our ANC sincerely harmonized all views in the neighborhood in its comment letter to you of July 27, 2011, the lone dissenter notwithstanding. On behalf of our entire neighborhood, we asked for the project to proceed to the design stage consistent with a number of general concepts, including road reconstruction with the same configuration, curbs and gutters, runoff controls, sidewalks or other paths, and bridge repair.

### Arguments Against or to Delay the Proposed Project

I have heard, listened, and studied the reasons advanced against or to delay the project. These are valid and sincere points, and respected. In the balance *of all factors*, they do not outweigh the above reasons in favor of the project.

1. **Oregon Ave. is a “quiet country lane” and we need to maintain the “aesthetic.”** Oregon Ave. is not a particularly quiet road, experiencing a high volume of cars. But having the park on one side, combined with the tree canopy and variation in the road does give the road a nice feeling. I do not perceive the reconstruction of Oregon Ave. to be “ruinous” of this aesthetic and I think certain comments tend towards exaggeration in this regard. The avenue should be reconstructed with the same width and configuration (perhaps minor variations will be needed for engineering reasons, but the intent is clearly to re-establish the identical configuration). Most importantly, the avenue is and will remain adjacent to the park, with a nice tree canopy, so it will necessarily retain a country lane feel, especially as the trees will improve in number and quality. To be sure, the addition of curbs, gutters, and a sidewalk/walking path would be an “upgrade” and change the current appearance of the road, making it a little less “country.” In short, when I weigh everything on balance, I think the pluses outweigh the negatives. I also note that in my experience, before a road project begins, its scale can be exaggerated and cause undue worry. A good example is Nebraska Ave. (from Oregon to Utah), which was a difficult issue as the work started, and certainly not easy while the work proceeded, but when all was said and done, the road was improved, and folks have generally been glad for it (although new traffic calming remains needed). Interestingly, where sidewalks have been added (such as on Beech St. and Western Ave.), some opposed to them have turned out to be in favor of them. For some more adamantly opposed to the project on Oregon Ave., I think there has been some exaggeration (e.g., that it will become a “highway” or a “freeway”). A reconstructed road (with sidewalks)

would not be an overly dramatic alteration to the character and aesthetic of the area. These things always look different in hindsight than in the beginning and one has to be wary of subjective concerns. Indeed, I recall vocal early opposition to the redevelopment of Broad Branch market, which has proven to be the diamond of Chevy Chase DC.

**2. A sidewalk would take away from “my front yard.”** The city owns a significant strip of land along the west side of the avenue – in some cases up to 50 feet. This is public land that is reserved for public use. The District would not have to take anybody’s privately owned land, with the exception of an easement across one private driveway near Oregon Knolls (which I understand has been tentatively granted) and a slight consensual adjustment from the National Park Service. There is a segment of Oregon Ave. where there is very little space between the road and the private property line (near Northampton St. and moving towards St. John’s High School). The EA report indicates that there is room in the public right of way for a curb and sidewalk in this immediate area (elsewhere, there is ample room). A few property owners in this tight area are opposed to the project in whole and are fighting to delay it. I believe they are opposed to the project from the point of view of their precise location, without due consideration for the broader public good. One owner has indicated from the start that no matter what, he plans to bring litigation to stop the project and he has even enlisted his private law firm to take action (in my view, against the public good). I believe that the public good should prevail over such individualized considerations. When any actual project proceeds, I believe DDOT will work closely with each individual homeowner to address their “front yard” issues. DDOT has and will work around old trees, flowerbeds, walls, and fence lines in public space. One thing I can say for sure – our ANC and its Commissioners will press DDOT to fulfill that objective.

**3. Retaining Walls.** The project would necessarily require several retaining walls. My review of the EA report is that these would not be overly problematic, would be done tastefully, and would in fact improve the road condition. They should be minimized to the extent possible. One example from experience: Nebraska Ave. added a large retaining wall just below Utah Ave., which at first was feared to be an eyesore, but turned out to be quite nice.

**4. Lighting.** Another concern is the lighting that would be improved along the avenue. In some locations, lighting is needed for safety. My review of the EA report reveals that these would be basic lighting improvements, not the addition of “high-intensity” lights. But as the details emerge, this is one to watch closely and guard against over-lighting.

**5. Resisting the Argument for Delay.** The argument for more delay is essentially a guise for inaction. The project was first discussed *in 2007*, and even if DDOT proceeds forthwith with design work, the project will not break ground until late 2012. The delay argument is that people need more time to understand what will happen. The delay group confuses the point of the EA Report, which is to lay out *concepts* consistent with environmental impact standards relative to the park. The EA Report is not meant to detail what will happen at any particular property. In that regard, the design

work needs to proceed through the production of the “35% plans.” At that point, a property owner can review what *might* happen at her or his property, subject to comment and edit. But we certainly know all that we need to know in order to agree on *general concepts* – reconstruct the road, add a sidewalk/walking path, protect the park from erosion, etc. The argument for more delay is the equivalent of a move to kill the project, which in my view is contrary to the majority view and the public good. There was a circular argument made to our ANC – to wait for comment until the litigation group’s FOIA requests are answered. But the FOIA requests ask for all comment submitted to DDOT to be made public for all to read, which necessarily cannot be fulfilled until *after* the public comment period ends. So if the ANC waited until after the litigation group’s FOIA requests were answered, it would necessarily have *missed* its own chance to submit public comment. Moreover, I am not comfortable with the litigation group’s FOIA request to make all private citizen comments public – I am not sure folks who submitted such comments envisioned their comments being published. I defer to the correct FOIA answer on that, but as an ANC Commissioner, I would not seek to reveal private comments (by name) submitted to DDOT unless those who commented were expressly informed that their comments would be published. In short, the argument for delay to proceed *even with design work* is, in my view, the equivalent of lobbying for inaction – which I believe would be detrimental to child and public safety, the environment of the park, and the public good.

### **Comments from Constituents**

It is critically important to consider the views of the constituents that elected me. This has been my primary focus in considering this matter, although the broader public interest is part of our oath. It is difficult in a matter like this to discern the “majority” view on any of this, as there is no clear or objective survey of opinions. DDOT and Parsons are better positioned to measure public views because they have received substantial public comment.

***That said, it is my belief that a substantial majority of my constituents support the project, including sidewalks, as follows:***

**1. Moreland Place.** The Moreland Place community (14 households) is overwhelmingly in favor of the road project and sidewalks to connect them to the neighborhood (indeed, their connector sidewalk or pathway should be built immediately), as reflected in their petition (which includes nearby residents of Ore. Ave.). The parents of Moreland Place have been especially vocal about the need for sidewalks for their kids. The kids, who number nearly 20, “are unable to safely walk outside of Moreland Pl. We feel that it’s a serious public safety issue and we have a reasonable right to safe pedestrian walkways to get to public transit and elsewhere.” They also point out that the Avenue becomes an “ice slick” at their intersection during the winter months. A couple from Moreland Place wrote: “my wife and I have been waiting for Oregon Ave. reconstruction ever since it was promised years ago. We for one would welcome both the upgraded roads and sidewalks (or even bike lanes) to allow safe pedestrian transit up and down Oregon, to the park, and to western Chevy Chase. We know from previous

meetings we are far from alone.” Residents complain about the inability to walk home at night from Military Road to Moreland Place.

- There is actually a small stretch of sidewalk around the intersection of Moreland Place and Oregon Ave. – the “sidewalk to nowhere” – but it stops before Northampton St. ***This small segment completing the link to Northampton St. should be completed immediately***, even if it is just a narrow gravel or asphalt pathway. These folks and their kids need safe passage. They have been asking for this connection for some time and it should not be tied up with the larger “sidewalk” issue regarding the entire 1.7 mile stretch of road, which might not be constructed until 2014. ***DDOT – for the sake of dozens of families and their kids, please act now to complete this small link regardless of the Oregon Ave. project.***

**2. Oregon Knolls.** The Oregon Knolls community (16 households) (also including many kids) likewise submitted a petition in favor of the road project and sidewalks to connect them to the neighborhood. As one Oregon Knolls resident wrote, we have a “responsibility to defend the overriding community interests in question...There are many more people whose interests at stake in the issues of safety and environmental control than you will be hearing from.” His “own view of the matter” is that “the project is urgent; it must include sidewalks; it should include a swale; it does not need to include a bike lane.” Another wrote that she “sincerely hope[s] that the sidewalk is wide enough to offer safe passage given the wild traffic on Oregon.” Another wrote that she “hope[s] that the ANC and the city will do the right thing and put safety ahead of” individual issues. A child from this community was struck by a car while walking to the Chatsworth bus stop.

I note that within my SMD, there are more households in the combined “trapped” Oregon Knolls and Moreland Place communities (30) than along Oregon Ave. itself (23).

**3. Knollwood.** This retirement community with ***several hundred elderly residents*** is on Oregon Ave. The institution, leaders in its residents association, and many residents (who walk into the park daily) have stated a view to me in favor of road reconstruction and sidewalks. I reject the view of those who have argued that Knollwood is “separate” from the neighborhood and should not be considered.

**4. Other Oregon Ave. Residents.** I have received emails or other indications of support from several other residents of Oregon Ave. From the petitions and other communications I have received, I believe that a majority of this sub-set are also in favor of the project and sidewalks. Those opposed tend to hold such position, in my view, driven my highly individualized property issues, such as being in a narrow stretch where their use of the public right of way down to the road is of more concern for them personally.

**5. Nearby Residents.** I have received or seen communications of substantial support from the nearby residents, for both the project and for sidewalks. A discussion

on the Chevy Chase List Serv revealed broad support for sidewalks. One person (address unknown) wrote: "...I avoided the recent ANC meeting because of my expectation that it would get pretty rough for those of us who support rebuilding crumbling Oregon Ave. and improving the safety and accessibility of this road by adding sidewalks. I hope that Gary and his ANC colleagues will not interpret my lack of bravery as a lack of agreement with his position, which I believe to be widely supported." Another wrote that "we cannot afford to lose this rare opportunity to repair and maintain this important road and the adjoining park edge before both collapse." Another wrote that while he does "not really have the time to go to ANC meetings," he would like sidewalks along Ore. Ave." Another wrote: "the balance here tips towards the rehabbed drainage and safe ways to walk along Oregon." Another wrote: "Walking the western side of Oregon gives me flashbacks to 'Death Race 2000.' A sidewalk would be a good thing." A resident just off of Oregon wrote: "I believe that Oregon Avenue is desperately in need of a safe pedestrian pathway....having read the Environmental Assessment, I support Alternative 3..." (sidewalks and a bike lane).

**6. "Neighbors United to Preserve Oregon Avenue."** This submission is very welcome and appreciated, focusing on process, but difficult to interpret as to any *substantive position* on what should or should not happen on Oregon Avenue. It is unclear how the petition was gathered or what was communicated to its signatories. There is a cover letter separate from the petition that states a perception that the EA alternatives would "severely undermine the tranquility of the Park and our neighborhood." The letter recognizes "the need to address long neglected storm water problems and pedestrian access issues in ways that are less intrusive to the surroundings." The letter states opposition to any of the alternatives as detailed in the EA letter but endorses a "limited" version of Alternative 2 (without comment). One signatory wrote that "the petition is not about whether we agree on the proposals," and is more about gaining more time for comment. One of the leaders of the group stated at an ANC meeting that they are not opposed to road reconstruction and are *not* opposed to sidewalks/walking paths. Another leader stated that when he walked his petition pages around, "most people I spoke with and who signed the petition...are willing to have a walkway on Oregon Avenue." The same person wrote in favor of walkways in lieu of sidewalks in the area near Oregon Knolls. Someone wrote on the petition "I favor sidewalks but not high walls." But other signatories of the petition have presented it as a petition against the project and against sidewalks, claiming that everyone who signed it agrees with them that there should be no sidewalks. On balance, it is difficult to discern what the petition exactly means. The litigation group is claiming that it speaks on behalf of all signatories and the group's law firm purports to act on behalf of each person that signed the petition, which is confusing.

**7. Adequacy of opportunity or time to comment.** Several residents reiterated that there was ample time for full comment and applauded the grass-roots democracy that we have through our ANC. Others complained. One wrote: "I have been waiting for over 20 years for a safe sidewalk and a safe road to travel on. I am not sure what else we are supposed to review. I think that the DDOT plans are clear, comprehensive, and explicit. I don't believe that there was inadequate notice. I have

been to at least 3 public meetings and reviewed plans over and over again.” Another constituent wrote: I “was very impressed with the presentations by DDOT and the environmental impact contractor.” I agree with these comments. At least in my five years on the ANC, I have not witnessed such exhaustive opportunity and time for comment, all duly noticed. Dating back to 2007, our ANC has noted the project was in the works, and at several meetings, DDOT representatives spoke generally about plans. DDOT has held three public meetings (October 28, 2010; December 2, 2010; and June 29, 2011) and worked with the National Park Service. Our ANC has addressed the issue, with public comment, in at least three public meetings (allowing everyone who wished to speak the chance to do so, effectively without time limits). The EA report is voluminous, detailed, and includes many appendixes, maps, and drawings. DDOT and Parsons have been open to all public inquiry and commentary outside of meetings and have provided all public information that must be shared. DDOT recently extended the time for public comment to July 29, 2011.

### **Concluding Comments**

There was vocal opposition to the reconstruction and licensing of Broad Branch Market, which has proven to be a jewel in our neighborhood. There has been vocal opposition to every road reconstruction project in the neighborhood. When action is being taken by DDOT, the voices of opposition tend to be louder than the voices of support. It does take a certain degree of political will to proceed with work that is in the best interest of the community as a whole. I think this is the case with Oregon Ave., for all the reasons stated above. To be sure, certain folks will continue to argue against the project and seek to lobby Councilmembers or DDOT to silently kill the project. I have done my best to see the bigger picture, study all information dispassionately, avoid exaggeration, and take a view in the best long-term interest of all. As a result, I have received substantial support and applause, as well as strident opposition. I suppose that is in the nature of volunteer ANC public service. I am sending this letter because I think it is important for the ANC Commissioner covering 75% of the proposed project area to state a view. The ANC Commissioner covering the other 25% of the proposed area has publicly stated the following: “I am in complete agreement with the necessity of installing sidewalks, curbs and gutters for public and environmental safety.”

If the project does proceed, I am fully committed to working with DDOT to help it all go as smoothly as possible. When DDOT releases its “35% plans,” we will certainly comment on the details as they emerge, and so on with the 65%, 85%, and final plans. All of that is far off into the future, and possibly for another ANC Commissioner to address in 2013-14 (if I hang it up for the next term). For now, I can say that the community as a whole favors the concept of road reconstruction, with curbs and gutters, runoff control, and sidewalks/walking paths. Obviously, these big road projects are a pain as they progress for residents & traffic, and the harder work is in the details, but we favor improvements to our neighborhood and when all is said and done, these projects (e.g., Nebraska Ave., Utah Ave., Western Ave.) have been for the better.

In closing, once again, thank you for your time, patience, and commitment to our neighborhood.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary Thompson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Gary Thompson  
ANC Commissioner 3/4G02

cc Councilmember Muriel Bowser  
Chevy Chase ANC  
Chevy Chase Listserv (message posted to receive letter by request)