December 11, 2018

Cameron Stokes  
Policy and Legislative Affairs Division  
Office of the Director  
District Department of Transportation  
55 M Street, S.E., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20003

Re: Residential Permit Parking Second Proposed Rulemaking (65 DCR 11504)

Dear Mr. Stokes:

On November 14, 2018, at a duly noticed, regularly scheduled monthly meeting of ANC 6C, with a quorum of 5 out of 6 commissioners and the public present, the Commission voted 5-0 to adopt the positions set forth in this letter.

Resident-Only Parking

As reflected in our 2016 comments on the First Proposed Rulemaking, ANC 6C endorses the idea of extending resident-only parking to additional areas in the District. We are pleased to see that DDOT has abandoned its earlier proposal to require ANC-wide resident-only parking.

The language implementing the new, more flexible plan for resident-only parking, however, requires additional refinement as follows:

- **Section 2437.1(b):** This provision seeks to establish a one-year waiting period between the date of an ANC resolution requesting resident-only parking and an earlier “date on which the majority of blocks in the ANC were designated as residential permit parking blocks.” The latter phrase is extremely ambiguous at best and confusing at worst. In many ANCs, the majority of blocks may not be designated RPP at all.

- **Section 2437.1:** The requirement to apply resident-only restrictions to “all blocks” in an ANC appears to be an erroneous holdover from the First Proposed Rulemaking and should be deleted.

- **Section 2437.7:** The phrasing in this section is unclear. Does this mean that DDOT will evaluate all ANC petitions on a fixed semi-annual schedule? That ANCs may submit
petitions at any time, with a maximum of two per year? We suggest rewriting the section to read, “Each ANC may submit, and DDOT will evaluate, up to two petitions per year.”

We note that the regulations are profoundly unclear on which parking devices (windshield stickers, temporary visitor passes, or annual VPPs) would allow parking in resident-only zones. Proposed section 2432.1(b) implies that only VPPs and regular windshield stickers—but not 15-day temporary permits—would be valid, but proposed section 2439.1 expressly exempts the provisions of section 2414. Part B of that section describes temporary (15-day) visitor permits, implying that such devices would be valid even in resident-only zones.

To the extent the regulations take account of the needs of non-residential uses in residential zones—and we question the wisdom of doing so—that consideration should be limited to the curb space abutting that use (as in proposed section 2434.2) rather than applying to the entire block (as reflected in the undesirable language of proposed sections 2436.2 and 2437.3, relating to expanded RPP hours and resident-only parking, respectively). In any event, we recommend requiring the non-residential use to document its purported parking demand.

The criteria for implementation of resident-only parking are completely backwards. Section 2437.2(b)(1) implies that non-resident parking demand from non-residential uses would be an adverse factor in granting the restriction. In fact, it is in areas that suffer exactly such heightened non-residential demands that resident-only parking is most needed. If the presence of this factor is intended to be a point in favor of establishing resident-only parking, then the ambiguous language of the proposed regulation needs to be changed to make that explicit.

Other Amendments

We object to the proposed amendment to section 2405.7, and recommend that it be deleted in its entirety. The proposed cross-reference to the zoning regulations—a subject on which DPW ticket writers will have no expertise—would make this provision incomprehensible and essentially impossible to enforce. We believe that the general prohibition on parking in public space (in section 2405.3) draws an appropriate line, and that there is no need for a conflicting exemption for driveways.

Section 2440.2 is deeply flawed for two reasons. First, it is hopelessly ambiguous: May vehicles with in-zone RPP stickers park within 25’ from an intersection notwithstanding prohibitory signage? How can “at all times” be reconciled with “at no time”? Second, the idea of allowing parking closer to an intersection is a bad one; it creates additional dangers for pedestrians and other vehicle operators/riders by allowing sight-line obstructions near intersections. We strongly recommend simply deleting the 25’ exemption (by striking the text from “except that” through “at all times”).

Finally, we urge DDOT to amend existing section 2414 Part B to require that temporary (15-day) parking permits be issued to an individual vehicle for no more than 30 days in any rolling 365-day period. At present, MPD’s official policy is to issue such passes to a given requester without limitation. As a result, these passes—which cost nothing—can be (and
are routinely) abused by vehicle owners who use them to circumvent RPP restrictions for months at a time.

These temporary passes should be strictly limited to temporary visitors rather than serving, at the expense of law-abiding residents who register their vehicles in DC and pay for RPP stickers, as a loophole for long-term circumvention of the rules.

Thank you for giving great weight to the views of ANC 6C.

Sincerely,

Karen Wirt
Chair, ANC 6C

Cc: Councilmember Charles Allen
Councilmember Mary Cheh (Chair, Transportation Committee)