

**THOMAS M. SMITH
ANC COMMISSIONER 3D-02
4601 TILDEN STREET NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20016**

July 8, 2009

Anthony Hood, Chairperson
D.C. Zoning Commission
441 4th Street NW
2nd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001

Re: Zoning Commission Order No. 06-43 – American University – Special
Exception Approval for Further Processing Of An Approved Campus
Plan – Application to Extend Time Limit On Zoning Commission Action

Dear Chairperson Hood and Members of the Commission:

This letter opposes the application by American University (“AU” or “Applicant”) to extend the expiration date of Zoning Commission (ZC) Order No. 06-43 for a period of two years until July 20, 2011 on the basis that AU has failed to satisfy the requirements for such extension as outlined in 11 DCMR 3130.6.

- **AU has failed to provide reasonable time for all parties to assess this application and respond to this request for extension.**
- **The facts upon which the Zoning Commission based its original approval of the application have changed significantly over the last two years.**
- **The applicant has failed to demonstrate good cause for the extension.**

At this late stage in the campus planning cycle, the Zoning Commission should provide the neighborhood an opportunity to assess this project within the context of other facilities’ expansion proposed in the next campus planning cycle already in progress, especially given that the already long-delayed McKinley Building project includes the construction of a new auditorium/theatre to be used for non-academic related public events.

Alternatively, the Zoning Commission should delay acting on this proceeding for a period of 2-3 months to provide an opportunity for the community (1) to review this application and (2) to assess this project in the context of new information that AU has committed to share with the community sometime in September, 2009, relating to new

AU facilities, including additional public auditoriums, envisioned as part of the 2011 campus planning cycle.

The applicant's approach in working with the community on this application would be sufficient cause for the ZC to reject the applicant's request for extension or take steps to encourage more dialogue between AU and neighbors.

- AU has failed and refused to meet the basic requirement to provide notice of this application to residents within 200 feet of the proposed project;
- AU has failed to provide the application to the ANC in a timely way resulting in ANC Commissioners receiving the application 8 days after it was hand-delivered to the ZC and only 6 days in advance of the ANC's last scheduled summer meeting on July 1;
- AU has refused to share specific information about a completed traffic study with the community that may highlight the negative impacts of this project saying it will provide such information after the ZC is scheduled to take action on this application;
- AU has failed to share even the most generalized information about expansion plans that university administrators and staff acknowledge already have been discussed, but that they refuse to share with the community until September after the ZC has taken action on this application; and
- AU's attorney and staff have incorrectly asserted to the ANC at the ANC's July 1 meeting that the application is a "routine" procedure when in fact the new Rules of Practice and Procedure governing this proceeding have only recently gone into effect.

I. Introduction and Background

AU requested ANC 3D to review in January, 2007, a request for a special exception approval for the further processing of an approved campus plan to permit the "renovation" of the existing McKinley Building. In reality, the renovation would expand the McKinley Building by more than 3,000 square feet. Additionally, the use of the space was to be altered to include an auditorium/theater for public events. Although AU argued that a 200-300 person auditorium would not have significant impact at the time on traffic, ANC 3D expressed concern that AU had not conducted a traffic assessment to support this claim.

ANC 3D voted in February, 2007, to support the request, with the condition and strong recommendation that the ZC require AU to conduct a traffic assessment before taking action on the applicant's request. This ANC recommendation was fueled by the realization that traffic conditions had deteriorated significantly since the last traffic study and analysis conducted by AU as part of the 2001 campus planning cycle. The ZC

Commission rejected this ANC recommendation and accepted AU's argument that a traffic study was not necessary.

Since the Zoning Commission issued its decision in Z.C. Case No. 06-43 on March 15, 2007, AU has not made any progress in following through in raising the funds or organizing the financing to begin work on the proposed "renovation" and expansion of the McKinley Building. In fact, AU acknowledges only being able to raise 5 percent of what is necessary to begin construction in the 31 months since proposing this amendment to the campus plan.

As a result of changes to the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Board of Zoning Adjustment (BZA) effective as of June 5, 2009, AU can now seek as much as a two-year extension for ZC Order No. 06-43 if it is able to meet certain requirements prescribed under 11 DCMR 3130.6.

On behalf of the residents of ANC 3D02 representing the eastern part of Spring Valley immediately bordering the AU campus, the residents of the eastern part of the American University campus, and a portion of the Westover Place development which also immediately borders the AU campus, I am writing to encourage the ZC to reject the request by AU on the basis that it has failed to satisfy the requirements for the extension.

These residents will experience the greatest impact from the construction of a new auditorium to be used for high-profile public events as part of the McKinley Building expansion. These events are in addition to other public events that are held on the AU campus at other existing auditorium facilities. The new McKinley auditorium/theatre could add as many as 200 cars – including media satellite vehicles – on already congested streets during peak rush hour periods. Additionally, AU has not come forward with any plan to mitigate parking by attendees in the community when such events are being held.

Alternatively, residents should be provided more time to review and comment on this extension request given the failure of the applicant to provide sufficient time for the community to review the application. Moreover, AU is in the process of preparing its 2011 campus plan and has committed to hold meetings with the community in September, 2009, to discuss the need for new facilities as part of that campus planning cycle. The community should be able to assess this request for an extension within the context of this new and timely information from AU.

II. Failure To Meet The Requirements Of 11 DCMR 3130.6

11 DCMR 3130.6 outlines that three requirements must be met for approval of the extension. These are:

- The extension request is served on all parties and that all parties are allowed thirty (30) days to respond;

- There is no substantial change in any of the material facts upon which the ZC based its original approval of the application that would undermine the ZC's justification for approving the original application; and
- There is a demonstration by the applicant of good cause for the extension with "substantial evidence" of one or more of the following criteria: (a) an inability to obtain sufficient project financing due to economic and market conditions beyond the applicant's reasonable control; (b) an inability to secure all required governmental agency approvals by the expiration date that are beyond the applicant's reasonable control; or (c) the existence of pending litigation or such other factors beyond the applicant's reasonable control.

A. AU has failed to provide reasonable time for all parties to assess this application and respond to this request for extension.

The applicant argues it has fulfilled its responsibility and the requirement to provide appropriate notice to all parties in its hand-delivered filing to the ZC on June 16, 2009.

Yet, ANC Commissioners did not receive the application until June 24. Moreover, the application was sent on June 24 electronically by AU to the ANC 3D's Administrator and forwarded to the ANC Commissioners upon my request. Upon receiving the application, I also asked to receive a copy of the plans and drawings for the project so the ANC could assess whether the applicant was proposing any changes in the original project. Those plans and drawings were provided to us on June 25 and included materials that had not been submitted originally to the ANC in January, 2007, when the application was first considered.

Because ANC 3D meets the first Wednesday of every month, and not in August, AU asked that this issue be put on the agenda of ANC 3D's July 1 meeting – less than one week after ANC Commissioners received the application. Moreover, AU asserted that the ANC had no choice but to consider the issue at its July 1 meeting – despite the short notice – saying the new Rules of Practice and Procedure – with which the ANC was unfamiliar – and that went into effect on June 5 – required the ZC to act on this matter by July 27.

AU did not provide ANC 3D with sufficient time to review the application and the new Rules of Practice and Procedure that mandate an assessment and determination of whether the applicant has met the specific criteria outlined in 11 DCMR 3130.6. Moreover, AU failed to provide ANC 3D and individual ANC Commissioners the time needed to contact interested parties who may reside at least within 200 feet of the McKinley Building. This burden was shifted to the ANC precisely because AU chose to interpret the new rules to mean it had no responsibility – either under the new rules or as a good neighbor – to alert these individuals to the proposed extension.

If this was a new application, AU would have been required to inform residents within 200 feet of the McKinley Building in order for the application to move forward. It is unclear if the new language of the Rules of Practice and Procedure outlined in 11 DCMR 3130.6 was intended to relieve AU of the responsibility to inform these residents. Residents living within 200 feet of McKinley are no less parties to this application today than they were in January, 2007, when AU was mandated to inform them of their attempt to amend the campus plan as part of this zoning proceeding.

Neighbors living adjacent to the university have an interest in having an opportunity to comment on the application, especially (1) given the view within the affected neighborhood that traffic conditions have only worsened in the last two years since the project was initially proposed, and (2) given that AU has fueled neighbors' concerns about unchecked expansion and encroachment into the community over the last six years as a result of a pattern in which AU has purchased commercial property and other residential properties immediately adjacent to the main campus area.

When applying for the special exception in January, 2007, AU was required to communicate with residents living within 200 feet as parties in the process. This same requirement should continue to hold true in the case of any request by any institution for an extension made under the new Rules of Practice and Procedure.

AU has failed to provide reasonable time for all parties to gather information and respond to this request for extension. In fact, the one week advance notice did not provide ANC Commissioners with the opportunity even to be familiar with the change in the BZA rules (the Rules of Practice and Procedure) that went into effect on June 5 that also serve to establish the basis for AU's application for the extension. ANC Commissioners also did not have an opportunity to fully review the requirements that AU must meet, according to these new rules, and to consult with constituents who may be most directly affected.

Moreover, the applicant has acted disingenuously in its limited communications with the neighborhood on this issue. Despite already having submitted an application for extension to the ZC on June 16, AU failed to include this issue as part of its formal agenda distributed in advance of the June 23 Neighborhood Liaison Committee (Attachment 1) meeting. Although "Facilities" is an issue on the agenda, the request for the extension to build McKinley was not among the three items listed for discussion on the agenda distributed in advance of the meeting.

B. The facts upon which the ZC based its original approval of the application have changed significantly over the last two years.

The material facts upon which the ZC based its decision in 2007 have changed significantly. Specifically, (1) traffic conditions have worsened and have continued to deteriorate significantly over the last two years to the point that the DC Department of Transportation (DDOT) and the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) are now engaged in a process that seeks to mitigate concerns raised by the community; and (2)

AU is now at the end of its campus planning cycle and is already working on its new campus plan suggesting (a) the proposed change in the use of McKinley to include a public auditorium can be incorporated in that plan, and (b) that the neighborhood should be able to assess the addition of a public auditorium in McKinley within the context of other facilities' expansion proposed in the next campus planning cycle already in progress.

(1) Traffic conditions around AU – which were bad and getting worse in 2007 – have deteriorated even more.

A public auditorium at McKinley that would be used to hold evening high-profile public events as suggested by the applicant could reasonably add 50-200 cars to rush hour traffic in Ward Circle and along Massachusetts Avenue NW and Nebraska Avenue NW. AU has indicated the primary audience for the public affairs programming to be scheduled for the McKinley Auditorium/Theatre is not the student population, but rather the public, especially national media and public policy stakeholders. That is why these high-profile events will be scheduled primarily in the evening. The additional traffic generated by these events will not be spread over the course of the day, but rather will be focused primarily on rush hour for arrival and later in the evening for departure. The lack of parking limits after rush hour already prompt major back-ups in the Ward Circle area – even when the number of cars is significantly reduced after peak rush hour periods.

The McKinley Auditorium/Theatre events are also intended to attract media attention and coverage meaning there will be a greater – perhaps routine – presence in the community of media trucks with satellite transmission capability. This will add to the existing congestion. These trucks will have little option but to park in the neighborhood or in areas along the major highway corridors that will further impede traffic flow.

Moreover, the McKinley Building is not located near a subway. In fact, adding more public auditoriums in this area of the AU campus seems to run counter to the District's commitment to promoting smart growth. A commitment to smart growth would suggest that AU should locate public auditoriums, like this, near a subway line where such growth may be better sustained.

The Ward Circle area – which already is highly congested – will experience the greatest burden as a result of this additional traffic. Over the last two years, added traffic to and from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) – which the local government has little or no ability to impact – has exacerbated road conditions in this area. Any parking to be used by individuals coming to the McKinley auditorium for a public event will be forced to travel in this area – even to access parking in one of AU's parking lots – or more likely on neighborhood streets which will be far more convenient for meeting attendees.

Traffic congestion in the Ward Circle area has increased to the point that both DDOT and the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) have identified this area for additional measures to control and manage traffic. DDOT has visited the site to consider

making changes in signage and traffic patterns in the area. DDOT already has installed special speed monitors on Massachusetts Avenue just within the last six months because of the increased use of the Massachusetts Avenue corridor. The number of traffic accidents in the area has increased to the point that MPD also has increased its traffic enforcement in the area.

AU argues that the new auditorium will only represent an addition of 100 seats because of its plans to close a small auditorium in the Mary Graydon Center next door to McKinley. AU has made no assurance to the ANC that the auditorium in the Mary Graydon Center will close. But more significantly, AU is planning state of the art facilities at the McKinley auditorium meaning that its use is likely to be more extensive than the Mary Graydon Center auditorium. Most events at Mary Graydon Center – which functions primarily as a Student Union – have a primarily AU focus. The McKinley Auditorium will have a significantly different mission and objective.

Because of the state-of-art capability at the new McKinley Auditorium, it also will be an added revenue source for the applicant. AU will have incentive to ensure a nearly constant use of the facility.

AU also acknowledges that the parking of students, staff, and campus “visitors” continues to be a problem in the surrounding neighborhood. AU routinely patrols and tickets the cars of students and staff – albeit not always so successfully or systematically – who park in our neighborhood. Additionally, buses carrying visitors to AU also park routinely on neighborhood streets. AU acknowledges it has no way of monitoring parking by visitors at the campus who are attending various public events.

Traffic in the area has worsened to the point that ANC 3D formally voted at its June, 2009 meeting to request that DDOT conduct a traffic study and analysis of the area near and surrounding AU.

As part of developing its 2011 campus plan, AU has indicated that it has recently completed its own traffic study and analysis of the area. It has outlined plans to share the results of this study with the neighborhood at the end of July. AU is unwilling to share this information with the neighborhood while this application for extension is being reviewed by the ZC. At the meeting of ANC 3D on July 1, an AU representative hinted the study will show no changes in traffic over the last ten year period.

This is a simply ludicrous and unreasonable assertion that should raise questions about the overall credibility of any claims by AU that its facilities have no added impact on traffic or parking in our neighborhood.

(2) If the applicant wants to plan for the addition of an auditorium at McKinley to be used for public events, it should now be required at this date to include this in its next campus plan which the Zoning Commission is likely to begin reviewing next year.

In their presentation to the ANC, AU officials have not ruled out the addition of other auditoriums to be used for public events as part of the 2011 campus plan. Before agreeing to allow the construction of another auditorium for non-campus related events at this stage in the current campus plan and in the upcoming campus planning cycle, neighbors should be able to assess the cumulative impact of AU's facilities needs and plans. Requiring that the applicant include the addition of a public auditorium at McKinley as part of its facilities plans in the 2011 campus plan – if the McKinley expansion is an AU priority – will enable residents to better assess the need for this facility and its impact on the community, especially given the changes in traffic conditions over the last two years.

Use of AU facilities for public events has an impact on the community even beyond traffic and parking. Outside groups convening meetings at AU have at times created other community disruptions. For example, in the last two years, neighbors have been subjected to a regular round of noisy PETA protest demonstrations that have targeted specific residential homeowners in the neighborhood. These individuals come into our community as a result of attending public meetings at AU, including training programs and seminars on non-violent protest.

AU already has many existing auditorium facilities beyond the small auditorium located in the Mary Graydon Center. It has facilities at its new Katzen Arts Center located at Ward Circle; the Bender Arena; the American University School of Law; and the Greenberg Theatre – just to name a few. In fact, the latter two facilities are located in former commercial properties that AU has now purchased to further expand its footprint into the neighborhood – in both cases – as a matter of right – with no opportunity for residents to comment.

Although the McKinley auditorium will be located internally on the main campus area, its impact will be felt by adjacent neighborhoods and nearby residents who will have to deal with exacerbated traffic tie-ups and parking problems – significantly impacting the residential flavor and quality of life in our neighborhood.

C. The applicant has failed to demonstrate good cause for the extension.

AU has cited the “unprecedented negative economic circumstances impacting development in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States” as its reason for seeking this extension. AU further indicates that it has received pledges totaling less than 5 percent of its goal for completing this project.

The applicant has had 31 months to assemble the financing for this project – more than enough time to raise funds in what for most of those 31 months was a healthy and booming economy, especially for university gift-giving and organized philanthropy. Certainly, a systematic fundraising effort should have been able to generate more than the 5 percent the applicant says has been raised.

Although AU now says it has put “significant effort” into raising funds for this project, this assertion is inconsistent with the information provided to residents of the neighborhood over the last two years who have participated in the AU Neighborhood Liaison Committee meetings. Residents have routinely inquired on the status of the McKinley Building expansion. AU has indicated at these public meetings that the McKinley expansion was not a priority.

There is no question that the economic climate for fundraising is not good right now and the forecast is not much better for the next few years. Nevertheless, AU began seeking approvals for this project in January, 2007 when the economic climate was booming and university giving was breaking all records nationwide. AU officials have indicated that the Communications Department – which is responsible for raising the funds – has simply not made this a priority.

The applicant has cited the current state of the economy and gift-giving in order to meet the criteria outlined in 11 DCMR 3130.6. AU has failed to provide “substantial evidence” for why a substantial amount of funding was not already in place before the recent economic downturn that hit in the 4th quarter of 2008. It also has not provided “substantial evidence” of any effort to raise the funds. AU was unwilling to share its plans for fundraising for this project at the July 1 meeting of the ANC. Does AU even have a fundraising plan in place?

If the applicant has been unable to raise the funds over the last 31 months – nearly three years of mostly boom times for university giving – how does AU expect to raise those funds at a time when noted experts in philanthropy predict a continued downturn in charitable giving, especially major gift-giving?

11 DCMR 3130.6 should not be a catch-all or a loophole that provides institutions with an automatic extension if they failed to put in place reasonable plans for financing new facilities when first asking the community and the Zoning Commission to consider processing an amendment to an already-approved campus plan. “Substantial evidence” should mean exactly that – not reliance on a general statement that economic conditions of the last 9 months do not now favor new construction projects.

Instead, AU cites – in the most general of language – the current state of the economy to justify this extension without offering specific details on why it has failed to identify financing for this project or whether it has a credible path to raising the funds. It almost seems like AU is trying to use the new BZA rules to keep a project alive that has failed to generate (a) much interest from givers and (2) much interest from its own Communications Department in raising the required funds.

Given its poor track record of raising funds for this project, it is hard to understand why AU would not want to include the McKinley expansion as part of its 2011 campus plan, so that it would have a longer period to raise the funds and realize its objectives for the Communications Department.

The applicant's fundraising lethargy should not be the justification for extending the time limit on the original ZC action.

The BZA rules were changed because of genuine problems associated with financing projects at this time – not just to give an institution, such as AU, another chance to do what it should have done more than two years ago – if this project was truly a priority.

III. ANC 3D Recommendation

ANC 3D has voted to support this project “with the caveat that the contribution of the McKinley Building expansion to increased traffic will be included in the American University 2011 Campus Plan treatment of the cumulative campus traffic increase with appropriate traffic mitigation measures.” On the surface, the language of the resolution seems almost incongruous. But, the significance of this resolution is that there was an acknowledgement by the ANC that McKinley would increase traffic problems that would put an even greater burden on AU to limit its facilities expansion in its 2011 campus plan.

Regrettably, ANC 3D simply did not have the time to thoroughly review the application within the context of the new Rules of Practice and Procedure that went into effect on June 5.

Moreover, the attorney for the applicant stressed to the ANC at its July 1 meeting that this proceeding was “routine.” This was consistent with a comment made in a meeting between AU administrators and two ANC 3D on June 29 – just a few days before the July 1 ANC meeting. When the ANC expressed interest at its July 1 meeting in limiting the extension for a period of less than two years, the attorney for the applicant incorrectly indicated that there was no option for seeking an extension of less than two years. Without being better informed of the new Rules, the ANC was not in a position to assess the credibility of the applicant's attorney.

The residents I represent consider the applicant's approach to this matter so egregious, especially the failure to provide advanced information and notice of this application in a timely way, that I am taking the unusual step of sending this letter outlining my disagreement with my colleagues on this issue. But, I also believe that the ANC may have reached a more considered position if the ANC had additional time for review and due diligence.

IV. The Zoning Commission Has An Opportunity To Encourage Reasoned Dialogue Between AU And The Community

Alternatively, the Zoning Commission should delay acting on this proceeding for a period of 2-3 months to provide an opportunity for the community (1) to review this application and (2) to assess this project in the context of new information that AU has committed to share with the community by the end of September, 2009, relating to new

AU facilities needs, including additional public auditoriums, envisioned as part of the 2011 campus planning cycle.

By taking this step, the ZC can encourage reasoned dialogue between AU and the community on this application and the issues underlying concerns in the community about a decision by the ZC to approve this application for extension so late in the current campus planning cycle.

The applicant has indicated that AU administrators and staff will schedule two meetings in the next 2-3 months on traffic and future facilities needs that are the basis of the concerns raised about extending this project at this time. (Attachment 2 provides a proposed agenda for two meetings being proposed by AU for late July and September.)

AU has indicated it will provide the community with the details of its transportation study and analysis at a meeting in late July. Additionally, AU has indicated it will discuss facilities needs to be outlined in the 2011 campus plan at a September meeting it is planning to convene. These meetings will provide the community with the opportunity to review the McKinley expansion within the context of the campus plan.

Precisely because AU has indicated it is not in a position to share this information with the community at this time – while this application is being considered by the ZC – the ZC could strike a blow for reasoned dialogue by delaying action until AU has had the opportunity to provide the community with a snapshot of its needs for the 2011 campus plan cycle.

A delay of 2-3 months does not stop the applicant from trying to assemble a financing package for the project. The new Rules do not require the ZC to act by July 27 and the new rules specifically allow the project to remain active until the ZC acts on AU's application whenever that may be.

Some ANC 3D Commissioners encouraged AU at its public meeting on July 1 to consider this delay. But, the ANC was told by AU's attorneys and staff that such a delay was not possible under the new Rules that had taken effect on June 5. After a review of 11 DCMR 3130.6 to 3130.10, it is clear the ZC has this option.

V. Conclusion

Although the ZC approved the construction of an approximately 3,000 square foot addition to the McKinley Building in 2007, the use of space in this new addition for an auditorium/theatre to be used for public events will further exacerbate traffic conditions that have continued to deteriorate since the ZC's 2007 decision. Precisely because AU has indicated interest in building other auditorium facilities on campus to be used for public events, this request for extension raises additional new concerns within the community because of the current status of the campus planning cycle.

Given the changing and worsening traffic conditions in the neighborhood and the timeline for consideration of the next AU campus plan, AU's request for a two year extension of the ZC action approved in 2007 should now be rejected.

In conclusion, the criteria outlined in 11 DCMR 3130.6 demonstrate that ZC review of the application for extension is not routine nor should it be guaranteed. The ZC should reject the two-year request because the applicant has simply failed to meet the tests outlined in 11 DCMR 3130.6. Alternatively, the ZC should delay acting on the application until the applicant has provided information to the community in September, 2009, as scheduled, on its facilities needs to be addressed in the 2011 campus plan.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Smith
ANC Commissioner 3D02

Attachment 1
Attachment 2

Attachment 1

American University Neighborhood Liaison Committee Meeting

Bender Library Archives Reading Room (3rd Floor)

7:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 23, 2009

AGENDA

1. Introductions & Attendance
2. Old Business
 - a. Approval of minutes from the March 9, 2009, NLC Meeting
3. Facilities
 - a. Update on construction of the new SIS building -- webcam on new website
 - b. Completion of new landscaping on Massachusetts Avenue
 - c. Status of replacement for Balducci's
4. Campus News
 - a. Freshman orientation underway
 - b. AU receives A2 rating from Moody's
 - c. AU branding study
 - d. Activities on campus:
 - e. Farmers Market every other Wednesday on the Quad
 - f. OLLI lectures that neighbors can attend free
 - g. Summer Exhibits at the Katzen
 - h. Summer programs at WCL
 - i. Arboretum tours
5. Neighborhood Issues
 - a. Benches for Spring Valley Triangle Park
 - b. Parking and Traffic
6. New Business
 - a. Introduction to new website www.american.edu and its new Community Relations page
 - b. Introduction of new AU Student Government President Andrew MacCracken and Sami Green, AU student interested in running for vacant ANC3D seat
 - c. Update on Army Corps Cleanup

- d. Update on Campus Plan, new Campus Plan working group, and first meeting date.

7. Other Business

Attachment 2

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY 2011 Campus Plan Community Working Group Proposed Agendas

July 2009

1. Overview of Campus Plan process -- definitions, legal requirements, timetable
2. Overview of university and its facilities
3. Overview of 2001 Campus Plan
4. Review neighborhood concerns from previous Plans
5. Present Transportation Existing Conditions Assessment

September 2009

1. Discuss Transportation Existing Conditions Assessment
2. Present and discuss population information and projections
3. Present and discuss facilities needs

Handwritten signature and text:
Yvonne de la Cruz
Chairman
Community Working Group