

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2E



Representing the communities of Burleith, Georgetown and Hillandale

**ANC 2E Supplemental Material
for the D.C. Zoning Commission**

Z.C. Case No. 10-32

Georgetown University 2010-2020 Campus Plan

June 2, 2011

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 10-32
EXHIBIT NO. 175

Index

	Page
Tab 1: Written testimony by ANC 2E Commissioners	3
Testimony by ANC 2E Commissioner Ron Lewis	4
Testimony by ANC 2E Commissioner Ed Solomon	18
Testimony by ANC 2E Commissioner Bill Starrels	22
Testimony by ANC 2E Commissioner Jeff Jones	25
Testimony by ANC 2E Commissioner Ron Lewis	33
Tab 2: Addresses for group houses pictured in ANC 2E Commissioner Jeff Jones's testimony	35
Tab 3: Additional material relating to Slide # 37, GU Campus Density (Students per Acre)	37
Tab 4: Georgetown University's assurances about its ability to comply with a campus-plan decision by the Zoning Commission	38

Tab 1

Written Testimony by ANC 2E Commissioners

At the conclusion of ANC 2E's verbal testimony on May 16, 2011, Chairman Hood asked if the testimony could also be submitted in writing. The ANC 2E written testimony is submitted on the following pages.

Testimony of Ron Lewis, Chair, ANC 2E

Slide # 1: ANC 2E Presentation to the D.C. Zoning Commission

Good evening Chairman Hood and members of the Commission. My name is Ron Lewis and I chair ANC 2E, which serves the Georgetown and Burleith communities.

Slide # 2: ANC 2E commissioners who will be presenting at the Zoning Commission

With me today are three ANC 2E commissioners who also represent the areas of our community closest to Georgetown University, west of Wisconsin Avenue.

Slide # 3: Map of Georgetown and Burleith

These are the areas in our community – West Georgetown and Burleith – most heavily impacted by Georgetown University – and the impact is severe.

Slide # 4: Map of Burleith and Georgetown west of Wisconsin Avenue

We also have two ANC 2E commissioners who are permanent residents east of Wisconsin Avenue. They aren't presenting tonight but they are in full support of the ANC 2E position.

ANC 2E Commissioner Ed Solomon is both a long-time resident of Burleith and a longstanding business owner in Georgetown.

Commissioner Bill Starrels is a mortgage banker and a longstanding Georgetown resident in the southern part of Georgetown – he is the dean of our ANC, having served on the ANC for over 10 years. He represented the ANC when the last GU campus plan was considered in 2000.

Commissioner Jeff Jones is an airline captain and a Georgetown-based entrepreneur. He lives in the area closest to GU's main gates.

I'm a business person with a background in law and government service, and I've lived in Georgetown for over 40 years.

We know our community very well. The six full-time resident ANC 2E commissioners have lived in this community for an average of over 20 years, and we have served on ANC 2E for an average of six years. More information on our ANC commissioners is in Attachment 1 to this presentation, submitted separately today.

With us also is Ann Haas, a commissioner from ANC 3D, which includes the Foxhall Village community to the immediate west of the university.

Slide # 5: Map of Burleith, West Georgetown and Foxhall Village

Ann will speak about the impacts on that community, which are similar to the impacts on ours.

We join the Office of Planning; the District Department of Transportation; our D.C. Council Members; and the Georgetown, Burleith and Foxhall Village communities in raising fundamental concerns about the campus plan that Georgetown University has presented.

I'd like to make three overall points about the proposed GU campus plan and why our ANC has concluded that the plan should be rejected or significantly conditioned because of its objectionable impacts on the nearby community.

Slide # 6: Enrollment growth and objectionable impacts; GU's failure to provide adequate on-campus housing; and GU's failure to control objectionable off-campus behavior and conditions

Some background first, for these three points: Our ANC has looked into the proposed campus plan very closely, over a long period of time.

We know – from conversations, telephone calls, emails, letters, our own observations, and testimony at our public meetings – that there is overwhelming concern in the community about the objectionable impacts GU is having on the neighborhood. And, unfortunately, we know that the proposed campus plan not only fails to address these impacts adequately, but would make them worse.

Slide # 7: Announcement of ANC 2E special public meeting January 20

We conducted an extensive inquiry, including a long and well-attended public hearing focused exclusively on the GU campus plan.

And we have observed first-hand, over a long period of time, the objectionable impacts of Georgetown University on our community. We are, sad but true, experts on this subject.

We have considered the proposed campus plan and the facts related to it carefully and we adopted a number of findings and recommendations at a public meeting earlier this year. These findings and recommendations are filed in the record of this case.

There is a big difference between the picture GU tries to paint and actual reality. The OP and DDOT reports have gone a long way toward illuminating the actual reality – and its consequences. We commend OP and DDOT for their thoughtful, insightful work in this case.

We'll also do our best to help separate the myth from the reality on the ground. Then remedies can be designed that are effective in dealing with the actual situation – including the key remedy of providing an on-campus bed for every traditional undergraduate.

That achievable goal – 100 percent of the undergraduates having beds on campus – was supported by the University itself as recently as the 1990 campus plan. That remedy is now strongly supported by the Office of Planning, our community, our Councilmembers and our ANC. We have all examined the situation and have come to the same conclusion.

Let's look at some of the key facts, starting with the growth in GU's enrollment:

Slide # 8: Three main points, with the first point – growth in enrollment – highlighted

There has been an enormous growth in GU's enrollment over the past 10 years – a growth in both undergraduates and graduate students.

Slide # 9: Growth in GU enrollment, 2000 – 2010 – 2020

GU has increased its enrollment from under 10,000 students in 2000 to over 14,000 students now.

These are the university's own numbers – for 2000 and for 2010, and the university's projection for 2020. GU has two projections, actually, for 2020, depending on whether we look at the proposed plan as filed or the conditional amended plan.

This increase in enrollment – over 40% from 2000 to 2010 – is not what anyone

expected would happen, when GU's campus plan was examined in 2000 – at least anyone in the community. GU now admits the numbers it presented in 2000 were “confusing” – I believe that’s the word they used here last month. Everyone else – the BZA, OP and the community – all took what GU was saying to be that total enrollment would be around 10,000 students by 2010. And GU did not take appropriate steps to advise anyone to the contrary at the time.

Both undergraduate and graduate student enrollment grew over the past 10 years. Undergraduate enrollment was supposed to be capped, but GU, unlike other universities in our city, created a category of undergraduates they called “nontraditional” – students 25 or older, nursing students in a bachelor’s program as a second degree, commuters etc. – and there was no enrollment cap for those students. GU took full advantage of this.

The growth in graduate student enrollment was even larger. Here are the increases GU made in enrollment over just the past three years –

Slide # 10: 2008, 2009 and 2010 growth in enrollment – from 12,860 in 2008 to 13,350 in 2009 to 14,033 in 2010

Graduate students and non-traditional undergraduates can and often do impact the community as much as traditional undergraduates do. Many live in the community and others drive to school, adding to the traffic congestion near the University and parking on the residential streets near the University. This is discussed more fully in Attachment 3 to this presentation.

Slide # 11: Growth in GU enrollment, 2000 – 2010 – 2020

The university also added up to 500 “traditional” undergraduates over the past 10 years in addition to increasing “nontraditional” undergraduates.

Overall, during the past 10 years, GU increased its undergraduate enrollment from 6,166 in 2000 to 7,379 in 2010. That's an increase in undergraduates of over one thousand two hundred students. (1,213)

The total increase in enrollment during the past 10 years was over 4,000 students.

That is not what was supposed to happen.

When the 2000 campus plan was adopted, the university, under pressure from the community, committed to housing 780 additional undergraduates on campus in new housing called the Southwest Quadrangle. GU also said – and this is key to the whole 2000 plan – that the new on-campus housing would greatly reduce the number of off-campus students and off-campus student houses.

The university's own consultant, Lewis Bolan of Bolan-Smart consultants, testified in the 2000 hearings that

- the 2000 plan would return 75% to 80% of the off-campus group houses to single-family use; and that
- returning these houses to single family use would not only benefit the neighborhood but would benefit the D.C. economy as well.

Additional material on that prediction is in Attachment 4 to this presentation.

We relied on that – but in reality, it didn't happen. Any possibility of that happening turned out to be overwhelmed by the university's aggressive increases in enrollment over the past 10 years. Any gains to the community from the new on-campus housing in the Southwest Quad were completely negated.

Slide #12: Three main points, with the second point highlighted – GU's failure to provide adequate on-campus or other non-intrusive housing for its students

Just as total GU enrollment has grown, the number of off-campus GU students in the surrounding community – which is considered to be zip code 20007 for campus plan purposes – has also grown or at the very least, remained around the same, between 2000 and now – despite the new on-campus housing in the Southwest Quad.

Slide # 13: Number of students living off-campus in zip code 20007 in 2000 and 2009

Both the number of undergraduates and the number of graduate students living off-campus in the community are larger or about the same now compared to 10 years ago. And the number of student group homes certainly has not gone down, contrary to GU's projection. If anything, it has gone up from 20 years ago.

This was not supposed to happen.

The university's proposed plan for the next 10 years asks to grow these numbers further. Their latest proposal – to add 250 beds on campus at some fairly distant time in the future – does not come anywhere close to remedying the problem. We discuss the University's latest and highly conditional offer in more detail in Attachment 6 to our presentation.

The community is already over-saturated with GU's students. The conditions found objectionable and in need of remedy in 2000 are even more objectionable and even more in need of remedy now. The university's new campus plan would only make this situation worse.

Let's look at the on-campus student situation. The Comprehensive Plan emphasizes the importance of universities housing their students on campus. GU's record in this regard is actually very poor.

Slide # 14: Percentage of GU undergraduates living on campus

GU would have us believe that it houses a high percentage of undergraduates on campus. But the facts show otherwise.

When we analyze GU's on-campus housing using all undergraduates and using, as other universities do, only housing that is actually on-campus, the actual percentage of undergraduates housed on GU's campus is only 64 to 73 percent. (64 percent is all undergraduates, 73 percent is all full-time undergraduates using assumptions generous to GU). This is explained in Attachment 7 to this presentation.

GU has a lower percentage of on-campus housing than comparable numbers for George Washington University. GW's on-campus-housing percentage – on-campus beds available divided by the number of full-time undergraduates – for the most recent reported period, Fall 2010, is 79 percent. More information about GW's on-campus housing is in Attachment 8 to this presentation.

And in all events the Office of Planning report is right: it's the objectionable impacts on the community that are important, not the percentage comparison with other universities located in R-5 zones or other, less fragile environments. As long as the on-campus percentage is less than 100 percent of GU's undergraduates housed on campus, it forces far too many undergraduates to live off campus in the adjacent community.

The GU campus plan basically asks us to ignore what has happened in the past 10 years – the addition of over 4,000 students and the failure to make meaningful, substantial reductions as projected in the number of off-campus group houses and GU students living off-campus in the community. And now GU proposes to add some 1,000 to 2,000 students on top of this. GU tries to portray all this as “modest” – GU's word – but it is nowhere close to modest.

Slide # 15: Three main points, with the third point highlighted – GU's failure to control objectionable off-campus behavior by its students and other objectionable off-campus conditions it is causing

The impacts on our community are severe - even greater and more objectionable and more threatening to the viability of our community now than they were 10 years ago.

Let's look at some of these impacts.

Slide # 16: Major impacts from off-campus GU students (first of two slides)

Objectionable impacts include –

- Loud, disruptive alcohol-driven noise from parties in student group houses – and more group houses than ever;
- Larger and more widely advertised parties than ever, as students communicate instantly by cell phone, text messages and other new media about where the parties are – that's a new factor from 10 years ago;
- Loud, disruptive noise from group houses even when there are no parties – one resident, for example, testified that he and his wife could not let their young children go out in their own back yard even in the daytime because of the foul language and crude behavior from a group house next door;
- Loud, late night alcohol-driven noise and disruption from groups of GU students moving through the neighborhood from one party to another, or going to the M Street or Wisconsin Avenue bars – and even more so, going back home from the bars – at 2:00, 3:00 or 4:00 in the morning. This includes alcohol-driven highly objectionable conduct in public, including urinating in

public, vomiting on the sidewalks and on homeowners' property, and frequent vandalism;

Slide # 17: Major impacts from off-campus GU students (second of two slides)

- Night-time activities by students moving on foot from place to place in the community in the middle of the night that are intrusive and objectionable even if not flamboyantly loud. Students often do things outside very late at night, even when alcohol isn't involved. Houses in our community are often located right at the sidewalk, and the master bedroom is often on the second floor at the front of the house, right over the sidewalk. A group of students talking back and forth in front of one of those houses at 2:00, 3:00 or 4:00 a.m., even if they're not shouting, will wake the residents up;
- Deterioration of transient student group houses – a failure to maintain the houses or keep up the lawns or landscaping – as neither landlords nor the transient student tenants have much incentive to keep them up;
- Constant trash problems with student group houses – trash strewn around the houses, put out or left out at inappropriate times and trash piled up outside or constantly strewn on other homeowners' property and on streets and sidewalks;
- An adverse effect on the value of nearby houses and on the stability of the neighborhood. One resident recently was told by a couple looking at a house with their real estate agent in the 3400 block of N Street in West Georgetown that they were skeptical about buying it because they had been told about night-time student noise around that location, and that a similar house for sale east of Wisconsin Avenue, which didn't have the noise problem, was priced \$200,000 or some 20% higher even though the other house was of lower quality; and

- Traffic congestion on our community's streets from students and others who commute to campus; and parking on the residential streets by both off-campus students and other campus-related commuters and visitors that takes up all-too-scarce parking spaces.

The reported incidents of misconduct, while important, are only the tip of the iceberg. There are hundreds of actual disruptive incidents every weekend, and often during the week as well, that are simply unreported.

A loud shout or a curse, for example, in the middle of the night outside – it happens all the time, and it wakes residents up all the time. But what's to report, and to whom?

This is an important point – these constant incidents can and do make residents' lives miserable, and they greatly degrade the quality of the neighborhood. They will not show up in the statistics, but the residents who live here know how frequent and how disruptive they are.

GU's efforts to control this disruption fall far short of being effective. In part, that is because the sheer number of off-campus students overwhelms any effort to address the problems on a case-by-case basis.

Slide # 18: GU's student-conduct rules are more lax off-campus than on – campus. The effect is to encourage off-campus partying.

It also is because GU's own conduct rules for students help to drive students off campus when they want to party. Unlike, for example George Washington University, Georgetown University's off-campus partying rules are much looser than for on-campus parties.

Slide # 19: Comparison of GU's strict on-campus partying rules with its lax off-campus partying rules

On-Campus Partying

Partying in the Community

No weekday parties after midnight

No such limitation

No weekend parties after 2:00 a.m.

No such limitation

Two "coherent" host requirement

No such requirement

Capacity limitations

No such limitations

No serving underage students

No such prohibition

No serving intoxicated students

No such prohibition

No parties to spill out of the premises

No such prohibition

Only one keg per party

No such requirement

No glass beer bottles allowed

No such prohibition

No drinking games allowed

No such prohibition

Clean-up required by 8:00 a.m.

No such requirement

Parties must be registered with GU

No such requirement

Look at all the things GU students can't do on campus that they can do off campus.

Do students want to party, for example, during the week after midnight? On campus – can't do it, might bother the on-campus neighbors. Off-campus – no prohibition, go right ahead.

This slide is important because it shows at least two things. First, GU is fully aware of alcohol-fueled disruptive conduct by its students. And second, GU doesn't seem to mind imposing on the community objectionable conduct the University won't accept on its own property.

Slide # 20 – GU pushes undergraduates off-campus to live – enjoys all the benefits of the extra tuition – and puts all the burdens on the community

GU's monitoring and discipline system for off-campus disruptive conduct puts far too many burdens on the community –

- The burden to report everything all the time, even the unreportable, like the constant transient shouts and noise.
- The burden to make sure the noise that woke you up isn't somewhere else by the time one of the University's SNAP cars shows up – as it often is and is then duly noted by SNAP as “unconfirmed complaint”.
- The burden to make sure the students don't see the SNAP car coming, with its flashing yellow light that can be seen blocks away, or that they don't post a lookout for SNAP or MPD cars at loud parties, which they often do, so they can be quiet by the time the car arrives.
- The burden to prove to the University that the transient noise that woke you up was from a GU student, though the odds are overwhelming that it was, and exactly which student.

The bottom line is: Our community should not have to live this way, with these objectionable burdens. The zoning rules provide the tools for remedying this objectionable situation, and the time to use those tools is now.

The University had its chance, for the past 10 years, and the serious problems remain. Now strong and effective measures are needed.

This includes, above all, the University providing beds for all traditional undergraduates on campus, as called for by the unified voices of the Office of Planning, our community and community organizations, our Councilmembers, and our ANC.

Slide # 21: Map of Burleith and Georgetown west of Wisconsin Avenue

The ANC 2E findings and recommendations set out our detailed factual findings and proposed remedies for this situation and also consider transportation and other objectionable impacts that need to be mitigated. We will be happy to discuss all of this with the Commission in as much detail as the Commission would like.

Testimony of Ed Solomon, Vice Chair (Past Chair), ANC 2E

Slide # 22: ANC 2E Commissioners, identifying Ed Solomon

Chairman Hood and Commissioners,

Thank you for this opportunity to testify before you concerning the Georgetown University 2010 Campus Plan.

I have been a resident of Burleith for the past twenty-eight years.

I'm currently serving my seventh year as an Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner. My Single Member District (SMD) includes Burleith, Hillandale and North Georgetown. Four of those years I served as Chair of ANC2E and I presently chair the ANC Safety Committee.

Before I was elected to the ANC, I served for three plus years as president of the Burleith Citizens Association (BCA). Prior to that position I served as a BCA board member. I am an advisor to the Burleith Safety Committee.

I'm on the Executive Committee of the Georgetown Business Improvement District and chair the BID's Safety Committee. Until recently, I also chaired the Georgetown Business Association Safety Committee.

I'm deeply disappointed at the effects of Georgetown University's enrollment jump and that the programs the University implemented did not mitigate the impact of student group houses in West Georgetown and Burleith.

When I became president of the BCA 10 years ago one of my goals was to forge a strong relationship between the University and the community. I wanted to set a new tone in the community. To accomplish that goal, I encouraged a positive dialogue between my board and University officials. Even when some community leaders had doubts about the University's sincerity in addressing community concerns, I was adamant in trying to forge stronger bonds.

With the Southwest Quad due to come on line in 2003, I anticipated a significant improvement in the quality of life in Burleith and West Georgetown – as the University assured the community would happen.

When voted to the position as chair of ANC2E, I continued to try to nourish a partnership between the University and the community.

I supported, at least at first, the Student Neighborhood Assistance Program (SNAP), the shuttle program, and the Alliance for Local Living (ALL). I participated in community patrols with the Metropolitan Police Department. I also joined university officials with MPD in patrolling the neighborhood of West Georgetown and Burleith. I usually spent an average of one night a week in the community... usually on the weekends...average time between one to two hours. Over ten years the total would be a conservative estimate of 500 times.

I participated in meetings in residents' homes that included university officials and students from nearby group houses. At times MPD attended. I did everything I could to try to help make the university's programs work.

However, in spite of all that effort, it became apparent, especially in the last 5 years, that GU's off campus resources were overwhelmed by, and certainly did not mitigate, the sheer number of off campus students and the impact of student occupied houses in the surrounding neighborhoods. A reduction of 911 calls, for one example, did not materialize. That observation is based on statistics from MPD.

Slide # 23: MPD calls for disturbing the peace and similar offenses from 2000 to 2010 on a block with a high concentration of students compared to a block with a lower concentration of students

Slide # 24: 911 calls for disturbing the peace and similar offenses from 2006 to 2010 for blocks with students, showing trend line

The programs Georgetown University developed have been a failure.

Although GU describes SNAP as a “proactive” program, it has functioned for the most part in a reactive mode. In addition to resident calls to SNAP, I also made many calls as well. I met SNAP on location with University officials as well as MPD. Too often these homes were repeat offenders. One never knew what sanctions, if any, the university imposed as a result of a 911 call or a visit by SNAP – but whatever the university has tried, it has not been effective.

The Alliance for Local Living (ALL) program initially had large turnouts by residents of Burleith and West Georgetown. As time went on, I would witness the same people on numerous occasions telling their stories of how their lives were impacted in unacceptable – but continuing – ways. Over the years, with little results to address their concerns, residents stopped participating.

The university’s shuttle bus program was implemented with no community input. The purpose of the shuttle was to transport students to their destination within Burleith or West Georgetown. The goal was to eliminate the high volume of student traffic along residential streets late at night.

But Burleith and West Georgetown are continuing to experience large, loud, disruptive groups of students moving on foot through the neighborhood late at night. We see this night after night, and it is constantly disrupting what should be our quiet residential community.

The shuttle did nothing to mitigate the noise from off campus students in the neighborhood. The Burleith and West Georgetown neighborhood is still impacted by noise late at night. The shuttle can actually make things worse - the amount of noise that groups of students make while waiting for the bus impacts residents living nearby. The bus also serves as mode of transportation from one party to the next.

It only takes one group house to start turning a block from predominately residential to predominately group houses. There are blocks in Burleith that have gone through and are going through this conversion. Once a block begins to turn, it is impossible to reverse the trend unless the undergraduates are brought back on campus.

Most students live in the community one or two years. A group house may change occupants one, two or three times in one year, as the semesters change and then the summer students come in. However, residents are there year round . . . each year not knowing what to expect from the new occupants.

Each resident copes with out of control noise in his or her own way.

1. Do nothing hoping the noise will cease – but it won't.
2. Attempt to talk with their neighbors the next day to address their concerns – but come nightfall, it's all the same again.
3. Some buy 'white noise' machines' – but that often doesn't work, and they shouldn't have to do this.
4. Call SNAP/MPD – but that's ineffective and often the disturbance isn't reportable.
5. Attend ALL meetings – but nothing changes.
6. Give up and accept their fate – but they shouldn't have to.
7. Sell their homes – and that's bad for everyone.

From what I have witnessed over the past 10 years, the neighborhoods of West Georgetown and Burleith will continue to be degraded unless the University provides on-campus housing for all of its undergraduates and takes other steps to mitigate its objectionable impacts.

Testimony Outline of Bill Starrels, Vice Chair, ANC 2E

Slide # 25: ANC 2E Commissioners, identifying Bill Starrels

Slide # 26: Map of Burleith and Georgetown west of Wisconsin Avenue

Overview

In 2000, ANC2E adopted a resolution in support of GU's 2000-2010 Campus Plan. As an ANC 2E commissioner at the time, I presented that motion, and it passed by a 4-3 vote.

The reason the plan had majority support:

- New dormitories
- 780 new beds
- Upwards of 85% undergrads to live on campus
- Expectation from GU that off-campus group houses would shrink by 75 to 80%

Ten Years Later, No Community Support for the 2010-2020 GU Campus Plan

- Georgetown University did not live up to its word
- They wiped out housing percentage gains by adding many new students
- Lots of graduate students, too
- No decrease in off campus student group houses
- Continued deterioration of off campus student behavior

No Constituent Support

- Even some of the most ardent supporters of the 2000 campus plans are now some of the most ardent opponents of the new campus plan

WHY?

- The quality of life has deteriorated to unacceptable levels.
- Things seemed to be getting a little better after the Southwest Quad was on line in 2003 – then things quickly got worse, much worse than before.
- No one seemed to know why – after all, hundreds of new beds were built. Yet things got worse.
- Things made sense when the numbers of new students were revealed. It now made sense.
- This is why constituents who were supportive of Georgetown ten years ago are now opponents of the plan.

ABC Issues – Bars – Pizza and Students

- I have been co-chair of the ABC Committee of ANC 2E for 9 years
- I interface with restaurant and bar owners
- I have spent many late Friday nights – Saturday mornings, and late Saturday nights – Sunday mornings observing the bar scene in Georgetown for ANC 2E
- I receive both MPD and ABRA reports
- I remember some years ago MPD declaring that Georgetown turned a corner on the underage drinking problem.
- Around five years ago things started to slip again
- There is a lot of frustration by restaurant owners and their attorneys with underage drinking and fake ID's that are of higher quality
- They speak about the “attitude” of so many of the GU students concerning underage drinking – even after confronted by MPD
- Tony and Joes banned an entire GU team
- Personally observed underage students trying to gain entrance to Rhino

Philly Pizza

For the first time in my recollection, a place of business in Georgetown was shut down for complete disregard to the peace, order and quiet of a neighborhood due to unruly customers, many or most of whom were GU students.

- LOUD, unruly late-night crowds of students outside of Philly Pizza, on a residential street
- Students urinating on doorsteps
- MPD had to station a car and an officer outside of the pizza store on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights
- Brick thrown at town house at 2AM
- Many late nights with constituents who could not sleep
- Total lack of respect for the neighbors
- Sitting, shouting and eating on residential doorsteps in the middle of the night
- Pizza waste and boxes everywhere
- Ended with the D.C. government revoking the Philly Pizza certificate of occupancy and statements by the Mayor, the DCRA Director and the Attorney General
- Throughout all of this, absolutely no assistance from GU

SUMMARY

The bottom line is that the quality of life for many of my constituents, from the Georgetown waterfront to N Street NW, has been negatively affected by GU student conduct and the over-population of GU students living outside of GU's 37th Street gates. There was a brief change in the quality of life when the Southwest Quad was built that quickly deteriorated due to the increased off campus student population and the failure of GU to control off-campus student behavior.

Testimony of Jeff Jones, ANC 2E Commissioner

Slide # 27: ANC 2E Commissioners, identifying Jeff Jones

Good evening Chairman Hood and members of the Commission.

My name is Jeff Jones, and I am currently serving as Commissioner for ANC 2E Single Member District 03 (West Georgetown). I also serve on the ANC's Community Safety Team and as chair of the Community Public Works Group.

I have attended every public meeting regarding the Georgetown University 2010 Campus plan and prior to my term as Commissioner, I served on the Citizens Association of Georgetown University Relations Committee. I have been and continue to be highly active and engaged with the community on a daily basis.

There are four items I would like to cover this evening:

1. Observations and experiences of the University's adverse impact on the community , particularly in West Georgetown ;
2. The objectionable impacts of Georgetown University's off-campus townhouses known as Magis Row;
3. Difficulties in maintaining an environmentally healthy community when trash laws are ignored by GU and its off campus students; and
4. A comparison of GU's campus density – students per acre – with other universities.

1.Observations and Experiences

Slide # 28: Aftermath of a student party

Welcome to West Georgetown. This first photo is the morning- after results from a backyard pool party at a student group house.

Our entire community is designated a National Historic Landmark. It has a canopy of tree lined cobblestone streets, where families, working professionals, and elderly individuals live. It is designated an R-3 zoned single-family residential area. It is not in the same urban setting as other Universities in DC, such as GWU's R-5 and C-3 zoned tall apartment and commercial building setting, or American University's R-5, R-1b, C-1, and WH zoned areas.

As GU President DeGioia stated during his testimony, our community is "*the finest residential area that you could possibly place a university.*" However, our community absolutely suffers a great deal from Georgetown University's current campus plan, and it will only worsen if the proposed plan is implemented.

The photo you currently see is far too common in West Georgetown. This particular student house has had ongoing issues for much of this school year, and is just being used as an example of other problem party houses.

It requires significant community and city resources to deal with party houses such as this. Behind this home runs the 3300 block of N Street, where neighbors have complained to me about multiple instances of severe disturbances, trash, public drunkenness and other issues.

Sometimes neighbors will call 911, but usually they simply suffer through it. Mostly they hope that someday, it will get better, somehow. Late night parties, such as this, can easily send disturbing noise over a block away in all directions. They also contribute to a general disregard for public order within that area of the community, and public order is prerequisite for creating a safe environment.

Slide # 29: Aftermath of a smaller student gathering

This next slide is an example of a more subtle disturbance that usually affects nearby residents only. Smaller groups of students and their friends will hang out late into the night, and the eventual short bursts of loud noise will disrupt adjacent neighbors' sleep.

Imagine setting your alarm clock to randomly go off at various times throughout the night, and that is what the experience is similar to.

Rarely have I seen SNAP be proactive with these type gatherings. If you notice this group, they had seating for eight, with about 40 drinks visible. Occasionally their friends walking by would yell over the fence to them. This example lasted well after midnight on a weekday.

The blocks in West Georgetown are such that backyard parties (even small) are often echoed in an enclosed auditorium type setting. It only takes one backyard party to severely impact an entire block.

On any given night, if only 10% of the student group homes in West Georgetown have gatherings such as this, the impact can affect hundreds of neighbors. The combination of small group parties and large keg parties, and what GU refers to as “walk-by noise,” result in an unbearable condition for the community.

One last point regarding the photo above, this specific address has had multiple complaints this year, and you can see the students do not seem to be worried about consequences, since this photo was just taken this month.

Slide # 30: Photo to accompany recording of a loud, intrusive student party

This recording was sent to me by a neighbor recently, and it is an example of what typical medium-size party noise is like. This was recorded from inside the neighbor’s home.

Slide # 31: Typical complaint about student group-house noise and disruption

As an ANC Commissioner, I receive complaints from neighbors in West Georgetown. Most of the complaints are GU-related. This example of a resident

complaint is fairly typical, in that it mentions details of repeated loud party disturbances adjacent to her property.

Most of the complaints I receive are in-person, telephone and occasionally email. It should be noted, even with the various programs and strategies currently in place, the severe impact continues to be very real and detrimental to our community. GU's programs are just not working.

In May 2009, neighbors in West Georgetown became so frustrated with negative impacts, and that their complaints to the University did not produce any meaningful results, they organized and began making records of their complaints. These complaints were forwarded to the Citizens Associations, and eventually some were sent to the ANC.

Here are some of the reports in my hand. Many of these complaints include photos, dates, times and police report records. This is just a small sampling of what the community refers as "war stories."

Neighbors should be able to count on a Campus Plan that is consistent with the City of DC's Comprehensive Plan and not be forced to go to these extreme lengths in fighting for the peace and preservation of their community.

2. Magis Row

Magis Row is the marketing name of the University-owned town houses located on the West side of the 1400 block of 36th Street, outside the campus boundary.

According to the GU website, it consists of 16 townhouses with four or more undergraduates per house. They are directly across the street from elderly, families with young children, working professionals, and single mothers.

The impact is everything you would expect from housing over 60 young undergraduates, and all of their visiting friends. Sleep cycles are different, party atmosphere, late night car stereo, loud loitering noise, all occurs on a regular basis.

Housing undergraduates in Magis Row also brings a much greater flow of student traffic further up and into the community at late hours of the night, both on foot

and in cars. There could not be a more clear case of the University having a negative impact on the community, than Magis Row.

In 1990, with 6,000 less students attending GU, and in response to community demands to place their students ON campus, the University decided to place students in these off-campus townhomes. 21 years later the community can conclusively state, they really did mean on-campus and not close to campus. This is not a good neighbor policy and has caused severe negative impacts for the neighbors closest to Magis Row.

Slide # 32: MPD disturbance calls for Magis Row vs. one block to the east

MPD reports have shown that there are three times the amount of disturbance calls on the Magis Row street, than one block over on 1400 block of 35th (which has a fair share of student rentals). By “disturbance calls” I refer to the MPD categories of disorderly conduct, destruction of property, damage to property and simple assault. You can also see the number of calls have remained consistently high over the last ten years.

This is an indication that GU cannot manage the supposedly select students that are in Magis Row, which points out how difficult it is for GU to manage the remaining off-campus students throughout the community.

Last fall, neighbors adjacent to Magis Row, former Commissioner Skelsey, and I met with GU OCSL staff, the Director of Student Life and the Director of Office of External Relations and requested that the use of these townhouses to house undergraduates cease. We did not receive any reply from the University regarding our request, and they continue to house undergraduate students.

According to the 2006 Comprehensive Plan, a buffer is *an area separating two distinct land uses that acts to soften or reduce the effects of one land use on another*. There is no buffer between GU and the community with the current setup at Magis Row. In fact, the opposite is occurring. If GU is genuine about implementing a good neighbor policy, they should act upon it at Magis Row.

3. Difficulties in maintaining an environmentally healthy community

Page 7 of the campus plan states the University has *beautifully landscaped open-space*, yet the community suffers greatly with severe on-going sanitation issues.

Slides # 33, 34, 35 and 36: Trash at student group houses in West Georgetown

As part of my duties as ANC 2E Commissioner and Chairman of the ANC's Public Works Group, I work very closely with the DPW, Director Howland, members of his staff and our Lead Ward 2 SWEEP Inspector.

The Citizens of Association of Georgetown and I recently sent written testimony in support of a strong SWEEP program to the Public Works and Transportation Committee of the D.C. Council. West Georgetown and Burleith have very tough battles with student trash issues, and I regularly do walk-alongs with our Lead SWEEP Inspector.

Typically, it takes our SWEEP Inspector about 1-2 hours to issue fines for 20-30 severe violations, which are fully documented and photographed. The vast majority of houses with serious violations are student houses.

It is a severe struggle for our community to constantly be reeducating the revolving door of new students. It should be noted that on page 8 of the GU Off Campus Student Life fall 2010 report, a total of "17 trash citations" were issued by GU's Off Campus Student Life office. This very low number issued by GU seems to indicate that they are either ignoring the problem, or not issuing fines, or most likely, it is not manageable.

Residents – if not the University – can easily see 17 or more violations each day. Either way, there is a severe disparity between what is being reported by OCSL and what is actually being experienced within the community.

This also should question how accurate other OCSL and SNAP reports are. In other words, just because there is not an interaction report provided by OCSL or SNAP, does not indicate there is not a disturbance occurring within the community. Many times, I have personally witnessed SNAP drive by loud loitering disturbances or parties and do absolutely nothing regarding the disturbance.

4.Campus Density

Slide # 37: GU campus density (students per acre) compared to the top 50 U.S. News listed universities

It is not uncommon for other institutions across the U.S to provide a “student density” or a “students per acre” calculation. It simply takes the total number of students divided by main campus acreage.

With over 14,000 students attending classes on its 104 acres, GU’s main campus student density is 135 students per acre.

In order to keep the research manageable, we took a look at the density of the top 50 Universities main campuses as ranked by U.S. News and World Report. GU’s density ranking is at the bottom.

This chart indicates that GU has attempted to pack more than three times the amount of students attending classes on its main campus than the average of the top 50 universities.

If you compare universities GU considers its peer institutions, GU is approximately 7 ½ times worse in packing in students. Even if you look at top 50 Universities that have less than 200 acres on the main campus, you will find they average approximately 8,800 students attending classes and an average of 155 acres, compared to GU’s 14,000 students and 104 acres – giving GU a density that is 2.5 times worse.

Source data for the summary on the slide is in Attachment 10 to the ANC presentation. If you look at the density ranking for each individual school,

Georgetown University is at the bottom of all other schools, other than NYU and Columbia which are in the extremely high density areas of Manhattan and do not have cohesive main campuses. The result has been devastating with the overflow impact upon our R-3 zoned historic and family-oriented community.

Georgetown University, by making the community an involuntary part of its residence hall system, has placed an unreasonably high priority on its own revenue interests over the impact on the surrounding community, and now is asking for more from the community with this latest campus plan. The time is past for GU using the community for its overflow of students on its relatively small lot. We need strong remedies, and the key is for the undergraduates to have beds on campus – west of 37th Street, or elsewhere than in zip code 20007.

Concluding Testimony of Ron Lewis, Chair, ANC 2E

Slide # 38: ANC 2E Commissioners, identifying Ron Lewis

Slide # 39: Map of Burleith and Georgetown west of Wisconsin Avenue

Ten years ago, we believed GU's rosy predictions.

GU said things would be far better in our community during the 2000-2010 period, with dramatically fewer group houses, far fewer undergraduates living in the community, and effective, stepped up measures to control off campus student behavior.

Then GU spent those years adding thousands of students that no one expected – at least no one in the government or the community – with ineffective measures to deal with, let alone control, that many off campus students. The rosy predictions never materialized.

Now our community is hurting worse than ever. We need your help.

The Comprehensive Plan encourages housing students on campus and the zoning regulations say that “number of students” is a key factor in determining objectionable impacts. The way to control number of students is with enrollment caps. That is the key to – and the beauty of – OP's recommendation, which we support.

The recommendation leaves GU plenty of options, including bringing on campus the traditional undergraduate students (TUS) who now live off campus by building new housing, or by re-purposing existing buildings, by itself or in cost-saving partnerships with experienced developers; or placing these TUS in university owned or leased housing elsewhere than in the adjacent 20007 zip code community.

If GU does not want to use those options, that is its choice; and then tighter enrollment caps would phase in, until the allowable number of traditional undergraduate students equals the then-current number of on-campus beds.

This is called for and it goes to the heart of the Zoning Commission's authority.

We ask you, please, to take this unambiguous and effective action to protect our community.

Tab 2

Addresses for Group Houses Pictured in ANC 2E Commissioner Jeff Jones's Testimony

The information requested from ANC 2E Commissioner Jeff Jones about certain pictures shown with his testimony is as follows:

Slide # 28: Aftermath of a student party

The address is 3301 Prospect Street, N.W.

The photo was taken May 1, 2011, at 6:17 p.m.

Slide # 29: Aftermath of a smaller student gathering

The address is 1431 36th Street, N.W.

The photo was taken May 5, 2011, at 10:00 p.m.

Slide # 30: Photo to accompany recording of a loud, intrusive student party

The address is 1419 36th Street, N.W.

The photo was taken April 9, 2011, at 5:37 p.m.

Slide # 33: Group-house trash

The address is 3509-3511 O Street, N.W.

The photo was taken March 12, 2011

Slide # 34: Group-house trash

The addresses are 1207, 1209 and 1211 33rd Street, N.W.

The photo was taken February 27, 2011

Students often leave trash out at inappropriate times on this block and intoxicated students often knock over trash cans on this block

Slide # 35: Group-house trash

The address is 1425 35th Street, N.W., a frequent party house

The photo was taken April 9, 2011

Slide # 36: Group-house trash

The address is 3527 O Street, N.W.

The photo was taken August 12, 2010, shortly after students moved in

Tab 3

Additional Material Relating to Slide # 37, GU Campus Density (Students per Acre)

Slide # 37 in the ANC 2E presentation to the Zoning Commission on May 16, 2011, compares the density of the GU campus (students per acre) with the density of the top 50 U.S. News & World Report listed universities and with two sub-categories within that group: universities GU considers its peers/competitors, and universities that have a main campus of under 200 acres.

Detailed information supporting Slide # 37 has been submitted to the Zoning Commission in Attachment 10 to the ANC 2E presentation, May 16, 2011.

In addition, the following information is supplied:

The U.S. News & World Report list of its designated top 50 universities is at

<http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges>

The source in Slide # 37 for universities considered by GU to be its peer/competitor institutions is information from the GU Admissions Office and the National Student Clearinghouse as reported in the "Georgetown Hoya" newspaper in an article the relevant paragraph of which is as follows:

From the Hoya - October 6, 2009

As in 2008, Admissions Yield Drops 2%

By Kait Gallagher | Oct 06 2009

According to Clearinghouse and the Office of Admission, Georgetown's top 10 competitors, including Harvard University, the University of Pennsylvania, Yale University, Princeton University, Duke University, Brown University, Dartmouth University, the University of Virginia, Stanford University and Cornell.

Georgetown University's Assurances about its Ability to Comply with a Campus-Plan Decision by the Zoning Commission

Georgetown University testified at an ANC 2E meeting on October 4, 2010, that its finances would be sufficient to comply with whatever the Zoning Commission decided in the 2010-2020 campus-plan case.

Specifically, at its public meeting held on October 4, 2010, ANC 2E considered a request by Georgetown University for District of Columbia government approval of a large (\$90 million) tax-exempt revenue bond.

The community was aware of this proposal and, prior to the ANC's October 4 meeting, expressed concerns that so large a bond – to be used for purposes other than constructing (or repurposing existing buildings for) additional undergraduate on-campus housing – might be taken by GU later as an excuse for not having financing available in the event a Zoning Commission decision re the 2010-2020 campus plan should direct GU to supply more on-campus housing.

Aware of these concerns, ANC 2E chair Ron Lewis contacted the ANC's principal contact with GU, Linda Greenan, GU's Associate Vice President for External Relations. Ms. Greenan, after looking into this, assured Mr. Lewis that the bond would not adversely affect GU's ability to comply with whatever decision the Zoning Commission should issue. Ms. Greenan agreed to provide this assurance publicly in the form of a colloquy at the October 4 ANC 2E meeting, the language of which was agreed to in advance of the meeting. Mr. Lewis introduced Ms. Greenan at the October 4 meeting and told the community that there would be an agreed-upon colloquy about this, in which Ms. Greenan would give assurances to the community. Ms. Greenan then testified as follows at the October 4 ANC 2E meeting, in accordance with the colloquy to which she had agreed:

Q (Mr. Lewis): Would the issuance of the requested bonds adversely affect in any way the university's ability to finance whatever might come out of the campus-plan review process?

A (Ms. Greenan): No. These bonds will not adversely affect the university's ability to finance plan-related projects.

That colloquy is reflected in the official minutes of the ANC 2E meeting held on October 4, 2010. The relevant portion of those minutes is attached, and the entire minutes are available at <http://anc2e.com/minutes/101004minutes.pdf>

Also attached is a copy of an email from Mr. Lewis to Ms. Greenan sent in advance of the ANC 2E meeting, reflecting the agreed-upon colloquy.

Later that week, on October 7, 2010, Mr. Lewis and Ms. Greenan appeared before the D.C. Council Committee on Finance and Revenue, which was considering approving GU's requested revenue bond. Mr. Lewis informed the Committee of GU's testimony to ANC 2E that the bond financing would not adversely affect its ability to finance whatever might be required in the 2010-2020 campus plan. Ms. Greenan did not contradict that in any way.

**Minutes for the Meeting of
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2E**

October 4, 2010

Georgetown Visitation School, 35th and Volta Place, Heritage Room

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Commissioner Lewis, Chair, with Commissioners Solomon, Lewis, Golds, Birch, and Eason present, constituting a quorum. [Commissioner Skelsey later joined the meeting]

New Business

Georgetown University application for the issuance of tax-exempt revenue bonds:

Linda Greenan from Georgetown University spoke about the nature and purpose of the bonds. Discussion focused on the purpose and nature of the bonds. The Council Committee on Finance and Revenue will hold a roundtable on the bonds at 10 am on Thursday morning. Commissioner Lewis reported that District of Columbia officials have advised that: this is a federal program to make tax-exempt bonds available to nonprofit organizations; the action by the D.C. government is purely administrative and does not involve any judgment by the D.C. government as to the merits of the projects proposed to be supported or alternative projects; the bond resolution is written by the entity requesting the bond in order to comply with federal specifications; and the D.C. government has no discretion to qualify or deny a project, but must approve it as presented. In response to questions from Commissioner Lewis, Ms. Greenan clarified that: there is no relation between these revenue bonds and the upcoming Zoning Commission review of GU's 10-year campus plan; the requested bonds will not adversely affect in any way the university's ability to finance whatever might come out of the campus-plan review process; and with regard to the use of the bond proceeds in the area of west Georgetown outside the campus gates, property improvements would benefit any and all future uses of the property. Commissioner Lewis suggested, without objection, that because there is no discretion in issuing these bonds, no resolution should be proposed or adopted related to this item.

At 11:10 p.m., with no further matters on the agenda, Commissioner Lewis moved (Commissioner Golds seconded) to adjourn this public session of ANC 2E. The motion passed unanimously.

Submitted for the approval of ANC 2E,
Aaron Golds
Secretary, ANC 2E

These Minutes for the October 4, 2010 ANC 2E meeting were approved by unanimous vote of ANC 2E at its public meeting on October 31, 2010.

Email from Ron Lewis, Chair, ANC 2E, to Linda Greenan, Assistant Vice President, Georgetown University, October 4, 2010, re bond-financing colloquy:

From: **Ronald Lewis** <ronald.b.lewis@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Oct 4, 2010 at 12:40 PM

Subject: Q&A re bond financing

To: Linda greenan <greenanl@georgetown.edu>

Cc: Ed Solomon <dctuxedo@aol.com>, Bill Skelsey <billskelseyanc@aol.com>, Aaron Golds <alg53@georgetown.edu>, Bill Starrels <bill.starrels@gmail.com>

Hi Linda,

A revised Q&A, per our earlier email exchange, is below. It takes out the redundant/confusing language in the third Q.

An updated agenda is also attached. The bond discussion is the third item in New Business - all three new business items should be fairly quick, I hope.

See you tonight. Best,

Ron

Q (Ron): It seems to me that there is no relation between these revenue bonds and the upcoming Zoning Commission review of GU's 10 year campus plan. Is that right?

A (Linda): Yes, that's right. They are entirely separate.

Q: Would the issuance of the requested bonds adversely affect in any way the university's ability to finance whatever might come out of the campus-plan review process?

A: No. These bonds will not adversely affect the university's ability to finance plan-related projects.

Q: With regard to use of the bond proceeds in the area of west Georgetown outside the campus gates, would the improvements be in the nature of upgrades that would benefit any future use of the property permitted under the zoning laws?

A: The improvements would benefit any and all future uses of the property and would not in any way limit the use of the improved property to student housing.