APR 26 2000

Outline of Testimony of Charles K. Barber
Senior Counsel, The George Washington University

Brief Review of Community Dialogue and how it shaped the GW Campus Plan

I. ANC Petition of August 2, 1998

A. ANC sought February 1999 filing, claiming expiration of current campus plan on December 31, 1999

B. GW sought April 2000 filing sufficient to meet a December 31, 2000 expiration date

C. BZA agreed that GW plan expired on December 31, 2000, but as a concession to the community the BZA directed GW to file an updated plan by January 4, 2000.

-- BZA set this date so as to allow ample opportunity for all parties to review and comment and to permit the Board to take action prior to the expiration date

II. In February 1999, GW began a series of monthly meetings with a community working group consisting of ANC commissioners and representatives of the West End Citizens Association and the Foggy Bottom Association

A. The meetings were intended as a means of soliciting community views on campus plan issues which would help guide the University's planning

B. Specific topics were jointly selected for each meeting with senior University officials present for discussion

-- Vice President for Student Affairs led discussion on housing and student behavior issues

-- Vice President for Academic Affairs led discussion on academic issues

C. In July 1999, community representatives refused to continue meeting in the absence of a plan document. The University continued to encourage dialogue while a draft plan was developed.

BZA
Case No. 16553
Exhibit No. 151

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16553
EXHIBIT NO.151

D. On October 29, 1999, GW provided copies of its draft campus plan to the community for review and comment. The GW campus plan team made formal presentation to the ANC at its November and December 1999 meetings and responded to numerous questions.

-- The University listened to the community comments, and where it could, incorporated constructive comments into the plan filed on December 28, 1999.

-- Many of the issues raised by the community were beyond the scope of the campus plan.

III. Since meeting the BZA ordered filing date, GW has continued to solicit community views.

A. Some of these discussions have small group sessions and 1 X 1 meetings.

B. To provide information about the Plan, GW established a web site, a campus hotline, and placed advertisements in local media. We readily made the plan available upon request and responded to specific questions orally and in writing.

C. The University made repeated requests to the ANC for more focused discussions. The ANC did not accept these offers.

IV. At the request of the Office of Planning, the University gave up its scheduled March 29, 2000 hearing date in order to engage in facilitated discussions with community representatives prior to the April 26, 2000 hearing.

A. These discussions involved Office of Planning representatives and facilitators from Resolve.

B. The University and community representatives reached agreement on certain issues and plan to submit draft conditions for the BZA Order on these issues.

C. Other issues, while not the subject of agreement, were fully vetted during the process.

V. The University has made several changes in its Campus Plan in response to community concerns. These changes have been summarized in a revised exhibit at Tab 13.

A. Enhanced transportation management plan designed to increase to increase use of Metro by faculty, students, and staff. These efforts involve the implementations of the Metrocheck program for faculty and staff and providing "SmartCards" and Metro information to incoming students.

B. Increased efforts to address off campus student behavior issues including the use of a hotline, establishing "good neighbor" programs for students, and working with local management companies.

C. Proposed an enhanced campus amenities plan

-- to be discussed by our architect

D. Agreed to establishment an Advisory Committee for on-going quarterly meetings.

E. Significantly increased the amount of on-campus housing.

F. When the plan was filed last January, the University's plan included some 310 new units on campus. Since that time, the University has identified two new priority housing sites which will add another 400 beds. This doubling of new beds will bring the total number of beds on campus from 3519 currently to more than 4250.

VI. University's commitment to housing

A. Up to now, the University has guaranteed a bed to every undergraduate who comes to the University and stays in our housing program. There has been no requirement that students live in University housing, but we have encouraged it.

B. After extensive discussions with OP and the community, the University has agreed to – for the first time – require freshman and sophomores to live in University owned and controlled housing. This is a significant departure from our previous operation. Freshman and sophomores, with carve outs for nontraditional students, were selected because their youth and relative immaturity render them most in need of the guidance University housing provides. Our data shows that these students account for most of the infractions under GW's Student Code of Conduct.

C. A second major accommodation the University is willing to commit to is provide housing for at least 60% of the entire full time undergraduate population at designated locations during the life of

the Plan. The 60% figure is historically a high figure for GW. For most of the life of the 1985 Plan, the University provided housing for no more than approximately 50% of the full time undergraduates. The designated locations would include all existing housing sites, commercial zones, and the higher density residential squares immediately adjacent to the campus in which the University already owns a significant number of properties.

D. The 60% requirement has the added benefit of acting as an indirect cap on the number of undergraduate students. As stated by Dr. Linebaugh, the University has proposed the same cap on total student as in the 1985 Plan. A separate, hard cap on undergraduates would unfairly hinder the University's ability to respond to market forces which vary the relative number of graduate and undergraduate applicants for reasons beyond the University's control. By tying the number of beds to the number of undergraduate students, however, the University -- for the first time – has effectively agreed to check the growth of its undergraduate population.

E. The University believes it might be able to provide more undergraduates housing and has a goal of 80% over the life of the Plan. The University cannot guarantee it will meet this figure, however, because it depends on the ability to construct housing on sites that are not now assembled. The University is prepared to report regularly to the BZA and the community its progress in moving towards this goal.

F. We would urge the BZA not to impose conditions based on the assumption that all the students GW does not house automatically flood the Foggy Bottom community. We do not believe this assumption is supported by reliable data. While we do not have perfect numbers concerning the addresses of our off campus students, our best data indicate that fewer than 800 undergraduates live in the District outside of University housing. We realize that all parties have an interest in exactly how many undergraduates live in Foggy Bottom and thus the University has committed to institute policies to collect this information during the life of the Plan and report it to the BZA and the community.

G. Finally, we have agreed to explore these and other issues in discussions convened by the Office of Planning during the time prior to next month's continued hearing date. Any further changes in our Plan will be reported at that time.