Paul A. Tummonds, Jr.
202.457.7854
ptummonds@wilkesartis.com

Wilkes Artis

Chartered
Attorneys at Law

Suite 300, 1666 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-2803
202.457.7800
Fax: 202.457.7814

'00 APR 28 P12:26
OFFICE OF ZONING
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MEMORANDUM

BY HAND DELIVERY

TO: Beverly Bailey

FROM: Paul Tummonds

DATE: April 28, 2000

RE: BZA Case No. 16565 – Georgetown University - St. Mary's Hall
Transcript of BZA Public Hearing – April 18, 2000

As we discussed, enclosed please find 10 copies of the transcript for the portion of the BZA Public Hearing on April 18, 2000 regarding the Georgetown University – St. Mary's Hall Building application (BZA Case No. 16565). The BZA was unable to complete this case on April 18, 2000 and continued the Public Hearing until May 10, 2000.

At the April 18th Public Hearing, Chairperson Reid asked that she receive a copy of the transcript so that she could participate in this case. It is our hope that Commissioner Moulden could also read this transcript and be able to participate in this case at the May 10th Public Hearing. I have included copies for all five BZA Commissioners (Reid, Sockwell, Renshaw, Moulden, and Mitten) as well as copies for the OZ staff.

If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please feel free to call me at (202) 457-7854.

Enclosures

cc: Andrea Salley (by fax w/o encl.)
Maureen Dwyer

BZA
Case No. 16565
Exhibit No. 55

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16565
EXHIBIT NO.55A1

GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

OFFICE OF ZONING
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
'00 APR 28 P12:26

EXCERPT ONLY OF

CASE NO. ~~16483~~ 16565

~~GEORGETOWN HOMEOWNERS' ALLIANCE~~

Georgetown University – St. Mark's Hall

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

APRIL 18, 2000

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing of the above-referenced case was held in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, at 4:10 p.m., Sheila Cross Reid, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

SHEILA CROSS REID	Chairperson
ROBERT N. SOCKWELL	Vice Chairperson
RODNEY L. MOULDEN	Board Member
ANN RENSHAW	Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN	Commissioner

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

Sheri Pruitt, Secretary, BZA
Beverly Bailey, Office of Zoning
Paul Hart, Office of Zoning
John Nyarku, Office of Zoning

OTHER AGENCY STAFF PRESENT:

Steven Cochran, Office of Planning
Mary Vogle, Office of Planning

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(4:10 p.m.)

MEMBER SOCKWELL: We'll just go forward with the Georgetown University case. Will the applicant please come forward, with all witnesses?

SECRETARY PRUITT: Application 16565, Application of Georgetown University, pursuant to 3104 for a special exception under Section 210 for further processing of an approved campus plan to permit a minor addition to the existing St. Mary's Hall Building, renovation of the entrance to the building, and redesignation of the use to category of the building from residential to mixed use, in an R-3 District at Reservoir Road, Square 1321, Lot 1.

All those planning to testify, would you please stand and raise your right hand? Everyone planning to testify in reference to Georgetown University case?

(Witnesses sworn.)

Vice Chair, let me -- there's been a change here. I have --

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Just don't call me "Madam."

SECRETARY PRUITT: I know. I almost --

(Laughter.)

-- almost slipped. Almost slipped.

We have three requests for party status, and I'm handing them to you here now. The ANC is, of course, automatically a party. And there is a request from the Cloisters in Georgetown Homeowners Association, the Burleith Citizens Association, and Georgetown Residents Alliance.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Okay. Will --

SECRETARY PRUITT: You need to make a determination.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Will the representative of Cloisters, representative of Burleith, and the representative of the Residents Alliance come forward?

SECRETARY PRUITT: I believe also their written information is in your file.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Okay.

MS. DWYER: And, Mr. Sockwell, for the record, the applicant opposes those requests for party status for failure to meet the filing requirements.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right. The Cloisters, representing 32 homes and/or lots located along Reservoir Road, etcetera, etcetera, consider yourselves particularly aggrieved by this. What kind of an -- are you a charter organization of some sort, or are you ad hoc? Are you -- how are you founded?

MR. HOPKINS: We're a D.C. corporation.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right. That's fine.

SECRETARY PRUITT: Excuse me. Sir, can you speak from the mike? You can sit down. You can have a seat. Actually, the table mikes are a little easier for everyone to hear, if you don't mind using them, if you can. And also, identify yourself, please.

MR. HOPKINS: My name is Stephen A. Hopkins. I'm President of the Cloisters in Georgetown Homeowners Association. We are a D.C. corporation representing the owners of some 32 homes and/or lots running on Reservoir, Winfield Lane, and 35th Street. We are located within 100 yards or so of the campus and St. Mary's Hall.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: When did you submit your request for party status?

MR. HOPKINS: I don't have it -- the date in front of me, sir, but I think you'll find it was --

SECRETARY PRUITT: April 1st. It's Exhibit 31. So it's --

MR. HOPKINS: It was sometime in March, I believe.

SECRETARY PRUITT: Is this from Burleith?

MR. HOPKINS: No.

SECRETARY PRUITT: I'm sorry. Excuse me.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Dated March 30th.

SECRETARY PRUITT: March 30th.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: It was received March 30th.

MR. HOPKINS: That is correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes, okay.

SECRETARY PRUITT: It's Exhibit 24 in your package.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes. Is there a reason -- so what -- under the rules they have to submit within --

SECRETARY PRUITT: The submission is timely. It's whether or not they've met the criteria.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes. And -- yes, go ahead.

MS. DWYER: Mr. Sockwell, I have a couple of points on the criteria. In looking at Section 3106.2(e)(3), it requires that the person filing for party status identify the distance between the properties they represent and the subject of the BZA case, and they fail to do so here.

And, in fact, there are actually two homeowners associations in Cloisters. It is Cloisters West that is immediately adjacent and within 200 feet

of St. Mary's. The Cloisters in Georgetown, as has been testified, is at 35th Street and Reservoir Road and is quite removed from St. Mary's.

The same section of the regulations also requires that you identify impacts from the requested action, and the filing here only contains a general statement about property values and quality of life. It also refers to the impacts of a parking garage which is not the subject of this application. It refers to the termination of dormitory use, which is not part of this application. And it does not refer to any specific impacts from the construction at St. Mary's.

We have no objection to them appearing as a person and offering testimony, but we don't believe they meet the filing requirements for party status.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: There is a specific reference to traffic congestion. And while they do represent 32 separate properties within the vicinity, are they within -- are you within the proximity -- are any of the properties that you represent close enough to be considered within the range of -- would put you really in a party status location?

MR. HOPKINS: Well, if I could, as a practical matter, I can certainly tell we're going to

be heavily impacted by this. I don't know what your linear feet requirement is, but those familiar with the area can determine quite readily that we're, you know, roughly half a block away from the beginning of the university boundary. And that boundary is only a few feet away from St. Mary's Hall, so I think we're quite close.

Certainly, traffic on Reservoir Road, the possibility of increased off-campus housing, all of those things will directly impact our homeowners.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And that the actual construction size is quite small.

MR. HOPKINS: Well, if I may, sir, that's one of the points that we would like to hear more about. This, as you know, falls into a much broader problem, with which we have had a long and continually historic --

MEMBER SOCKWELL: I understand that, and certainly we are sensitive to the issue of university construction and the surrounding communities. But, again, we are taking about a fairly minor element of construction.

MR. HOPKINS: I think that in itself is an issue, isn't it, the degree of -- I don't think we're prepared to concur at this point that this is minor.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Well, as an organization, I think that you may have a right to party status.

Does anyone else on the Board have --

MR. HOPKINS: If the distance is a factor, Winfield Lane, which is used by all of our residents at one time or another, enters off Reservoir Road, within, what, 50 feet of the university property and very close to that. So anything that affects that entrance to the university, right in front of St. Mary's Hall, is going to -- 50 feet or so, whatever, from Winfield Lane, which is used very actively by all of our homeowners. So anything that affects it would affect us.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Mr. Sockwell?

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Ms. Dwyer, is your objection basically that they didn't file -- that they didn't meet the proper filing requirements, or that they really -- even if they had met the requirement, they're not eligible to be a party?

MS. DWYER: It's both. The purpose of the filing requirements is so they can set forth the issues that entitle them to party status. And on the basis of what they filed, and given their position in

terms of distance -- I think he testified they're about 300 yards, I think, from St. Mary's -- it puts them outside of the distance of impact area.

And I think that the homeowners association within that community, which is Cloisters West, which is directly adjacent, is best able to represent the interests of that community, not someone who is further down at 35th and Reservoir.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. Mr. Hopkins, is your group a part of the Georgetown Residents Alliance?

MR. HOPKINS: I believe that we are.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay.

MR. HOPKINS: No. Excuse me. We are not.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: You're not.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Well, I would want to think that -- unfortunately, I don't have -- I'm not showing the map that we've had that would give me a more complete picture of your specific development in this particular case file. And that -- I've had it before, but I don't have it in this case file.

I would be willing to -- unfortunately, for lack of better information, and because if the proximity of the boundary of your organization is within the required distance for notification of

homeowners within your group, that you have the right to speak for those homeowners, and I would be willing to grant you party status.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Mr. Vice Chair, I support that.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Okay. So you would receive party status, then.

Burleith Citizens Association, please.

MS. SCOLARO: Yes, I'm here. I'm Patricia Scolaro, the President of the Burleith Citizens Association.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: How do you spell that, please?

MS. SCOLARO: My name or Burleith?

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yours.

MS. SCOLARO: S-C-O-L-A-R-O. First name is Patricia.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Okay. And your organization is?

MS. SCOLARO: The Burleith Citizens --

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Is your organization an incorporated citizens association, etcetera?

MS. SCOLARO: Yes, it is.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And you represent citizens within what approximate range?

MS. SCOLARO: A four square block area directly across from the university and directly across from St. Mary's Hall, across Reservoir Road.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So you're next to --

MS. SCOLARO: No, we're in the opposite direction. I'm sorry. I'm assuming you were pointing to this gentleman. Yeah.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So you're --

MS. SCOLARO: We're north of the university, across Reservoir Road.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right.

MS. SCOLARO: And north of St. Mary's Hall.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And your letter states that your particular grievances are --

MS. SCOLARO: In addition to any exterior change, our issue is pertaining to the use. This has been a dormitory and defined as a residence, for use as a residence. And what they're asking is to change the use to -- and I may not have the terminology correct, but to eliminate the dormitory and turn it into an administrative facility or a mixed use facility. So our issue is with the use of the facility.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right.

MS. DWYER: Mr. Sockwell?

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes.

MS. DWYER: In looking at that filing, it doesn't meet the filing requirement of being filed two weeks in advance. Although the letter is dated April 1st, it wasn't filed with the BZA until April 7th, so it doesn't meet the two week in advance requirement.

MS. SCOLARO: Excuse me, but it was faxed to Ms. J. R. Kress on April 3rd, which was a Monday, and the hard copy was to arrive in the mail. So it was faxed on April 3rd.

MS. DWYER: The file is -- the copy that's in the BZA record is date stamped April 7th, and that's the only one that we were able to find in the record.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Our Exhibit Number 25, if you have that, is -- well, actually, it has the 3, and initials written on it. And then at the top of the page, the 3rd, it came through on the fax.

MS. DWYER: All right. The copy of the letter we have, I guess it's the hard copy and it's date stamped April 7th.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And my copy isn't date

stamped at all.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Do you have any other objection, besides the --

MS. DWYER: No. The only other point is really one of clarification. In the last full paragraph of the letter, it suggests as an issue things that are not the subject of this case, which are campus plan issues. And I just want it understood that what we're looking at today is a further processing at St. Mary's Hall. We are not starting the 2000 campus plan case today; that would be next month. And I just wanted it clear.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I think we all understand that.

MS. DWYER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Thank you.

So aside from the date, you have no objection to --

MS. DWYER: Yes. We don't have any objection.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So have we -- I still haven't found in this file that exhibit number. It looks like there's an overwrite on that. All right.

I would suggest in this case that we could waive the rules and let this stand --

MS. DWYER: I agree.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: -- and grant party status.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I agree.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Georgetown Residents Alliance.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, my name is Don Crockett. I'm Chairman of the Georgetown Residents Alliance, which is a civic association incorporated in the District of Columbia, with more than 250 members.

Our interest in this case, as was stated by the representative from Burleith, is the same. What is proposed here is a significant change in use on the existing campus plan for St. Mary's Hall from a dormitory into office space, which will have an incredible impact on the surrounding community, on -- not just in the close proximity of St. Mary's Hall but in all of the communities surrounding the campus, because when you take 415 beds that are programmed on the current campus plan, change -

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I think we want to just stick to sort of, you know, general issues related to impact.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Well, I am --

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Not specific --

MR. CROCKETT: -- I am in the -- to the issue that she raised about being in proximity.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: When you change the use, that affects everyone in the area because those students who are no longer able to be accommodated on campus are housed next to us, and that creates horrible noise and traffic problems. That is our interest in this case.

I would add that my application is one day late. It was filed on April 5, under the false assumption on my part that the hearing was on Wednesday, which it usually is. And that is the reason why it was late, and I would ask that the Board waive the rules for that mistake on my part because I just was not aware that this was on Tuesday rather than Wednesday.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right.

MS. DWYER: Mr. Sockwell?

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes.

MS. DWYER: We object in terms of meeting the filing requirement. There's a reference to 250 members who reside in Georgetown. There's no indication where they reside in Georgetown, how close

these members may be to the subject of the BZA application.

The whole point of party status is to give someone who is going to be more significantly, distinctly, or uniquely affected by the application party status as opposed to persons in the general public. The issues that Mr. Crockett seems to be raising are more general issues, and we think that they are well represented by others in the larger community, and that there's no basis for party status.

There is also no specific reference to, you know, again, the distance requirement or the specific impacts of this project on any member of the Georgetown Residents Alliance.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Mr. Crockett, in as few words as possible, would you explain or express the proximity of most of the members of the Alliance to the campus, and St. Mary's Hall in particular.

MR. CROCKETT: The members reside throughout historic Georgetown in all sections thereof. Mrs. Zartman, who is going to testify here, is secretary. She lives in the Cloisters. We have other members in the Cloisters, and we have members that are right next to the campus, and we have members that are in all locations in historic Georgetown.

And as I pointed out before, we are here to talk about the impact of this change of use upon everybody in Georgetown, just not those in close proximity. Everybody in Georgetown will be affected by this proposed change of use.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: I would be inclined not to grant party status to your organization, but to allow you to testify as a representative for the group.

MR. CROCKETT: I'm not here to testify, Your Honor. I'm here to actually represent -- and I will represent the Burleith Association as a party, as a lawyer, to cross examine the witnesses.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: I see. And with regard to the Residents Alliance, who was or is to be spokesperson for that?

MR. CROCKETT: I will be the spokesperson, but I just have a statement to submit.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Then I will allow you to submit your statement, but would decline the Residents Alliance request for party status.

MR. CROCKETT: Very good.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right. Any other preliminary --

MS. DWYER: Mr. Vice Chair?

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes.

MS. DWYER: I just noticed that we were handed out today another request for party status from the Cloisters West Homeowners Association, and that is the -- a document dated April 13th.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Is there a representative of Cloisters West? Would you come forward, sir?

You all may return to your seats. Thank you.

Identify yourself.

MR. SPENCER: Yes. Can you hear me?

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes.

MR. SPENCER: My name is Sidney D. Spencer. I am here on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Cloisters West Homeowners Association.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And, Mr. Spencer, your property is located directly adjacent.

MR. SPENCER: We -- the Cloisters West Homeowners Association, which consists of 109 homes, 15 of which actually share a property line with Georgetown University, immediately adjacent to St. Mary's Hall -- and perhaps that same number or a few more are within a street's width of St. Mary's Hall --

we are completely different legally, organizationally, and policy-wise than the organization known as the Cloisters in Georgetown, which you just granted party status to.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And your issues particularly for your homeowners -- in particular, the 15 who share the property line and/or others whose homes and/or points of access are affected directly by or assumed to be affected directly by this proposed project --

MR. SPENCER: Any activity there has a direct impact on us. It's our backyard, literally.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So you wish to present yourselves to review, at this point, what is being proposed.

MR. SPENCER: We wish to present ourselves as being in support of the proposal, because we do not want to see that revert to the dormitory status that it had a number of years ago. That's the essence of our concern.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Now, your letter was submitted to us on the -- well, it's dated the 13th.

MR. SPENCER: That's right. That's correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And you are asking us to

waive the rules to allow --

MR. SPENCER: Yes. I might say by way of explanation that we had planned to present testimony, which -- and there are a number of us here today to do that. It was not until we read that the Cloisters in Georgetown, the Cloisters -- the organization -- much further from the university and to the east of us had requested party status, and, in effect, was at odds with the position of those of us who live closer to the university. The result: we were late getting it in. That's the long and short of it.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: I see. Would one person -- you would be the representative. Can you become the representative of the views of your organization?

MR. SPENCER: Yes. I have been authorized by the Board of Directors of the Cloisters West Homeowners Association, which is a covenanted -- ungated covenant community -- to represent their interest in this matter.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right. With the exception of the tardiness of the application for party status, would the applicant have any other objection to this particular organization?

MS. DWYER: No, we have no objection to their being accorded party status.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Even with the lateness of the filing? Because you've objected to the others.

MS. DWYER: Yes. Even with the lateness, because I think of --

MEMBER RENSHAW: But why?

MS. DWYER: As was testified, the late -- the filing in this case by Cloisters West was to -- in response to and to clarify their position within the Cloisters community, to make clear to the Board that there are two organizations and that there's being the one closest is in support.

MEMBER RENSHAW: But that could be done with filing testimony, right?

MS. DWYER: Right. I agree. But I have no objection to them being accorded party status.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Well, because of their proximity -- the 15 homes sharing a property line -- I would say that since we have waived the rules to allow tardy filings on the other organizations that we could as well do that for this one.

MS. DWYER: I agree.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, if I might -- Don Crockett again.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes, sir.

MR. CROCKETT: In that event, I would like

some clarification on the grounds for the denial of my motion.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Your organization is a community-wide organization, rather than one focused most closely upon the boundaries of the campus and the proximity of St. Mary's Hall. In the other case, the gentleman's property owners have 15 homes that share a property line with the university campus, proximate to this particular project. As well, the total of 109 homes are in a tight knot, closely associated with the campus environment.

And I would say that on that basis they are far more focused to the specific issues of immediate effects of this construction than would your organization be. Your organization certainly has a broad impact and a broad interest in Georgetown as a whole, and certainly would have a particular interest in the university, being part of the Georgetown environment.

But still, this is a more focused position, and I assume him to be more deserving of party status for his organization for that reason.

MR. CROCKETT: I just wanted to make clear that it wasn't on the grounds that I was a day late.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: No, sir.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right. Now, the ANC has requested party --

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: ANC is an automatic party.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes, I know.

SECRETARY PRUITT: For clarification, because I was out of the room, I just wanted to -- Mr. Spencer will be representing Cloisters West. Who will be representing Burleith, and who will be representing Cloisters East?

MS. SCOLARO: I will be representing --

SECRETARY PRUITT: You need to come to the mike, please.

MS. SCOLARO: I'm sorry.

SECRETARY PRUITT: So these will be the only spokespersons during cross examination.

MS. SCOLARO: My name is Patricia Scolaro. I'm President of Burleith Citizens Association, and I will be representing Burleith.

SECRETARY PRUITT: Could you spell your last name, please?

MS. SCOLARO: S-C-O-L-A-R-O.

SECRETARY PRUITT: Thank you.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right. Yes, sir?

MR. HOPKINS: Steve Hopkins from Cloisters.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes, sir.

MR. HOPKINS: I will be the party of record. Mr. Crockett, however, will probably be handling --

SECRETARY PRUITT: I'd like to know who is going to be actually doing the cross examination, so we can keep that straight.

MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Crockett.

SECRETARY PRUITT: That'll be Mr. Crockett?

MR. HOPKINS: Yes.

SECRETARY PRUITT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Mr. Vice Chair?

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: You know, at 4:00, we had said that we were going to try and hear two cases in the two hours that we had left, and I think in fairness to the Kingsbury people we should tell them now that it is not going to happen today.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Unless they are willing to stay later.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I believe Ms. Renshaw has to leave at 6:00.

MEMBER RENSHAW: No later than 6:30.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: They are in the other room, the applicants.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Well, let's get started with this and see where we go with it. When we -- it has been -- because the schedule was reset once, Ms. Dwyer has requested that her case be heard in the order that we adjusted it to, and I don't think that we should keep adjusting.

Proceed.

MS. DWYER: Thank you. We will begin, and let me tell you from the outset that we have eliminated two of our witnesses, so we are going to be very focused in what we believe are the issues in this case.

For the record, I am Maureen Dwyer with Wilkes, Artis, counsel for Georgetown University, the applicant in this case.

We are here today to request special exception approval for a minor addition to St. Mary's Hall. This is a further processing or second stage case under an existing campus plan. As we indicated in our pre-hearing submission, the existing campus plan continues through December 31st of this year, and this will probably be the last further processing case

under that campus plan.

This is a very straightforward and very uncomplicated case. As described in our pre-hearing statement, and as the witnesses will address, the application involves the addition of 427 square feet to St. Mary's Hall. That is why we are here.

If the renovation work could be done completely on the interior, without any addition of space, then it is a matter of right under the existing campus plan. It is simply the addition of that space that requires us to come before you.

We have attached as Exhibit 4 to our prehearing submission the pages from the existing campus plan that show the mixed use category of St. Mary's. Under the current campus plan, it is designated for mixed use, education, educational support, and residential. What that mixed use category means is that the building can be devoted to any one of those three uses, or all three of those uses in combination.

The uses that are proposed for St. Mary's following this renovation include the nursing school, the information technology group, and the employee credit union, and all of those uses fall within the existing mixed use category under the existing campus

plan. The fact that we are adding 425 feet is why we are here before you.

What we had pointed out in our prehearing submission is that at the time of the last campus plan St. Mary's was identified as one of three potential housing sites on the campus. There was no requirement that housing be located here. It was simply identified as a possible site.

Instead, what the university has done is provide housing on other locations on campus, including increasing the capacity of the southwest quad dorm project. So St. Mary's is no longer needed as a potential housing site, and some of you may have participated in the decision last year on the southwest quad project.

That southwest quad project completed the university's housing commitment under its existing campus plan.

Beginning on page 8, our prehearing statement sets forth our compliance with the special exception requirement. As the witnesses will testify, the use is so located but is not likely to be objectionable due to noise, traffic, or number of students. We are not requesting an increase in enrollment or staff, nor are we adding or taking away

parking. The changes are nominal and fully in compliance with the campus plan and the regulations.

I am not going to walk through the statement and the exhibits, but I hope that you have had the time to do that. And it does set forth our compliance with the zoning requirements.

We started out this afternoon wanting to request expedited approval because it's important that this project begin immediately in order to have it online in the fall 2001 semester. I will revisit that issue at the end of the hearing. And in light of the fact that some of the Board members are not here, that may not be possible.

But this certainly is a very important project, which is why it's being filed now. The expectation is it will take 15 months to complete the work, and the nursing school obviously wants to be back in as soon as possible.

Following -- or the first witness that we will have will be Linda Greenan, and she is going to describe the process of presenting this concept, this project, to the community as well as the university's compliance with its housing commitment. She will be followed by Alan Brangman, the university architect, who will describe the plans.

And then we have eliminated the representative of the nursing school, and the information technology group, since we don't believe that the issues are really questions for them. In the event there are questions, they are in the audience and they can be called up to answer them.

But I think the two key points that we want to focus on are, one, the process that we have followed with the community; and, two, the fact that this is a very small addition of space but very much needed by the university.

And with that, I'd like to ask Linda Greenan to give her testimony.

MS. GREENAN: Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Vice Chair and members of the Board. My name is Linda Greenan, and I am Assistant Vice President for External Relations at Georgetown University.

I was hired by Georgetown University in 1994 to help promote a stronger working relationship between the university and the community, which includes the neighborhoods bordering the campus as well as the larger District of Columbia community.

In my role, I serve as the university's representative to all of the community associations in our neighborhood, including ANC-2E. I also report

directly back to the President, so there is always a direct line of communication.

My testimony will focus on two issues -- one, the process we have followed in informing the community about our plans for St. Mary's; and, two, the university's fulfillment of its housing commitment made to the BZA back in 1990 when our existing campus plan was being approved.

First, as to the process. As part of our last campus plan approval, the Board imposed as a condition a quarterly meeting process between the university and representatives of 14 community organizations. That process has been strictly followed by the university. In the 10 years since we've -- since our campus plan was approved, we've had close to 40 meetings with these organizations.

In fact, the first time we discussed St. Mary's with the community and the offlining of that facility as a residence hall was in 1996 and was in the context of a BZA quarterly meeting that was chaired by the Burleith Association. We actually have with us a copy of the agenda, which we could file into the record.

It was at that time that we began our discussion about the construction of a new dormitory,

which has now since been called the southwest quadrangle and was approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment I believe in 1998. We are fully underway with that, in terms of our preconstruction.

Most recently, the St. Mary's project has been discussed with the community, also during a quarterly meeting process. Attached to our prehearing statement at Tab 16 is the notice of the January 24, 2000, quarterly meeting. The purpose of that meeting was to discuss both St. Mary's Hall as well as our campus plan.

Prior to that time, we also met with members of the Cloisters West community. Also, the Burleith community was in attendance at that meeting. We held a special meeting to discuss current plans with St. Mary's as well as the Fox Hall Citizens Association. I believe that that sign-in sheet is made part of the record.

That meeting was held -- that special meeting was held on January 11, 2000, and it is -- the sign-in sheet is attached as Exhibit 15.

We also made a presentation to the ANC -- ANC-2E -- at its February 29, 2000, public meeting, and a copy of that notice is attached as Exhibit 17 to our prehearing submission. The ANC subsequently

decided not to take a position on the application, and they have filed a letter in the record to that effect.

To summarize the process, to date we have been completely open about our plans for St. Mary's and have made every effort to inform the community and to provide them with an opportunity to comment on the proposal. There are several letters in the record from individual residents indicating their full support of the project.

The second point I would like to make is equally important, and it has to do with the issue of on campus housing and whether the St. Mary's Building is needed for student housing.

The short answer is that we believe that the university has fulfilled its on campus housing commitment as set forth in the 1990 campus plan. At the time of our last campus plan, the university negotiated with the community a commitment to provide additional on campus housing for its undergraduate students. That commitment was described in Appendix H to our campus plan.

Specifically, the university committed to increase the number of undergraduate beds on campus by 925 beds. That commitment was contingent upon the university's ability to finance the beds, and also, as

outlined in the BZA order approving our plan, was contingent upon the approval and construction of the cogeneration facility.

That facility was important because it would have enabled the university to significantly reduce its energy cost and thus provide monies needed for the new dormitory construction as well as the ongoing maintenance of those new dorms.

As you are aware, the cogeneration facility was never built due to community opposition. The university at that time -- in fact, it was discussed internally about whether it was, in fact, still obligated to provide the on campus housing. But we decided that we had a commitment to the community to increase our on campus housing, and we have gone ahead and developed the southwest quadrangle, the key component of which is a 780-bed residence hall.

Attached to our prehearing submission as Exhibit 8 is a summary of the university's housing commitment and where we stand today. As discussed on page 1, in 1990, the university committed to provide 925 beds on campus and identified three projects as potential housing sites.

As Ms. Dwyer has previously stated, one of these projects was St. Mary's, and at that time it had

217 students living in it. When we offlined it in 1996, which we went to the community and told them we were doing, there were 217 students living in that building at the time. We moved every single one of those students into Darnall Hall. Not one of them went into the community. So they have all remained on campus, and the St. Mary's Hall has been offlined since 1996.

The other commitment with respect to our beds, the other -- there were two other projects identified in the campus plan, our 1990 campus plan, and one was LXR. And in 1991, the university received approval for the renovation of LXR, and that project was brought online in 1994.

I believe you have in your packet the information about how many beds were brought online as a result of that. It was around 190.

So, therefore, the university completed the first of the three projects with LXR, and then two years later we have begun to increase the capacity of our residential on campus housing by 780 beds with the southwest quad. So we believe that once that building is completed -- and we are on track, we are on schedule -- that we will have more than fulfilled our commitment for on campus housing. We will have added,

at that time, 1,083 undergraduate beds since 1990.

We further believe that by relocating the students from St. Mary's to the new southwest -- the southwest quadrangle we will have brought -- provided student housing in a location that is removed from the surrounding residences and is much more conducive to student dormitory use than was the existing St. Mary's Building.

In summary, we strongly believe that this project makes sense in terms of its use and location and that your approval in no way detracts from the strong commitment the university has made to on campus housing. For all these reasons, we ask for your approval.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Thank you.

MS. DWYER: Mr. Vice Chair, may I suggest that Mr. Brangman completely his testimony, and then the questions be of both witnesses at one time. And in terms of Mike Bartholf, who is the Director of Transportation at the university, we will have him available to answer questions that may come up in terms of traffic or parking, but he will not directly testify.

And with respect to Mr. Brangman, I'd like to submit for the record his resume and ask that he be

qualified as an expert witness in the field of architecture.

MR. BRANGMAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Vice Chairman, members of the Board. My name is Alan Brangman. I'm the university architect and Director of Facilities Planning for Georgetown University. I've been in that position since 1994 and am primarily responsible for all of the projects that Georgetown either undertakes with respect to new construction and/or renovation.

So a couple of the projects that Ms. Greenan has spoken about, the southwest quadrangle, which is a 780-bed residence hall, 1,200-seat dining facility, 800-car parking garage, new bus maintenance facility, as well as a new Jesuit residence, something that, as she mentioned, a project that you guys have seen in the last 18 months. And also, recently we were before you with the Leavey book store addition, which were similar in the sense that these were projects that required BZA approval because they were adding square footage to the campus.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Mr. Brangman, let me just interrupt you for a minute.

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Does anyone have a

problem with Mr. Brangman being considered an expert witness?

Thank you. Proceed.

With respect to St. Mary's, I would very quickly step through this. We do have the architect with us today, Cal Bowie of Bowie Gridley, who is the architect of record. But I think because we have provided you with extensive documents as part of the application package, it probably makes the best sense -- and also because of the time issues that we've got -- for me to step through this very quickly, and we'll kind of highlight the aspects of both the building and the plan, and then also address some of the issues with respect to the zoning concerns for you.

With respect to campus context, St. Mary's is located in the northeastern quadrant of the campus, as was mentioned earlier. In fact, I would like to just pass a photo around for the Board members. This is St. Mary's here, which is in the northeastern quadrant. North should be up, but we've reversed the photograph.

This is the Cloisters West. These are the 15 houses immediately adjacent to St. Mary's. This is Lot B/Lot A, which I'll speak to in reference to Reservoir Road, and then Burleith is north of that.

St. Mary's is next to the main entrance to the hospital, which is also known as Entrance 1. It is immediately adjacent to 38th Street, which is the street that goes north into the Burleith neighborhood. As I mentioned, parking lot A is due west, parking lot B is on the north, and then the Cloisters West is on the east. To the south is Darnall Hall, which was the hall that Ms. Greenan had mentioned we have moved the 217 students from St. Mary's into that facility.

The building itself is 81,329 square feet. It is a four-story brick and concrete building, with a full basement, which was constructed in 1959 as a residence hall for the nursing school. It was decommissioned, as Ms. Greenan mentioned, in 1996, when again we moved those 217 students to Darnall when it was completed -- or when we had completed renovation of that facility.

Currently, the building is about 40 percent vacant, but it is still the home for the school of nursing, the student volunteer programs, employee credit union, and campus retreat programs. Of those users currently, the nursing school is the only user who will remain in the building. Excuse me. I misspoke.

The nursing school and the employee credit

union are the two current users that will remain in the building. They will be joined by University Information Services, which will be consolidating its locations from some 14 other locations on campus into location at the St. Mary's.

With respect to the renovation, the renovation proposed in this project is an interior renovation to basically bring the building up to today's standards and codes for safety, for ADA, and in general improvements to the building systems with respect to heating, ventilation, air conditioning, the plumbing, electrical risers, new elevators, and new exit stairs, in order to meet today's requirements.

With respect to the 425 square feet that's been addressed, which is what really brings us before you, that is for two new entrance vestibules, both of which can be seen in the elevations there -- a main entrance, which would be on the Reservoir Road side, which will become the new entrance for the nursing school. And then the other main entrance renovation, which will be on the western facade, which is for an entrance into the new UIS portion of the building.

The second, third, and fourth floors are currently vacant. All floors of the building will be renovated. The nursing school and UIS will

effectively split the occupancy of the basement floor. The nursing school, along with a series of classrooms, as well as the main entrance for UIS, and the employee credit union, will occupy the first floor. The second floor will be totally dedicated to the nursing school, and the third and fourth floor will be dedicated to the University's Information Services offices.

In terms of the zoning issues that need to be reviewed, with respect to noise, the project will have no objectionable aspect with respect to noise. We are using, you know, the materials that are there today. It's a brick building, as I mentioned. All of the interior renovations will involve putting all of the appropriate sound insulation materials in that one would do in an interior renovation. So there should be no noises that would be objectionable in terms of what would be escaping from the building.

With respect to traffic and parking, as Mr. Greenan had mentioned, there is no proposed change to the road system on campus. There is no proposed changes to the parking. Those employees that will be occupying this building currently park on campus or come to campus either through our GUTS bus system or through public transportation.

If they happen to currently drive to

campus, they will continue to park in the lots that they currently park in now and will simply walk to the St. Mary's Building rather than to the current offices that they are -- presently have occupancy in on campus.

With respect to the number of students, there will be no increase to the student population as a result of the renovations to this building. With respect to campus FAR, those 425 square feet are adding to our FAR number. The existing number now is 4,906,634; with the added will be 4,907,061. Our FAR count is 1.12. After that addition, it will still be 1.12.

Other objectionable conditions -- the building will remain in the ownership of the university. I believe in one of the letters you received there was some question as to whether or not this was being renovated for Med Star to take occupancy of this. Med Star will not take occupancy of this. This will remain a main campus academic and administrative office building for its life.

And that brings me to the final item, which is land use. As Ms. Dwyer has mentioned, previously the building was educational mixed use. Under its future land use category, it will still be

educational mixed use.

In conclusion, we believe that the project meets the criteria for approval under the zoning regulations and respectfully request approval for our application. Thank you.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Thank you.

MS. GREENAN: That concludes our direct testimony.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Questions by the Board?

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I just want to be clear. I've heard a couple of different things than what the application says specifically. I just want to be clear about what you're asking for regarding the use designation for the property.

In the application it says seeks to change the St. Mary's Hall Building's designation in the campus plan from residential to mixed use. And I've heard different things about what it is designated now and what you're seeking in that regard, specifically.

MS. DWYER: To clarify that, we're not seeking any change in the use. Under the existing campus plan, it's mixed use, which includes residential as well as the other uses that have been historically in the building and are proposed for the building.

The only reason the residential was mentioned is to make clear that whereas Appendix H identified this as a potential housing site, it will no longer be a potential housing site. It will be simply restricted to the other mixed uses, the educational, educational support.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. And in the --there are some -- I don't know what to call them exactly -- like plats with callers and use designations in the campus plan, the bicentennial --

MS. DWYER: Right.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- plan.

MS. DWYER: From the 1990 campus plan.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And under future facilities, St. Mary's is designated education/educational support/residential facility. And that's under future facilities 2010.

MS. DWYER: Right.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And then again later in the future again. So you're looking to have that sort of be raised as well. Is that fair to say?

MS. DWYER: Well, it would stay as education/educational support. What we are making clear is that dormitory use at this location is not in the university's plans, given --

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: So the residential aspect would be -- you are seeking to have that deleted from --

MS. DWYER: Right.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- the future.

MS. DWYER: Right.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And I have to apologize for asking this, because I wasn't here when you had the discussion about the southwest quad. Did you discuss St. Mary's and the fact that St. Mary's had been -- I don't know what your term was -- decommissioned for residential, in the context of that project also?

MS. DWYER: Right. And I'll let Linda Greenan address that. But if you'd look at what she handed out, the chart shows that in 1996 to '97 --

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Tell me which chart I'm looking at now.

MS. DWYER: It's the Burleith community -- the Burleith agenda for April 18, 1996.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay.

MS. DWYER: Which was the BZA-mandated quarterly meeting.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Yes.

MS. DWYER: And attached to that, as the

second-to-the-last page, is a chart that shows each of the residence halls on campus and the number of beds. And you will see in the column '96 and '97 it shows St. Mary's as having zero beds. So that was the point that St. Mary's was decommissioned.

That was discussed with the community in the context of the southwest quad. And as you read through these materials, you'll note that initially the southwest quad was only proposed for 500 beds, and instead the university increased that capacity to 780 to meet its housing commitment.

MS. GREENAN: If I could -- let me clarify something. At the time, in 1996 when we offlined St. Mary's and went to the community and discussed it, we were actually thinking about a new residence hall that would be 250 the first phase and then 250 the second phase, ultimately getting to 500.

It was during our internal work that took a couple of years to look at the programming for the residence hall that we began to have a design that basically has three buildings to it, each roughly 250. So it would be 250, 250, and 250.

And after we completed our internal programming, took it to Father Donovan, our President, he essentially said, "Why don't we just do the whole

thing? We have a commitment to the community, and let's do the 780 and not phase it in." It would be probably better that way, more efficient, and so that's what happened.

Initially, we were talking 250, with a phase-in of 500 ultimately. And then when we -- and throughout this whole period, by the way, we were continuing to keep the community informed through the community -- through the quarterly process. In fact, I have my notes that indicate out of -- I started in '94 and began keeping notes and a record on our quarterly meetings.

So I have what -- while we've met probably -- the university has met more with the community in terms of quarterly meetings, my record indicates 22 meetings beginning July 12, 1994. Of those 22 meetings, 13 of them we discussed the residence hall project -- about 60 percent of the time roughly.

So we were keeping the community updated, and I guess it was roughly '98 that we came back and said, "We're going to do the whole thing, 780." And that's where we are today. That's what we got approval for.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. And there's -- as I understand it, there's sort of two aspects to

St. Mary's. There's what had been there in terms of the, I think, 217 or 215 beds that's shown on the chart, and then there was this plan that it be increased by 200 more to meet the 925-bed objective.

So was the increase in the southwest quad project in response to the beds at St. Mary's that had been eliminated because it was taken offline, or the 200 that were not going to be built at St. Mary's but were the 200 additional beds that were not going to be -- which is it meant to cover?

MR. BRANGMAN: Actually, there was a sensitivity to -- as we were looking, planning, to anything that would effectively reduce the number of beds that were on campus. And as we tried to determine how we were going to deal with the fact that we were looking at the possibility of decommissioning St. Mary's, the discussion came up relative to the cost associated with that, and where we could best spend our dollars in terms of meeting our housing needs on campus.

The decision was made to take the dollars that would have been invested in St. Mary's and put those towards the project that is now in the area of about $120 million, and that we'd have much better ability, both because of the economic basis of that

larger project, as well as the fact that the southwest quadrangle site where there's a southern and western portion of the campus, which if you look at that photograph is that big parking lot that's all the way at the bottom of that photograph, just makes more sense to gather all the students in that area.

And we felt that our dollars would be best spent in that area. That's below the baseball field and the soccer field.

MS. GREENAN: Just off of Canal Road.

MR. BRANGMAN: Right. Exactly.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And I don't dispute or disagree with anything that you just said, but I know that the sheer numbers, you know, in terms of keeping a tally is important to the community.

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: So tell me -- maybe I'll rephrase my question, which is there is -- there were 215 beds that went away and -- or 217 beds that went away.

MR. BRANGMAN: Right.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And then there were 200 that hadn't been real -- hadn't been constructed yet or provisions hadn't been made for them, but there was this idea that they would be built in the context

of the decade in which we now find ourselves. So how were those two -- just on the numbers -- and I appreciate everything that you just said, but just tallying up, where did they go?

MR. BRANGMAN: The numbers that you compare are the 925 to the 1,083. Those are the two numbers. And in the document, there is an exhibit -- Exhibit 8 -- that looks at those comparisons of what our bed counts were over the years as they went up and down --

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay.

MR. BRANGMAN: -- as we took beds offline or brought beds online, and that is the comparison of -- the issue that you're trying to get to. There have been no students, as a result of the decisions that we have made, that have gone out into the community.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay.

MR. BRANGMAN: They've all been kept on campus, and, in fact, as that chart will show, over the last number of years we've -- when the southwest quadrangle is completed, which is an important point, we will have surpassed anything that we committed to do before.

MS. GREENAN: And it's currently -- today, we've added 303 beds in various ways, which is what is

shown on page 2 of Exhibit 8. And added to that 303 -- if you add the 780 to the 303, it takes you to the 1,083. And so -- and this is the listing of how we got there.

The other discussion that we had relative to St. Mary's was adding 200 more would have necessitated raising the height of that building, and it does abut Cloisters West. And we did know at that time that there were some concerns about a residence hall there anyway, let alone increasing the density of students at that location.

So all of that was taken into consideration.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. When -- oh, go ahead.

MR. BRANGMAN: I was just going to say, to get to the point that you're raising about the 217 versus the 200, that 303 number is net over the 217 we took offline. So --

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I understand.

MR. BRANGMAN: -- if you were to add the 217 back, you would then be up to 520, which is the total beds that would have been in the system --

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay.

MR. BRANGMAN: -- as a result.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: What's the projected completion time for the southwest quadrangle project?

MR. BRANGMAN: We hope to be open in two years, 2002.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: There was an issue raised by some folks that live in Cloisters West about a walkway that exists between --

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- St. Mary's and Cloisters West and leads to Reservoir Road.

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Do you have any response to their concerns?

MS. GREENAN: We met with them. We did a walkthrough the other morning, and we're looking at doing some landscaping there. We can't close that off because it's a fire lane. And so there are security issues there. And what came up during our walkthrough -- we're going to do some landscaping to buffer the area. That won't be a problem.

But another issue came up that we're going to be addressing, but we can't close the area off to pedestrians. It's a security issue.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay.

Mr. Sockwell, those are all the questions

that I have at the moment, but I might have more after I hear some of the other folks ask questions.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Ms. Renshaw?

MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Vice Chair, I have some questions about bed capacity. And I'd like to know, first of all, how many undergrad students do you have right at the present time, Ms. Greenan?

MS. GREENAN: We have about 6,300.

MEMBER RENSHAW: 6,300. And what percent of the undergrad students are now housed on campus?

MS. GREENAN: We house 78 percent of our undergraduate students on campus. Now let me explain. In the BZA order approving our campus plan in 1990, they -- it allows us to back out of that overall number that I just gave you -- the 6,300 number -- certain categories of individuals.

Those are people -- well, part-time students, for example, non-degreed students, commuters, people who are 25 and over returning to college, veterans returning to college, RNs returning. All of those populations are backed out of our overall number. So the 6,300, roughly, number I gave you, when you back out of that number those populations, our current FY2000 number is 5,516. 5,516. And it is

that number that we use to determine the percentage of undergraduates that we house on campus.

We have 4,273 beds, and so our percentage of on campus housing for undergraduates -- traditional undergraduates, using the definition I just gave you, is 78 percent. And with the Southwest quad, we'll have 92 percent.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So the 5,516 is the full-time equivalent.

MS. GREENAN: That's right. It is, in fact -- actually, it's not even a full-time equivalent because that is an actual head count of those individuals. And it's not even an FTE.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Okay. So as of 2002, you will then house, per your information, 92 percent of your traditional undergraduate students on campus. Correct?

Earlier in a Tab Number 5, it talks about the addition of 925 new beds will essentially meet the university's long-term goal of being able to house 100 percent of its undergraduates. Now, would you explain the difference?

MS. GREENAN: The only explanation --

MEMBER RENSHAW: Under your housing program.

MS. GREENAN: This was under the 1990 proposed. This was contained in our '89 submission.

MEMBER RENSHAW: So is your goal to get up to 100 percent or only 92?

MS. DWYER: The goal, as stated in 1990, was the long-term goal of housing 100 percent of their students. And as the university has testified, you know, while they're close they're obviously not there yet. The whole issue of what their goal will be over the next 10 years will be the subject of the next campus plan, which those hearings are scheduled for next month.

What we're showing is that under this campus plan we have met the housing commitment by providing those additional beds on campus.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So realistically the item --

MEMBER RENSHAW: So right now you're at 78 percent.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: -- was old and --

MS. GREENAN: Right. That --

MEMBER SOCKWELL: -- dollar numbers would have changed.

MEMBER RENSHAW: But you're at 78 percent.

Now, on this Burleith material that you've

handed us, on your chart you have undergraduate occupancy only up to '95/'96. Could you provide the rest of the information? Also, you've got your resident occupancy through '96/'97, but nothing '97/'98, '98/'99, '99/2000.

MS. GREENAN: Yes. That's fine. We'd be happy to provide that information. That's because, as Ms. Dwyer explained, this was handed out in April of 1996.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Okay. Well, I would expect for a meeting that's in 2000 this would have been brought up to date.

MS. GREENAN: This was a handout at a meeting in April of 1996.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Right. I understand that.

MS. GREENAN: And we have updated it in our campus plan, in our proposed campus plan.

MS. DWYER: There have been quarterly meetings, which -- you know, four times a year, as well as other meetings. The only reason we filed that particular information was to show you that back in 1996 the whole question of offlining St. Mary's was raised with the community and discussed then. It was not -- it is not a new issue.

But certainly there have been many agendas and meetings since then as the university continues the quarterly meeting process.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Mr. Brangman, one of the things that we discussed was things like noise deadening, and there was discussion of the possibility of changing the size of St. Mary's vertically, all of which were part of the decisionmaking in what you're doing one way or the other.

Now, the renovations to St. Mary's are in part, you said, to increase -- improve the code compliance of the building.

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: But to a large extent, you're going to be gutting out the existing residence portion of it, which is probably still in place, I assume.

MR. BRANGMAN: That's correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So --

MR. BRANGMAN: The walls are there.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So what is now segmented off as rooms for students to live, as housing, is going to be stripped out for a different purpose basically.

MR. BRANGMAN: That's correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: You didn't mention that in your discussion, so I just --

MR. BRANGMAN: No, it is a full interior gut of the building and renovation. That's correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And the timeframe, once it goes under construction --

MR. BRANGMAN: Fifteen months. We're trying to have this open by September of next year.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And the construction plan would be to minimize -- first of all, are the windows all going to be replaced?

MR. BRANGMAN: The windows are all going to be replaced.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And the construction plan, to minimize the discomfort to members of the Cloisters West in particular, would be to do all of your heavy removal from the campus side of the building rather than from the opposite side, which would be adjacent to the community. Is there a plan in place to minimize any construction -- objectionable construction work, related noises, and dust, and what not?

MR. BRANGMAN: We do not have a plan in place as of yet, but it is -- we've just actually brought our construction manager on board. And it is

typical, as is typical for the projects that we do on campus, to make sure that we are working within the hours that the BZA allows, adjust -- or that the District allows -- excuse me -- and adjusting those hours where we may have problems either with noisy periods of constructions with our neighbors.

It's not unheard of for us to do that on campus, as well as potential impact on both students and classes, which is something that we pay attention to.

There is a loading dock, which is on the western side of St. Mary's. St. Mary's is an H-shaped building. As you know from the plans, the loading dock is on the western side, and we can, in fact, run chutes on -- in the loading dock area or on the west of the building in order to mitigate noises during demolition of the interior of the building.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Let's see. One of the other things that was discussed was that all of the employees who would be housed at this project once it is completed would be relocating from other campus locations. You're not bringing in new --

MR. BRANGMAN: Correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: -- employees or new bodies to populate the building.

MR. BRANGMAN: That is correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And you stated that the parking for this building would be the same parking as utilized by those employees and others elsewhere on the campus and would not be materially affected by the changeover on this building.

MR. BRANGMAN: That's correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And that you meet your parking requirements for the building and for the campus with excess, or at least with regard to this change of specific use as it is incorporated within the parking requirements for the campus.

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes. We are within our cap.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Okay.

MR. BRANGMAN: And don't anticipate any reason whatsoever to have to exceed the cap as a result of this project.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Okay. And the traffic generated by this building, in its new mixed use relationship, would have more peak hour impact on the surrounding community perhaps because it is not a residence anymore. It is a business-oriented use based on the typical employee work times for the university.

MR. BRANGMAN: My answer to that would be no, and the reason being is remember I said that the building is currently 40 percent vacant. The users of the building now is primarily the nursing school. There is some medical center office space in it, in the basement level. The employee credit union is in the basement level, and student volunteer services is currently located in the basement level.

The nursing school occupants will be returning to the building in the numbers that they are in the building now. The UIS, you're correct, will be coming from other locations on campus to this building, but their habits in terms of coming to campus will not change as a result of now being occupants in this building

If they park in the Leavey Center currently, they park there now and they walk to any one of the other 14 locations they're in. If they park in Lot 3, which is all the way down on Canal Road, they have to walk up to campus, or they walk all the way to north campus in order to get to the buildings that they are currently occupying.

We see no reason to change that. We will not be changing parkers' locations as a result of their being in St. Mary's. For instance, if a UIS

worker currently is in Old North, which is in the heart of the campus right next to the Leavey Center -- or, excuse me, right next to the Healey Center, and they part in Lot 3, in the future they will park in Lot 3. They will just walk a different path in order to get to their workplace.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So parking assignments for the lots that surround the St. Mary's Building are based on some overall assignment schedule --

MR. BRANGMAN: Correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: -- but not on the specific locations of employees with regard to the building themselves.

MR. BRANGMAN: Correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And I assume that that's with the exception of certain directors and more --

MR. BRANGMAN: Now, if David Lambert were here --

(Laughter.)

-- he is still going to be parking in the Leavey Center.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right. All right. Thank you.

MEMBER RENSHAW: I would like to ask, how many, again, are going to use this building if under

a mixed use --

MR. BRANGMAN: The number is roughly about 250.

MEMBER RENSHAW: 250.

MR. BRANGMAN: And that number is arrived at by going through and basically counting all of the chairs in the building.

MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. And of the 250 persons who will use the building, how many of them live on campus?

MR. BRANGMAN: When you say "live" as in residence on campus?

MEMBER RENSHAW: Undergraduate? Are these undergraduate people?

MR. BRANGMAN: No. These are all nursing school employees, as in professionals for the most part, as well as the UIS employees, which are professionals. They're not student employees.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Are they classified as students, or are they classified --

MR. BRANGMAN: No, they're staff.

MEMBER RENSHAW: They're staff.

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: The previous total population of the building, as best you can estimate,

including students and the nursing school and --

MR. BRANGMAN: The nursing school has about 50 folks in there now. The other users in there, probably about another 20, 25. And if you're talking about when the students were in the building, that was 217.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: So although there will be some reduction in the actual number of persons using the building, because the parking relationship was not tied directly to the building, it would not materially be affected regardless of the use.

MR. BRANGMAN: That's correct.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Do any of the Board members presently have additional questions?

MEMBER RENSHAW: Not at this time.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Thank you.

We are now at 5:30, and we are just getting to the government reports, after which -- oh, that's right, we've got to do cross now. I'm sorry. So we're well into the early portion of our schedule. And because we are not going to -- the problem is we're not going to be able to continue without a quorum. We will lose our quorum in approximately one hour.

We hope to be able to address at least a

portion of the Kingsbury application, effectively enough for it to be meaningful. And the problem that we're having is that we may not get to that. At 6:30, we are losing Ms. Renshaw, and that presents a problem.

And if we are forced to continue or to postpone the Kingsbury application, I would want that decision to be made now rather than at 6:30. I apologize for that, but this is what has happened. And would want to reschedule Kingsbury if that is acceptable, because we have no choice at 6:30. We're just not going to get to you. We'd like to reschedule the Kingsbury application for as quickly as is possible.

SECRETARY PRUITT: Based on your schedule, and based on the urgency of Kingsbury, next week you have -- next Wednesday is Georgetown University -- excuse me, George Washington University campus plan. We have so many campus plans coming in. That's the only case for that day. You may want to consider taking that, since the Kingsbury case should not be anywhere as lengthy as the campus plan, the first thing in the morning.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Yes. If we could put the Kingsbury case first thing next Wednesday --

SECRETARY PRUITT: Next Wednesday.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: -- would you be amenable to that?

MEMBER SOCKWELL: All right.

SECRETARY PRUITT: Do you want to schedule it for 9:00? Because we have a 9:30 -- I mean, normally, the university campus plan would start at 9:30, so at 9:00 we might even be able to get the majority of it out of the way before the majority of the people come for the campus plan.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Then that's what I would suggest that we do.

SECRETARY PRUITT: So we won't readvertise. So at 9:00 next Wednesday, which would be April 26th, we will hear the Kingsbury case.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: And I apologize again. We thought we were going to be able to maximize this, but we had more cases. Even though we actually lost two cases out of our schedule, it just hasn't worked out. So thank you very much for indulging us in this.

All right. Then we will go to cross.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't --

MEMBER SOCKWELL: What is the time limit? There can be no time limit on cross.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, it's not that there can be no time limit. Cross examination needs to be germane to the testimony given today, and the Board does have the discretion to shape and limit it. So it's not an unlimited timeframe.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: You'll have time to --

MR. CROCKETT: I will try and proceed through this as expeditiously as I can.

MEMBER SOCKWELL: Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: I'd like to address the first few questions to Mr. Brangman. First of all, with respect to the facility, could you tell us what the plans are for the front portion between the north of St. Mary's and Reservoir Road. Isn't that going to be a large underground parking garage?

MR. BRANGMAN: No, it is not, with respect to this project. Not with respect to this project, but with respect to the university's plans for that property in the future.

MS. DWYER: Mr. Chair, Vice Chair, if I may interject here. We are focused on the case that is before the Board and not any future plans which may be, again, a campus plan issue. And this application, as the witness has testified, does not include a parking structure.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, I would point out that one of our primary contentions is that this particular case has no basis coming up on its own, that it should be consolidated with the campus plan so all of these causes and effects can be judged by the Board at one time.

And what they're trying to do here is to segregate this out and say, "Well, we want to stay just with this little piece of it. We'll get that done now, and then after that's gone then we address these other problems without considering what effect the proposal for St. Mary's would have on all other phases of the campus plan.

And that is our position here today, and I think I'm entitled to cross examine one that.

MEMBER MOULDEN: If the applicant was correct in stating its case on the renovation of this building not being of necessity to come before the Board without the two entrance modifications, then they could have proceeded on the more salient issue, which is renovating the building for its intended purpose without having come before us at all.

So the issue -- and, of course, the issue of -- the larger issue would come up at some time. And yet the larger issue is not before us. If that