CLOSING STATEMENT

Barbara Zartman, Commissioner
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2E 04
Board Member, Cloisters in Georgetown and Georgetown Residents Alliance

---

The zoning regulations form a social contract between residents and their government. We are here to ask you to honor that contract, and we are prepared to do our part to come to reasonable terms.

The Impact:

Georgetown University has adversely affected the residential community in which it is situated over the life of the existing campus plan.

Georgetown University has failed to meet its burden of proving that the elements of the proposed plan will not be further objectionable because of increased student levels, traffic, noise, or other conditions.

The university has offered only its assertions about past or present impact. Its own witnesses have inadvertently made the case about harmful impact.

By increasing the intensity of its use of the property, the impacts will be exacerbated, and this plan offers nothing but vague promises of mitigations, an acknowledgement that there will be further harmful impacts. Office of Planning offers no affirmation that there will be no harm, just a series of measures to limit harm as it arises, which it proposes to develop bilaterally with Georgetown University, without a voice from the community. This is unacceptable.

For the many reasons articulated by the other parties, and for the legal reasons presented by Mr. Crockett, **the ten-year plan as presented to the Board must be rejected.** Georgetown University has not met its burden of proof. As was said, to put a ten-year mortgage on our futures based on a plan so fraught with change and risk is to truly fail to protect the residential communities from harm.

Yet, we do not want to be absolutists, to oppose all that may be needed to keep the university operating, to recover from disastrous recent losses at the hospital. We ask instead that the BZA adopt the more limited option that we placed on the table during mediation, with a series of protections that will limit the harm to residential neighbors.

The elements of this compromise plan:

That a five-year timeline be adopted, bringing the plan back to the BZA (or the Zoning Commission) after the Southwest Quadrangle is operational and its impacts can be measured. This same timeline will allow a new university president to assess this plan and his own goals for the university; Father O'Donovan allowed that his own experience was to reject major elements of the campus plan that had been adopted shortly before his own assumption of the presidency. Harvard's Neil Rudenstine similarly has commented that he will leave Harvard in order to allow his successor to guide the planning process at that institution *(see attachment)*.

BZA
Case No. 16566
Exhibit No. 157

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16566
EXHIBIT NO.157

The changes proposed for the north campus, similarly, will need careful assessment as that medical center engages in very different operations under MedStar leadership. To make decisions now that control so many variables for what MedStar's own leaders say is an incredibly fluid field of health care makes no sense (indeed, at our first meeting, MedStar said it could not plan for longer than a three-year time horizon).

And a new Vice President for Student Affairs has just joined the administration; his understanding of and commitment to enhanced campus life, and protections for neighboring communities, will not be known for some time

That undergraduate student enrollment be capped at its present level, 111 students above current enrollment. With a five-year timeline, this will not disadvantage the university at all. Under the terms of the present campus plan, no increase in enrollment is possible until new beds are available on campus for new heads; Georgetown University acknowledges the essence of this by suggesting no increase within its proposed plan until the Quadrangle is operational. Georgetown University under our proposal could add 55 students in each of the last two years of its five-year plan, just as it could in those same years under its proposal.

The impact of these additional students, as well as the success of other elements of campus operations, could be assessed before any new increase in enrollment is authorized, along with any requirements for housing on campus.

In the interim, Georgetown University, the Office of Planning, and the community can adopt objective measures of impact of increasing enrollment before any new, higher enrollment number is considered. We can see whether the campus-life enhancements planned by Georgetown University are working to limit impacts of students on community residential life. We can learn how committed the new President and the new Vice President for student affairs are, and how the policies and programs they adopt are working.

Is there a need to say more than the witnesses have about the harm that has been done to the quality of life in our neighborhoods? Do these photos speak loudly enough?

That graduate enrollment be limited to 200 additional students. The detailed plans proffered by the university indicate this is a realistic number over five years. The 1300-student increase is unreasonable on its face, constituting a 50% increase over present levels. Again, objective standards to assess the harmful impact on the community can be employed over the next five years, and judgments can be made about further increases based on the objective experience with this 8% increase over the next five years, a number that reflects the university's anticipated level of programmatic increase as it has been reported to us.

That MedStar facilities on the north campus be limited to the new parking garage for approximately 500 vehicles (nearly all underground) on the site to the west of St. Mary's Hall, and the new physician's office building, with occupancy by 80 physicians and 220 support staff (with no variance greater than 10%).

The community is being generous in not opposing either of these new facilities, since: (a) no additional parking spaces are to be allowed on campus, and this allowance for greater convenience in more efficient garages should not, by BZA order, be followed by a new request for increased numbers of parking spaces. and (b) the additional clinical facilities MedStar argues are needed for integrated patient care could simply become private doctors' offices unrelated to medical school operations. Community vigilance will be required, as will careful language in a BZA order, but we are pleased that we have been able to come to agreement on this facility's use.

The additional expansion space sought in this order, 100,000 square feet each at the hospital and the Lombardi facility, however, present unacceptably vague potential to become still more commercial office facilities. We have attempted to reach a voluntary agreement with MedStar about the uses to which they would NOT put this space – NOT for doctors' offices, NOT for conferencing and other traffic generating activities. Having been unable to successfully accomplish this, we are left with no options but to oppose this expansion in the next five years. Since the facilities are slated for Phase III and IV, leaving them out of this five-year plan should not prove financially burdensome for MedStar. We are hopeful we will reach agreement with MedStar about these facilities as well over the next five years.

That the helicopter pad be capped at the intended increased use, measured on a quarterly basis. MedStar seeks unlimited use of this aircraft facility in a residential neighborhood, which is unacceptable. Again, seeking to be reasonable about urgent medical needs, we ask for protections against the danger and noise of excessive, nonemergency helicopter overflights of residential space. We propose that MedStar's request for an increase from 8 to 12 flights a week (i.e., 48 flights a month – a 50% increase) be the limit of usage, reported on to the community at quarterly meetings with specificity. We would review all usage at quarterly meetings, and any overutilization would need to be reported back to the BZA at all second-stage applications. This provision is dependent upon MedStar's promise to have no disproportionate increase in the level of trauma or transplant care under its management of the hospital, which should be included in the BZA order as a condition.

That the zoning of the north campus be appropriately dealt with in a variance procedure. A letter outlining the issues, as we in the community see them, was sent to the Office of the Zoning Administrator; although no answer has been received, we strongly believe there is no matter-of-right authority for allowing the private corporation to run a hospital and other facilities in an R-3 district. Moreover, a new Certificate of Occupancy is required for the hospital, now that it is being run by a legally separate corporate entity, and the land-use issues must be addressed as part of that procedure.

That a careful and articulated program of assessment and mitigation be adopted for the north campus, the east campus, and the Canal Road/M Street corridor to measure the impact of traffic and parking before a final BZA order is issued, and that it require reports back to the BZA with each second-stage project that is brought forward for approval. The steps tentatively mentioned by Georgetown University and MedStar hardly constitute a mitigation program; Messrs. Braun, Cutro, and Andrew effectively describe the woeful unreliability of the background data, the nonexisting quantification of the present Georgetown University contribution to the traffic burden, and the ephemeral basis on which future projections are offered.

We are prepared to work with the Office of Planning, the Department of Public Works, and the university to establish a series of site-specific measurements that need to be taken at least annually at the university's expense by a mutually-agreed upon professional. These objective data can be used to determine the impact and the degree of further mitigation necessary to reduce harm from increased levels of activity – or they may serve as the basis for rejecting further development.

That the Department of Public Works be asked to carefully reassess the changes in parking allocation proposed in the new MedStar/Georgetown University division of the authorized 4080 spaces, in light of Georgetown University's acknowledgement of an 1100-space deficit for university operations. The short shrift that has been given this critical matter is government reports, as well as Georgetown University's own papers, is nothing short of shocking. The menu of potential mitigations is an earnest start on remedies, but there

is nothing to indicate any (much less all) will be successful. Moreover, the reallocation between north and south campuses appears to violate the directive of the current campus plan. Further, Georgetown University denied the size of the change until confronted with public documents very late in the campus plan process. The community, for good reason, feels it will be pressed for a significant increase in on-campus parking in the near future. We have trouble understanding why there is a need for two additional parking garages if there is to be no increase in parking.

That private parking should not be subsidized. MedStar is reported to be planning to provide its employees with fully subsidized on-campus parking. The BZA should require that the same policies to promote car-pooling, mass transit, and other environmentally constructive programs be enacted by MedStar as have been successful in the Georgetown University population.

That the new campus facilities planned in Phase I and Phase II for the main campus be limited to use for student productions, games, and activities, and that these facilities not be rented for public events, concerts, and the like. These facilities receive support from the community because they will increase the quality of campus life for students at Georgetown University. For student productions, these facilities will be manageable in terms of traffic brought to campus. If, however, they become venues for commercial operations, the burden on neighborhood streets and parking will increase greatly and will serve no university purpose other than revenue generation. *With this caveat,* we would also offer early support for the sports facilities planned for later in campus development, since we believe they will contribute to the quality of student life on campus.

That off-campus university facilities in the immediate vicinity be identified, their utilization volumes recorded, and their impact on campus traffic assessed. While current campus plan rules do not require inclusion of off-campus properties, we strongly argue that because they generate traffic to and through the community and the campus, there is a clear impact on the residential community; they require administration, oversight, and often parking on campus.

That the community liaison process be enhanced and made independent of year-to-year inconsistency through advance funding. Curtailing adequate funding for Off-Campus Affairs is an understandable pressure in financially difficult times. However, this small budget item makes huge impacts on the community, and the office should be insulated from such pressure through advance funding of their operations, at a level that assures adequate staff support for its excellent leadership, and incentives for that staff not only to remain, but to grow in reasonable proportion to the increasing burdens.

That objective measures be adopted as part of the final BZA order. We are committed to creating a series of indices (including summonses, police citations, arrests, documented violations, the Department of Public Works citations, DCRA citations, and the like), in addition to traffic data, that can be used to measure impacts on the community of university operations. After our consultation with the university and the Office of Planning, we ask the Board to include such recommended measures in its final order.

That the quarterly meeting process be continued, with clarification about meetings being open to the press and the community. If we can keep these meetings from becoming Greco-Roman wrestling matches, they are helpful avenues for exploring plans and resolving concerns. They are, of course, no panacea. But several years of "tension on the wire" have produced at least a workable series of events; they should be continued. With any luck, the years ahead will forge them into still better vehicles for effective liaison.

Harvard's Rudenstine Says He Will Move On

By Valerie Strauss
Washington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday , May 23, 2000 ; A02

Harvard University President Neil Rudenstine announced yesterday that he will leave the most prestigious post in American higher education next year after a decade in which he raised billions of dollars and promoted key administrative and academic change at the nation's oldest university.

Rudenstine, 65, said he will leave on July 30, 2001 because he has accomplished his major goals and because "the time seems right" to allow new leadership to chart the university's progression in the 21st century and react to the technological revolution.

"There's no gain in postponing the beginning of that process," Rudenstine said. "We've been through a decade of intense planning and we worked through the agenda . . . and it's time for someone to start another planning process."

Harvard officials will conduct a nationwide search to replace Rudenstine, the 26th president since the school was founded in 1636. A leading Renaissance literature scholar, he said he will take the next year to make post-Harvard plans.

Educators across the country said Rudenstine will leave the institution, long a financial and academic powerhouse, stronger than it was when he arrived on July 1, 1991.

He raised $2.6 billion in a record-breaking fundraising campaign and oversaw a tripling of the school's endowment, from $4.7 billion in 1991 to more than $15 billion, making it the nation's biggest. (Next is the University of Texas, with $8.1 billion, and Yale University, at $7.2 billion.)

What Rudenstine called his most important accomplishment was starting the difficult process of bringing more unity to the operations of the dozen schools that make up what has been a decentralized university.

By forcing autonomous deans to work together more closely, Rudenstine promoted the growing importance of interdisciplinary scholarship, giving students more academic options and bringing Harvard's "full power to bear on important problems," said Charles Vest, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Vest and other colleagues also said that Rudenstine's leadership on issues such as the need for diversity among staff and student body were important to higher education. The Harvard presidency offers a platform for influencing a variety of topics and academics pay attention to what any Harvard leader says.

"He is an individual driven by his personal conscience and his convictions and as a result tends to see issues with a moral dimension that some of his colleagues tend to miss," said Stan Ikenberry, president of the American Council on Education. "He has the capacity to rise above some of the immediate frustrations of the issues of the day, to take a broader, longer-term strategic view of higher education that I think has served Harvard very well and has served the country very well."

He also saw to it that the school's 90 libraries and all its classrooms were wired to the Internet, but did not rush to embrace every aspect of the technological revolution. He predicted that Harvard will never offer for-credit or degree courses online.

His tenure was not, however, without controversy, some of it personal.

In November 1993, amid complaints that Rudenstine was unable to delegate responsibility and divorce himself from the job's minutiae, he abruptly announced he was taking a medical leave for exhaustion. But first, he handwrote more than 30 notes, a longtime practice of his. "I believe in personal communication," he said.

He spent the next 3 1/2 months reading science, history and the works of Anthony Trollope and returned refreshed and more willing to delegate some of the work of administering the campus of 19,000 students, 2,200 faculty members and a budget of more than $1 billion.

There were other problems. Despite his fundraising acumen, the school often operated with budget deficits. And wage disputes with the university's clerical, janitorial and technical workers ended with Harvard last year paying millions of dollars in back pay and benefits to as many as 500 misclassified workers. Another brouhaha erupted recently over whether Harvard paid its janitorial staff a "living wage."

Rudenstine expanded contacts with institutions of higher education abroad, but as the university opened research offices in Asia, Europe and Latin America, some critics charged it had become too cozy with the ruling governments in China and Burma.

The son of a Jewish prison guard and a Catholic waitress, Rudenstine was far different from the man whom he replaced, Derek Bok, whose strong personality and booming voice had dominated the campus for 20 years.

Rudenstine was seen as quiet and humble, constitutionally unable to grandstand, a man who maintained a low-key presence on campus and earned a reputation among many students for having little "sizzle." Some students complained that after a semiformal ball and barbecue that he and his wife hosted for freshmen every year, they rarely saw him.

But behind the scenes, in small meetings with donors and others, he was "magical" as he set out a vision for the university, according to former Harvard Crimson newspaper editor Matthew Granade, 25, who graduated in January.

© 2000 The Washington Post Company