CLEARY, GOTTLIEB, STEEN & HAMILTON

2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1801

(202) 974-1500

FACSIMILE
(202) 974-1999

WWW.CLEARYGOTTLIEB.COM

ONE LIBERTY PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10006-1470

41, AVENUE DE FRIEDLAND
75008 PARIS

RUE DE LA LOI 57
1040 BRUSSELS

CITY PLACE HOUSE
55 BASINGHALL STREET
LONDON EC2V 5EH

PAVELETSKAYA SQUARE 2/3
115054 MOSCOW

J. EUGENE MARANS
DANIEL B. SILVER
RICHARD deC. HINDS
SENIOR COUNSEL

MAIN TOWER
NEUE MAINZER STRASSE 52
60311 FRANKFURT AM MAIN

THEODOR-HEUSS-RING 9
50668 COLOGNE

PIAZZA DI SPAGNA 15
00187 ROME

VIA SAN PAOLO 7
20121 MILAN

BANK OF CHINA TOWER
ONE GARDEN ROAD
HONG KONG

SHIN KASUMIGASEKI BUILDING
3-2, KASUMIGASEKI 3-CHOME
CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0013

KENNETH L. BACHMAN, JR.
SARA D. SCHOTLAND
JOHN S. MAGNEY
MARK LEDDY
JOHN C. MURPHY, JR.
DAVID M. BECKER
GEORGE S. CARY
JANET L. WELLER
MITCHELL S. DUPLER
LINDA J. SOLDO
JOHN T. BYAM
MATTHEW D. SLATER
MICHAEL R. LAZERWITZ
DAVID I. GELFAND
MICHAEL A. MAZZUCHI
ROBERT W. COOK
MARK W. NELSON
ROBIN M. BERGEN
DEREK M. BUSH
PAUL D. MARQUARDT
BRIAN BYRNE
RESIDENT PARTNERS

W. RICHARD BIDSTRUP
SCOTT N. BENEDICT
LINDA S. MATLACK
KEVIN A. GRIFFIN
MITCHELL L. RABINOWITZ
STEVEN J. KAISER
COUNSEL

JOYCE E. McCARTY
KAREN A. KERR
SCOTT R. GOODWIN
SENIOR ATTORNEYS

MATTHEW I. BACHRACK
CRAIG A. BENSON
LEE F. BERGER
MATTHEW J. BERMAN*
CATHERINE A. BERNARD
PATRICK R. BOCK
KIERSTEN L. BOYCE
LEAH BRANNON
JOANNE C. BYARS*
JEREMY CALSYN
KATHERINE M. CARROLL*
KERRI J. CHASE
FARAH F. COOK
SEAN D. COREY
ALYSON J. DAIS
MACRUI DOSTOURIAN*
TANYA N. DUNNE
CARL EDMAN
CHRISTOPH T. FEDDERSEN
WILLIAM S. FULTZ
DARIAN M. FUTRELL
ERIK F. GERDING
RICHARD B. HOLBROOK
MEGHAN A. IRHLER
MELISSA M. JOHNS
MEETU KAUL
MICHAEL J. KEHOE

DINAH R. KNIGHT*
SARAH G. KOSS*
BRENT LATTIN*
JOHN R. LOATMAN
JELENA MADIR
MUTHEU MAITHA
LEE ANN A. McCALL
PATRICIA M. McDERMOTT
AMY E. McFARLANE*
JOHN P. McGILL, JR.
MARY A. McLAUGHLIN*
ADAM J. MILLER
JANET P. MORRIS
JENNIFER A. MORRISSEY
ANDREW X. NIEBLER
JONATHAN L. H. NYGREN
JAMES C. OWENS*
PAUL PASTERNAK*
HELEN M. PATAKI
SUZANNE B. PERRY
BROOK G. ROSENBAUM
TANARA D. SCHMIDT
SARA STAINBACK*
JOSHUA B. STERLING
PETIA VRETENAROVA
MARK J. WOODWARD

* ADMITTED ONLY TO A BAR OTHER THAN THAT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. WORKING UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF PRINCIPALS OF THE WASHINGTON OFFICE

December 23, 2004

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2004 DEC 23 AM 9:48

BY HAND

Geoffrey Griffis
Chairman, Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Re: *BZA Application No. 16566-D (Procedural Order on Remand)* –
President and Directors of Georgetown College

Dear Mr. Griffis and Members of the Board:

On behalf of the Citizens Association of Georgetown ("CAG"), a party in this case, we are enclosing proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as requested Board Order 16566-D. For your convenience, we have enclosed a copy of our submission marked to show changes made from the original order in this case. Additionally, attached hereto is data submitted by the University as part of its quarterly reporting requirements under the original order. Although not a part of the record in this case, these materials are properly before the Board and should be considered in making your ruling.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard Hinds /oor

Richard deC. Hinds

Attachments

BZA
Case No. 16566
Exhibit No. 288

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16566
EXHIBIT NO.288A1

MEMORANDUM

13 November 2003

TO: Citizens Association of Georgetown
3222 N St., NW
Washington, DC
20007

FROM: Jeanne Lord
Interim Associate Vice President of Student Affairs

SUBJECT: Campus Plan Order

Condition 9 of the Board of Zoning Adjustment's Order approving Georgetown University's Campus Plan through December 2010 directs the University to report certain data concerning off-campus student conduct to your office on a quarterly basis. Enclosed please find Quarterly Reports for July, August, and September 2003.

BZA Quarterly Report
Off Campus Student Life Hotline*
July-September 2003

Week of	Number of Hotline Calls	Number of Incidents Reported	Incidents Reported in Georgetown	Incidents Reported in Burleith	Number of Continued Incidents
Jul 1- Jul 5	1	1	0	1	0
Jul 6- Jul 12	1	1	0	fs	0
Jul 13 - Jul 19	0	0	0	0	0
Jul 20 - Jul 26	0	0	0	0	0
Jul 27- Jul 31	0	0	0	0	0
Aug 1- Aug 8	0	0	0	0	0
Aug 9- Aug 16	0	0	0	0	0
Aug 17- Aug 23	0	0	0	0	0
Aug 24- Aug 31	8	8	5	3	3
Sep 1- Sep 6	14	9	4	5	7
Sep 7 - Sep 13	14	11	8	3	5
Sep 14- Sep 20	12	11	7	4	5
Sep 21- Sep 30	14	12	5	7	5
TOTALS	64	53	29	24	25

* Incidents reported during this time period include-- noise violations in private student homes off campus; walk-by pedestrian noise; and disorderly conduct

** Note: This report does not reflect MPD's weekly arrest/noise violation information because MPD has not provided such information, as in the past. The University is presently working with MPD to receive this information.

Off Campus Student Life Trash Report
July-September 2003

Month	West Georgetown	Burleith	Total
July, 2003	0	0	0
August, 2003	0	0	0
Sept. 2003	2	0	2

Georgetown University Office of Student Conduct

Offenses: Committed by Off Campus Students
Between July 01, 2003 and September 30, 2003

Offense	Total
- Failure to comply	2
- Noise	18
- Trash Disposal	2

Total Offenses Committed by Off Campus Students: 22

Georgetown University Office of Student Conduct

Sanctions Given To Students Living Off Campus
Between July 01, 2003 and September 30, 2003

Sanction	Total
Disciplinary Probation	3
Fine	21
Letter of Apology	2
Reflection Paper	2
Work Sanction	19
Total sanctions given to students living off campus:	**47**

MEMORANDUM

20 January 2004

TO: Citizens Association of Georgetown
3222 N St., NW
Washington, DC
20007

FROM: Jeanne Lord
Interim Associate Vice President of Student Affairs

SUBJECT: Campus Plan Order

Condition 9 of the Board of Zoning Adjustment's Order approving Georgetown University's Campus Plan through December 2010 directs the University to report certain data concerning off-campus student conduct to your office on a quarterly basis. Enclosed please find Quarterly Reports for October, November, and December 2003.

BZA Quarterly Report
Off Campus Student Life Hotline*
October-December 2003

Week of:	Number of Hotline Calls	Number of Incidents Reported	Incidents Investigated by Police	Incidents Reported - Unfounded	Number of Summons Issued
Oct 1- Oct 4	3	3	2	1	0
Oct 5- Oct 11	7	5	5	0	1
Oct 12- Oct 18	18	12	7	5	6
Oct 19- Oct 25	17	14	9	5	5
Oct 26- Nov 1	27	19	11	8	12
Nov 2- Nov 8	15	12	7	5	3
Nov 9- Nov 15	14	11	6	5	3
Nov 16- Nov 22	1	1	1	0	0
Nov 23- Nov 29	7	6	4	2	2
Nov 30- Dec 6	7	7	3	4	3
Dec 7- Dec 13	6	6	4	2	3
Dec 14- Dec 20	3	3	2	1	0
Dec 21- Dec 31	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	125	99	61	38	38

* Incidents reported during this time period include-- noise violations in private student homes off campus; walk-by pedestrian noise; and disorderly conduct

Off Campus Student Life Trash Report
October-December 2003

Month	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Oct-03	0	0	0
Nov-03	0	0	0
Dec-03	0	0	0

Georgetown University Office of Student Conduct

Sanctions Given For Offenses Committed Off Campus
Between October 01, 2003 And December 31, 2003

Students Living On-Campus

Sanction	Total
EVAL: HealthEd	2
Reflection Paper	1
Restitution	1
Suspension Was Suspended	2
Total For Students Living On-Campus	**6**
Total Sanctions:	**6**

Georgetown University Office of Student Conduct

Offenses: Committed Off Campus
Between October 01, 2003 And December 31, 2003

Committed By On-Campus Students

Offense	Total
- Damage or destruction	1
- Disorderly conduct	2
- Failure to comply	1
- Possession or consumption of alcohol by a person who is under 21 years of age	1
Total Offenses Committed by On-Campus Students:	**5**

Total Offenses: 5

MEMORANDUM

29 April 2004

TO: Citizens Association of Georgetown
3222 N St., NW
Washington, DC
20007

FROM: Jeanne Lord
Interim Associate Vice President of Student Affairs

SUBJECT: Campus Plan Order

Condition 9 of the Board of Zoning Adjustment's Order approving Georgetown University's Campus Plan through December 2010 directs the University to report certain data concerning off-campus student conduct to your office on a quarterly basis. Enclosed please find Quarterly Reports for January, February and March 2004.

BZA Quarterly Report for January-March 2004

Off Campus Student Life Hotline

Week of	Total Hotline Calls	Total Complaints Reported	Went Gone	Unable to Locate	TYPE OF COMPLAINT: Pedestrian Noise	Loud Party/ Loud Music	Other	DISPATCH*: SNAP	MPD	RESULTS of SNAP VISIT: Substantial Violation	No Substantial Violation	Referred to MPD	Unable to Locate
Jan 1- Jan 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jan 4- Jan 10	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
Jan 11- Jan 17	4	4	1	3	1	2	1	-	4	-	-	-	-
Jan 18- Jan 24	3	3	1	2	-	3	-	2	1	2	-	-	-
Jan 25- Jan 31	4	3	2	1	1	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
Feb 1- Feb 7	8	8	4	4	-	7	1	6	2	2	1	3	-
Feb 8- Feb 14	5	4	2	2	-	4	-	2	2	-	2	-	-
Feb 15- Feb 21	4	4	3	1	2	2	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
Feb 22- Feb 29	4	4	2	2	1	3	-	2	2	-	1	-	1
Mar 1- Mar 6	2	2	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-
Mar 7- Mar 13	2	2	-	2	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
Mar 14- Mar 20	9	8	5	4	1	7	-	6	2	3	-	2	1
Mar 21- Mar 31	16	14	5	9	-	13	1	7	7	-	2	4	1
TOTALS	62	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	6	46	5	27	30	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

*SNAP is dispatched Thu-Sat 9 PM-3 AM. Calls received outside of these hours (and repeat calls after SNAP has already responded) result in an immediate MPD dispatch.

[illegible]

Georgetown University Office of Student Conduct

Offenses: Committed Off Campus
Between January 01, 2004 And March 31, 2004

Committed By Off-Campus Students

Offense	Total
- Destruction of Property	2
- Noise	29
- Disorderly Conduct	18
- Indecent Exposure	1
- Defacement	4
- Possession of Alcohol Underage	1

Total Offenses Committed by Off-Campus Students: 55

Committed By On-Campus Students

Offense	Total
- Possession/ consumption of alcohol by a person under 21 years of age	3
- Misrepresentation of age	1

Total Offenses Committed by On-Campus Students: 4

Total Offenses: 59

Georgetown University Office of Student Conduct

Sanctions Given For Offenses Committed Off Campus
Between January 01, 2004 And March 31, 2004

Students Living Off Campus

AlcoholEDU Administrative Fee	7
AlcoholEDU On-line Program	7
Fine	11
Other Sanctions	70
Disciplinary Probation	5
Suspended Suspension	2
Housing Relocation	2
Work Sanction	16
Restitution	2
Letter of Apology	2
Total For Students Living Off-Campus	**125**

Students Living On-Campus

Sanction	Total
AlcoholEDU Administrative Fee	3
AlcoholEDU On-line Program	3
Fine	4
Work Sanction	1
Total For Students Living On-Campus	**11**
Total Sanctions:	**136**

MEMORANDUM

15 July 2004

TO: Citizens Association of Georgetown
3222 N St., NW
Washington, DC
20007

FROM: Jeanne Lord
Interim Associate Vice President of Student Affairs

SUBJECT: Campus Plan Order

Condition 9 of the Board of Zoning Adjustment's Order approving Georgetown University's Campus Plan through December 2010 directs the University to report certain data concerning off-campus student conduct to your office on a quarterly basis. Enclosed please find Quarterly Reports for April, May and June 2004.

BZA Quarterly Report for April - June 2004
Off Campus Student Life Hotline

Week of	Total Hotline Calls	Total Complaints Reported	Weekend	Weekday	TYPE OF COMPLAINT			DISPATCH*		RESULTS of SNAP VISIT			
					Pedestrian Noise	Loud Party/ Loud Music	Other	SNAP	MPD	Action Taken	No action Taken	Noise Abated	No Contact Made
Apr 1- Apr 3	4	3	1	2	1	3	-	2	2	1	-	1	-
Apr 4- Apr 10	5	4	2	2	1	4	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
Apr 11- Apr 17	5	4	-	4	1	4	-	1	4	1	-	-	-
Apr 18- Apr 24	5	5	3	2	3	2	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
Apr 25- Apr 30	3	2	2	-	-	3	-	2	1	2	-	-	-
May 1- May 7	6	6	2	4	-	6	-	2	4	-	-	2	-
May 8- May 14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
May 15- May 21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
May 22- May 29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
May 30 - Jun 5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jun 6 - Jun 12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jun 13 - Jun 19	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Jun 20 - Jun 30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	29	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	6	23	0	7	22	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

SNAP is dispatched Thu.-Sat. 9 PM- 3 AM. Calls received outside of these hours (and repeat calls after SNAP has already responded) result in an immediate MPD dispatch.

[illegible]

Georgetown University Office of Student Conduct
Offenses: Committed Off Campus
Between April 01, 2004 And June 30, 2004

Committed By Off-Campus Students

Offense	Total
- Noise	23
- Failure to Comply	6
- Guest Policy	12
- Disorderly Conduct	7
- Harassment	1
- False Testimony	1

Total Offenses Committed by Off-Campus Students: 45*

Committed By On-Campus Students

Offense	Total
-Underage Possession of Alcohol	3
-Possession of Alcohol	2
-Misrepresentation of Age to Enter ABC Establishment	2
-Burglary	1

Total Offenses Committed by On-Campus Students: 8*

Total Offenses: 53*

* These numbers include data from the Metropolitan Police Department of violations committed by GU students during the months of April, May and June that MPD reports that were not received by the University until May 22, 2004 (arrests/citations in April) and June 12, 2004 (arrests/citations in May and June). Since the University did not receive notice of these violations until after the students had left for the summer- and in many cases graduated from the University- there were no sanctions levied by Georgetown University for these offenses.

Georgetown University Office of Student Conduct

Sanctions Given For Offenses Committed Off Campus
Between April 01, 2004 And June 30, 2004

Students Living Off Campus

Suspension from the University	2
Prohibition from all GU property and graduation activities	2
Other Sanctions	29
Denial of Senior Week Privileges	13
Disciplinary Probation	6
Fine	12
Work Sanction	12
Total For Students Living Off-Campus	**76**

Students Living On-Campus

Sanction	Total
N/A	0
Total For Students Living On-Campus	**0**
Total Sanctions:	**76**

CITIZENS ASSOCIATION OF GEORGETOWN
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

Application No. 16566 of the President and Directors of Georgetown College, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3104.1, for a special exception for the review and approval of the University Campus Plan - years 2000-2010 under Section 210 in the R-3 and C-1 Districts at premises bounded by Glover Archbold Parkway to the west, the National Park Service property along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal and Canal Road to the south, 35th Street, N Street to 36th Street, and 36th Street to P Street to the east and Reservoir Road to the north. (Square 1222, Lots 62, 801-810; Square 1223, Lots 85-86, 807-810, 812, 815, 826, 827, 831, 834, 846-847, 852-853, 855, and 857-858; Square 1226, Lots 91, 94-101, 104-105, 803-804, 806, and 811-815; Square 1248, Lots 122-125, 150-157, 800-802, 804-806, 829-831, and 834-835; Square 1321, Lots 815-817.)

HEARING DATES: June 13, and July 18, 2000

DECISION DATES: September 5, November 8, and December 5, 2000

ORDER DATE: March 29, 2001

RECONSIDERATION DECISION DATE: June 5, 2001

STAY DECISION DATE: September 4, 2001

DECISION AND ORDER

PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

1. This Decision and Order supercedes BZA Order 16566-A, as amended by Order 16566-B and Order 16566-C, hereinafter the "Original Campus Plan Order."

2. The President and Directors of Georgetown College (hereinafter "University" or "Applicant") filed an application on January 31, 2000 for review and approval of the Georgetown University Campus Plan for Years 2000–2010 (hereinafter "Proposed Campus Plan").

3. Advisory Neighborhood Commission ("ANC") 2E was a party in this proceeding. The Board received requests for party status from the Burleith Citizens Association ("BCA"), Citizens Association of Georgetown ("CAG"), Cloisters in Georgetown Homeowner's Association, Foxhall Community Citizens Association, Georgetown Residents Alliance, and Hillandale Homeowners Association. These requests were all granted. The Wormley Neighbors Association also requested to participate as a party, but failed to appear at the hearing. Its request for party status was denied.

BZA
Case No. 16566
Exhibit No. 288-A

4. By Order issued March 29, 2001, the Board approved the Proposed Campus Plan until December 31, 2010, subject to conditions intended to mitigate the adverse impacts arising from the location of a university in a residentially zoned district. The Applicant appealed the Order to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. On December 4, 2003, the Court of Appeals issued an opinion vacating the Board's decision, *President & Dirs. of Georgetown College v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 837 A.2d 58 (D.C. 2003). The case was remanded to the Board for further proceedings consistent with the Court's opinion.

5. On October 15, 2004, the Board issued an order permitting any party to submit a proposed order including findings of fact and conclusions of law. After reviewing the record in this case, the submission of the parties, and the Court's Opinion, the Board approved this Decision and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The Georgetown University campus, known as premises 3800 Reservoir Road, comprises 104 acres zoned R-3 or C-1 located within the Georgetown Historic District. The campus is bordered on two sides by public parkland and Canal Road. The southern boundary extends east along Prospect Street to 35th Street, excluding the structure on the north side of Prospect Street between 36th and 37th Streets. The campus is bounded on the west by Glover Archbold Park and on the north by Reservoir Road. The eastern boundary runs from Reservoir Road at 37th Street south and east past the Cloisters residential development and the grounds of the Sisters of Visitation High School and Convent to a point just west of 36th and P Streets, then continues south, excluding a row of residences on the west side of 36th Street to O Street, south on 37th Street to N Street, east to 35th Street, and finally south to Prospect Street. (Applicant's Statement at 1, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A).

2. The University has been located on its present campus since its founding in 1789. With certain exceptions, the campus boundaries include land owned by the University that has been actively devoted to university use for over 200 years. The Proposed Campus Plan does not seek any change in the previously adopted campus boundaries, and does not propose to move any major new building off campus. (Applicant's Statement at 1-2, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A).

3. The Applicant submitted a plan for developing the campus as a whole, showing the location, height, and bulk of all present and proposed improvements, as required by 11 DCMR § 210.4. (Applicant's Statement at 16-20, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A).

4. The Proposed Campus Plan anticipates several new developments on campus, including a science building, a business school, an administrative/academic building, and a physicians' office building at the Medical Center. Other projects set forth in the proposed plan include additions or renovations to several existing buildings as well as the renovations of Harbin Field into a multi-sports facility and McDonough Gym to allow its use as a convocation center. (Applicant's Statement at 3-4, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A).

5. The proposed additional gross footage and existing square footage will result in a floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.41, or 0.39 below the 1.8 FAR permitted by the Zoning Regulations. *See* 11 DCMR §§ 210.3, 402.4. (Applicant's Statement at 15, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A).

THE 1990 CAMPUS PLAN

6. In the order approving the University's 1990 Campus Plan, the Board stated, "To further ensure that there will be no adverse impacts, the Board incorporates as a condition to its Order a limitation on enrollment so that by the year of 1997, the University will be providing beds on campus for essentially 100 percent of those undergraduate students requiring housing." This cap of 5,627 Full-Time Equivalent undergraduate students allowed the University to add an additional 340 students over current enrollment, provided a new on campus bed was provided for each student. The Board also conditioned the approval of the 1990 Campus Plan on the University's commitment to provide 925 additional undergraduate beds on campus and to implement an Off-Campus Affairs program. (Application No. 15302, decision date September 5, 1990, order date October 12, 1990, hereinafter the "1990 Campus Plan"; See Appendix H, Exhibit 145).

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT

7. The Applicant reported that fall 1999 enrollment of traditional full-time undergraduate students was 5,744. (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8).

8. The Applicant reported that fall 2000 enrollment of traditional full-time undergraduate students was 5,840. (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8).

9. The Applicant stated that fall and spring enrollment was averaged to reflect enrollment for the academic year. For example, fall 2000 enrollment of 5,840 was averaged with spring 2001 enrollment of 5,366 to arrive at a FY 2000 enrollment of 5,603. (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8).

10. The Board finds that the University has improperly calculated its traditional full-time undergraduate student enrollment by averaging the fall and spring enrollment numbers to arrive at the reported enrollment figure.

11. The Board finds that the University exceeded its enrollment cap of 5,627 by enrolling 5,744 traditional full-time undergraduate students in fall 1999 and enrolling 5,840 traditional full-time undergraduate students in fall 2000.

UNDERGRADUATE HOUSING

12. The University provided 303 additional undergraduate beds over the life of the 1990 Campus Plan. The increase in undergraduate beds came primarily from the elimination of 200 graduate student beds in 1992-93. The additional 103 beds were the result of renovations and conversions of existing space. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix F, Exhibit No. 46). The Southwest Quadrangle, a new residence hall required as a Condition under the 1990 Campus Plan, is not scheduled to be completed until fall 2003, when it will provide 780 new undergraduate beds on campus. (O'Donovan Testimony, June 13, 2000, Exhibit No. 68)

13. The Applicant stated that 1989 traditional full-time undergraduate enrollment was 5,287 and the University had 3,970 undergraduate beds. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix E, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A). The Board finds that at least 1,317 (5,287-3,970) traditional full-time undergraduate students lived in off-campus housing in 1989.

14. The Applicant reported that fall 1999 traditional full-time undergraduate enrollment was 5,744 (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8) and the University had 4,273 undergraduate beds. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix E, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A). The Applicant subsequently revised its count of on-campus undergraduate beds to 4,173 to reflect 100 off-campus beds that were counted as on-campus beds. (Exhibit No. 67, BZA July 18, 2000 Hearing Tr. 90:2-91:8 and 301:19-303:9, R.844). The Board finds that at least 1,571 (5,744-4,273) traditional full-time undergraduate students lived in off-campus housing in fall 1999.

15. The Applicant reported that fall 2000 traditional full-time undergraduate enrollment was 5,840 (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8) and the University had 4,173 undergraduate beds. (See ¶ 14, Supra). The Board finds that at least 1,667 (5,840-4,173) traditional full-time undergraduate students lived in off-campus housing in fall 2000.

16. The Board finds that during the period 1989-2000, the University added 303 beds and 553 (5,840-5,287) additional traditional full-time undergraduate students with the result that the number of undergraduates living off campus increased by at least 250. The Board finds that the Applicant did not meet its 1990 Campus Plan requirement to provide one new on campus bed for each additional student enrolled under the cap.

STUDENT CONDUCT

18. Testimony and written submissions from the community association parties and from individual members of the community demonstrate that student misconduct off-campus has grown progressively worse over the life of the 1990 Campus Plan, and reached intolerable levels in 1999 and 2000. (Community Letters, Exhibit Nos. 61-66, 71-73, 75, 77-78, 81, 95-100, 102, 106, 108-113, 120-122, 124-130, 132-133, 137-138, 140-141, 143, 152, 163, 187).

19. The Applicant submitted a sample of data tracking citizen complaints from August 24, 2000 to September 24, 2000. According to that data, 57 calls were placed to the hotline regarding 48 separate events. Georgetown dispatched hotline staff to the premises 46 times resulting in the sanction of 38 students and 9 houses. There was no information regarding the types of sanctions imposed or whether any students were sanctioned for their off campus behavior. (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 3).

20. The Applicant submitted a sample data tracking Metropolitan Police Department action from August 24, 2000 to September 24, 2000. According to that data, there was one noise violation by an off campus student, one instance of disorderly conduct by an off campus student, one instance of urinating in public and 23 alcohol violations involving both on campus and off campus students. Of the 26 total violations, 11 were for off campus students, 7 of whom were

sanctioned by the University. There was no information regarding the types of sanctions imposed or whether on campus students were sanctioned for their off campus behavior. (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 4).

21. The Board finds that as the number of students living off-campus increased, objectionable conditions in the community caused by student misconduct also increased.

22. The Board finds that a decrease in the number of students living off campus is required to address the objectionable conditions existing at the present time. The Board finds that any increase in the undergraduate enrollment cap has the potential to increase the objectionable conditions in the surrounding neighborhood that the Board finds to exist at the present time.

OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT AFFAIRS PROGRAM

23. The 1990 Campus Plan incorporated as a condition of approval a commitment by the University to create an Off-Campus Student Affairs Program that addresses the University's responsibility to both its students living in the neighborhoods and to the residents of Georgetown, Burleith and Foxhall, ensures that students are responsible in their conduct within the neighborhood, and ensures that students who cause serious problems in the neighborhood are dealt with in an appropriate manner. (1990 Campus Plan, Condition 5, Appendix H, Exhibit 145).

24. The Board finds that the Off-Campus Student Affairs Program under the 1990 Campus Plan has not been successful in preventing or mitigating the objectionable conditions in the community.

25. As part of the Proposed Campus Plan, the Applicant proposed a new Off-Campus Student Affairs Program, outlining proactive measures intended to better ensure that students living off-campus are responsible community citizens. The Off-Campus Student Affairs Program and Implementation Plan includes:

a. An acknowledgement by the University that it will address adverse impacts from students living off campus, including noise, drinking, partying, parking, trash, and disrespectful behavior;

b. A clear statement that the University will not tolerate behavior that adversely impacts the surrounding community and reflects poorly on the institution;

c. Clear-cut procedures for educating students living off-campus as to their community responsibilities, enforcing the University's new Code of Conduct, and implementing stiffer sanctions and penalties for violations of the Code;

d. The creation of a new neighborhood council, called the Alliance for Local Living (ALL), that will meet with the University to bring issues to the attention of the University and to identify problems and their solutions, inviting representatives of District government agencies as needed to work toward community-wide solutions;

e. Increased coordination with the Metropolitan Police Department to assure an institutionalized and coordinated approach to issues concerning student conduct off campus;

f. Increased and enhanced on-campus events, programs, and activities as well as comprehensive alcohol education programs; and

g. An implementation plan that outlines immediate, short-term, and long-term actions that can be monitored, tracked, and evaluated, so that statistics can be shared with ALL and reported to the Office of Planning and the Zoning Administrator annually. (Exhibit No. 169).

26. The Off-Campus Student Affairs Program is part of the Office of Student Affairs. The Office of Student Affairs also includes the Department of Public Safety. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix G, Exhibit No. 46, 46A).

27. The Board finds that the new Off-Campus Student Affairs Program is reasonable as a means to attempt to reduce the incidence of serious student misconduct in the surrounding neighborhoods.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

28. The Applicant currently employs 6,727 faculty and staff on campus, but projects that the number will increase to 7,500 over the life of the Proposed Campus Plan. The Applicant's traffic and parking calculations were based on the projected number. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix E, Exhibit No. 46, 46A).

29. The Applicant's proposed Transportation Management Program (TMP) encourages the use of public transportation and the Georgetown University Transportation System (GUTS). Components of the TMP include providing additional parking spaces at off-campus locations, operating more GUTS shuttle buses, and other measures to reduce use of single-occupant vehicles for trips to and from the campus, especially during peak hours. (Applicant's Statement at Appendices L, M, Exhibit No. 46, 46A).

30. The University currently has 1,535 marked parking spaces located on the main academic campus, and 2,494 marked and stacked spaces located on the north campus, for a total campus inventory of 4,029 parking spaces. The existing campus parking supply is consistent with the cap of 4,080 spaces approved in the 1990 Campus Plan as a means to discourage people from driving to the campus. Two new parking facilities are proposed for the Medical Center campus to replace surface parking and an existing valet parking program that includes 400 parking spaces and handles approximately 560 cars per day. A large surface lot at the south end of campus will be replaced with a below-grade parking structure as part of the Southwest Quadrangle, with access directly from Canal Road. (Applicant's Statement at Appendices L, M, Exhibit No. 46, 46A).

31. The Board finds that the Applicant's proposed Transportation Management Program is reasonable, particularly with respect to its efforts to increase use of public transit and GUTS buses.

32. The Applicant testified that students who live in campus housing are not permitted to have vehicles on campus. Additionally, those students who live in the District and in those areas in Northern Virginia which have good Metrobus and GUTS service may not use campus parking facilities. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix L, Exhibit No. 46, 46A).

33. Street-parking decals are available from the D.C. Department of Motor Vehicles to Georgetown students who live off-campus in the neighborhood and register their cars in the District. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix L, Exhibit No. 46, 46A).

34. The Applicant testified that it currently has no method of determining whether a student has a vehicle or whether such vehicle is registered in the District, but would be concerned if its students violated District parking regulations. (BZA June 13, 2000 Hearing, testimony of Linda Greenan).

35. Community members testified that illegally parked student vehicles in residential parking zones create an adverse impact by contributing to the shortage of on street parking in the community. (See Community Letters, ¶69, infra.)

36. The University has reached an agreement with MedStar to operate the clinical care enterprises of the Georgetown University Medical Center. Pursuant to the agreement, the facility will continue to be used as a university medical center with a university hospital, university medical school, and accessory buildings and uses. The University continues to own the land, and will exercise exclusive control over aspects of the medical center relating to its academic program as a learning facility for medical students and medical residents in furtherance of the academic mission of the University. The Applicant stated that the number of staff, parking spaces, and visitors will stay within the Proposed Campus Plan projections. (July 11, 2000 Letter from University to Board, Exhibit 67).

OFFICE OF PLANNING

37. The Applicant participated in a mediation process sponsored by the Office of Planning in May 2000. During the mediation process, the Applicant met with representatives of the community groups opposed to the proposed Campus Plan. The University subsequently amended its proposed plan by (1) reducing the proposed increase in the enrollment cap to 389 traditional full-time undergraduate students, 500 students above the reported enrollment at that time; (2) proposing to delay any increase in enrollment above its current cap until after the Southwest Quadrangle project is occupied or until fall 2003; (3) strengthening the University's off-campus student affairs program; and (4) providing the Zoning Commission with progress reports in every future application for further processing. (Exhibit No. 46).

38. The Office of Planning submitted a report on June 12, 2000 ("OP June 12 Report") recommending approval of the Proposed Campus Plan, allowing the University the full requested increase in undergraduate enrollment (389) subject to conditions relating to housing and enrollment. OP recommended a formula approach to future increases in undergraduate enrollment designed to provide certainty about enrollment increases while requiring the University to take additional actions to address impacts if the number of off-campus undergraduate students living in the community near the campus (i.e., within Zip code 20007)

exceeds a specified threshold percentage. Measures undertaken by the University to mitigate adverse impacts could include: (1) providing more on-campus housing; (2) providing housing elsewhere, outside Zip code 20007 and other areas affected by other universities; and (3) undertaking an increased off-campus student program. (OP June 12 Report, Exhibit No. 52).

39. OP expressed concern that the future increase of undergraduates without any additional on campus housing could lead to continuing negative impacts on nearby neighborhoods. Although OP believes that the situation will improve upon completion of the Southwest Quadrangle, it believes that it would be "somewhat counter-productive to see an improvement for several years and then see new negative impacts, essentially slipping backwards, as the University added 389 new undergraduates, above the present cap." (OP June 12 Report at 20, Exhibit No. 52).

40. OP identified additional student enrollment and the relationship of enrollment to student housing on campus as the "major issue" with the Proposed Campus Plan. (OP June 12 Report at 9, Exhibit No. 52). OP recognized the objectionable impacts of students that living in neighborhoods adjacent to and near the University, often in "group houses," creating objectionable impacts on those neighborhoods because of noise, parked cars, trash, conversion of back yards to parking, etc. (Id. at 9). OP indicated students living in rented houses off-campus have been a significant community problem, especially in Burleith. (Id. at 4).

41. OP identified residents' concerns that use of houses for rental student housing prevents those houses from being owner occupied and contributing to the stability and diversity of the neighborhood. OP stated that "[f]rom a planning perspective, it is desirable to have a stable neighborhood and housing stock and avoid a concentration of group houses that affect the character of the neighborhood." (OP June 12 Report at 9, Exhibit No. 52).

42. OP cited Sec. 1342.1(b) of the Ward 2 plan that includes a reference to "enforce Georgetown University's commitment to the surrounding neighborhood to move student residences and university offices out of the local community and onto the campus." (OP June 12 Report at 7, Exhibit No. 52).

43. OP expressed concern that graduate and professional students will move into units vacated by undergraduates upon the completion of the Southwest Quadrangle thereby resulting in little improvement in West Georgetown and Burleith. OP recommends that the University carefully track the number and residency pattern of graduate students on a regular basis so that any changes in impact can be assessed. (OP June 12 Report at 23, Exhibit No. 52).

44. In its OP Supplemental Report, dated July 14, 2000 ("OP Supplemental Report"), OP stated its belief that the opening of the Southwest Quadrangle in fall 2003 would greatly lessen the impacts of undergraduate students on adjacent neighborhoods, especially Burleith and West Georgetown, because many undergraduates will be removed from the neighborhoods. (OP Supplemental Report at 5, Exhibit No. 116).

45. OP testified that "some upper limit should be set for Georgetown University (traditional) undergraduate students living off campus in Zip Code 20007." Therefore OP proposed that off-campus undergraduates living in Zip Code 20007 should "not be allowed to exceed 700 after the

2003-2004 academic year," because a population of undergraduate students approaching 700 "would be an indication that a problem situation was developing." According to OP, the 700-student limit was a compromise that "allows room for considerable University enrollment growth after 2003" but would also "serve as a protection for the surrounding neighborhoods Under OP's recommendation, if the number of undergraduate students living in Zip Code 20007 after fall 2003 reached 700, the University should be required to provide additional housing on-campus, elsewhere in the District of Columbia (but not in areas with other university impacts), or nearby suburban locations; provide incentives for students to live outside Zip Code 20007; or forego any increase in undergraduate enrollment until the number of undergraduates living in Zip Code 20007 drops below 700. (OP Supplemental Report at 6, Exhibit No. 116).

46. OP also expressed concern about traffic impacts (traffic flow and parking), especially with respect to traffic on Reservoir Road and the north-south streets that intersect it between 35th and 39th Streets, N.W. (OP Supplemental Report at 8, Exhibit No. 116).

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS REPORT

47. The Department of Public Works (DPW) submitted a report dated June 8, 2000 addressing the transportation elements of the Proposed Campus Plan. DPW stated that "one of the best and most effective ways to minimize traffic to and from the campus is to provide on-campus housing for students presently living off-campus." Development of the Southwest Quadrangle project "would have an extremely beneficial improvement on local traffic." Another effective way to decrease traffic volume to and from the campus, according to DPW, is to encourage use of the available public transportation and the Georgetown University Transportation Shuttle (GUTS) by the University's faculty and staff, including medical staff. (DPW Report at 2, Exhibit No. 48).

48. DPW reported that University-related traffic along 38th and 39th Streets adjacent to the campus is not significant enough to cause an adverse traffic impact in the residential area. However, according to DPW, "Reservoir Road suffers from traffic congestion, especially during the morning and evening peak hours, which severely affects local residents' ability to access Reservoir Road." DPW has undertaken an investigation, in cooperation with the University, MedStar, and local residents, to consider alternative traffic management strategies designed to reduce overall congestion on Reservoir Road. DPW also expects that some of the traffic currently approaching the campus via Reservoir Road may shift to the Canal Road entrance once the proposed improvements to the south entrance are completed. (DPW Report at 3-4, Exhibit No. 48).

49. DPW commented on the traffic concerns expressed by the Hillandale Homeowners Association, concluding that differences in traffic analyses conducted by the Applicant and by Hillandale result from traffic monitoring at different times. DPW stated that the differences did not affect the overall findings of the Applicant's traffic report, which generally used the higher (worst case) scenario in its findings. (DPW Report at 4, Exhibit No. 48).

50. In calculating future traffic generation, DPW concluded that "the undergraduate student population would have negligible impact on traffic and parking due to its small increase and limited automobile usage." The largest single increase in anticipated traffic generation would

come from graduate students, who could be expected to create approximately 308 new trips per day, parking primarily on the south campus parking lot. While much of the graduate student traffic would likely occur during non-peak hours, DPW encouraged the University to increase mass-transit usage by graduate students. (DPW Report at 4, Exhibit No. 48).

51. DPW noted that the Applicant's traffic report showed very limited university-related traffic on local streets, but remained concerned about local streets with respect to the difficulty residents have in accessing Reservoir Road during peak-hours congestion on Reservoir Road. (DPW Report at 4, Exhibit No. 48).

52. DPW also concluded that the University's parking supply – 4,029 campus parking spaces, including 1,535 marked spaces on the main academic campus and 2,494 marked and stacked spaces on the north campus – is adequate for peak demand requirements. (DPW Report at 5, Exhibit No. 48).

53. DPW recommends the realignment of Entrance #1 and 38th Street, N.W. to improve traffic and pedestrian safety, with Entrance #1 designed with channelization and signage to require all vehicles using the entrance to turn either left or right, to eliminate cut-through traffic on 38th Street. (DPW Report at 6, Exhibit No. 48).

54. DPW concluded that the Proposed Campus Plan would result in an increase in traffic generation at both the northern and southern entrances. However, much of the increase would likely be spread throughout the day, and would not significantly affect peak-hour traffic congestion. DPW will work with the University and local residents in assessing overall congestion on Reservoir Road, and will seek to implement traffic management and parking modifications to reduce congestion, especially during peak hours. (DPW Report at 7, Exhibit No. 48).

COMMUNITY RESPONSE

55. The Board received numerous letters in support of the Application. The letters generally cited the contributions made by the University and its students and faculty, for example, in tutoring elementary school children, providing various types of assistance to public and private schools, teaching adult literacy and other classes, providing medical outreach services, and assisting economic and human development efforts of community organizations. Other letters in support, written by residents of Georgetown, described advantages of living near the University, including the vibrant community and proximity to students who volunteer for community programs and whose foot traffic through the neighborhood creates a sense of security for pedestrians. (Community Letters, Exhibit Nos. 82-94, 104-105, 107, 123, 134-136, 139, 161, 165).

56. At a special meeting held June 6, 2000, with all commissioners present, ANC 2E passed a resolution in support of the Proposed Campus Plan by a vote of five to three. The resolution notes that the University affirmed that, over the life of the 10-year plan, it would (1) maintain an on-campus undergraduate student population of at least 85 percent after completion of the Southwest Quadrangle in September 2003; (2) phase in an increase in the authorized enrollment cap from 5,627 to 6,016 upon completion of the Quadrangle; (3) reduce off-campus housing

demands in nearby neighborhoods to approximately 400 undergraduate students, a decrease of 60 percent from current levels; and (4) strengthen its off-campus student affairs program. ANC 2E conditioned its approval of the Proposed Campus Plan "by urging that measures be taken to strengthen the off-campus student affairs program," such as by suspending students who are cited for repeated disturbances in residential neighborhoods or requiring them to live on campus. (ANC Resolution, Exhibit No. 49).

57. In a "position statement" dated October 31, 2000, ANC 2E described the standards of conduct necessary to avoid adverse impacts associated with students living off-campus, addressing issues of trash, loud parties, and late-night street noise. The ANC emphasized that the University bears primary responsibility for educating its students and ensuring that they adhere to community standards and the laws of the District of Columbia. ANC 2E also expressed support for the Applicant's efforts to address issues associated with students living off-campus and to educate students about the appropriate standards of community living. The position statement was adopted by unanimous vote at its regularly scheduled meeting of October 30, 2000, which was duly noticed and at which all members were present. (ANC Position Statement, Exhibit No. 220).

58. The community association parties – the Foxhall Community Citizens Association, the Hillendale Citizens Association, the Burleith Citizens Association, Cloisters in Georgetown Homeowners Association, the Georgetown Residents Alliance, and the Citizens Association of Georgetown – testified collectively about the importance of strong, livable residential neighborhoods to both the city and the University. They expressed support for most of the goals of the Proposed Campus Plan, including planned infrastructure improvements and new academic buildings. However, the community association parties stated that present University operations are objectionable to neighboring property, and the proposed plan failed to address existing objectionable impacts. Citing a "large number of unknowns" in the planning process, the community association parties suggested approval of a five-year Campus Plan instead of committing to the 10-year proposed plan. (Community Association Parties Statement, Exhibit No. 151).

59. The community association parties argued in favor of maintaining the cap on enrollment adopted by the Board in the 1990 Campus Plan, on grounds that large numbers of students, both students living on-campus, and those living off-campus, are causing objectionable conditions in the community because of behavior, housing, and other issues. Further, they argued that the University's efforts to mitigate the impact have not solved the problem. The community association parties concluded that increasing the cap would increase existing objectionable conditions in the community because of increasing numbers of students. (Community Association Parties Statement, Exhibit No. 151).

60. The community association parties expressed concern about the operation of the Medical Center by MedStar. Specifically, they were concerned about an increase in the number of helicopter flights to the Medical Center, adding to the noise and increasing the possibility of a crash in the neighborhoods. (Community Association Parties Statement, Exhibit No. 151).

61. The Citizens Association of Georgetown ("CAG") argued against any increase in enrollment and expressed concern that the University had abandoned its goal of housing 100

percent of its undergraduate students on-campus. CAG also expressed concern regarding University owned townhouses and condominium units being used as campus housing outside the campus boundary. According to CAG, the University has at least 179 undergraduate beds in group houses located off-campus that have a very significant adverse impact on the community, including disruption of community development due to the transitory nature of the inhabitants. CAG also suggested approval of a five-year Campus Plan instead of committing to the 10-year proposed plan. (Citizens Association of Georgetown Statement, Exhibit No. 154).

62. The Burleith Citizens Association ("BCA") argued in opposition to any increase in undergraduate enrollment, asserting that the 1990 Campus Plan cap should be maintained to help mitigate the adverse impact of students. According to the BCA, there is a serious community impact from excessive numbers of students living off-campus, citing especially the prevalence of rental properties occupied by undergraduates in Burleith and associated serious behavior problems, overcrowding and inappropriate use of single-family housing, trash problems, and the use of yards for parking. BCA witnesses testified about extensive efforts by Burleith residents to address student-related problems with the University, the Metropolitan Police Department, DPW, and the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, among others. (Burleith Citizens Association Statement, Exhibit No. 160).

63. According to the BCA, the University's Office of Student Affairs has not been successful in eliminating the disruptive effect of student misconduct in the surrounding neighborhood. The BCA emphasized that off-campus living should be considered a privilege and not guaranteed to all students irrespective of their behavior. The BCA also testified that the hotline should be extended to Thursday nights and improved with follow-up calls to inform neighbors what actions were taken, and that the University should provide adequate support for the Office of Student Affairs. (Burleith Citizens Association Statement, Exhibit No. 160).

64. The BCA also opposed the proposed realignment of 38th Street with Entrance No. 1 because it would cause drivers to use side streets in an effort to avoid traffic signals and stop signs. (Burleith Citizens Association Statement, Exhibit No. 160).

65. The submission of the Foxhall Community Citizens Association urged the Board to maintain the 1990 Campus Plan enrollment cap, restrict graduate student expansion to 400 students, require the University to continue the quarterly meetings under the 1990 Campus Plan, set conditions requiring that sporting and theatrical events not be held during rush hours, prohibiting the use of the expanded stadium and theatre facilities to off-campus for-profit organizations, make no changes in the internal University traffic barriers separating the north and south campuses (Foxhall Community Citizens Association Statement, Exhibit No. 150)

66. The Georgetown Residents Alliance argued against any increases in student enrollment, citing the "severe adverse impacts on the surrounding residential neighborhoods" that an increase would cause. (Georgetown Residents Alliance Statement, Exhibit No. 158).

67. The Hillandale Homeowners Association expressed concerns about the lack of access to Hillandale, 267 single-family residences located directly across Reservoir Road from the Georgetown University medical complex, when Reservoir Road is blocked for community events or due to heavy traffic. In light of its "overarching concern" about the impact of increased

vehicular traffic on Reservoir Road, the Hillandale Homeowners Association requested that the Board require the Applicant to undertake a traffic study and to implement effective traffic amelioration measures as a condition of approval of the Proposed Campus Plan. (Hillandale Homeowners Association Statement, Exhibit No. 168).

68. The Federation of Citizens Associations submitted suggestions for Board action on the Proposed Campus Plan, including: (1) deferment of any increase in undergraduate enrollment until on-campus housing has been built to accommodate the new students; (2) consideration of graduate students as well as undergraduates when assessing the impact of students on surrounding communities; and (3) denial of any request to realign the north campus entrance with 38th Street into Burleith. (Federation of Citizens Associations Statement, Exhibit No. 162).

69. The Board received numerous letters and proffered evidence at the July 18, 2000 hearing in opposition to the Proposed Campus Plan. Many residents of surrounding neighborhoods, especially Burleith, described objectionable living conditions caused by students living off-campus, as well as on-campus students when off-campus, including frequent loud noise; excessive use of alcohol; disorderly behavior; loud late-night parties; parking violations; accumulations of trash and infestations of rats; poor maintenance of properties rented to students by absentee landlords; vandalism and destructive behavior by students, including causing damage to neighbors' houses, yards, and property; the prevalence of group houses occupied by transient students instead of permanent residents; and the overcrowding of large groups of students into single-family residences. Many noted that these problems are significantly reduced during the summer and when the university is otherwise out of session. Opponents of the Proposed Campus Plan generally stated that the University should not be permitted to increase its undergraduate enrollment until more on-campus housing was provided. (Community Letters, Exhibit Nos. 61-66, 71-73, 75, 77-78, 81, 95-100, 102, 106, 108-113, 120-122, 124-130, 132-133, 137-138, 140-141, 143, 152, 163, 187).

70. The Board finds that the number of undergraduate students at the University's campus is having an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood because of the frequent occurrence of serious student misconduct off-campus and the displacement of permanent, non-student housing as a result of the lack of sufficient on-campus housing. In making this finding, the Board gives great weight to OP's testimony that students living in rented houses off-campus have been a significant community problem, especially in Burleith, and to the premises underlying ANC 2E's resolution in support of the proposed Campus Plan, especially a reduction in off-campus housing demand, and a stronger off-campus student affairs program.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND OPINION

1. The Applicant is seeking a special exception, pursuant to sections 210 and 3104 of the Zoning Regulations, for approval of an updated Campus Plan for a period of 10 years. The Board is authorized to grant a special exception where, in the judgment of the Board based on a showing through substantial evidence, the special exception will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Maps and will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps. D.C. Code §5-424(g)(2), 11 DCMR § 3104.1.

2. The Zoning Regulations specify that use as a university in a residential zone shall be located so that it is not likely to become objectionable to neighboring property because of noise, traffic, number of students, or other objectionable conditions. 11 DCMR § 210.2.

3. In all applications to the Board for a special exception the burden of proof rests with the applicant. *President and Dir. of Georgetown Coll. v. Dist. of Columbia Bd. of Zoning and Adjustment*, 837 A.2d 58, 67 (D.C. 2003). In evaluating requests for special exceptions, the Board is limited to a determination of whether the exception sought meets the requirements of the particular regulation on which the application is based. The applicant has the burden of showing that the proposal complies with the regulation. *Id.*

4. The Board concludes that the Applicant has not met its burden of showing that the proposed University use complies with the Zoning Regulations. Specifically, the Board concludes that the Applicant has not met its burden of showing that the proposed University use will not be objectionable to neighboring property. Therefore, the Board concludes that it is necessary to condition its order on measures to minimize the impacts from existing conditions and potential impacts from planned future development, and allow the University to operate and improve its facilities to eliminate the adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.

5. The Zoning Regulations specify that the number of students is one factor that the Board must take into account when assessing whether a university use in a residential zone is likely to become objectionable to neighboring property. *See* 11 DCMR § 210.2. The Board has a statutory mandate to regulate land use in the District and is expressly required to take into account the number of students in this type of case.

6. In this case, the Office of Planning, the affected ANC, and parties in opposition have asserted that the number of undergraduate students at the University are creating adverse impacts in the surrounding neighborhoods because of the frequent occurrence of serious student misconduct off-campus and the displacement of permanent, non-student housing as a result of the lack of sufficient on-campus housing. The Board concludes that both factors – the insufficient supply of on-campus housing and the repeated occurrences of off-campus student misconduct – are creating objectionable conditions and are likely to exacerbate objectionable impacts on neighboring property unless steps are taken to prevent that outcome. The Board notes especially the concerns of the Office of Planning about the continued viability of Burleith and other neighborhoods close to the campus, as pressures associated with the large numbers of undergraduate students threaten their livability and residential character.

7. The Board heard substantial, persuasive testimony describing adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods resulting from the presence of undergraduate students living in those neighborhoods. Some students – albeit a minority of students and a small fraction of the University population – have created serious objectionable conditions in the communities surrounding the campus, particularly Burleith. The adverse impact created by students has several causes, especially the frequent incidences of student misconduct as well as the failure of landlords to ensure that their properties are adequately maintained and occupied legally, and other conditions associated with a relatively transient population living in otherwise stable neighborhoods containing primarily of single-family residences.

8. The Board concludes that there is a direct relationship between the number of undergraduate students living off campus and the incidence of student misconduct causing serious adverse impacts in the surrounding community. Based on the evidence in the record, the Board concludes that an increase in undergraduate enrollment above the existing cap of 5,627 would create further objectionable conditions in the surrounding neighborhood. The Board notes in that connection that the fall 2000 traditional full time undergraduate enrollment exceeded that cap by 213 students. Maintenance of the current cap, and University compliance with that cap, should help prevent further objectionable conditions in the surrounding neighborhood by decreasing the number of students required to find off-campus housing due to a lack of housing on campus.

9. The Board concludes that a substantial reduction in the number of students living off campus is necessary to eliminate the objectionable conditions that currently exist. The Board finds that the completion of the Southwest Quadrangle project and University compliance with the existing cap should result in a substantial decrease in the number of undergraduates living off campus, and the strengthened Off-Campus Student Affairs Program should lessen the incidence of serious student misconduct in the surrounding neighborhoods. However, based on the record before it, the Board cannot now find that the anticipated new dormitory and strengthened off-campus program will in fact rectify the current adverse impacts described by OP, the affected ANC, and neighborhood parties in opposition.

10. Finding that the Southwest Quadrangle was approved under the 1990 Campus Plan under which the University was granted an increase in enrollment, and that the Proposed Campus Plan contains no new on campus housing, the Board concludes that the current cap on traditional full-time undergraduate enrollment of 5,627 should be maintained.

11. The Board concludes that retention of this cap, in conjunction with the new Off-Campus Student Affairs Program, will create the highest likelihood for the University's success in eliminating the objectionable impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods. The Board concludes that before there is any increase in the traditional full-time undergraduate cap, the University must demonstrate that the objectionable conditions in the community caused by the number of undergraduate students, and in particular the number of those students living off-campus, have been remedied.

12. The Board believes that the University must direct and guide the conduct of its students when they are off campus. The Board believes that the policies established in the new Off-Campus Student Affairs program will better allow the University to monitor student activity off campus in a proactive manner to prevent adverse impacts on the community.

13. However, the Board concludes that the Off-Campus Student Affairs program, as proposed, lacked assurances that the program would have the structure, support and resources necessary and that there would be meaningful reporting of information back to the community. With the addition of the conditions specified in this Order, the Board is persuaded that the Off-Campus Student Affairs program is sufficiently comprehensive, that the students will be fully committed to and knowledgeable about the standards of conduct specified in the program, and that the University has committed adequate resources to make the off-campus housing program effective. Additionally, the Board concludes that requiring certain aspects of the program to be

administered by the Department of Public Safety, rather than the Off-Campus Student Affairs Office should ensure that the University can provide meaningful reporting of information to the community without violating its obligations under Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g. FERPA protects students' privacy interests by withholding federal funds from educational institutions that permit the release of educational records. Specifically exempted from the Act are records maintained by a law enforcement unit of the educational institution that were created by that law enforcement unit for the purpose of law enforcement. 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(ii).

14. The Board concludes that graduate student conduct is not likely to cause adverse impacts due to their greater level of maturity. However, the Board also recognizes that the presence of graduate students living in the community leads to the displacement of permanent, non-student housing and to additional traffic around the University. At this time, the Board declines to restrict the University's proposed increase in graduate student enrollment. Rather, the Board believes that the concerns regarding objectionable impacts are more effectively addressed by the cap on undergraduate enrollment. The displacement of non-student housing – by both graduate students and undergraduate students – is one factor that the Board has considered in deciding to maintain the current undergraduate enrollment cap.

15. While agreeing with the underlying concern for imbalance, the Board is not persuaded that OP's proposal to limit the number of undergraduate students living in Zip Code 20007 is consistent with the District of Columbia Human Rights Act, D.C. Code § 1-2501, et seq. OP concluded that greater than 700 undergraduate students living in the 20007 zip code "would be an indication that a problem situation was developing." The Board concludes that maintenance of the cap at the current level, in addition to the greater emphasis on off-campus student conduct, address the concerns raised by OP with regard to the continued viability of the neighborhoods bordering the campus and will adequately ensure that the University will not create objectionable impacts in those neighborhoods.

16. The Board notes that the Proposed Campus Plan continues the same boundaries and many of the same buildings and uses approved in previous plans. No party proposed any modification to the boundaries of the Applicant's Campus Plan. The Board concludes that the previously approved Campus Plan boundaries remain reasonable and should be adopted for purposes of the 2000 Campus Plan.

17. The Board concludes that the Applicant's proposed Transportation Management Program is reasonable, particularly with respect to its efforts to increase use of public transit and GUTS buses.

18. The Board concludes that the Applicant must take appropriate actions to ensure that student-owned vehicles are not illegally parked in the community creating an objectionable condition.

19. The Board concurs with the Applicant that its agreement with MedStar does not alter the nature of the Georgetown University Medical Center as a university use or affect the Campus Plan process. The University continues to own the underlying land and the lease arrangement with MedStar has not changed the use of the hospital for zoning purposes. The Board declines to

impose limits on the number of helicopter flights to the hospital, because those flights serve a broad regional need and are reasonable if not abused. However, the helicopter flights to the campus must be exclusively for medically required purposes, and the University must provide the Board and the community with periodic reports of credible evidence demonstrating compliance with this condition.

20. The Board accorded the issues and concerns of ANC 2E the great weight to which they are entitled. In doing so, the Board fully credited the unique vantage point that the ANC holds with respect to the impact of the University and its Proposed Campus Plan on its constituents. The ANC adopted a resolution in support of the Proposed Campus Plan subject to conditions designed to minimize the potential adverse impact of the University on surrounding residential neighborhoods. Although the ANC resolution recognized an increase in enrollment, it also included a University commitment to reduce off-campus housing demands in nearby neighborhoods to approximately 400 undergraduate students. An increase in the cap is incongruous with this commitment. An increase in enrollment to 6,016 would result in at least 1,063 (6,016-4,953) undergraduate students living off-campus after the completion of the Southwest Quadrangle brings the total number of on-campus beds to 4,953 (4,173+780). Finding that the number of undergraduate students living off-campus has the greatest potential for creating objectionable conditions in the community, the Board therefore concludes that the current enrollment cap must be maintained.

21. The Board concludes that upon the completion of the Southwest Quadrangle and the demonstrated elimination of objectionable impacts in the community related to the number of students, the University may petition the Zoning Commission for an increase in the undergraduate enrollment cap.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application is GRANTED SUBJECT to the following CONDITIONS:

Court of Appeals Discussion: Conditions 3(c), 4(b), 5, 8, and 10 of the Original Campus Plan Order have been deleted from this proposed Order to comply with the ruling of the Court of Appeals. The following Proposed Order addresses the remaining issues raised by the Court of Appeals decision.

1. The Applicant's Proposed Campus Plan is approved until December 31, 2010, subject to the following conditions intended to mitigate any adverse impacts potentially arising from the location of a university use in a residentially zoned district, or until such time prior to December 31, 2010 as the Zoning Commission determines that conditions warrant submission of an updated Campus Plan or grants a request to amend the plan.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This Condition is identical to Condition 1 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition.

This Condition is supported by Conclusions of Law ¶1-¶4, and ¶21.

2. The Applicant shall not, at any one time, increase actual undergraduate enrollment above the cap of 5,627. This cap shall apply to each semester; averaging of enrollment is not permitted.

The cap shall apply to traditional full-time undergraduate students; that is, undergraduate students who require housing.

Court of Appeals discussion:

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶6-¶22, ¶39-¶42, ¶45, ¶56-¶59, ¶61-¶63, ¶65-¶66, ¶68-¶70, and Conclusions of Law ¶4-¶11, ¶14-¶16, and ¶20.

Court of Appeals requirements

The Court of Appeals concluded that "the Board made no findings 'of a basic or underlying nature,' explicating how a small and gradual increase in enrollment, under a plan which significantly increased the number of students living on campus and reduced the need for off-campus housing would adversely affect the adjoining neighborhoods." 837 A.2d at 74 *(citations omitted). To satisfy the Court of Appeals mandate, the Board must describe, " in non-conclusory terms the manner in which the retention of the cap would protect the residents of the adjoining communities" and " the need for continuing the 1990 cap, based on reasonably detailed underlying evidentiary findings."* 837 A.2d at 75.

However, the Court of Appeals rejected as "altogether unreasonable" the University's argument that the BZA inquiry should be limited to whether the new Campus Plan would significantly increase the objectionable conditions in the neighborhood. 837 A.2d at 63 n.7. *It thus specifically found the BZA authorized to take action necessary to mitigate existing objectionable conditions in the neighborhood in the Campus Plan review process.*

The 1990 Campus Plan Cap

In the 1990 Campus Plan proceedings and the current proceedings, substantial evidence has linked the increase in the number of students living off campus to a rise in objectionable conditions in the community. The Board, in the 1990 Campus Plan order, approved a full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment cap of 5,627, an increase in 340 over the 1989-90 full-time undergraduate enrollment of 5287. Recognizing the potential for objectionable conditions caused by students living in off-campus housing, the Board conditioned the increase in the enrollment cap on the provision of 925 new beds on campus which would have produced a substantial net reduction in the number of students living off campus. Any actual increase in enrollment was also conditioned on the provision of additional beds on campus to accommodate that increase. Additionally, the 1990 Campus Plan set a goal to house 100% of undergraduate students in on-campus housing.

From 1990-2000, the University added 303 beds, which effectively capped traditional full-time undergraduate enrollment under the 1990 Campus Plan to 5,590. The University did not meet its on campus housing commitments under the 1990 Campus Plan until the Southwest Quadrangle was completed in 2003. In 2000, more students were living off-campus than ever before and the incidence of misconduct by students living off campus was very high.

The University argues that the proposed increase in enrollment will be phased in after the completion of the Southwest Quadrangle and that there will be a net reduction in the number of undergraduates living off campus after it is built. This argument ignores the fact that approval

of the 1990 Campus Plan was premised on a substantial reduction in the number of undergraduate students living off campus and that completion of the Southwest Quadrangle was a condition of that plan. If the University's proposed increase in the cap were approved, the completion of the Southwest Quadrangle in the fall of 2003 would not result in a substantial reduction of students living off campus. The increase in the number of on campus beds (780) would be cut in half by the proposed increase in enrollment (389). As the evidence in this proceeding demonstrates, and as the Board found in 1990, a substantial reduction in the number of undergraduate students living off campus is required to eliminate the potential for the current objectionable conditions in the community continuing indefinitely.

Current Objectionable Conditions

The Proposed Findings of Fact demonstrate that over the ten years leading up to the 2000 Campus Plan, an increasing number of both undergraduate and graduate students have moved off-campus leading to further displacement of single family residences, further objectionable conditions due to behavioral issues and further parking problems. While the number of students living off campus is not precisely known, due to the University's "Traditional Full-Time Undergraduates" unit of measurement it is likely far greater than the number of students Georgetown has reported. For example, according to OP figures, in addition to the 1,041 traditional undergraduate students living in the 20007 zip code during Spring 2000, there were also 301 "non-traditional" undergraduate students living in the 20007 zip code. (See OP June 12 Report at Attachment H, Exhibit No. 52). That these figures were from the spring semester is also important since the University stated that spring enrollment is usually 6-10% less than fall enrollment. (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8). The traditional full-time undergraduate enrollment figures for fall 1999 and fall 2000 show that the University has increased traditional full-time enrollment above the cap resulting in at least 1,667 traditional full-time undergraduates living off-campus plus an increasing number of graduate students. While not all off-campus students live in the Georgetown community, OP calculated that 84% of off-campus students live in the 20007 zip code. Even when reduced by that factor the number of undergraduate students living off campus in Georgetown is substantially higher than envisioned under the 1990 Campus Plan and a direct cause of the increasing incidence of student misconduct in Georgetown since 1990.

The Proposed Findings of Fact demonstrate that the number of undergraduate students attending the University has created objectionable conditions in the neighborhood for several years. The report of the Office of Planning, and the testimony of several neighborhood associations and many individual community members, indicate a clear connection between the number of students living off-campus and the current objectionable impact on the community. Maintaining the cap at current levels will prevent any further growth in the off-campus undergraduate student population thereby preventing the further displacement of single-family residences. While continuing the cap at current levels is not likely to improve the objectionable conditions caused by the conduct of undergraduate students and illegal parking, it should prevent it from becoming worse.

The opening of the Southwest Quadrangle has resulted in a modest net reduction in undergraduate students living off campus; however, it has not been sufficient to lessen student misconduct by students off campus. Data from the University's quarterly reports to the Board

for the last two quarters of 2003 (i.e., Fall 2003) indicate a total of 189 hotline calls resulting in a total of 52 offenses and 28 sanctions. Similar data for first two quarters of 2004 (i.e., Spring 2004) indicate a total of 100 offenses committed by off-campus students and 12 offenses committed by on-campus students while off campus resulting in a total of 212 sanctions. These figures do not include Noise Control Act citations and warnings issued by MPD, of which there were 25 during Spring 2004. Again, it is significant that this increasing number of offenses occurred in the spring since the University has stated that spring enrollment is typically 6-10% less than fall enrollment (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8). Clearly an objectionable impact still exists and allowing any increase in enrollment will only further exacerbate these objectionable conditions.

Georgetown May Petition for an Increase in the Cap

In BZA Order 16566B, the Board modified Condition 1 to allow amendment to the Campus Plan. In so doing, the Board recognized that "circumstances may change to an extent that renders the new plan, or a condition of its approval in some way out of date or inapplicable." A specific modification that the Board contemplated was an " increase[] in student enrollment based upon facts not presently in the record." The current record is a snap-shot of Georgetown as it existed nearly 4 years ago. As CAG noted in its previous submission to the Board on August 2, 2004, much has changed since the record in this proceeding was closed. Proposed Conditions 1 and 2 do not limit the University to the 1990 cap until 2010. Rather, as noted by Commissioner Franklin, the Zoning Commission would be able to consider a future Georgetown request for an increase in the enrollment cap "with much better information as to the effectiveness of the off-campus housing plan that has been instituted. We would be able to look at the possibilities of an increase in enrollment knowing much more than we know today about the effectiveness of that program." (BZA Transcript, November 8, 2000, 30:20-31:1). These conditions thus allow the University an opportunity to present its case for an increase in the enrollment cap, provide the community an opportunity to present evidence concerning the incidence of student misconduct and give the Zoning Commission an opportunity to make an informed decision.

Averaging Must be Prohibited

In an application for further processing under this Campus Plan, CAG noted that the University was not in compliance with the undergraduate cap set in the original campus plan Order of this Board. CAG argued that the practice of averaging defies the very definition of a cap and that the use of averaging is inconsistent with a cap whose purpose is to prevent adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood caused by the number of undergraduate students attending the University. The Zoning Commission agreed with CAG and ruled, "The Commission does not agree with the Applicant that the use of average enrollment during an academic year is appropriate for purposes of determining compliance with the cap on undergraduate enrollment established in the Campus Plan. With respect to further processing applications that may be filed in the future, the Commission will not assess compliance with the enrollment cap on the basis of an average of the fall and spring semesters of an academic year, but will consider the enrollment cap to be the maximum permitted enrollment of undergraduate students at any given time during the academic year." (Zoning Commission Order 02-32, ¶26). After reconsideration, and a complete review of the record, the Zoning Commission stayed the effective date of that paragraph until November 12, 2004, to give the University adequate time to comply. (Zoning

Commission Transcript, November 12, 2003, 119:10-131:6). Accordingly the proposed Order clarifies that averaging is no longer permitted.

3. The Applicant shall maintain an Off-Campus Student Affairs Program that effectively educates students on their rights and responsibilities in the community, and monitors and regulates the conduct of all students when they are off-campus such that noise, traffic, and other objectionable conditions do not have an adverse impact on neighboring property. In implementing this program the Applicant shall:

a. ensure that the Off-Campus Student Affairs Program is fully funded and staffed, and shall obtain the endorsement of the University's Board of Directors for the program and its implementation;

b. specify that a student's ability to live in off-campus housing can be revoked for misconduct, whether a violation occurs on or off campus;

c. conduct periodic community education workshops for students living off-campus;

d. maintain a telephone hotline staffed by the Applicant's Department of Public Safety to receive complaints regarding student misconduct off-campus;

e. specify the measures that the Applicant's Department of Public Safety shall undertake, immediately upon receiving a complaint regarding student misconduct, to resolve any objectionable behavior pending the University's investigation of a complaint;

f. initiate disciplinary proceedings to impose appropriate sanctions for any student misconduct found to have occurred;

g. investigate complaints received by the Applicant's Department of Public Safety regarding violation of sanitation or housing regulations involving or affecting students living in an off-campus residence and report findings to the appropriate District agency;

h. make publicly available data indicating the number and types of complaints received concerning student misconduct off-campus by students living on or off-campus, and the outcome of each complaint, including any sanctions imposed by the University. The Applicant shall also report this information quarterly to the Office of Planning, the Zoning Administrator, ANC 2E, and the Alliance for Local Living, and to other interested community organizations that may request the information; and

i. continue the quarterly meeting process established by the Board in 1990.

Court of Appeals Discussion: The Court of Appeals determined that many of the previous conditions relating to the off campus student affairs program "involve[d] the board in the details and mechanics of the University's enforcement of student discipline and other similar concerns." 837 A.2d at 77. CAG's proposed conditions deletes the provisions to which the Court of Appeals objected and simply requires the University to devise and implement an Off Campus Student Affairs Program similar to that proposed by the University in its original Proposed Findings of Fact & Conditions of Law.

The preamble to Condition 3 sets forth the intent of the Off-Campus Student Affairs Program and clarifies that it applies to the conduct of <u>all students</u> occurring off-campus, whether the student lives on-campus or off-campus.

Subsection (a)

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶24-¶25, ¶27, ¶37, ¶56, ¶59, and ¶69, and Conclusions of Law ¶4 and ¶11-¶13.

Subsection (a) above is identical to Condition 3(a) of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition. Based on the record, this Condition has already been satisfied. (Letter from Board of Directors, Exhibit 169 at Exhibit P)

Subsection (b)

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶24-¶25, and ¶63, and Conclusion of Law ¶4.

Subsection (b) above is identical to Condition 3 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition.

Subsection (c)

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶24-¶25, and ¶57, and Conclusions of Law ¶4, ¶12-¶13.

Subsection (c) above is similar to Condition 3(c) of the Original Campus Plan Order. The Court of Appeals concluded that the University, not the Board, should determine how often students living off campus should be required to attend community education workshops. Although CAG believes that students and the community would benefit from annual attendance by students at a community education workshop, the requirement that they be attended annually has been deleted.

Subsection (d)

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶24-¶26, ¶63, and ¶69, and Conclusions of Law ¶4, ¶12-¶13.

Subsection (d) above is similar to Condition 6 of the Original Campus Plan Order. The Court of Appeals concluded that the Board's imposition of an around the clock staffed hotline was arbitrary given that the student hotline may receive no calls during weekdays, weeknights, or mornings. CAG's proposed condition addresses this concern as well as the University's FERPA reporting concerns.

By requiring the hotline to be a part of the University's Department of Public Safety ("DPS"), FERPA concerns raised by the University are eliminated. As the Court of Appeals notes, "FERPA protects students' privacy interests by withholding federal financial assistance to educational institutions that have 'a policy or practice of permitting the release of educational records' or 'personally identifiable information contained therein other than directory information', unless disclosure is permitted by an exception to the Act." 837 A.2d at 78 n.21, citing 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1). Specifically exempted from the Act are records maintained by a law enforcement unit of the educational institution that were created by that law enforcement unit for the purpose of law enforcement. 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(ii). The Court of Appeals specifically suggested, "the BZA might limit the University's reporting obligation to apply only to complaints received by the University's Department of Public Safety." Id.

DPS is under the supervision of the Office of Student Affairs, which also has oversight over the Off-Campus Student Affairs Program. DPS already maintains a telephone line 24 hours per day that records complaints and refers calls to MPD (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional

Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 7). The concept of a separate "hotline" has proven unworkable and is unnecessarily duplicative of existing facilities. DPS staff already serve as the University's first responders in an emergency situation. It is therefore appropriate that DPS serve as the operator of the hotline. The only effective alternative at the present time is for residents to call the D.C. Police to respond to each incident of misconduct. The DPS hotline affords the University the opportunity to respond to issues internally, rather than subjecting its students to fines and arrest while District taxpayers are burdened with the expense.

Subsection (e)

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶24-¶26, and ¶63, and Conclusions of Law ¶4, ¶12-¶13.

Subsection (e) above is similar to Condition 3(b) of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition. To eliminate FERPA issues and be consistent with condition 3(d), CAG has revised the Condition to place this responsibility under the DPS.

Subsection (f)

This Condition is supported by Finding of Fact ¶25, and Conclusions of Law ¶4, ¶12-¶13.

Subsection (f) above is similar to Conditions 5 and 8 of the Original Campus Plan Order. This Condition conforms to the Court of Appeals decision because it only requires Georgetown to bring disciplinary action when warranted; it does not dictate the procedures of such disciplinary proceedings.

Subsection (g)

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶24-¶26, and Conclusions of Law ¶4, ¶12-¶13.

Subsection (g) above is similar to Condition 7 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Georgetown objected to this condition on the grounds that reporting violations of sanitation or housing regulations to District authorities could force it to violate FERPA. As the Court of Appeals suggested with respect to original Condition 6 (See Subsection (d) above), CAG has limited the University's reporting obligation to apply only to complaints received by DPS to eliminate FERPA issues.

Subsection (h)

This Condition is supported by Finding of Fact ¶25, and Conclusions of Law ¶4, ¶12-¶13.

Subsection (h) above is similar to Condition 9 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition. This Condition has been revised to clarify that the reporting requirements apply to incidences of off-campus misconduct by any student, not just those living off-campus.

Subsection (i)

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶25 and ¶65, and Conclusions of Law ¶4, ¶12-¶13.

Subsection (i) above was not a part of the Original Campus Plan Order. It was originally proposed by Georgetown and remains an important forum for communication between the University and the community. (See GU FOF Condition 13, Exhibit No. 186) Although not

specifically required by the 2000 Order, Georgetown has in fact continued these meetings. The Order should contain a provision requiring the continuation of these meetings.

3. The Applicant shall avoid scheduling events that attract large numbers of visitors to the campus during the peak traffic times of 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. The Applicant shall employ campus personnel as necessary to direct visitors to campus parking areas and to ensure smooth flow of traffic into and out of the campus.

a. All weekday evening performances at the Performing Arts Center expected to draw more than 100 visitors shall begin no earlier than 7:00 p.m.

b. Athletic events at Harbin Field expected to draw over 100 visitors shall begin before 4:00 p.m. or after 7:00 p.m.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This condition is identical to Condition 11 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition.

This Condition is supported by Finding of Fact ¶65 and Conclusion of Law ¶4.

4. The Performing Arts Center, Harbin Field, and McDonough Arena shall be used for purposes related to the University or the community, and not for non-University events whose primary purpose is revenue generation.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This condition is identical to Condition 12 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition.

This Condition is supported by Finding of Fact ¶65 and Conclusion of Law ¶4.

5. The helipad shall be used only for medically necessary purposes. The Applicant shall provide monthly reports regarding use of the helipad, including credible evidence of medical necessity associated with its use, to ANC 2E, the Alliance for Local Living, and other community organizations that request the information.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This condition is identical to Condition 13 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition.

This Condition is supported by Finding of Fact ¶60 and Conclusions of Law ¶4 and ¶19.

6. The Applicant shall not permit students who live in campus housing, the District of Columbia or areas of Northern Virginia serviced by Metrobus or GUTS to park their vehicles on campus. The Applicant shall require all University students to provide it with a copy of the vehicle registration of any vehicle that they intend to keep or have kept within the District of Columbia for more than 30 days. The Applicant shall maintain an accurate list of vehicle license plate numbers kept by all University students and shall direct its students to register their vehicles in the District of Columbia if they are kept in the District of Columbia for more than 30 days. The Applicant shall require each student keeping a vehicle within the District of Columbia for more than 30 days to provide evidence of registration of that vehicle in the District of

Columbia. Failure to register such student vehicles in the District of Columbia shall constitute a violation of the Code of Student Conduct.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This condition is similar to Condition 14 of the Original Campus Plan Order. After declaring the University's objections to consulting with the District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles moot, the Court of Appeals found that the University had not met its burden of showing that Condition 14 was arbitrary and capricious. 837 A.2d at 82. However, the Court of Appeals suggested that the Board take a "fresh look" at this provision to determine whether it is likely to achieve its goal of reducing objectionable impact on the community by curtailing illegal student parking. Currently, many University students who park their cars off-campus do not register their cars in the District as required by law. This creates parking difficulties for community residents that do comply with those laws. Residents have difficulty finding parking in the neighborhood because University students who do not comply with registration laws occupy the already limited available spaces. The requirement that the University obtain information from its students about their vehicle registration is an effective means to curtail illegal parking and provides a disincentive for students to bring their out of state vehicles to school.

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶32-¶35, ¶62 and ¶69, and Conclusions of Law ¶4 and ¶18.

7. The Applicant shall maintain the current parking cap of 4,080 off-street parking spaces within the campus boundary to avoid encouraging additional cars from coming to the campus.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This condition is similar to Condition 15 of the Original Campus Plan Order. The Court of Appeals objected to this condition because it was unclear whether 4,080 was a cap or floor. 837 A.2d at 80-81. The condition has been modified to clarify its intent as a cap. The Court of Appeals concluded that this Condition, "if construed as a cap and only a cap, would be supported by substantial evidence and would not be arbitrary and capricious." 837 A.2d at 81.

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶30 and ¶52, and Conclusion of Law ¶4.

8. The Applicant shall enhance its Transportation Management Program:

   a. to promote greater transit usage, including increased ridership of the GUTS bus service;

   b. to provide additional parking in satellite locations linked to the campus by shuttle bus;

   c. to work with the community, MedStar, and the Department of Public Works as part of a cooperative team effort to look at mitigation strategies for Reservoir Road.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This condition is identical to Condition 16 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition.

This Condition is supported by Findings of Fact ¶29-¶31, ¶36, ¶47, ¶54, and ¶67 and Conclusions of Law ¶17 and ¶19.

9. The Applicant shall include, in all future applications for further processing of the Campus Plan, the following information:

a. actual enrollment of traditional full-time undergraduate students, as of 30 days prior to the hearing date, including documentation and an explanation of the methods and assumptions used in the calculation;

b. whether the Southwest Quadrangle project has been completed, and, if so, the date it began use as an undergraduate dormitory;

c. evidence demonstrating that the Off-Campus Student Affairs Program has been effective in reducing student misconduct off-campus, and that student misconduct off-campus has been appropriately sanctioned on an ongoing basis.

d. the number of off-street parking spaces within campus boundaries, as of 30 days prior to the hearing date, including documentation and an explanation of the methods and assumptions used in the calculation; and

e. a status report on the Transportation Management Program.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This condition is similar to Condition 17 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition. CAG has revised subsection (c) to clarify that the evidence provided in a further processing plan must demonstrate that the Off-Campus Student Affairs Program has been effective in reducing student misconduct off-campus, not that a plan merely exists.

10. The Applicant shall prepare a revised Campus Plan that is consistent with this Order and shall submit an original and 10 copies of the revised plan to the Board no later than 90 days from the effective date of this Order. The revised plan shall be accompanied by a table of changes that lists each page on which a change appears, and describes each change. The Board shall certify the revised copy as the approved Campus Plan. Copies of the approved plan shall be maintained in the Office of Zoning and the Office of the Zoning Administrator.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This condition is identical to Condition 18 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition.

11. No special exception application filed by the University for further processing under this plan may be granted unless the University proves that it has consistently remained in substantial compliance with Conditions 1 through 10 set forth in this Order. For purposes of this condition, substantial compliance with Condition 4 means that the University has implemented the Off-Campus Student Affairs Program and that it has been has been effective in reducing student misconduct off-campus. Further, any violation of a condition of this Order shall be grounds for the denial or revocation of any building permit or certificate of occupancy applied for by, or issued to, the University for any University building or use within the campus boundary, and

may result in the imposition of fines and penalties pursuant to the Civil Enforcement Act, D.C. Code §§ 6-2701 to 6-2723.

Court of Appeals Discussion: This condition is similar to Condition 19 of the Original Campus Plan Order. Neither Georgetown nor the Court of Appeals objected to this condition. CAG has revised this condition to clarify that the evidence provided in a further processing plan must demonstrate that the Off-Campus Student Affairs Program has been effective in reducing student misconduct off-campus, not that a plan merely exists. The Court of Appeals has ruled that a moratorium on non-residential development on the campus, if imposed for a meaningful violation, is not unreasonable. 837 A.2d at 63 n.2 citing George Washington Univ. v. District of Columbia Bd. of Zoning Adjustment, 831 A.2d 921, 934-34 (D.C. 2003) and George Washington Univ. v. District of Columbia 318 F.3d 203, 211 (D.C. Cir. 2003).

VOTE:

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

Each concurring member has approved the issuance of this Order.

Final Date of Order:

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR §3125.6. THIS ORDER WILL BECOME FTNAL UPON ITS FILTNG IN THE RECORD AND SERVICE UPON THE PARTIES. UNDER 11 DCMR §3125.9, THIS ORDER WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE 10 DAYS AFTER IT BECOMES FINAL.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3205, FAILURE TO ABIDE BY THE CONDITIONS IN THIS ORDER, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, SHALL BE GROUNDS FOR THE REVOCATION OF ANY BUILDING PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY ISSUED PURSUANT TO THIS ORDER.

THE APPLICANT SHALL COMPLY FULLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, D.C. LAW 2-38, AS AMENDED, CODIFIED AS CHAPTER 25 IN TITLE 1 OF THE D.C. CODE. SEE D.C. CODE § 1-2531 (1999). THIS ORDER IS CONDITIONED UPON FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT. THE FAILURE OR REFUSAL OF THE APPLICANT TO COMPLY SHALL BE A PROPER BASIS FOR THE REVOCATION OF THIS ORDER.

~~GOVERNMENT OF~~CITIZENS ASSOCIATION OF GEORGETOWN
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

Application No. 16566 of the President and Directors of Georgetown College, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3104.1, for a special exception for the review and approval of the University Campus Plan - years 2000-2010 under Section 210 in the R-3 and C-1 Districts at premises bounded by Glover Archbold Parkway to the west, the National Park Service property along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal and Canal Road to the south, 35th Street, N Street to 36th Street, and 36th Street to P Street to the east and Reservoir Road to the north. (Square 1222, Lots 62, 801-810; Square 1223, Lots 85-86, 807-810, 812, 815, 826, 827, 831, 834, 846-847, 852-853, 855, and 857-858; Square 1226, Lots 91, 94-101, 104-105, 803-804, 806, and 811-815; Square 1248, Lots 122-125, 150-157, 800-802, 804-806, 829-831, and 834-835; Square 1321, Lots 815-817.)

HEARING DATES: June 13, and July 18, 2000

DECISION DATES: September 5, November 8, and December 5, 2000

ORDER DATE: March 29, 2001

RECONSIDERATION DECISION DATE: June 5, 2001

STAY DECISION DATE: September 4, 2001

DECISION AND ORDER

PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

1. This Decision and Order supercedes BZA Order 16566-A, as amended by Order 16566-B and Order 16566-C, hereinafter the "Original Campus Plan Order."

2. The President and Directors of Georgetown College (hereinafter "University" or "Applicant") filed an application on January 31, 2000 for review and approval of the Georgetown University Campus Plan for Years 2000–2010 (hereinafter "Proposed Campus Plan").

3. Advisory Neighborhood Commission ("ANC") 2E was a party in this proceeding. The Board received requests for party status from the Burleith Citizens Association ("BCA"), Citizens Association of Georgetown **("CAG")**, Cloisters in Georgetown Homeowner's Association, Foxhall Community Citizens Association, Georgetown Residents Alliance, and Hillandale Homeowners Association. These requests were all granted. The Wormley Neighbors Association also requested to participate as a party, but failed to appear at the hearing. Its request for party status was denied.

BZA
Case No. 16566
Exhibit No. 288-B

~~1. The President and Directors of Georgetown College (hereinafter "University" or "Applicant") filed an application January 31, 2000 for review and approval of the Georgetown University Campus Plan for Years 2000–2010.~~

~~2. The Applicant participated in a mediation process sponsored by the Office of Planning in May 2000. During the mediation process, the Applicant met with representatives of the community groups opposed to the proposed campus plan. The University subsequently amended its proposed plan by (1) reducing the projected increase in enrollment by 111 students, so that the total proposed increase was 389 rather than 500; (2) proposing to delay any increase in enrollment above its current cap until after the Southwest Quadrangle project is occupied or until Fall 2003; (3) strengthening the University's off-campus student affairs program; and (4) providing the Zoning Commission with progress reports in every future application for further processing. Exhibit No. 46.~~

4. By Order issued March 29, 2001, the Board approved the Proposed Campus Plan until December 31, 2010, subject to conditions intended to mitigate the adverse impacts arising from the location of a university in a residentially zoned district. The Applicant appealed the Order to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. On December 4, 2003, the Court of Appeals issued an opinion vacating the Board's decision, *President & Dirs. of Georgetown College v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 837 A.2d 58 (D.C. 2003). The case was remanded to the Board for further proceedings consistent with the Court's opinion.

5. On October 15, 2004, the Board issued an order permitting any party to submit a proposed order including findings of fact and conclusions of law. After reviewing the record in this case, the submission of the parties, and the Court's Opinion, the Board approved this Decision and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

~~3.~~ **1.** The Georgetown University campus, known as premises 3800 Reservoir Road, comprises 104 acres zoned R-3 or C-1 located within the Georgetown Historic District. The campus is bordered on two sides by public parlkand and Canal Road. The southern boundary extends east along Prospect Street to 35th Street, excluding the structure on the north side of Prospect Street between 36th and 37th Streets. The campus is bounded on the west by Glover Archbold Park and on the north by Reservoir Road. The eastern boundary runs from Reservoir Road at 37th Street south and east past the Cloisters residential development and the grounds of the Sisters of Visitation High School and Convent to a point just west of 36th and P Streets, then continues south, excluding a row of residences on the west side of 36th Street to O Street, south on 37th Street to N Street, east to 35th Street, and finally south to Prospect Street**. (Applicant's Statement at 1, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A)**.

~~4.~~ **2.** The University has been located on its present campus since its founding in 1789. With certain exceptions, the campus boundaries include land owned by the University that has been actively devoted to university use for over 200 years. The ~~proposed campus plan~~**Proposed Campus Plan** does not seek any change in the previously adopted campus boundaries, and does not propose to move any major new building off campus. (Applicant's Statement at 1-2, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A).

~~5.~~ **3.** The Applicant submitted a plan for developing the campus as a whole, showing the location, height, and bulk of all present and proposed improvements, as required by 11 DCMR § 210.4. **(Applicant's Statement at 16-20, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A).**

~~6. The proposed campus plan~~**4. The Proposed Campus Plan** anticipates several new developments on campus, including a science building, a business school, an administrative/academic building, and a physicians' office building at the Medical Center. Other projects set forth in the proposed plan include additions or renovations to several existing buildings as well as the renovations of Harbin Field into a multi-sports facility and McDonough Gym to allow its use as a convocation center. **(Applicant's Statement at 3-4, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A).**

~~7.~~ **5.** The proposed additional gross footage and existing square footage will result in a floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.41, or 0.39 below the 1.8 FAR permitted by the Zoning Regulations. *See* 11 DCMR §§ 210.3, 402.4. **(Applicant's Statement at 15, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A).**

THE 1990 CAMPUS PLAN

6. In the order approving the University's 1990 Campus Plan, the Board stated, "To further ensure that there will be no adverse impacts, the Board incorporates as a condition to its Order a limitation on enrollment so that by the year of 1997, the University will be providing beds on campus for essentially 100 percent of those undergraduate students requiring housing." This cap of 5,627 Full-Time Equivalent undergraduate students allowed the University to add an additional 340 students over current enrollment, provided a new on campus bed was provided for each student. The Board also conditioned the approval of the 1990 Campus Plan on the University's commitment to provide 925 additional undergraduate beds on campus and to implement an Off-Campus Affairs program. (Application No. 15302, decision date September 5, 1990, order date October 12, 1990, hereinafter the "1990 Campus Plan"; See Appendix H, Exhibit 145).

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT

7. The Applicant reported that fall 1999 enrollment of traditional full-time undergraduate students was 5,744. (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8).

8. ~~Currently, approximately 77 percent of the University's traditional undergraduate students live on campus. "Traditional undergraduate students" do not include students of English as a second language, commuters, and other non-traditional students not requiring University housing.~~ **The Applicant reported that fall 2000 enrollment of traditional full-time undergraduate students was 5,840. (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8).**

9. The Applicant stated that fall and spring enrollment was averaged to reflect enrollment for the academic year. For example, fall 2000 enrollment of 5,840 was averaged with spring 2001 enrollment of 5,366 to arrive at a FY 2000 enrollment of 5,603. (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8).

10. The Board finds that the University has improperly calculated its traditional full-time undergraduate student enrollment by averaging the fall and spring enrollment numbers to arrive at the reported enrollment figure.

11. The Board finds that the University exceeded its enrollment cap of 5,627 by enrolling 5,744 traditional full-time undergraduate students in fall 1999 and enrolling 5,840 traditional full-time undergraduate students in fall 2000.

UNDERGRADUATE HOUSING

12. ~~9. A new residence hall project, the~~**The University provided 303 additional undergraduate beds over the life of the 1990 Campus Plan. The increase in undergraduate beds came primarily from the elimination of 200 graduate student beds in 1992-93. The additional 103 beds were the result of renovations and conversions of existing space. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix F, Exhibit No. 46). The** Southwest Quadrangle, ~~is~~**a new residence hall required as a Condition under the 1990 Campus Plan, is not** scheduled to be completed ~~by Fall 2003, providing 780 new beds on campus.~~ **until fall 2003, when it will provide 780 new undergraduate beds on campus. (O'Donovan Testimony, June 13, 2000, Exhibit No. 68)**

~~10. The Applicant testified that at least 84 percent of undergraduates will live on campus by 2010, with the requested increase in enrollment 389 deferred until the Southwest Quadrangle is completed and then phased in at a rate of no more than 55 students per year. June 13, 2000 Transcript at 61.~~

13. The Applicant stated that 1989 traditional full-time undergraduate enrollment was 5,287 and the University had 3,970 undergraduate beds. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix E, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A). The Board finds that at least 1,317 (5,287-3,970) traditional full-time undergraduate students lived in off-campus housing in 1989.

14. The Applicant reported that fall 1999 traditional full-time undergraduate enrollment was 5,744 (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8) and the University had 4,273 undergraduate beds. (Applicant's Statement at Appendix E, Exhibit No. 46, 46-A). The Applicant subsequently revised its count of on-campus undergraduate beds to 4,173 to reflect 100 off-campus beds that were counted as on-campus beds. (Exhibit No. 67, BZA July 18, 2000 Hearing Tr. 90:2-91:8 and 301:19-303:9, R.844). The Board finds that at least 1,571 (5,744-4,273) traditional full-time undergraduate students lived in off-campus housing in fall 1999.

15. The Applicant reported that fall 2000 traditional full-time undergraduate enrollment was 5,840 (Applicant's Response to Request for Additional Information; Exhibit No. 191, Appendix P, P. 8) and the University had 4,173 undergraduate beds. (See ¶ 14, Supra). The Board finds that at least 1,667 (5,840-4,173) traditional full-time undergraduate students lived in off-campus housing in fall 2000.