Maureen E. Dwyer
202.457.7860
mdwyer@wilkesartis.com

Wilkes Artis

Chartered
Attorneys at Law

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

April 25, 2000

'00 APR 25 P4:33

BY HAND

Ms. Sheila Cross Reid, Chairperson
D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment
Room 210
441 4th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Re: BZA Application No. 16566
Georgetown University Campus Plan

Dear Chairperson Reid and Members of the Board:

By letter dated April 18, 2000, five of the community organizations surrounding the Georgetown University campus requested a one month postponement of the Board's proceedings on the campus plan application in order to permit facilitation to go forward, sponsored by the Office of Planning. While the University strongly believes that its campus plan meets all requirements and it is ready to proceed forward with its case on May 16, it does not want to lose the opportunity to sit down with the community and OP and hopefully create a "win-win" situation from which the University, its neighbors, and the city would all benefit. Accordingly, the University agrees to the requested one month postponement provided a second hearing date in July is scheduled. (Staff has advised that July 18 is available.) Accordingly, the University will not be filing its pre-hearing submission on May 2 and instead will file two weeks in advance of the June 13 public hearing date.

Since the facilitation process is scheduled to begin this week, the University requests that the Board decide this postponement request as a preliminary matter at its regularly scheduled public hearing on Wednesday, April 26, so that all parties are clear as to what the time frame will be for the facilitation and public hearing process.

While the University is agreeable to the requested one month postponement, it strongly objects to the assertions in the request for postponement that the plan lacks adequate detail and that the University has failed to either answer questions about the

BZA Case No. 16566 Exhibit No. 30

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16566
EXHIBIT NO.30

plan or provide relevant information. To clarify the record, attached is the University's summary response to the points raised in the request for postponement.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Ellen Dwyer

MED:lm/192094

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY RESPONSE

1. The University has met with the community through the BZA quarterly meeting process as well as through a specially assembled campus plan working group which has met for over ten months with respect to the campus plan. The quarterly meetings have continued over the last ten years and all University plans for projects on its campus have been reviewed at those meetings. Additionally, with the exception of ANC 3D, all organizations surrounding the University campus appointed representatives to a campus plan working group which met monthly from September, 1999 to January, 2000 and then biweekly once the plan was filed with the BZA in January.

2. The University has responded promptly and completely to all questions that are within the purview of the BZA and campus plan process. Attached is a chart showing the issues raised and responded to over that period of time. Those questions that are not part of the campus plan review process, such as certificate of need issues, are not included in the plan so that they can be addressed, per statute, before the appropriate regulatory agency.

3. To the extent that any institution can know its plans for a ten year period, the University has been completely forthcoming about its plans and their specific uses. Although requested by the University during the meeting process, to date no community organization has suggested any alternative to what is proposed in the campus plan.

4. No additional housing is proposed as part of the 2000 Master Plan. With the completion of the Southwest Quadrangle (currently under construction) the University will have added 1,083 undergraduate beds, an increase of over 27% since 1990. This currently gives the University the highest percentage of housing for undergraduates of any college or university in the District of Columbia.

5. The University has discussed MedStar's future role on the campus and MedStar's representatives have even attended the campus plan working group meeting to answer specific questions. In partnership with the University in a new entity, MedStar will operate the clinical enterprise described in detail in the certificate of need application. The University, however, will continue to own the property and it will continue to be used as a University hospital. The University will continue to be responsible for the development rights and responsibilities governed by the campus plan process.

6. All projections for MedStar's use of the medical center have been taken into account in the development of the plan. This resulted in the change in total square footage to 1.3 million, which includes MedStar's projections for development on the medical center portion of the campus. Further, the transportation analysis as part of the campus plan includes all activities on the north end of campus and Reservoir Road. All of this information has been provided to and discussed in great detail by the community working group.

7. All projections within the campus plan for student population, staffing, patients and visitors have taken into account both the needs of the University and the projections by MedStar. All assumptions in the transportation report likewise take into account the projected increases in outpatient rates of growth and projected inpatient goals by MedStar. Thus, the campus plan information is thorough and complete and in full accordance with the zoning requirements.

8. The use categories in the campus plan are consistent with the use categories used by the University in the past and are identical to the use categories used by other universities in filing their campus plans, including the recently approved Mount Vernon campus plan. These use categories have been recognized by both the Board and the D.C. Court of Appeals as necessary to provide the universities with the needed flexibility to adjust programs on campus over the ten year period. For those sites where a combination of uses is needed, they are indicated as striped colors and fully identified on the charts included in the campus plan.

9. The campus plan document provides the broad conceptual framework for the University's growth over the next ten years including all required projections for students, faculty, staff and visitors and fully addresses the University's transportation and other impacts. Specific information about the design of individual buildings will be addressed in each of the further processing or second stage applications and is not the level of detail required for campus plan review.

#192118