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

May 30, 2000

BY HAND

Ms. Sheila Cross Reid, Chairperson
District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 Fourth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Re: BZA Application No. 16566
Georgetown University Campus Plan
Prehearing Submission

Dear Ms. Reid and Members of the Board:

As required by the Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure, enclosed are copies of the Applicant's prehearing submission for the upcoming June 13, 2000 public hearing on its campus plan application.

Additionally, with this letter, the Applicant is formally amending its campus plan to reflect the offer it put on the table during the course of the facilitation sessions conducted by Resolve, at the behest of the Office of Planning. Specifically, as an accommodation to the community and in order to address their concerns, Georgetown University offered to amend its campus plan to reflect a lower projected enrollment number and also offered not to add any students above its current cap until the Southwest Quad project is brought on line. The University stands by this offer and, accordingly, the University is amending its campus plan to specifically reflect this change.

Attached to this letter is the May 22, 2000 memorandum that was distributed to the community during facilitation and discussed at both the May 22 and May 24 mediation sessions. As that memorandum describes, the University is willing to do the following:

BZA Case No. 16566 Exhibit No. 46

1. Reduce its projected enrollment increase by 111 students which means that the total increase under this campus plan would be 389 rather than 500 as originally proposed.

2. Delay any increase in enrollment above its current cap until after the Southwest Quad project is brought on line or until Fall 2003.

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16566
EXHIBIT NO.46

3. Strengthen its Off Campus Student Affairs program.

4. Continue to update the BZA on its progress with each further processing application.

The University made these concessions in the spirit of compromise and as an accommodation to community concerns. Since the community groups will be meeting to decide what position to take on the campus plan, the University wants to make clear that the campus plan includes the offer made during facilitation. Accordingly, the campus plan document filed this date is amended to reflect this change and to let the Board know that the University agrees to be bound by this lower enrollment number and to have it included as a condition of its campus plan approval.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen E. Dwyer

Paul A. Tummonds
Land Use Counsel for Georgetown University

MED:lm/197272

Georgetown University Memorandum

Date: May 22, 2000

To: Community Campus Plan Facilitation Group
Office of Planning

From: Linda Greenan
Alan Brangman
Karen Frank
Alice Boyer
Andrea Salley

RE: Enrollment and Housing Proposal

From our meeting on Friday May 19 at RESOLVE, we understood the community's concerns to be:

- Negative impact of undergraduate students on the community due to concentration of group housing.
- Graduate student impact. There was no consensus as to what these impacts were except with respect to increased traffic. There was consensus, however, that the community was not requesting the University to provide housing.

The University requests an increase in undergraduate and graduate enrollment for financial as well as academic reasons:

- Financially, our budget is largely (over 90%) tuition based, requiring increases in enrollment (undergraduate) to build and maintain the necessary facility improvements required by our top ranked programs as well as to hire and maintain new faculty and to fund GU's financial aid program.
- Graduate programming is highly dynamic and projections beyond a few years are difficult. Although current plans (3-4 year) only call for the increase of less than 100 FFTE's, we are exploring distance learning opportunities that could increase this number significantly. The university must preserve flexibility to meet societal and market forces to maintain and improve its academic standing.

Starting Points:

- Students contribute to the fabric of the community. They are not per se, negative.
- The University understands that there may be some negative impacts from undergraduate students in the neighborhoods of Burleith and West Georgetown due to the concentration of undergraduates in those neighborhoods, particularly in group housing. To that end, the University's investment in the Southwest Quadrangle will allow for market forces to significantly alter the character of these neighborhoods and counter any further higher concentration.

- Limiting where students can live in the District of Columbia is a violation of the DC Human Rights Act. Students are specifically cited as a protected population, and restrictions, therefore, are illegal.
- Like all other universities in the District of Columbia, we believe that off-campus living must be preserved as an option for upper classmen. No other university is required to house 100% of its students.
- The process of reviewing the University's progress with respect to housing and enrollment already exists through updates given to the BZA in further processing cases. These reviews occur far more frequently than the 5-year review suggested.
- It is critical to the University's planning needs to understand what it can do with respect to enrollment over the life of the plan. OP's suggestion for a supplemental hearing on housing and enrollment in affect leaves in limbo the issue of enrollment increase. Moreover, this essentially would be tantamount to the development of a new Campus Plan, a time consuming and costly endeavor for all parties.
- The University has made significant progress in the last 10 years in addressing off-campus student behavior, which means that any objectionable impact from students living off-campus has been significantly reduced.

University Response Re: Undergraduate Proposal:
This proposal incorporates elements of the proposals put forward by the communities of Foxhole and Cloisters of Georgetown.

- Delay any increase to the undergraduate enrollment beyond the current cap until the SWQ is occupied (Fall 2003). Maintaining the cap at its current level until the 780 students have left the community will allow for market forces go into effect and alter the neighborhood character.
- Reduce the overall increase in the undergraduate cap from 500 to 389, a decrease of 111 students. This condition was not requested, but in the spirit of cooperation, is offered by the University.
- Strengthen the undergraduate Off-Campus Student Affairs programs. Even though our exceptional program is often cited as a model for other DC universities, we believe this program may be further improved.
- Continue to update the BZA on our housing program as part of each further processing application.
- Continue to provide the community with updates during the BZA quarterly meeting process.

University Response Re: Graduate Proposal:

The average age of our graduate students is 30.1 years old. They are responsible adults who make their own decisions regarding living arrangements. To the extent that there are any negative impacts from graduate students, they are with respect to traffic and parking only. To that end, the Gorove Slade transportation report takes into account the full-proposed increase on campus in their analysis. Their analysis concludes that this level of activity can be accommodated without a negative impact. We therefore are proposing no changes to our projections.