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

July 11, 2000

BY HAND

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
2000 JUL 11 P 4:25

Ms. Sheila Cross Reid, Chair
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

Dear Ms. Reid and Members of the Board:

At the conclusion of the June 13, 2000 public hearing, BZA staff asked the University to provide copies of the written testimony of all witnesses. In accordance with this request, enclosed please find copies of the testimony of the following witnesses:

Exhibit A	Opening Statement of Maureen Dwyer, Counsel.
Exhibit B	Leo O'Donovan, President of Georgetown University.
Exhibit C	Dorothy Brown, University Provost.
Exhibit D	Linda Greenan, Associate Vice President for External Relations.
Exhibit E	Jeanne Lord, Assistant Dean of Students.
Exhibit F	Alan Brangman, University Architect and Executive Director for Facilities Planning.
Exhibit G	John Green, Senior Vice President, MedStar Health.
Exhibit H	Louis J. Slade, Gorove/Slade Associates, Traffic Engineer.
Exhibit I	Karen S. Frank, Executive Director, University Facilities and Student Housing.
Exhibit J	Lewis Bolan, Bolan Smart Associates, Inc., Economic Consultants (with attached resume).

BZA
Case No. 16566
Exhibit No. 68

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16566
EXHIBIT NO.68

If you have any questions regarding the attached materials, please feel free to call the undersigned at (202) 457-7800.

Respectfully Submitted,

Maureen E. Dwyer

Paul A. Tummonds

cc: All Parties (see attached Certificate of Service)
Office of Planning

Wilkes Artis
Chartered

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing document were hand delivered this 11th day of July 2000, to the following parties:

Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 2E
c/o Jelleff Boys Club
3265 S Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Hillandale Homeowners Association
Scott Anderson, General Manager
3939 Hillandale Court, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Georgetown Residents Alliance
Don W. Crockett, Esq., Chairman
3070 Q Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

The Citizens Association of Georgetown
Barbara B. Downs, President
3222 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Burleith Citizens Association
Patricia Scolaro, President
1807 37th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Foxhall Community Citizens Association
R.D. Andrew, President
1413 Foxhall Road, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Cloisters in Georgetown Homeowner's Association, Inc.
Stephen A. Hopkins, President
3524 Reservoir Road, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Paul A. Tummonds, Jr.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MAUREEN DWYER

Good morning, Madame Chairperson and Members of the Board. For the record, I am Maureen Dwyer with the law firm of Wilkes Artis, Chartered, counsel for the Applicant, Georgetown University. With me is Paul Tummonds, also with the firm. The other witnesses will be introduced shortly.

My remarks will provide an overview of the testimony and evidence you are about to receive from the other witnesses.

Since the adoption of the 1958 zoning regulations, the University has submitted nine campus plans to the BZA for review and approval. The campus boundaries include land owned by the University and devoted to University use for over 200 years.

In all respects, this plan is an update of prior plans. The changes represent further study of issues discussed in earlier plans and the differences between this plan and the 1990 plan will be described by the witnesses. In summary fashion, they are the following:

1. A lower level of development on campus than was approved in 1990. In fact, this plan proposes one million square feet less.

2. A focus on the University's academic mission and needs. The last academic building on campus was built in 1980. This plan proposes three new academic buildings which are sorely needed.

3. A new partnership with MedStar to ensure that the hospital and clinical components of the medical campus get back on sound financial footing and return to the levels of service they provided the community back in 1995.

4. A modest increase in the undergraduate enrollment cap – 389 students above the current cap – in order to provide the tuition revenues needed to carry out academic programs.

5. A new housing goal, which means that in the year 2010, the University will be providing sufficient beds on campus to house 84% of its traditional undergraduate enrollment.

6. A reorientation of the campus back to more traditional design principles through the creation of quads and more on-campus space for student activities.

All of these issues will be discussed in detail by the witnesses.

At this time, I would like to call the Board's attention to several exhibits that have been filed in the record. But first, I want to make certain that everyone is clear that as a result of facilitation the University has agreed to reduce its projected enrollment. In the letter we filed with our pre-hearing submission on May 30, the University formally amended its campus plan to reflect the offer it put on the table during the course of the facilitation sessions. Attached to the May 30 letter was the May 22 memorandum that was distributed to the community during facilitation. As that memorandum describes, the University is willing to do the following:

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. Thus, the new cap would be 6,016, not 6,127.

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

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. We are very pleased that ANC 2E has voted to accept this offer and to support the campus plan.

Turning now to the book, there are several exhibits that I would like to point out. (For your convenience, we have prepared an index to those.)

Exhibit 1 is a copy of the 2000 campus plan which is the same plan that was distributed to and discussed with the community.

Exhibit 5 is a copy of BZA Order No. 15302, dated October 12, 1990, approving the Georgetown University campus plan through December 31, 2000. Where appropriate, this order will be referred to by the witnesses.

Exhibit 12 is a copy of the letter of agreement which established the quarterly meeting process back in 1990 and also includes a chronology of those meetings.

Exhibit 13 is a chronology of the campus plan working group meetings.

Exhibit 14 is a chart showing the issues raised during the campus plan working group process and the University's response to those issues. No less than 125 questions have been asked and answered. This exhibit also includes materials distributed to the community, including a housing chart showing the University's compliance with the 1990 plan.

Beginning with Exhibit 16 and continuing through Exhibit 26 are outlines of the testimony of the witnesses.

Exhibit 29 contains materials describing the University's off-campus student affairs program.

Exhibit 30 is a map showing the renovation of existing residence halls and the new addition of the Southwest Quadrangle residence hall to the campus. This illustrates the University's significant commitment to housing over the last decade.

Exhibit 31 is the Department of Employment Services directory of the top 200 major employers in the District of Columbia which shows that the University is ranked No. 2 and the hospital is ranked No. 9.

Exhibit 33 is a comparison chart which shows that Georgetown University currently provides the highest percentage of on-campus housing of all universities in the District of Columbia. Even with the proposed enrollment increase, it will still be ranked No. 1 with the provision of housing on campus for 84% of its undergraduate students.

For your convenience, we have also prepared a listing of the witnesses, the order in which they will be presented and the issues they will address. I will begin by calling as the first witness Father Leo O'Donovan, President of Georgetown University. He will address the goals of the campus plan and the academic vision. An outline of his testimony is found at Exhibit 16.

#201219

Testimony
Leo J. O'Donovan, S.J.
President, Georgetown University
BZA Campus Plan Hearing
June 13, 2000

Thank you, Madame Chair and Members of the Board. It is a pleasure to be here today to discuss Georgetown's proposed ten-year campus plan. We appreciate very much your interest in the University, our mission, and our tradition of citizenship and partnership here in the District of Columbia.

Since the approval of our 1990 campus plan, a great deal has happened at Georgetown. We have continued our tradition of academic excellence, earning top 25 rankings every single year. We have become one of the ten to fifteen most selective institutions in the country in terms of undergraduate admissions.

Our students continue to achieve distinction nationally, including more than 30 who have won Rhodes, Marshall, Mellon or Luce Foundation scholarships since 1990. Currently 51 of our recent graduates are serving in the Peace Corps. Our Law Center ranks first in the nation in the number of graduates who go into public interest and public service law, and is regularly either first or second in the number of African American attorneys graduated. Our Medical School graduates continue to perform exceptionally well in their licensing exams and in the National Residency Matching Program.

But at the same time, like other world-class universities with academic medical centers, we have experienced significant financial turbulence because of the rise of managed care, which limits reimbursements for patient care. In the four fiscal years from 1996 to 1999, our Medical Center lost $218 million. As a result, we had to borrow $100 million and our bond rating was lowered. While our impending clinical partnership with MedStar Health, the local non-profit health care organization that runs the Washington Hospital Center, will alleviate our risk of future clinically related losses, we still face substantial deficits on the academic side of our Medical enterprise. One measure of the fiscal pressures we have faced is that in 1999 the financial resources of the fifteen institutions with which Georgetown competes for undergraduates increased by a mean of 10.7 percent, while our financial resources declined by 3.9 percent. Looking to the future, we have limited ability to borrow money, because we are already highly leveraged, and we have limited ability to raise tuition, which right now is one of the highest in the country.

I make this point about constrained resources because it is the context in which I hope you appreciate the strategic investments we have worked to make during the past decade. We have invested in new faculty and financial aid, because academic excellence is the core of our mission. We have invested more than $25 million in information technology in the past three years, mostly out of necessity and on a no-frills basis. And we have invested significantly in our relationship with our neighboring community and the city as a whole. Please allow me to say a little more about that.

In the city, in the past decade we became the largest provider of volunteer tutors in the D.C. Reads Program, with more than 250 work-study students and volunteers working in 13 public schools and community sites throughout the District. We funded several major youth enrichment programs that meet the needs of immigrant families, at-risk youth, and college-bound students at Ron Brown Junior High. We made a founding investment of $1 million in City *First* Bank, which provides community development assistance to the city's at risk neighborhoods. Overall, we have assisted more than 20 public schools, including Hyde, Hardy, and Duke Ellington in our community.

Our multifaceted efforts to strengthen ties with the neighborhoods in which our University is located is perhaps the single greatest change at Georgetown in the past decade, and it represents very large expenditures of money. In the past decade, we spent $76 million to renovate dorms so that they didn't have to be taken off line for serious repairs, and are undertaking another $15 million renovation this summer. We designed, gained approval for, and now have begun site work on a $140 million 780-bed residence hall complex called the Southwest Quadrangle. This residence hall complex is 280 beds larger than we had originally announced, and builds upon the 303 beds we added earlier in the decade. The Southwest Quadrangle necessarily includes substantial expenditures on an underground parking lot so that we won't displace parkers and on a dining hall because our existing facilities can't handle 780 more students. We have developed fund-raising and borrowing strategies to cover the $140 million price tag for this facility. I want to emphasize again that this enormous commitment to providing on-campus residences for students comes at the same time that we have experienced more than $200 million in Medical Center losses.

In this decade we also devoted University resources to creating an Office of Community Relations, since renamed the Office of External Relations, to ensure that members of the community have a resource at the University and a voice within the University. We created an Office of Off-Campus Student Affairs, to ensure that students know our rules and our standards when they live off-campus, and we extended our Student Code of Conduct to consider off-campus behavior. Since 1990 we have held quarterly meetings at which community leaders and

University leaders discuss important issues. We developed a bulk trash program, supported a measure to reduce the number of students' cars parked on the street, and initiated a hotline for members of the community.

I am proud to bring before you this record of achievement. When it comes to promoting academic quality and strong relations with our community, we have backed up our words with deeds, and with dollars.

So it is a great pleasure to present our proposed Campus Plan for the next decade. We have developed this plan with rigor and care, seeking to project University needs accurately and to build on the progress we have made the past ten years in neighborhood relations. We met regularly with representatives of the community for almost a year, providing detailed information and answering 125 questions promptly and responsively, and we have participated in facilitation meetings recommended by the Office of Planning. I am grateful to Alan Brangman, Alice Boyer, Linda Greenan, and many other University leaders for their hard work and responsiveness.

Our Year 2000 Campus Plan has three interrelated and mutually sustaining goals. Those goals are:

- First, to enhance the academic excellence of the university, in a time of increasing competition and fiscal constraint in higher education;

- Second, to provide a physical and architectural environment on our campus that lifts the mind, builds community, and attracts students to the campus for intellectual pursuits, as well as social and recreational activities; and,

- Third, to promote collaboration and community among the University and the surrounding neighborhoods, so that all of us might realize our various goals and enjoy a common high quality of life.

There are a variety of ways that this plan realizes these goals, and you will hear more from other witnesses. Please allow me to mention some of the highlights:

First, this plan provides Georgetown with the opportunity to develop our first new academic buildings on campus in more than twenty years. These include a new home for our outstanding school of business, our first new building for undergraduate science since the 1960's, and the first performing arts center in Georgetown's history. These new academic facilities -- for which we are seeking private funds -- are essential if we are to maintain our academic quality. It is

somewhat amazing that we have not enhanced our academic infrastructure in twenty years. For our faculty, our students, and our mission, we must do so.

Second, this plan allows Georgetown and MedStar to build a successful partnership that protects the academic future of our Medical Center while preserving a world renowned hospital that is a source of learning, life-saving care, security, and jobs in our community. A new physicians office building and new parking facility are the cornerstones of MedStar's proposals. The changes to traffic flow that we expect to occur as a result of our partnership have been studied carefully and discussed fully with the community. As you may know, the D.C. State Health Planning and Development Agency (SHPDA) has carefully reviewed and just recently approved MedStar's Certificate of Need application to operate our clinical facilities.

Third, this plan brilliantly integrates those new academic buildings and our new 780 bed Southwest Quadrangle into our historic campus core and the surrounding community. As you will hear later, we engaged the renowned architect Robert A.M. Stern, landscape architects, and transportation consultants to help us think through how best to use our limited geographical space without imposing upon the community. This plan develops the back portion of the campus on the model of a village, creating new pedestrian walkways, beautiful quadrangles, river views, and enhanced green space. It will re-center student life and culture on our campus and create an even more welcoming environment for the many neighbors who enjoy strolling our grounds.

Finally, this plan recognizes and addresses the desire of neighbors who have asked us to reduce the number of students living in the community. It increases the number and percentage of undergraduates who live on campus, and dramatically reduces the number and percentage of students who live off-campus. Let me explain how: We are moving forward aggressively on the construction of the Southwest Quadrangle and plan for it to house students in the fall of 2003. When that happens, 780 fewer students will live in neighborhoods like Burleith, West Georgetown, Foxhall, and the Cloisters. The total number of undergraduates living in these neighborhoods at that time will be about 430. This will provide an extraordinary opportunity for the local housing market to move towards families, and we certainly would be willing to do our part by encouraging faculty and staff to live nearby.

Our plan does propose giving us the potential for a modest enrollment increase, but we have tried to build into our proposal still further measures to address community interests. We have compromised on our proposed increase to our undergraduate enrollment cap and are now asking for your approval to increase by 389 students over a ten-year period, not the 500 we originally

considered. This campus plan calls for no increases—zero—above our current cap until the Southwest Quadrangle opens in 2003. Furthermore, once the Southwest Quadrangle opens, we are willing to phase in any enrollment increases at a rate of no more than 55 students per year.

As a result of these community-focused proposals, the percentage of undergraduates living on-campus will increase significantly from the current level of 77 percent, which is already the highest in the District. Under our plan, if we utilized the full phased-in enrollment increase of 389, in the year 2010 no fewer than 84 percent of our undergraduates will live on campus.

At this moment in my testimony, I would like to tackle head on three questions that have been posed by critics in the community.

The first question is, "Has Georgetown fulfilled the housing commitments it made in the 1990 Master Plan?" The answer is, "Yes, we have." Our housing commitment, which was contained in Appendix H, had several essential components, all of which we have implemented:

- First, we agreed to require all freshmen and sophomores to live on campus. We did that.

- Second, we agreed to create an off-campus student affairs program. We did that.

- Third, we agreed to extend our Code of Conduct to all students living off campus. We did that.

- Fourth, we agreed to move graduate students off campus to make room for undergraduates. We did that.

- Fifth, we agreed to rehabilitate existing residence halls on campus. We did that.

- Sixth, we agreed to provide 925 new beds on campus. We will have exceeded that by 150 beds once the SW Quadrangle is completed.

I should emphasize that we did all of this even though it was clear that our 1990 housing program was conditioned on financial ability and, especially, the cogenerator project, which was blocked in 1994.

The second question we sometimes hear is "How come you don't set a goal of having the capacity to house 100% of undergraduates on campus, as you did in 1990?" The short answer is that our new goal is to provide housing for 84% of our students for several reasons:

- First, this is a realistic goal - we know that in the year 2010 we will achieve it.

- Second, this is a financially sound goal. Knowing how much the renovation and construction of residence halls have cost us over the last 10 years, we cannot foresee having the financial ability to provide on campus housing for 100% of our students.

- Third, this goal takes into account the fact that we know that some juniors and seniors will choose to live off campus.

- Fourth, this goal does not place us at a competitive disadvantage with those institutions against whom we compete for undergraduates.

- Fifth, this goal recognizes that we now have in place a very successful off campus student affairs program that addressees impacts from students living off campus.

A lot has changed in the last ten years. We certainly recognize that, and this is now a plan for the next ten years. Our new goal of 84% is realistic, financially sound, and higher than any other institution. We are proud of that.

And that brings me to the third question, which is "Why, in fact, is Georgetown proposing any increase to its enrollment cap, even this modest figure of 7 percent over ten years?" The answer is that, as President of the University, I have an obligation to protect the fiscal foundation of this institution. It is my obligation to ensure that Georgetown has the option over the next decade for timely planning and prudent growth if doing so is necessary to meet critical University needs. Ten years ago, no one could have predicted to the BZA that, at the end of the decade, the Information Revolution would require Georgetown to spend the $25 million I alluded to earlier on information technology. But we had to, and we did, and the modest enrollment growth that the BZA authorized in 1990 helped us to cover those urgent academic costs.

I am pleased to report that we have not yet reached the enrollment cap the BZA gave us ten years ago, and I hope that my successor is able to report the same to you or your successors in the year 2010. But it would be fiscally irresponsible of Georgetown, or most universities, to enter an entire decade of its existence

without requesting the capacity to increase enrollment modestly if in fact serious academic and fiscal reasons emerge for doing so.

So those are my answers to those three questions. But I would like to leave you too with three questions: Do you support the mission of Georgetown University, the oldest Catholic university in the nation? Do you recognize the millions of dollars we have invested in renovating dorms, launching the Southwest Quadrangle, and creating new programs to address community concerns? Do you view a world-class university as an asset for the city and the community?

I believe you do, which is why I was surprised to learn that the BZA denied our request to renovate St. Mary's Hall for our School of Nursing and our information technology office. We were very disappointed that a proposal endorsed by the Office of Planning and the Cloisters community was denied by the BZA. It was a real setback for our School of Nursing—a top 25 program that provides a great deal of indigent care in this city and may lose some of the gifts that would have paid for the renovation. I am hoping you will see the wisdom of that proposal, which is an element of the Master Plan before you. We have now lost one year in meeting critical academic needs in nursing and information technology, and we hope we will not lose more.

We ask you to support our mission, and we ask you to support our Campus plan. We commit to you that we will continue to listen to and respond to the concerns of our neighbors. We will continue working to educate students about their responsibilities as citizens. We will continue to work to hold students accountable for their actions. We will continue to develop new strategies for promoting the very best behavior among the smaller number of students who will be living in the community if you approve our plan. This is something that the Georgetown ANC asked of us last week when they voted to support our Master Plan. And the answer is yes, absolutely, we view our relationship as a partnership and we will always do our part to listen and respond.

I would now ask that our Provost, Dr. Dorothy Brown, gives her statement which goes into greater detail about the academic focus of our 2000-2010 Campus Plan.

TESTIMONY OF DOROTHY M. BROWN - BZA - JUNE 13, 2000

Thank you, Father O'Donovan. As Provost, I am the chief academic officer of the Main Campus. I have had that responsibility for two years, but have been a member of the faculty in the History Department since 1966 (and a resident of Georgetown since 1975). Today, I want to place the bricks and mortar, green space, and numbers of the Master Plan in the context of our academic strategic planning. I will talk about people - faculty and students, and our planning for their support. It is the view from inside the University.

In our strategic planning of the 1980s and 1990s, we built our faculty. We added more than a hundred new tenure track lines, enabling us to reduce class sizes and to reduce teaching loads commensurate with our competition. Overwhelmingly, we recruited talented faculty at the junior level. They have become national leaders in their fields. To retain them in an increasingly competitive environment, we are implementing a 10-year faculty compensation plan that is essentially a replacement model. While, as Father O'Donovan emphasized we are operating under fiscal restraints, it is imperative that we act to retain the faculty we have developed.

At the same time, we have, by all measures, recruited a highly talented student body, entering the ranks of the most highly selective universities in the nation. For the past twenty-two years, our financial aid policy has been "need blind" (we do not consider ability to pay in our admissions decisions). Our policy is also to meet the full demonstrated financial need of our students. Fifty-five percent of our students receive some form of financial aid. Forty percent of our students receive Georgetown funded aid enabling us to admit a diverse, talented student body.

Our strategic planning is committed to the recruitment and retention of high quality faculty and students. To accomplish this, we must concentrate on their support in technology and facilities. Technology is transforming the landscape in teaching, learning, and research. We have invested $25

million in the past three years in developing our infrastructure and classroom enhancements, we now face funding a five-year austerity technology plan that calls for an additional $24 million in operating funds in the next five years.

Our strategic plan is titled *Building the Future*. We must now build the facilities to support our faculty, students, and academic programs. As Father O'Donovan noted, we have not built a new academic facility since the Bunn Intercultural Center in 1980. We have concentrated on construction and renovation of residence facilities. With the completion of the Southwest Quadrangle, we will have provided 1,083 new beds since 1990. We will continue to add student recreational and athletic space, but it is now imperative to meet our academic needs. For twenty years, our survey data of graduating seniors have indicated that we need to strengthen our facilities and opportunities in the arts and sciences. The Third Century Campaign has garnered the funding for a new Performing Arts Center. We have made some progress in fund-raising for a new Science Center where our need is greatest. It is also urgent that we provide first-rate facilities for our increasingly competitive McDonough School of Business. Plans for the renovation of St. Mary's Hall provide for more space for the School of Nursing and, importantly, will give us needed operational, laboratory and classroom space for technology. To remain a leading American University, we must build these buildings.

To accomplish all of the above: support our faculty and students, enhance technology, build new facilities, during a time of fiscal strain, we must also develop additional revenue streams and retain flexibility in our planning. Georgetown is heavily tuition dependent. While our tuition increase last year was the lowest in 25 years and our increase of 2000-2001 is a modest 3.7%, our tuition of $23, 952 places us among the highest of selective colleges and universities. To remain competitive, we must carefully monitor and contain tuition increases. In this Master Plan we then

ask for an enrollment increase of 389 undergraduate students beyond our current cap. As Father O'Donovan observed, we are still under the cap of our last Master Plan, but in the current financial reality and in the dynamic environment of higher education, it would be irresponsible not to seek this approved increase to retain flexibility in planning. We have also proposed added graduate enrollment. While we do not anticipate major increases in our existing programs; with trends in new interdisciplinary programs, globalization, and continued innovations in technology, we must have the ability to respond programmatically. At least half of the increase we propose would be in distance learning or at off-campus locations. Additionally two university committees are developing policies and strategies for enhanced revenue from technology transfer and partnerships. Finally, of course, we are in the midst of a $750 million campaign, however, many of those dollars are earmarked for specific projects ($67 million in financial aid). We are working with the chief financial officer to accomplish reductions and reallocation of our funds. In brief, we have a clear sense of our goals and what we need to accomplish them in this Plan.

I'd like to end on a personal note informed by three decaades of academic planning and recruitment of faculty and administrators at Georgetown. I have watched planning transform Georgetown from a university known for its good undergraduate education to a leading American, Catholic and Jesuit University making significant contributions to higher education and to local, national, and international communities. It has worked hard and achieved much.

Our new University Mission Statement captures that identity and anchors our planning. It is who we are and aim to be. I'll end with that:

Georgetown is a Catholic and Jesuit, student-centered research university. Established in 1789 in the spirit of the new republic, the University was founded on the principle that serious and sustained discourse among people of different faiths, cultures, and beliefs promotes intellectual,

ethical, and spiritual understanding. We embody this principle in the diversity of our students, faculty, and staff, our commitment to justice and the common good, our intellectual openness, and our international character.

An academic community dedicated to creating and communicating knowledge, Georgetown provides excellent undergraduate, graduate, and professional education in the Jesuit tradition - for the glory of God and the well-being of humankind.

Georgetown educates women and men to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active participants in civic life, and to live generously in service to others.

It is a mission worth having and planning together for.

TESTIMONY OF LINDA GREENAN

ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONS

Good morning Madam Chair and members of the Board. My name is Linda Greenan. I am the Assistant Vice President for External Relations at Georgetown University. My office serves as the University's liaison to the city and local community. I report to the President of the University through the University's Chief of Staff. Last year, I purchased a house at 3835 S Street, therefore, I am also a resident of Burleith.

My office helps to coordinate the University's many resources to assist organizations and efforts throughout the city. For example, my office helped coordinate a recent year-long technical assistance project by our business school to nearly every community development corporation in the city; and, several years ago, when the DC Preservation League wanted to highlight Georgetown's campus as part of its conference on the city's many historic treasures, my office made available our archivist and historian and organized a tour of our historic campus.

Another important function of my office is the University's outreach to the local community which takes many forms. For instance, rebuilding the front steps at Duke Ellington School to avert a shut-down of the school; helping local fundraising efforts for Volta Park, Hardy Recreation Summer Camp, Hyde Elementary, St. John's Church Annual House Tour, and providing start-up funds to the Georgetown Business Improvement District even though its boundaries stop just short of the University.

These are just a few examples of the ways in which the University works to build bridges with its neighbors next door as well as across the city.

The other type of outreach my office does is something more relevant to this proceeding. It is work we do with the surrounding neighborhood groups, including four ANCs, to assure they are informed of the University's ongoing plans and provided an opportunity to comment and have input. This occurs in many ways, such as attendance at monthly community meetings, newsletters

and providing a monthly calendar of University events for publication in neighborhood newsletters.

My office also coordinates the quarterly community meetings which were mandated by the BZA in connection with our 1990 Campus Plan. These meetings began in September of 1990 and have resulted in approximately 40 some meetings since then. The meetings are open to 14 different neighborhood associations, all of whom take turns hosting. The University maintains the mailing list which currently consists of approximately 250 individuals although attendance is typically around 25 to 30 individuals representing associations that immediately surround the University. Representation from the University generally includes myself, the university architect, the assistant dean of students, and the vice president of facilities. The agenda is set by the community and ranges anywhere from issues that are relevant to BZA matters, such as upcoming cases as well as matters having nothing whatsoever to do with BZA filings, such as a report on our capital campaign. In short, whatever the community asks us to report on or discuss, we do so. These meetings are also attended by the *Georgetown Current*, which then reports on the meetings in its weekly publication, thus, keeping the larger community informed as well.

The BZA quarterly meetings served as a model in developing our community working group on our campus plan. In June 1999, I wrote to the 14 community groups with whom we work on the quarterly meetings, asking them to appoint two representatives each to serve on a campus plan working group. All organizations but two – ANC 3D and Wesley Heights – responded. In addition, a representative from the Office of Planning attended nearly every meeting and similar to the quarterly meetings, the *Georgetown Current* attended and wrote articles in its newspaper, here again, helping to keep the larger community informed.

We began in September 1999, meeting 11 times over an 8 month period. The community

was kept fully informed as the plan was being developed and in fact, helped to shape some aspects of the plan, such as increasing student activity space. During this time, we responded to 125 questions and provided additional requested information in the form of attachments to the Q&A Matrix and/or separate hand-outs. In March, at the suggestion of the Office of Planning, we began discussions about entering into facilitation; in mid-April, with the prospect of facilitation beginning soon, we gave up our May BZA hearing date with the expectation that facilitation would yield consensus on two primary issues: housing/enrollment and traffic issues relating to Reservoir Road. Facilitation began in mid-May and concluded after four meetings. With respect to the two issues, the meetings resulted in the formation of a community task force which has now met separately with DPW to identify and address area-wide issues relating to traffic on Reservoir Road. And, the University suggested a proposal on the housing/enrollment issue which reduced our new enrollment goals, delayed implementation of any new enrollment until the SW Quadrangle is occupied in Fall 2003 and committed to a gradual phasing in of any new students. While this proposal was not accepted by the community during facilitation, it was adopted as part of ANC 2E's Resolution in support of our plan and is contained in our filing.

As you know, the BZA approved the SW Quadrangle project in 1998, therefore, it is part of our existing plan. When this project is completed in the Fall of 2003, 780 new beds will be added on campus resulting in an overall increase of 1083 new beds under the existing plan. At occupancy, we will be housing 90% of our traditional undergraduate students on campus. If the BZA were to authorize the 389 enrollment increase *and* if we were to reach that number, we would housing 84% of our undergraduates on campus. Thus, 84% is a minimum percentage that we would reach and it is substantially higher than any other university in the city and/or country.

It is our strong opinion that, with the SW Quadrangle, we will have more than fulfilled the

housing commitment stated in the 1990 campus plan. In fact, given the failure of the cogeneration facility, we question any obligation on our part to such a commitment. I would point out that the Office of Planning, during the recent St. Mary's hearing concurred with this opinion.

Nevertheless, as stated previously by myself and Fr. O'Donovan, we have increased our on campus housing and will do so by a substantial amount in the Fall of 2003. In this regard and in ways that other University witnesses will discuss, the University has worked hard to be a good neighbor. We are constantly reaching out to inform and respond. I am extremely proud of the effort my office has made in this respect. And, extremely proud of the work my colleagues also make in this regard. As you heard earlier with respect to the BZA quarterly meetings, we work as a team; meeting internally to carefully consider literally everything we do that will have an impact on the community and always with a view as to how we might mitigate whatever that impact might be, often at great financial cost to us.

As you will now hear from Jeanne Lord, these efforts extend beyond what I have described here and, again I'm proud to say, are often pointed to as a model of town-gown relations.

Testimony of Jeanne Lord
Assistant Dean of Students
June 13, 2000

Good Morning. I am the Assistant Dean of Students at Georgetown University. Like Dr. Brown, I am also a resident of Georgetown, where my family and I have lived for over twenty years.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to talk about the work of the Office of Student Affairs. Some of what our office does is familiar to many of you. I hope that I can share with you today some of the other things we do that you may not be familiar with.

The purpose of the Office of Student Affairs is to enhance the educational mission of the University; to provide opportunities for students to learn and grow outside the classroom.

Our Volunteer and Public Service Center gives our students the chance to participate in social justice programs on the international, national and local level. But it's the opportunity to work with people in need in the District of Columbia, to reach out and become a part of this community that means the most to Georgetown students. Fr. O'Donovan has mentioned some of these programs, but I'd like to tell you about some of the other service projects that our students are involved in here in Washington:

Georgetown students also participate in Habitat for Humanity, Best Buddies, and are involved in activities at the Temple Courts and Sursum Corda housing projects and many other community activities. They work with Bread For the World, Increase the Peace, and GU Melody, which provides musical instruction to students living in low income neighborhoods. In addition, each year about 100 Georgetown students spend vacations and Spring Break in Appalachia performing community service.

As Fr. O'Donovan mentioned, The Center for Minority Educational Affairs, another branch of Student Affairs, sponsors a number of volunteer tutoring programs for DC public school students. Georgetown students are

fundamental to the success of these programs.

The Office of Student programs is a vital part of student life at Georgetown, and sponsored more than 84 separate weekend events during the last academic year alone. This office is working vigorously to create a dynamic campus culture which will make campus activities attractive to our students.

As you can see, Georgetown students are deeply committed to community service, to extracurricular activities and to academics. I have come to know many who are extraordinary young people. But they're still college students and young people, facing the challenges and concerns of people their age everywhere.

For this reason, it is an important part of our job in Student Affairs to help them face these challenges. And because some of them live in our community as our neighbors, it is also an important part of our job to educate, encourage and expect them to be responsible and thoughtful citizens.

Fr. O'Donovan recognized this in 1990, when he created the Office of Off Campus Affairs. At that time, he acknowledge that " Georgetown has a responsibility to its neighbors, and strives to be a constructive, responsive, helpful neighbor and a valuable resource." That commitment remains as strong today as it was ten years ago.

We've developed a strategy to carry out Father O' Donovan's commitement- It's a three pronged program of education, accountability and responsiveness.

We educate our students about their responsibilities as members of the community from the first week they arrive on campus.

First year students receive a Student Handbook which is their guide to life at the university. This year, for the first time, there is an Ethos Statement on the cover of the handbook. The Ethos Statement articulates our expectations of Georgetown students. It reads, in part: " membership in this (Georgetown University) community carries with it high expectations regarding the ways in which each person will act both within and beyond Healy Gates."

From the beginning, we want our first year students to understand that we have certain expectations of them - whether they're in the classroom or in the

community.

Another significant piece of our educational effort is the Off Campus Orientation, which is mandatory for all sophomores. This program gives students the information they need to be responsible members of the community and is the only program of it's kind in the District of Columbia.

Soon, the information provided by the Off Campus Orientation will be reinforced by a series of lectures on good neighbor relations sponsored by the new Housing Referral Service Office. Beginning on July 1, this office will be operated by the university's Auxiliary Services and will replace the old housing listing service.

We also publish a Guide to Off Campus Living and periodic newsletters about issues of interest to students and neighbors.

An extremely important part of educating our students is alcohol education. We recognize that alcohol abuse is a serious and pervasive problem on college campuses nationwide. Georgetown has a comprehensive alcohol education program that begins in the first year residence halls. For students who are at risk for problems with alcohol, we have programs conducted by both Health Education as well as by the Alcohol and Substance Abuse program in the Department of Psychiatry.

The second prong of our off campus program is accountability. In 1992, we established a Weekend Hotline to provide a way for our neighbors to contact us about noise from student houses. In 1996, in response to requests from our neighbors, we added an additional staff person to the hotline to enable the hotline operator to send someone directly to student houses to deal with noise.

From 1995-1999, we disciplined approximately 90 students for off campus misconduct each year. In the 1999-2000 academic year, we disciplined 56 students. Students typically received sanctions ranging from community service and fines to disciplinary probation for these violations.

In the fall 2000 semester, the Code of Student Conduct will specifically authorize me to suspend students. I anticipate that this will send a clear message to students about how seriously we view misconduct in the community.
living off campus.

The third prong of our program is cooperation with the community and with the Metropolitan Police Department. This cooperation takes many forms:

Georgetown University students participate in community clean up efforts. Sometimes, student organization send volunteers; at other times, we send students into Burleith and Georgetown to sweep sidewalks and bag leaves as part of their disciplinary sanctions. Regardless of whether it's voluntary or not, spending time this way reinforces our message that the community and our expectations of our students extend beyond Healy Gate.

We cooperate with the community when crimes occur in the neighborhood and our Department of Public Safety prepares flyers to alert our neighbors and these flyers are passed from house to house by Georgetown students.

Our students reached out to the community this year when they revived the tradition of GU Community Day, a non-alcoholic event with food, music and games and invited all our neighbors to attend.

We cooperated with the community this year when we heard their concerns about outdoor events on campus and Dean Donahue implemented a new noise policy restricting the hours and days of the week that outdoor music is permitted.

Finally, we cooperate with the community when we participate in community task force to address the issue of underage drinking and false Ids, as Linda Greenan and I did earlier this year.

Georgetown University has forged a strong collaborative relationship with our local police officers.

We cooperated with MPD in posting signs alerting the community to the noise ordinance enforced in the District of Columbia.

This spring, we participated in a pilot program to deal with quality of life issues with by providing call phones which the police used to allow citizens to call officers patrolling Burleith and Georgetown directly.

Georgetown is participating in the DC campus Alcohol Initiative with Chief Ramsey and other universities in the District of Columbia in an effort to

establish uniform standards and to assess our programs. Through quarterly meetings and discussions, we hope to identify issues that are causing harm to our students and our communities, to share information and to develop a uniform approach to addressing this serious problem

The last prong of our program is responsiveness.

Nationally, Georgetown is one of the few universities to exercise jurisdiction over its students living off campus and is in the forefront among universities in the District of Columbia.

We meet regularly with the community, both at monthly citizens' association meetings and at quarterly BZA meetings. In addition, I meet frequently with smaller groups of our neighbors to listen to their concerns.

We try not only to listen to concerns, but to be responsive and to adapt our practices whenever possible. I've cited some examples of this with the Hotline and noise policy.

In conjunction with the university's Facilities Dept, we operate a Bulk Trash Collection twice each year: at the beginning of the Fall semester and before graduation. (cost and tons) This year, we convened a group of residents, DPW staff, a charitable organization that recycles clothing and university administrators to work together to improve this process; our cooperative efforts resulted in the most successful project to date.

I hope that this overview of the work of the Office of Student Affairs has been helpful in understanding our continuing efforts to educate our students. To hold them accountable for their actions, and to be responsive to the concerns of all our neighbors.

TESTIMONY OF ALAN BRANGMAN

University Architect and Executive Director for Facilities Planning.

- Main Campus is located in Northwest Washington on the westside of Historic Georgetown.
- 104 acres R-3 District, Lots in Squares 1321, 1222, 1223, 1226, 1248, surrounded by institutional, governmental, and residential neighborhoods.
- 1.8 FAR – 7,880,787
- The southern boundary National Park Service property adjacent to Canal Road and Prospect Street.
- The eastern boundary 35th Street, 36th Street, and The Georgetown Visitation Prep School.
- The northern boundary is Reservoir Road.
- The western boundary Archbold Glover Park forms.
- The neighborhoods: West Georgetown, The Cloisters, Burleith, Hillendale, and Foxhall.

- 1789 the college was founded as America's first Catholic College.
- One of its original Georgian brick structures, McSherry built in 1792, is still utilized today along with Old North which was built in 1795. These structure attest to the deep roots that the University has in the community. A community that has become increasingly more urban in nature, from the time of Georgetown's founding to the realization of the international city that we know today.

- The 1983 and 1990 Campus Plan organized new development on

campus in a series of podia buildings.

- Six podia buildings were to be developed through the center of campus marching toward the river.
- 2,970,000 Gross Floor Area represents a 40% lot coverage
- The first of the podia buildings, the Leavey Center, was completed in 1988.
- Student Center including bookstore and dining facilities, a conference center, a hospitality center, and offices for student affairs and the career center.
- Under the 1990 Campus Plan the Board has approved 9 projects with 7 of them totally 250,000 GFA complete to date.
- These completed projects include facilities in the medical center, academic facilities, and residential projects that are highlighted in Appendix D.
- Two yet to be completed projects are:
- Leavey Center Bookstore Addition
- Southwest Quadrangle project, 780 bed residence hall, 1200 seat dining facility, new Jesuit Community residence/administrative facility, 800 car parking garage, and a bus maintenance facility.
- Both projects are slated to begin construction this fall.
- The SWQ will add 1083 beds to the University's on campus housing stock, bringing the total beds on campus to 5053 in the Fall of 2003. 89% of the traditional undergraduate population.

- The University has also undertaken an extensive renovation and refurbishment effort of no less than 8 of its residence halls
- $76,000,000 has been spent to date with another $15,000,000 being expended on Harbin Hall this summer.

- In 1992 Robert A. M. Stern Architects examined 1990 Campus Plan and developed a concept plan to provide a cohesive architectural image for the campus.
- Planning goal was to create a development model compatible with the Georgetown urban context, respectful of the historic campus core and one that extends the architectural quality of the historic core as defined by the Healy Lawn and Healy Quadrangle.
- The Stern while consistent with the quantitative parameters of the 1990 Campus Plan, proposed a new pattern of organization for future development based on the extension of the gridiron plan of downtown Georgetown.
- Proposed traditional academic quadrangles as the fundamental planning tool for the campus.
- Plan sought to organize a pattern for pedestrian circulation, give an appropriate scale to the campus outdoor spaces by creating a series of regular room-like spaces in direct contrast to the residual spaces that characterize many areas on campus.

- Georgetown University stands at a critical juncture in its history. To

maintain and improve its leadership position in higher education, Georgetown must expand its Catholic, Jesuit tradition of scholarship, service and faith and its 200-year record of achievement to meet the rapidly developing demands of the twenty-first century. The goals of this plan are to:

- Secure the University's position as a premier Catholic and Jesuit academic institution.
- Realize the University's potential as a global resource.
- Increase the University's contribution to research and discovery.
- Extend the University's commitment to excellence in teaching and its focus on spirituality and service.

- The continued success of our academic programs is compromised by the lack of sufficient facilities in both quality and quantity to compete effectively with our peer institutions. To attract the talent required to be competitive, it is essential that the campus provide the necessary environment for the full range of academic pursuits.
- To fulfill the University's academic goals, the Campus Plan must be able to accommodate developments in research, curriculum planning and delivery, information management and communications.
- Alleviate conditions of overcrowding and insufficient suitable space for existing and future academic programs.
    - Provide facilities that allow Georgetown to continue to attract and retain that rare faculty who combine the finest scholarship with

demanding teaching and a sincere concern for their students.

- In developing the 2000 Campus Plan the University has employed the following planning principles

    1. Provide adequate/appropriate space for existing and future programs.
    2. Reinforce and enhance the campus image based on its historic roots.
    3. Create a pedestrian campus.
    4. Provide rational vehicular circulation.
    5. Preserve and enhance vistas within, to and from the campus.
    6. Preserve and enhance the University's sense of community.
    7. Develop a plan sensitive to community concerns.
    8. Create a campus that provides an environment for "sacred space".

WALK THROUGH OF THE PLAN

- 1,272,000 GFA with a 36% lot coverage
- 1,698,000 GFA less than the 1990 Campus Plan
- 4 new buildings – Science Building, Business School, Administrative/Academic Building, Physicians Office Building
- 6 additions/renovations – Leavey Student Affairs, Lauinger Library, Walsh Studios, Dahlgren Library, Lombardi Cancer Center, Ryan Performing Arts

- Athletics – Harbin Multi Sports Facility, McDonough Gymnasium
- Parking Facilities – Lot A, Lot B

Zoning Categories:

1990 Campus Plan		2000 **Campus Plan**	
ED	Educational –Classrooms, administration and Faculty offices	**AA**	Academic Administrative, ED & ES
EDMU	Educational Mixed Use, Residential, Educational, Decentralized recreation		
ES	Educational Support, Parking, utility plant, And miscellaneous auxiliary services		
M	Medical, Hospital, clinic, staff, doctor's Offices, Administrative and faculty offices, Medical library, classrooms, lecture halls, Conference facilities, research laboratories	**HMC**	Medical/Health Care, M & MS
MS	Medical Support, Parking and Miscellaneous uses		
REC	Recreational	**RCA**	Residential, Campus Life, Athletic, REC & RES
RES	Residential		
C	Commercial	**C**	Commercial/Investment Properties

NEW CONSTRUCTION & BACKFILL
Through 2010

Type	Project	Gross Square Feet
AA-1	Science Building	121,000
AA-2	Graduate School of Business	305,000
AA-3	Technology Center **	97,500
AA-4	Leavey Addition **	22,200
AA-5	Fine and Performing Arts Facility	55,300
AA-6	Lauinger Library Addition	100,000
AA-7	Walsh Addition	10,500
RCA-2	Harbin Field and Field House	76,500
RCA-1	McDonough Gym Renov. & Addition	12,000
MHC-1	Dahlgrin Medical Academic	112,800
MHC-2	Lombardi Addition	102,000
MHC-3	Physicians Office Building	102,000
MHC-4	Parking Structure	138,000
MHC-5	Parking Structure	34,000
	Subtotal New Construction	**1,272,263**

Type	Backfill Space	Gross Square Feet
AA	Jesuit Community Backfill	39,500
RCA	New South Backfill	29,500
AA	New North Backfill	12,100
AA	Old North Backfill	4,500
AA	White Gravenor Backfill	11,600
AA	Reiss Science Backfill	36,500
AA	Maguire Backfill	1,700
	Subtotal Backfill	**135,400**

OUTLINE OF TESTIMONY
JOHN GREEN

I. INTRODUCTION

II. MEDSTAR'S ROLE AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

A. Creation of new nonprofit entity to run hospital and related health facilities.

B. Goal is to return the hospital to financial health and to improve service to the community.

C. The use as a university hospital with teaching for the medical school will continue.

III. MEDSTAR'S OUTREACH TO THE COMMUNITY THROUGH THE CAMPUS PLAN PROCESS

A. Participated in campus working group meetings at the request of the University and the community.

B. Several meetings were focused specifically on MedStar and its building plans and traffic impacts.

C. Also participated in meetings sponsored by the Office of Planning.

D. Plan to continue meeting with the community and working together on area-wide traffic issues.

IV. DESCRIBE BUILDINGS PROPOSED FOR MEDICAL CAMPUS

A. Location, size and use.

B. Level of development is less than what was approved in 1990 Plan.

C. All traffic impacts have been included in analysis done by Gorove Slade.

V. CONCLUSION:

MedStar's use of portion of medical campus will have no objectionable impact in terms of noise or traffic and no impact on number of students.

MedStar will abide by all conditions of the BZA order approving the campus plan.

Georgetown University Campus Plan
Louis Slade Testimony for BZA Hearing
June 13, 2000

Introduction

Good Morning Madame Chair and members of the board. My name is Louis Slade; I reside at 3500 Quesada Street, NW, Washington, DC and I am a principal with Gorove Slade Associates. My firm is responsible for the traffic and parking components of the Georgetown University Campus Plan.

My testimony today covers our studies of existing and future campus traffic and parking conditions. I will also provide testimony about the University Transportation Management Plan which will be addressed in more depth by Karen Frank. I also have some comments on neighborhood parking.

The Georgetown University TMP is extremely successful in reducing traffic and maintaining parking demand within the cap. The keys to this success are the University's extensive bus system which will be increased, the University's commitment to intensive traffic and parking management efforts which will continue, and the parking cap itself, which will remain unchanged,

Parking at the University is an important resource, and allocation of parking to faculty, students, staff, and visitors must be carefully measured to ensure that all the University's goals are met. In this campus plan, one of the critical goals is the business plan for Georgetown University

hospital and clinical center. This plan requires that a greater proportion of the parking supply be allocated to the hospital and clinical center and therefore that fewer parking spaces be allocated to University employees and students. The Transportation Management Plan provides attractive alternatives to parking on campus for University employees and students. They will be encouraged to use alternative transportation modes, or they will be able to park at satellite parking locations and use GUTS bus service for the final leg of their trip to the University. This will result in a win/win/win situation: the University, hospital, and clinical center will win by reaching its goals, the employees and students will win because they will have more alternatives to driving, and the community will win because it is ensured that the University, hospital and clinical center will continue to thrive without adverse effect on traffic and parking conditions.

Scope of Studies

The traffic analysis of the Georgetown University Campus Plan addresses the south academic campus and the north hospital and clinical center campus separately. This is because the campus is divided by internal gates which restrict north/south traffic movements. Thus, access to the parking for the north portion of the campus is limited to Reservoir Road and access to parking for the south portion of the campus is limited to Canal Road and Prospect Street.

In 1998, extensive studies of the traffic requirements of the south portion of the campus were completed by the Department of Public Works and the Federal Highway Administration as part of the Canal Road access study. That study concluded that the access should be changed from the existing situation which allows right turns in and right turns out only from westbound Canal Road, to a conventional intersection which allows right turns and left turns in and out for both westbound and eastbound traffic. This change has been in the campus plan since 1971. The study found that this change would have significant benefits by reducing traffic on Reservoir Road and on Prospect Street.

Because the FHWA and DPW studies of Canal Road were carried out prior to the campus plan which is before you today, we carefully reviewed all aspects of this campus plan and determined that the FHWA and DPW studies for Canal Road remain valid. None of the changes proposed in the new campus plan will change the assumptions or the bases of the Canal Road studies.

On the other hand, because the hospital and clinical center business plan will increase activity in the north portion of the campus, we carried out new studies of the north campus and of the potential impacts of the proposed changes on traffic and parking conditions on Reservoir Road..

Parking Analysis

The current parking cap which was established in the last campus plan is 4080 parking spaces. At the present time, the University has a total of 4029 parking spaces with 1535 on the south campus and 2494 on the north campus. The University intends to increase this capacity up to the cap and the additional spaces will be added on the north campus bringing that total to 2545. At the present time, the capacity in the north campus includes several hundred attendant-assisted parking spaces where visitors who arrive midday park their cars in the circulation aisles and vehicles are moved in and out with the assistance of attendants. This is standard operating procedure in a number of locations in the District of Columbia.

At the present time, the peak parking demand on the entire campus occurs at approximately 2pm on weekday afternoons and is approximately 3600 vehicles. This is just under 90% of the available capacity which leaves a comfortable excess supply to ensure that motorists arriving in the midday can easily find a parking space.

We worked closely with the University, Med-Star, and Med-Star's traffic consultant O.R. George and Associates Inc. to develop the 2010 plan for campus parking. This is based on new survey

data we collected, the University's population projections, and Med-Star's projections for the hospital and clinical center.

First and foremost, the University will maintain its 4080 space parking cap, the internal gates will remain in place, and the distribution of spaces to the north and south portions of the campus will be as it is today. Therefore, traffic volumes and patterns will remain very similar to what they are today.

The plan for the Hospital and Clinical Center calls for an increase in the number of employees and anticipates an increase in patient visits in order to bring the hospital back to where it was five years ago. To support this goal, more parking spaces on campus are being allocated to the hospital and clinical center. Ultimately, this allocation will be 2,800 out of the (cap) total of 4,080. The majority of these spaces will be provided on the north portion of campus as they are today, but, in addition, a portion of the south campus parking will also be allocated to the Hospital and Clinical Center use. This allocation will not change traffic patterns. Hospital and clinical center employees will use Reservoir Road or Canal Road depending on if they are designated to park in the north campus or south campus facilities. All visitors to the hospital and clinical center will use Reservoir Road as they do today.

The remaining spaces on the south campus will continue to be used for academic campus faculty, staff, students and visitors. Since it will be a smaller number, however, this means that more people will be using carpools, GUTS buses and public transportation through improvements to

the University's Transportation Management Plan. For those employees who elect not to use alternative transportation modes, the University will provide satellite parking.

Traffic Analysis

To give a sense of the order magnitude of the impact of the University on Reservoir Road, our traffic counts indicate that approximately 30% of the traffic on Reservoir Road during the peak hours is related to the University. The balance is commuter and neighborhood traffic.

We conducted traffic counts during peak periods in the morning and afternoon on Reservoir Road. The results show that at the present time all of the intersections which abut the University operate at acceptable levels of service. This is not to say that there are no traffic problems on Reservoir Road. Those problems are being addressed in an area-wide traffic study which is a cooperative effort of the University, Medstar, DPW and the community.

As I noted in my introduction, the impacts of the campus plan on the south portion of campus were fully addressed in the Canal Road studies by the Federal Highway Administration and the DPW. That study concluded that the improvements to the Canal Road entrance will reduce peak hour traffic on Reservoir Road. We took that reduction into account in our forecasts of future traffic conditions on Reservoir Road.

We developed our estimates of future traffic conditions on Reservoir Road based on University and Med-Star projections of faculty, staff, students and visitors taking into account the new allocation of parking between the Hospital and Clinical Center and the academic campus. The net result of these changes will be a ten percent increase in traffic turning into and out of the University's entrances on Reservoir Road. Given that the University's traffic is thirty percent of the total traffic, this increase is only approximately three percent of the total traffic. Our forecasts indicate that all intersections which abut the campus will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service.

Neighborhood Parking

One other study was done at the request of the community. We estimated the impact of the University on neighborhood on-street parking. We conducted surveys of street parking in the area bounded by 37th Street, 39th Street, Reservoir Road and T Street where we enumerated the cars both on weekdays and on weekends at various times of the day. Almost the entire neighborhood is protected from long term parking by University or other non-resident parkers with zone 2 residential parking permits, or parking meters. At the worst times, on weekdays, 38% of the spaces were occupied by vehicles that did not display a zone 2 sticker. On weekends this number was 28%. Many, but not all of these parkers are medical center visitors and employees. It should be noted that during these time periods, there were abundant vacant parking spaces in this study area.

Because this campus plan allocates more parking for the Hospital and Clinical Center, and because Med-Star plans will improve the quality and supply of parking for its patients and visitors, we anticipate that there will be fewer parkers in the neighborhoods from visitors to the Hospital and Medical Center.

Conclusions

In summary, the findings of our studies indicate the following:

- The parking cap, the location of internal gates, and the allocation of parking between the north and south portions of the campus will remain as it is today so that the basic patterns of traffic will be similar in the future as they are today.
- The assumptions and bases of the Canal Road study and E.I.S. remain valid with this campus plan.
- The hospital and clinical center will increase activity on the north portion of the campus which will increase University traffic on Reservoir Road by ten percent and total traffic by three percent.
- All intersections which abut the University will operate at acceptable levels of service during the morning and evening peak hours.
- Traffic growth will be contained because the parking cap will not be increased.
- The future requirements of the Hospital and Clinical Center for parking will be accommodated in both the north and a portion of the south campus.
- The University's Transportation Management Program will be enhanced in order to accommodate the smaller amount of parking available in the south portion of the campus for

academic staff and faculty.

Based on these findings we have determined that the campus plan will have no objectionable impact on traffic and parking conditions.

P:/1701/002/BG2/2000docs/gcptestimony6600

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

KAREN FRANK

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND STUDENT HOUSING

Good afternoon. My name is Karen Frank and I am the Executive Director of University Facilities and Student Housing at Georgetown University. I will outline the enhancements that will be made to Georgetown University's Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to assure that any parking and traffic generated by the University will not create any adverse impacts on neighboring communities.

Georgetown's TMP is based on three central strategies: 1) maximizing the use of mass transit systems; 2) providing and enhancing alternative transportation programs; and 3) developing off-campus satellite parking locations in nearby Rosslyn with shuttle service to and from the campus.

We believe that through enhancements to the existing TMP, the impact of the reallocation of parking spaces will be completely mitigated and there will be no adverse impact to the neighboring communities. This is a comprehensive, multi-faceted plan with numerous options, financial incentives and flexibility for the employee and student to make his or her own choices to meet their needs. The proposed enhancements to the TMP include:

1) Continued operation and expansion of the GUTS Bus System. The University has doubled the fleet of GUTS vehicles to service the existing GUTS bus

routes as well as new routes. At the behest of the community, the new buses are smaller than the existing GUTS buses so will be less intrusive on neighborhood streets. In addition, the hours of operation have been extended and more frequent trips will be made on each route, particularly during the rush hours.

2) Alternative Transportation Programs. The University has increased incentives to its students, faculty and staff to utilize van and carpools. Current parkers who form carpools will not only be able to share the cost of a single parking decal, but will also be guaranteed on-campus parking. Employees who form vanpools of Georgetown University employees may make arrangements with the Office of Transportation Management to use a University-leased van and will be able to share the cost of transportation and the cost of a single parking decal as well as park on campus. The University's website will assist employees and students in locating other members of the University community who wish to join a car- or vanpool. The University will continue to sell WMATA flash passes at the Office of Transportation Management for the added convenience of its employees and will also implement the WMATA Metrochek program, allowing employees to purchase mass transit passes through pre-tax payroll deductions.

3) Implementation of an Off-Site Parking Program. As I indicated earlier the University will create satellite parking options conveniently located in

nearby Rosslyn for use by University students, faculty and staff. Students, staff and faculty who utilize this lot will receive free shuttle bus service every 10 to15 minutes to and from campus, and individual return service to the satellite location in the event of emergency. Off-campus parking rates will be 50% of the cost of on-campus parking, being heavily subsidized by the University, and employees who voluntarily choose this option will receive three months of free parking. The University is also looking at the possibility of developing satellite parking options in Maryland, depending on demand. While commuting students have never been assured of parking privileges on campus, we will offer the satellite parking option to these students to avoid their parking in the neighborhoods bordering the campus.

Therefore, as result of these enhancements to the extremely successful TMP, the University will continue to be a good neighbor and will not adversely affect neighboring communities due to traffic or parking issues.

The University will study the feasibility of further strategies for possible future implementation:

1) Developing alternate work and class schedules to better distribute traffic and the demand for parking.
2) Telecommuting
3) Distance learning
4) Providing shuttle service from more distant Park 'N' Ride sites.

Let me make just a comment about the financial burden that this Transportation Management Program and its enhancements places on the University. These many options and strategies come at a tremendous cost to the University. The costs of doubling the number of GUTS buses and increasing the number of routes and frequency of runs, continuing to provide GUTS service with no fare, and subsiding the cost of off-campus parking for employees and commuter students are all committed in addition to programs that already tax our financial resources. We offer these programs in the spirit of cooperation and good citizenship.

Thank you for your time and attention. I will gladly answer any questions that you may have.

198954

Georgetown University- Testimony of Lewis Bolan – BZA – June 13, 2000

Good morning Madam Chair and members of the Board. My name is Lewis Bolan and I am President of Bolan Smart Associates, a District of Columbia based real estate and economic consulting firm, and adjunct professor of real estate economics at Johns Hopkins University.

I am here today to provide testimony on a study I have just completed for Georgetown University, which analyzes the Burleith and West Georgetown housing markets. Specifically, I have been asked to provide objective analysis having to do with the real estate and economic impact of a planned new 780 room dormitory on the university campus, an integral part of the university's proposed campus plan.

I would like to state at the outset that my conclusion is that the development of the Southwest Quad dormitory facility will have a highly positive impact on the Burleith and West Georgetown neighborhoods. Let me briefly summarize the principal findings and conclusions from my study.

1. Residential property values in Burleith and West Georgetown have increased at a significantly faster rate than for the District as a whole. This provides strong evidence as to the desirability of the area for homeowners.

2, In 1999, the average residential sales price in Burleith was $298,000. For the first 5 months of 2000 that number increased to $340,000 – an increase of 14 percent or more than 25 percent on an annualized basis.

3. We have been able to find NO consistent sales price differential based on whether a house is within a block of high student occupied group housing or not. In short, there is no statistical evidence that adjacency to a group houses depresses residential property values.

4. We estimate that approximately 680 undergraduates from 175 to 180 group homes in Burleith (90) and West Georgetown (85 to 90) will move into the new 780 bed Southwest Quad upon its completion.

5. We project that 75 to 80 percent of those group houses will be removed from the rental inventory and sold for owner occupancy. Based on an inspection of a random sampling of these group facilities, we estimate that they will require $20,000 to $40,000 on average in renovation and modernization before they could be rented for single family occupancy. Furthermore, despite a very strong citywide rental market, these units would on average rent for 20 percent less than what students are today paying for them. Thus an existing landlord would be faced with the prospect of laying out some $20 to $40,000, and in return receiving 20 percent less than current rents.

6. Given the strong sales market, limited product offering that is available and rapid appreciation in property values, our conclusion is that the vast majority of these units will be sold.

7. In Burleith we estimate that approximately 70 houses will be converted from their rental status to owner occupancy. This will further reinforce the desirability of an already highly desirable area.

8. On average, this conversion from rental status to owner occupied status will be financially very advantageous to the District of Columbia. We estimate that the average dwelling unit that goes from rental to owner occupied status will generate an estimated $7,374/dwelling unit to the District in additional sales tax revenue and income tax revenues. If a total of 175 group houses in Burleith and west Georgetown are converted to single family owner occupied status, this would generate $1,290,450 annually to the District of Columbia in the form of additional sales and income tax revenue.

9. Given the strength of the housing market, there is no evidence to suggest that putting these houses on the market will depress property values. Quite the opposite is likely – a stronger and more pronounced single family owner occupied neighborhood is likely to see an increase in property values.

10. While it is impossible to ascertain who these new residents will be, we believe that a substantial number will be drawn from the faculty and senior staff of the University.

11. Taking a longer term perspective, we can find no evidence to suggest that an increase of 389 students over a ten year period of time will bring back significant amounts group rental housing into Burleith or West Georgetown. Most of the current group-housing inventory will have been removed and converted to single family owner occupancy. That, together with relatively high housing prices which will only go up over the coming decade, will effectively price students out of the Burleith- West Georgetown housing market.

In summary, our conclusion is that the completion of the new 780 student Southwest Quad dormitory will be very positive for the University, the immediate Burleith and West Georgetown neighborhood, and the District of Columbia.

LEWIS BOLAN
PRINCIPAL

BOLAN SMART ASSOCIATES, INC.

Mr. Bolan is a real estate economist and development consultant with thirty years professional experience. He is the co-founder of Bolan Smart Associates, Inc. the independent economic consulting affiliate of the national commercial brokerage firm of Grubb & Ellis. Mr. Bolan formerly was Vice President of Real Estate Research Corporation, Director of its Washington office and head of its investment advisors services division. A planner as well as an economist, he also served as Director of Planning for Victor Gruen International, a European based planning and design firm.

His activities encompass 40 states, nearly all the nation's major cities, and many foreign countries. Mr. Bolan has directed development planning activities and investment evaluation for major new communities and mixed use projects together with office, industrial, retail, hotel and residential land uses. A recognized expert in the fields of strategic planning and financial analysis, he has worked for many leading developers, Fortune 500 companies and financial institutions, as well as served as advisor to numerous local, state and federal government agencies.

Mr. Bolan is an adjunct professor of real estate at Johns Hopkins University, where he also serves on the board of the Allan L. Berman Real Estate Institute. Active in the Urban Land Institute, he frequently contributes time to the Panel Advisory Service and other research projects. In addition, Mr. Bolan is a board member of Lambda Alpha, an honorary land economics fraternity.

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Arts in Sociology and Economics, Columbia University
Masters of City Planning, University of Illinois

PUBLICATIONS

Mr. Bolan is a frequent contributor to real estate and business publications. His articles and comments have appeared in such publications as The Wall Street Journal, The New York Times, The Washington Post, National Real Estate Investor, Real Estate Forum, Urban Land, The Business Review, Kiplingers Report, US News and World Report, and numerous other publications.

AFFILIATIONS

Urban Land Institute
American Planning Association
Washington, DC Association of Realtors
Lambda Alpha