Foggy Bottom and West End
Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC-2A)

c/o St. Mary's Court 725 24th Street, NW Washington, DC 20037 (202) 736-1775

February 19, 2004

Presentation by ANC-2A
Before the District of Columbia Zoning Commission,
Re: A Proposed PUD by The George Washington University for a New Residence Hall at 2025 F Street, NW, in Square 103, Lot 817
(Zoning Commission Case No. 03-29)

Chairperson Mitten and Members of the Zoning Commission:

My name is Dorothy Miller. I live at 2440 Virginia Avenue, Washington, DC. I am the Chair of ANC-2A and am here today to present our ANC's findings and conclusions regarding the proposal by George Washington University for a PUD at 2025 F Street NW for a residence hall.

ANC-2A understands the need to have the students on campus but is strongly opposed to the proposed approach for this development for the reasons detailed in this testimony.

This presentation is divided into four sections. First, I will detail of findings and conclusions regarding the proposal itself: the use of the PUD approach, the zoning variances, and the other zoning and planning issues. Second, even if the Zoning Commission accepts the concept of a PUD approach, I will document how the proposed development does not meet the requirements of a PUD. Third, I will demonstrate how the Comprehensive Plan and the Campus Plan do not support the specifics of the proposed development. Fourth and finally, I will address the issues raised by the Office of Planning's report of February 9th, 2004.

Findings and Conclusions Regarding the Proposal Itself

PUD Approach

1. ANC-2A finds that a PUD is not, and should not be, permitted within the boundaries of an approved Campus Plan.

First, under neither the Zoning Regulations for a Campus Plan nor the Zoning Regulations for a PUD state that a PUD is permitted under a Campus Plan. Absence of a reference in either the Campus Plan regulations or PUD regulations does not imply permission to use the PUD tool to meet a need created by the University itself.

Second, under the Campus Plan regulations, an applicant university or college already is provided significant "flexibilities of development" (page 4 of the University's Statement) and

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
Case 03-29
Exhibit 44
ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.03-29
EXHIBIT NO.44

bonuses in exchange for the submission and approval of a Campus Plan. Use of a PUD would set a precedent that would have severe negative consequences for the future for all neighborhoods bounding an approved Campus Plan area and for the height and bulk of buildings within an approved Campus Plan. Instead of neighborhood expectations being clear and fixed about campus development, such neighborhoods would live in fear that everything is flexible and negotiable or, in other words, "anything goes."

2. Even if a PUD would be permitted within a Campus Plan boundary, our ANC finds that the George Washington University does not need a PUD to construct a new residential hall on the subject site.

First, the variances being requested by the University would be essentially the same whether or not a PUD was proposed. The University would need no additional variances beyond those required in any event by the underlying zoning (R-5-D). Our ANC disagrees with the proposal's assertion that "the University will be able to provide more beds ...[than it would be able to provide under matter-of-right guidelines." That would be true only if the same variances requested for the PUD were not requested for a matter-of-right development. In addition, we find that the reference to dormitory-style units versus apartment-style units not relevant to the discussion.

Second, the University did not provide specific development advantages for using the PUD approach. Rather, the University states that one of its reasons for requesting a PUD is "flexibility of development" (page 4). Since the University requires a number of variances to the underlying R-5-D zoning in any event, the "flexibility of development" would appear to apply more (if not only) to the remainder of Lot 817, the future development plans for which are not provided. Given the current level of trust between the University and the neighborhood, giving the University "flexibility" for some future development plans is not warranted.

Moreover and third, the University states that a significant benefit of the PUD approach is "flexibility from the requirements of the Zoning Regulations in return for meeting District and neighborhood planning goals" (page 8). However, this presumes that the proposed development meets District and neighborhood planning goals. Since, as detailed below, our ANC finds that the proposed development does not meet those goals, the presumed "flexibility" needed is not warranted.

Zoning Variances

3. ANC-2A finds that the variance for relief from the rear-yard setback requirement is not warranted. The zoning requirement is 30 feet and the University's proposal is 0 feet. The University asserts as a conclusion without sufficient documentation that the alleyway of 16 feet is sufficient, because this distance will provide "adequate light and air." Our ANC has several serious concerns with this assertion.

First, if the City, through its Zoning Commission and its Zoning Regulations, thought 16 feet was "adequate" for light and air, the Zoning Regulations would require only 16 feet. But, the

Zoning Commission has determined that 30 feet is adequate and thus the Zoning regulations require 30 feet and these regulations should be enforced as promulgated.

Second, using the width of an alleyway for rear-year setbacks is not an approved method for calculating minimum requirements. More significantly, use of alleyways for such a calculation would set a precedent that would have severe negative consequences for the future for all properties bounding a developable parcel.

Third, the University states that "University-related fraternities" own the properties abutting the alleyway. Since the University does not now own the properties and since the properties in question could be more intensely developed in the future than they are today, it is quite possible for "canyon walls" to be the result of approved future development along the alleyway. We note, parenthetically, that the Fire Department recently was unable to use the alleyway behind the newly expanded Red Cross building development for its ladder truck to fight a fire in Letterman apartment building that fronts on F Street.

4. Whereas our ANC finds that the variance for relief from the court requirement is not warranted. The zoning requirement is 22 feet, 6 inches and the University's proposal is 13 feet, 10 inches. The University asserts as a conclusion without sufficient documentation that the court depth of 13 feet, 10 inches is sufficient, because this distance will provide "ample light and air." ANC-2A has two serious concerns with this assertion.

First, if the City, through its Zoning Commission and its Zoning Regulations, thought 13 feet, 10 inches was "adequate" for light and air, the Zoning Regulations would require only 13 feet, 10 inches. But, the Zoning Commission has determined that 22 feet, 6 inches is adequate and thus the Zoning regulations require 22 feet, 6 inches.

Second, the court for the adjacent residential building, Francis Scott Key Hall, is already only half of the required depth (11 feet, 3 inches). Thus, the residential rooms along most of the east face of the proposed residential hall will have almost "tenement-like" courts outside their windows, significantly eliminating light and sun from most of the rooms.

5. ANC-2A finds that the requested variance for relief from the lot occupancy requirement is misleading.

The calculation for the lot occupancy includes the unloading and parking area behind the Support Building, a portion of Lot 819 that is potentially developable at a significant increase in building footprint, height, and bulk. Thus, the lot occupancy for the proposed residential hall should also be viewed from the perspective of coverage of the rectangular portion of the lot occupied by the building itself (lot area is 88.69 feet by 120.79 feet or 10712.87 square feet). Each court (measured from the drawings, since dimensions are not provided) measures approximately 65.33 feet by 13.83 feet or 903.51 square feet. Thus, the lot coverage would be approximately 83.13 percent.

6. Our ANC finds that the lack of a dedicated off-street loading area is inappropriate for a residence hall with its proposed 380 beds.

First, the University apparently intends to use a new or expanded dumpster located in now-crowded service yard of the Support Building for trash storage and pickup and to use a loading dock accessible only from the same service yard for deliveries of equipment and supplies to the building. Since the University provides no guarantees that this space will be provided in perpetuity to service the proposed residence hall, the lack of a dedicated off-street loading area is a significant problem.

Other Zoning and Planning Issues

7. ANC-2A finds that the proposed development will exacerbate an already extremely difficult traffic situation on F Street.

The original intent of the consolidated Support Building, as our ANC remembers it, was for outside delivery trucks to use the service yard behind the Support Building for unloading into the building and for campus delivery vehicles to use the service yard for loading goods from the building for distribution throughout the campus. In fact, the proposal states that "the service area behind the Support Building serves as the central receiving area for deliveries to GW." Unfortunately, during all day most weekdays, F Street in front of, and to either side of, the Support Building also serves as a central receiving area for deliveries to GW and is filled with double-parked trucks unloading mail, express packages, and a wide variety of goods and equipment. Moreover, elimination of the curb cut on F Street to the off-street parking may have a minor impact on reducing pedestrian-vehicular traffic conflicts. However, the curb cut elimination will also increase curb space for the double-parked trucks that will increase pedestrian-vehicle traffic impacts.

Now the University apparently also intends that the loading and unloading of student clothes, books, electronic equipment, and related goods will occur at the F Street entrance of the new development. This will only reinforce the current problems with on-street loading and unloading and its negative impacts on the adjacent neighborhood residents.

8. Our ANC finds that inclusion of a publicly-accessible, ground-floor retail tenant in the building is in violation of the intent of the Campus Plan, the Zoning Regulations, and the Comprehensive Plan. Moreover, commercial use is in conflict with the Zoning Commission's statement at the hearing on November 12th, 2003 of "no commercial."

First, the specific use of the "university and public retail space" is not defined.

Second, publicly-accessible, food-oriented retail uses are not appropriate at the boundary edge of a Campus Plan. They should be located more centrally within the campus boundaries to serve

more students. The renovations of Quigley's (which is a separate development issue and not a part of the proposed development) would serve that purpose much better.

Third, the need to serve the "public" (i.e., the neighborhood) at this site has not been demonstrated and is highly questionable.

Fourth, the area in front of the proposed residential hall will be busy and noisy enough at all hours of the day and night with its significantly negative consequences on the residents in the apartment buildings across F Street. Adding the retail space of unknown use and unknown hours will make the already difficult situation intolerable.

Finally, this neighborhood does not need another food service establishment that will be open at all hours with itys accompanying pedestrian and vehicular traffic, because a new food service operationis being constructed less than a block away at 1957 E Street.

Findings and Conclusions Regarding the Requirement of a PUD

While ANC-2A strongly opposes the use of a PUD approach for the proposed development, our ANC also finds that that the proposal does not meet the requirements of a PUD. The proposal lists one overarching presumed public benefit and four other presumed public benefits and asserts without supporting documentation that they "will offer important public benefits to the Foggy Bottom neighborhood" (page 1). Our ANC finds that the proposed amenities and benefits are essentially nil and merely assertions on the part of the University without any meaningful supporting documentation. ANC-2A has significant reservations about these presumed public benefits that will benefit the University more than the neighborhood residents.

Provision of 380 new beds within the Campus Plan boundaries. The proposal asserts that the "increase in on-campus is the single most important public benefit associated with the Proposed Project" (page 11). But the provision of 380 beds as proposed (actually 379 beds for undergraduate students) or approximately 280 beds under matter-of-right development plus many other on-campus-housing units are already required as a condition of approval of the Campus Plan. Therefore, the University cannot double count any new on-campus housing as an important public benefit.

In addition, the University, under the approved Campus Plan, has the obligation to find appropriate sites within the Campus Plan boundaries to build the required number of new beds, above and beyond those ultimately provided on this site, under existing appropriate Zoning Regulations and Campus Plan content. Meeting the goals for new beds should not be the forcing function to approve variances from the Zoning Regulations, Campus Plan, or Comprehensive Plan. As the Office of Planning points out and ANC-2A concurs, the University has not been forthcoming about its intent regarding the old hospital site, which if used for dormitory development could adequately meet all the University's needs for new undergraduate on-campus housing.

Our ANC applauds increases in the number of beds within the Campus Plan boundaries. However, we believe that the number of new beds on a specific site should be based on that site's development capacity excluding variances and thus not produce excessive development inappropriate to this site with its negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.

Moreover, our ANC finds that the proposal's assertions are misleading in that the 380 beds, rather than the approximately 280 beds, is the result – not of the PUD approach – but of the variances from matter-of-right development. Thus, our ANC finds that the benefits claimed under Sections 2403.9(f) and 2403.9(I) are not really supported as public benefits for the proposal.

Reference to the District of Columbia, Office of Planning report of April 21, 2000 (page 12) is relevant only to the extent that Square 103 (interestingly not Lot 817 itself) was identified as an appropriate "site" for additional housing. As noted in our finding regarding Land Use Impact above/below, the issue is not the location of a residential development on the site per se but the excessive development of the site. The issue of sufficiency of housing already has been superseded by the conditions imposed on the University for approval of the Campus Plan.

Provision of 1000 square feet of university and public retail space on the ground floor. As noted above with supporting rationale, our ANC finds that inclusion of a publicly-accessible, ground-floor, retail tenant in the building is neither an amenity nor consistent with the intent of the Campus Plan, the Zoning Regulations for a R-5-D zoned site, and the Comprehensive Plan.

Provision of a new food service facility at Quigley's. Our ANC funds that this is not an amenity in support of this PUD or even the requested zoning variances. The renovations and the food service use are independent business decisions that have nothing to do with the presumed benefits of the proposed development – even though they are in the same Square.

Provision of a more attractive streetscape for the portion of F Street located in front of the new building. ANC-2A finds again that this is not an amenity in support of this PUD. If the University wanted a more attractive streetscape along the approximately 89-foot frontage, it could do so with very limited costs. The presumed benefit to the nearby residents is clearly overwhelmed by the negative consequences of the development.

Provision of a superior, environmentally sensitive design. Our ANC finds that this is not an amenity in support of this PUD. First, this is a qualitative statement about which reasonable people (from neighborhood citizens to non-neighborhood architects) could easily disagree. Second, it had to imaging the University would put up any building on any part of the Campus that it did not consider "superior and environmentally sensitive," whether or not a PUD for the building's site was involved.

The University's proposal concludes, again without supporting documentation, that "these public amenities and benefits [will encourage] a more attractive and efficient overall planning and design not achievable under matter-of-right development" (emphasis is the ANC's). It is difficult to read this bold assertion with a straight face. Our ANC concludes otherwise. With the exception of the excessive number of beds and the provision of the retail space, which we

oppose, the "construction of [a] well planned residential development" is not only readily achievable but also expected under matter-of-right development.

Findings and Conclusions Regarding Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and the Campus Plan

Comprehensive Plan

ANC-2A also finds that that the Comprehensive Plan and the Campus Plan do not support the specifics of the proposed development. The proposal lists five presumed ways without supporting documentation that purport to show this support (page 2). Moreover, our ANC finds that the proposed consistency with the Comprehensive Plan is meager and overstated in some aspects and non-existent in others. The University merely asserts this consistency without any meaningful supporting documentation. ANC-2A has significant reservations about some of these presumed consistencies.

Helping stabilize the Foggy Bottom neighborhood by providing more on-campus housing. As stated above, our ANC applauds increases in the number of beds within the Campus Plan boundaries. However, also as stated above, we believe that the number of new beds on a specific site should be based on that site's appropriate development capacity. The excessive development, as proposed for the site, will in fact help destabilize the immediate F Street neighborhood and drive tax-paying permanent residents out to be replaced by more off-campus students.

Improving the physical character of the District by replacing a surface parking lot with an attractive new residential building. As noted above, ANC finds that improving the physical character and attractiveness of the F Street streetscape and the parking lot could be done with very limited costs and much less impact on the immediate neighborhood. The presumed benefit to the nearby residents is clearly overwhelmed by the negative consequences of the proposed the high-density use and excessive development.

Promoting land use patterns and transportation services which decrease reliance on automobiles for commuting and other routine trips. Our ANC could not determine what this unclear assertion is intended to convey. It is difficult to imaging that many of the students, who would be housed in this residential development (whatever the number of beds provided), would otherwise be commuting to the University by automobile.

Enhancing the streetscape by reducing conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular traffic in order to increase pedestrian safety and comfort. Our ANC finds this assertion also somewhat puzzling. During all day most weekdays, F Street in front of, and to either side of, the Support Building is filled with double-parked trucks unloading mail, express packages, and a wide variety of goods and equipment. Thus, the conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular traffic already is unsafe and discomforting. The proposed building is designed that the student and staff entrance is only on F Street. Adding 380 students (or fewer as hoped by ANC-2A) plus staff will only exacerbate an already difficult, unsafe, and discomforting streetscape environment.

Realizing several objectives set forth in the Ward 2 Plan in a manner entirely consistent with the Generalized Land Use Map. The proposal asserts that the project fully satisfies the Ward 2 objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. The fact that the Comprehensive Plan states that the "university must continue to construct student dormitories" (page 20) and the Ward 2 Element of the Comprehensive Plan reinforces this statement does not support the proposed development. Rather, it merely demonstrates that the proposed development is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Moreover, the BZA already has codified the objective of these statements in the conditions laid down for the approval of the Campus Plan. Thus, our ANC finds that the proposal conclusion regarding satisfying the Comprehensive Plan's and Ward 2 Element's objectives is a minor issue of not being inconsistent versus a major issue of support for the proposed development.

The University's proposal concludes, again without supporting documentation, that "approval of this application will promote orderly development in conformity with the entirety of the District of Columbia zone Plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map of the District of Columbia." Again, it is difficult to read this bold assertion with a straight face. Our ANC concludes otherwise. A less excessive development more in keeping with its F Street neighbors would promote a more orderly development that would be in greater conformity with the District of Columbia zone plan.

In addition to the five aspects asserted as demonstrating conformity to the Comprehensive Plan, the proposal notes that increasing available on-campus housing for students will achieve an important goal of the Comprehensive Plan (page 8). This important goal of the Comprehensive Plan, codified numerically in the approved Campus Plan, should not be the driving force to create excessive residential buildings anywhere on campus. This statement is particularly relevant at the periphery of the campus where negative impacts on the neighborhood are likely to be greatest. Moreover, with regard to the specific site, within several hundred feet of the proposed development, several thousand undergraduates – including virtually all on-campus freshmen – are housed within several hundred feet of the proposed development. Thus, any development over matter-of-right will exacerbate the always difficult and at times intolerable conditions of noise and overcrowding that negatively impact the neighborhood residents.

ANC-2A has reviewed other specific issues that relate to the Comprehensive Plan and has major concerns about three of them.

Land Use Impact. The proposal asserts, without supporting documentation, that " the proposed residence hall ... is entirely appropriate ... from the land use perspective" (page 9). With the exception of the retail space, our ANC agrees that the residence hall use *per se* is appropriate from the land use perspective. It is the degree of excessive development of the proposed residential structure that our ANC has found not appropriate.

Zoning Impact. The proposal asserts, without supporting documentation, that the proposed development "will not result in an adverse zoning impact" because "GW is the owner of all the adjacent properties" (page 10). Our ANC finds that this causal relationship is misleading in that adjacent properties are not the only ones affected. The apartment buildings and the condominium across F Street and the fraternity properties across the alleyway are not owned by the University. Yet they will be affected. Moreover, approval of the use of the PUD approach

within a campus plan area and of the variances requested will set important zoning precedents that will have impacts on neighborhoods throughout the District.

Urban Design Element. The proposal asserts, without supporting documentation, that the proposed development "will complement the immediate area ...which is primarily devoted to high-density commercial, high-density residential, and University use" (page 19). This assertion is a qualitative statement, about which reasonable people (from neighborhood citizens to non-neighborhood urban designers) could easily disagree. From the urban design perspective, our ANC finds that the low-density development of surface parking (with appropriate landscaping) in fact is preferable because it provides necessary and desirable relief from that high-density development. Thus, this lower density development "preserves and enhances the outstanding physical qualities of the District neighborhoods" (page 19).

Campus Plan

ANC-2A finds that the proposed development is not inconsistent with the Campus Plan, in so far as the site was designated for residential development (as one of two optional uses) and the site is located at the periphery of the Campus Plan boundaries, a location appropriate for residential use. This finding is caveated by our ANC's concerns that any specific development be appropriate for the site – a concern we find is not met by the proposed development.

In the same manner as with the Comprehensive Plan, the lack of inconsistency with the Campus Plan should not be taken as support for this specific project that our ANC finds is excessive for the site. This finding relates both to the 36 percent increase in proposed beds over matter-of-right and its impact on neighborhood residents and to the addition of the approximately 100 beds to the cluster of thousands of beds within a block of the site and its already devastating impact on neighborhood residents.

Office of Planning Report

ANC-2A has concerns about several aspects of the Office of Planning (OP) Report.

First, OP's report is strangely silent on the issue of a PUD approach itself within the context of an approved Campus Plan. OP appears to have accepted the University's desire for a PUD without analyzing the potential impacts of the precedent in using the PUD approach in this instance. Our ANC finds that the potential impacts downstream are all negative. OP also appears to have accepted the University's desire for a PUD without analyzing the need for the PUD. Our ANC finds that the same variances would be needed with or without the PUD designation.

Second, OP's comments on the Campus Plan noted that the community needed protection from being engulfed by the University's expansion and development plans. Our ANC finds no similar concerns in their report on the proposed development.

Finally, OP's report is filled with the terms "believes" and "recommends." Unfortunately, little supporting documentation is provided in their report for their beliefs and recommendations. We understand why the University's proposals might choose to include only assertions and not supporting documentation. However, we are disappointed in the OP report because their supporting rationale is non-existent, weak, or unclear. This is especially problemsome where OP addresses (without specifying so) issues raised by ANC-2A.

Conclusion and Summary

In conclusion, ANC-2A has two overarching reasons and a number of other important specific reasons for opposing the proposed development.

First and importantly for the future not only for our neighborhood but for the District as a whole, ANC-2A opposes the use of the PUD zoning tool within the Campus Plan boundaries for the proposed residence hall (or any other development) as an inappropriate and unneeded tool for Campus Plan development.

Second, ANC-2A opposes any residential development in this portion of the campus above matter-of-right because of the already excessive density of students – mostly freshman – within a block of the site and thus the already excessive negative impact on the neighborhood residents and businesses.

In addition to these two overarching reasons, our ANC also:

- Opposes most of the variances for relief from the Zoning requirements as unwarranted;
- Opposes the lack of a dedicated off-street loading area;
- Opposes the inclusion of a publicly-accessible, ground-floor, retail tenant in the proposed residence hall; and
- Finds that the proposed amenities and benefits to the Foggy Bottom community and the District as a whole are essentially nil.

Although the concept of residential development on this site may not be inconsistent with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and the Campus Plan, ANC-2A finds that these two plans do not – in any way – support the specifics of the proposed excessive development.

Therefore, on these bases, ANC-2A recommends that the Zoning Commission reject the proposed precedent-shattering request to use the PUD approach for residence hall development.

We trust that the Zoning Commission will take the specificity of our concerns and issues and the rationales of our findings and conclusions into account and reject the proposed PUD approach for the development of this residence hall and return the proposal to the University for resubmission as a matter-of-right development.

Appeals court made fundamental mistakes

VIEWPOINT

SOL S. SHALIT

The D.C. Court of Appeals has finally ruled on the latest suit George Washington University filed against the Board of Zoning Adjustment, challenging the conditions the latter attached to the approved campus plan. Although the appeals court sided with the zoning board (and, hence, the Foggy Bottom/West End community) on some major issues, the decision is a mixed bag at best.

The appeals court decision suffers from two fundamental errors:

1. In ruling on the crucial Condition 9(a), the appeals court demonstrated great sensitivity to a potential adverse effect on the university's finances. But it did not even consider — let alone balance — the adverse effect on the neighborhood, in which George Washington is a guest under our zoning regulations.

2. Even more baffling, the appeals court decision views the number of the university students as exogenous — accepting the university's notion that tens of thousands of transient students just happened to appear in Foggy Bottom while the university is trying so hard to cope with the "problem" thrust upon it. In fact, the "problem" is of the university's own making, since it controls the only two variables in this setting, the number of students it admits and the housing it provides.

The zoning board's record is replete with evidence that during the past 20 years George Washington has been fully and repeatedly advised of the consequences of its continued encroachments into Foggy Bottom/West End.

I believe there is ample evidence in the record to demonstrate clearly the university's deliberate use of blockbusting through its enrollment and expansion activities. Yet the city has never held George Washington accountable for it. The non-university community has been squeezed almost out of existence by the university's repeated violations of the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning board's orders. The university has purposefully failed to provide campus housing for its oversized student body and has continued to acquire property outside campus boundary to convert for use by the university.

The university's behavior has long been a consistent scheme of sophisticated defiance of any regulatory attempt to control its continuing and unmitigated expansion into the neighborhood.

Moreover, in the past two years, George Washington University has initiated a series of lawsuits against the District, using the legal hiatus to execute yet another end-run of accelerated student enrollment, knowing full well it was in further violation of its housing requirements. And now it comes before the court asking for relief from what it considers onerous conditions on grounds of financial exigency.

That the D.C. Court of Appeals would accept this approach is nothing short of astounding. This would be tantamount to condoning a driver who was fully aware of a series of road signs posting the speed limit but decided to disobey them by speeding ahead, believing the road signs to be an unconstitutional infringement of his freedom. After causing a series of traffic accidents, and losing his constitutional defense lawsuit, he is finally ordered to pay damages, but he argues on appeal that paying damages is onerous, as it would set him back financially.

This was not a glorious day for the D.C. Court of Appeals.

Sol S. Shalit is a Foggy Bottom resident and a professor emeritus of economics and finance.

Attachment (1)
Appeals court made fundamental mistakes—Sept. 24, 2003 Current