GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING
OF
BZA APPLICATION 16566
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY CAMPUS PLAN

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

JUNE 13, 2000

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Sheila Cross Reid, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

SHEILA CROSS REID	Chairperson
ROBERT N. SOCKWELL	Vice Chairperson
RODNEY L. MOULDEN	Board Member
ANN RENSHAW	Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

HERBERT M. FRANKLIN	Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

Sheri Pruitt,	Secretary, BZA
Beverly Bailey,	Office of Zoning
Paul Hart,	Office of Zoning
John Nyarku,	Office of Zoning

OTHER AGENCY STAFF PRESENT:

Ellen McCarthy,	Office of Planning

D.C. OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL:

Mary Nagelhout, Esq

. C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
PRELIMINARY MATTERS	5
APPLICATION OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY:	
16566 ANC-2E	43
MAUREEN E. DWYER, Esq.	44
PAUL TUMMONDS, Esq.	
Wilkes, Artis, Hedrick & Lane, Chartered	
Suite 1100	
1666 K Street, N.W.	
Washington, D.C. 20006-2897	
(202) 457-7814	
WITNESSES	
FATHER LEO O'DONOVAN	51
DOROTHY BROWN.	66
ALAN BRANGMAN.	73
LINDA GREENAN.	98
JEANNE LORD.	104
JOHN GREEN	113
LOUIS J. SLADE	118
KAREN FRANK.	126
LEWIS BOLAN.	131

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:36 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON REID: Good morning. The hearing will please come to order.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the June 13th Public Hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia. My name is Sheila Cross Reid, Chairperson. Joining me today is Robert Sockwell and Ann Renshaw, Rodney Moulden representing the National Capital Planning Commission, and representing the Zoning Commission is Herb Franklin.

Copies of today's hearing agenda are available to you. They are located to my left at the door.

All persons planning to testify either in favor or in opposition are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located on each end of the table in front of us. When coming forward to speak to the Board, please give both cards to the reporter, who is sitting to my right.

The order of procedure for special exception and variances cases are as follows: One, statement and witnesses of the applicant; two, government reports, including Office of Planning, Department of Public Works, etcetera; report of the ANC; parties or persons in support; parties or persons in opposition; closing remarks by the applicant.

Cross-examination of witnesses is permitted by the applicant or parties. The ANC within which the party is located

is automatically a party in the case.

The record will be closed at the conclusion of each case except for any material specifically requested by the Board, and the staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected.

Decision of the Board in these contested cases must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Board requests that persons present not engage members of the Board in conversation.

Please turn off all beepers and cellphones at this time so as not to disrupt these proceedings.

The Board will now consider any preliminary matters. Preliminary matters are those which relate to whether a case will or should be heard today, such as requests for postponement, continuance or withdrawal, or whether proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been given.

If you are not prepared to go forward with the case today or if you believe that the Board should not proceed, now is the time to raise such a matter. Are there any preliminary matters?

All right. Does staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. PRUITT: Yes, Madam Chair. There are two -- first, preliminary matters. You have a letter dated -- request from Citizens Association of Georgetown dated May 24 requesting

postponement; a letter from Citizens Association of Burleith dated May 22 requesting postponement; a letter from the applicant dated May 30 in opposition to this request. They are all in your package.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Excuse me. You are saying there is a request for postponement?

MS. PRUITT: There are two requests for postponement from two different citizens organizations.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Parties? Are they parties?

MS. PRUITT: No. You have not done party status yet.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No, no.

MS. PRUITT: They are requesting party status.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay, they are requesting party status.

MS. PRUITT: Correct. From potential parties.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. So we would have to first do the party status to determine whether or not they would have standing to request a postponement.

MS. PRUITT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What's the basis of the postponement?

MS. PRUITT: Time. It's actually -- Let me pull up the request for continuance. If you look at Exhibit Number 38 and Exhibit Number 37, both of them are requesting basically

postponement. They feel they need more time to work out issues and resolve them.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. First, I think we should just do the party status assessment and determine who has party status, and then from that we can continue based upon how that comes out.

MS. PRUITT: Madam Chair, you have seven requests for party status, if you look at the little tally sheet. They are also in your folder. That was dated June 13, the very last folder that you got.

You have a party status request from Hillendale, who is in opposition; Citizens Action of Georgetown in opposition; Burleith Citizens Association, opposition; Foxhall Community Citizens Association; Wormley Neighborhood Association; and the Cloisters in Georgetown. They all have submitted party status in writing, and their requests are timely.

CHAIRPERSON REID: And all in opposition?

MS. PRUITT: No. Only the ones I mentioned. The other two -- It was a little hard to determine if they were in complete opposition or they weren't sure.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. So we know we have at least five?

MS. PRUITT: Seven.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No, no, five in -- How many in opposition?

MS. PRUITT: Oh, correct.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Five? Okay. And the other two, we weren't -- Okay.

MS. PRUITT: An actually, if you have your sheet right in front of you, all that information is on it.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Where is that sheet? Right there, okay. All right.

The parties -- The entities that have requested party status, are you being represented by an attorney? Can I have those persons who are representing these organizations come forward, please, who are representing the organizations for party status. All right, have a seat, please.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, on behalf of the applicant, could I just state for the record that we have no objection to six of the seven party requests. The only one we were going to issues with respect to is the Wormley Association. The others --

CHAIRPERSON REID: And what's the basis for that objection, please?

MS. DWYER: The Wormley Association has filed a request, and their issues concern property that is not within the campus plan. The Wormley School is a site outside of the campus plan boundaries. So the issues they raise have nothing to do with the campus plan, and the Wormley School project is not before this Board.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Let me start with that one. The Wormley School representative -- who is that? Is there a representative from the Wormley School this morning? No? Wormley Neighborhood Association? There is no one here from the Wormley Neighborhood Association? Okay. So then that takes care of that one.

All right. Then --

MS. DWYER: With respect to the others, we have no objection. They seem to have met the filing requirements, and have issues that are germane to this proceeding.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. All right, now typically for you to be granted party status, it is predicated upon your demonstrating that you are uniquely affected. Typically, when we have organizations, which you are all organizations, that's kind of a gray area. How can the organization be uniquely affected, more so than other persons who are in that community? This is what we need to establish this morning. Start here.

MR. ANDREW: My name is Robert Andrew, President of the Foxhall Community Citizens Association, representing 875 homes in the area immediately west of Glover Archbold Park.

We have been part of the BZA quarterly meeting process mandated by this Board in 1990, and have been in continuous involvement in that process for the last decade. Does that answer your question, Madam Chair?

We have also been part of every single working

group session that the University has held towards --

CHAIRPERSON REID: No. My question, sir, is how are you uniquely -- How are you more affected than the other persons who live in that community? It is predicated upon your demonstrating that you have some unique situation.

MR. ANDREW: More than who? The associations before you, ma'am, represent every single neighbor around this university.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. Let me read this. Under Section 3106.3: "In considering a request for party status pursuant to Section 3106.2, the Board shall grant party status only if the person has clearly demonstrated that his or her interest would be more significantly, distinctively or uniquely affected in part or in kind by the proposed zoning action than those of other persons in the general public."

MR. ANDREW: Ma'am, if you take the one issue, for example, of the proposed 49 percent increase in graduate enrollment, my area of uniquely affected by that, including myself. Is that sufficient? I'm not --

CHAIRPERSON REID: How are you more affected than anyone else? Is there anything unique about your organization that makes you more affected than anyone else in the community?

MR. ANDREW: Well, the value of our properties in terms of -- Ma'am, I don't quite understand the question. Sorry. We do represent a large portion of the general public.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Sir, I think it might be appropriate for you to state the location of residences with your organization in proximity to the University, those kinds of factors, which would be specific to the interest of your members to the University's intended efforts.

MR. ANDREW: We represent the homeowners in the area bounded by Canal Road, Reservoir Road, and Glover Archbold Park. That is all the homes immediately west of the University contained in Ward 2. We have been an association in existence since 1928. That's the area of interest. We have 875 homes to whom we can deliver newspapers by hand. We have another 410 condos and the like which have locked mailboxes we cannot deliver to, but we represent all of those homeowners.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Are all of you all similarly situated in that you feel that, because of the block of constituents that you represent, that you want to have party status to be able to speak on behalf of that particular organization, geographical -- All of them are different? There's no overlapping? No overlapping in these -- The area is not that large. So you all have distinctively different geographical locations than the others?

MR. ANDREW: Yes, ma'am. They are, in fact, shown on the latest Office of Planning map for neighborhood interests. Office of Planning could provide you their map showing where all of these named neighborhoods and associations that are represented

here today. John Farnsmith could bring that to you. That is laid out in the neighborhood planning process.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. So, basically, we'll discuss that --

MR. ANDREW: And the comprehensive plan.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Basically, it's a geographical -- - It's a geographical type of --

MR. ANDREW: Yes, ma'am, to the west, to the north and to the east. The groups you see here before -- of the university -- represent those geographies.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Do any of the others of you have anything different or any other unusual circumstance or anything that is distinctive about your entity that is the reason why you're asking party status? Your name, sir?

MR. BRAUN: Madam Chair, my name is Charles Braun, and with Dr. Stan Talpers we represent the Hillendale Homeowners Association.

The Hillendale planned unit development was created by the Zoning Commission some 20 years ago. It's a gated community. It is one entrance, an exit on 39th Street, as well as an emergency entrance and exit on 39th Street.

It is uniquely affected by traffic on Reservoir Road, because the main way in and out of Hillendale to the rest of the city is via Reservoir Road. Other groups are affected by Reservoir Road, but not to the same degree, because their

geographic location is different. They're not gated, and they have more access to the city's streets than we do.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. And everyone else is basically because of the geographical proximity to the University. Is that correct?

MR. ANDREW: Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, Don Crockett for the Georgetown Residents Alliance. I understand that, before I walked in, you indicated there wasn't an application on file from our organization.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Who said that? We have Georgetown Residents Alliance?

MS. PRUITT: Yes, it's on there.

CHAIRPERSON REID: And you're representing them? I was asking who was being represented by counsel, and no one said anything.

MR. CROCKETT: We will -- Georgetown Residents Alliance will be represented by counsel.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. All right now, so then that's one represented by counsel. Then we have five other organizations. All right. Now our problem is, when we have so many different entities asking for party status, then the cross-examination is what becomes very labored.

What I'd like to know is do each of you intend to cross-examine each witness?

MR. BRAUN: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Is there a way that you all could perhaps -- If your concerns are similar, can you combine your questions and have one person proffer the questions to the witnesses, because it will take forever to have so many people doing the cross.

If we give you the party status, let's try to compromise here; because quite frankly, I don't think that -- I think there are too many people for party status, but trying to accommodate, if you would try to combine your questions and have one person or two people to do the cross-examination, you will receive all notices and all submissions and materials germane to this case. But I just don't think that it is in anyone's best interest to allow six people to cross-examine each of the witnesses. That's just too much.

MR. BRAUN: Madam Chair --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Excuse me. If among you, there was a representative of each group at the mediation sessions and other pertinent meetings with the University, we would appreciate your indulgence of the Board by trying to pool your responses, where necessary, into single groups of questions rather than separate restatements of the same issues. It would certainly speed up the hearing.

MR. BRAUN: Madam Chair, I'm Charles Braun from Hillendale. There have been discussions between -- by e-mail

between the different organizations, and I think it's understood that different organizations have different issues, and that, for example, Hillendale is not concerned with number of students. It's concerned with north campus traffic, and it's focused on that and the helicopter pad; and that's all.

Other people are focused on other things. So there has been informally by e-mail a fair amount of consultation and parceling up of the issues. It's not perfect, but it's already been done, because we don't want to stay here any longer than you do.

CHAIRPERSON REID: So in other words, you all have made some attempt to try to consult with each other.

MR. BRAUN: That's been done, yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Well, it goes without saying that any questions that are proffered should not be repetitive or duplicated. Am I hearing you say that there will be different ones questioning different witnesses and not all questioning the same witness? I can't have six people questioning the same witness.

If your concern -- If you are the one who is concerned about the -- Did you say helicopter pad?

MR. BRAUN: Helicopter pad and north campus traffic.

CHAIRPERSON REID: -- and north campus, and you're asking those questions of the traffic -- I guess, the traffic

report or DPW, whatever, then are you saying that that would basically suffice, and there would not be five other people coming up and asking questions of the traffic report?

MR. BRAUN: If somebody else is asking questions of the traffic consultant, it might be relating to the main campus -- more likely to be relating to the main campus than the north campus. I think it divides up by issues rather than -- I mean, we're not -- There was no advance explicit requirement to do this. So we haven't done it, but the issues have been divided up to a considerable degree.

I mean, I'm not planning to ask questions of many of the witnesses, because they don't have anything to tell on the issues that I'm here to express our concerns about.

So I think -- I mean, I understand your concern, although I'm not here as an attorney for my association -- I'm here as a representative of the association -- I am an attorney, and I have appeared before this body before as an attorney when the membership of the Board was different.

I think this is just an unusual situation where the University is ringed by different neighborhoods, and they have their own different associations and different rules and different representatives. I realize that's inconvenient, but there is an effort -- there has been an effort not to have undue duplication.

CHAIRPERSON REID: The purpose of -- The primary purpose of your asking for party status -- is it so that you can

cross-examine? Is that the primary reason why you are requesting the party status?

MR. BRAUN: No, not for Hillendale. It may be so for the others.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. And yours is?

MR. BRAUN: We are concerned about traffic and the helicopter pad. We have already put into the record by submitting to DPW -- We hired our own traffic consultant. We produced a report. We're here to express our concerns.

Incidentally, if it's necessary on the issues that concern us, we may also need to cross-examine and should not be denied the right to do so, but we are here to present an affirmative case. We realize that won't come until the next session, the next public hearing after we've had a chance to hear the University's case and digest everything that we learn today, but we're not here primarily to cross-examine.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right, thank you. Just one second. Let me just confer.

By consensus, the Board has decided that, while this is not an idea situation for us, it is probably prudent to allow the parties that have requested party status to be granted party status, because there is some little confusion as to how this procedure should be done.

Nonetheless, we can proceed, but we will have to be very vigilant about the questioning and moving things along, and

we ask that you be cooperative with us and not get into trying to be a Perry Mason and to ask a lot of lead questions to build up to a question. Just ask what you have to ask. Cut straight to the chase, get it over with, and get the question out, and let's move it along.

That's what we have to do in order to try to get through this case in a reasonable amount of time.

MS. PRUITT: Madam Chair, could I get a motion on those who will be granted party status, and so we can vote?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes. The Wormley Neighborhood Association representatives -- have they come in? Okay. All right, then could someone put a motion on the floor, and then we can vote on this and move on?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Madam Chair, I will move that the six neighborhood associations whose representatives are present today be granted party status, that the Wormley Neighborhood Association whose representative is not present today be denied party status for lack of appearance.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Second?

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Second.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All in favor? Opposed?

MS. PRUITT: Staff would record the vote as five to zero, motion made by Mr. Sockwell, seconded by Ms. Renshaw, to grant party status to six of the seven parties requested, with Wormley Neighborhood Association being the only one denied party

status.

MS. SCOLARO: Madam Chair, may I ask a question, please?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes.

MS. SCOLARO: On cross-examination -- Oh, I'm sorry. Patricia Scolaro. I'm President of the Burleith Citizens Association. We, too, caucused, and we also hope that we will use good judgment in questioning. We have -- and please depend on us, that we will listen to what the other person has asked and try very hard not to ask the same or similar questions.

I do have a question about cross-examination. Do we have to do it as the person speaks? Can we do it as a group? Could we do it when we have our opportunity, whenever that's going to be, sometime in July to cross-examine? Does it have to be done immediately as that person speaks?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Wait just one second, please. Yes?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, we had discussed with staff that, as in other cases, we would present the witnesses as a panel with cross-examination afterwards of all the witnesses. That was our plan today. So it would be at the completion of the direct case. All the witnesses would be brought back, and that way we avoid questions being asked of an early witness that would be addressed in later testimony.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes, by the panel, because, as you said, sometimes if one person speaks and then you have questions, it may be that that question will be answered by one of the subsequent witnesses that are going to speak with the applicant's presentation.

So once the panel is done, then we will allow cross-examination of each witness that has been presented.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, Don Crockett. I would have no objection to that if we had three and four member panels, but they have a long witness list.

CHAIRPERSON REID: How many do you have, Ms. Dwyer? How many do you have?

MS. DWYER: We have nine witnesses. In a meeting with staff we have agreed to complete our case within two hours. So we're going to be very focused in our testimony.

CHAIRPERSON REID: One panel, nine witnesses?

MS. DWYER: Right. Nine witnesses, one panel.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What were you saying, Mr. Crockett?

MR. CROCKETT: I'd prefer to take them three at a time. I think it would probably go better that way, if we did. You've got groups. You've got traffic consultants, and you've got various other types of people.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Why don't we split in half? You know, do five and then let them cross-examine those five, and then

do the other four?

MS. DWYER: The only problem is that some of the later witnesses, again, might be still answering questions in the first five.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Same problem.

MS. DWYER: It's proven to be much more efficient in other cases to do it as one panel.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes, I see.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Madam Chair, if they present as a single panel and, for the sake of witness cross, we break the panel into its pertinent subsets, then we might be able to more effectively deal with the large number of parties, say if the people responding to transportation issues would be crossed at one time.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Maybe we could break it down like Mr. Sockwell is saying, by issues. For example, you have different people who would testify on different things.

Now, obviously, the traffic portion, traffic -- your traffic consultant portion is just one or two people?

MS. DWYER: Yes, although there's some overlap, because the physical plan, obviously, discusses existing and proposed traffic circulation. For cross-examination we will try to bring back a panel of the three or four who are discussing maybe the physical aspects of the campus plan, another three or four who are discussing academic mission, and if it turns out that

one of them is asked a question that someone sitting in the audience needs to answer, they can just come forward.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. So repeat that. We've talked about so many different scenarios. I think that we're getting somewhere with the last one.

MS. DWYER: We will present our direct testimony as one panel.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay, and that's how many people?

MS. DWYER: That's nine people within two hours. Then for cross-examination we will bring three to four witnesses at a time on specific issues, such as traffic.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Oh, I see what you're saying, for cross-examination. That's not what he was -- That's not what I was saying either.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, it's just a lot of notes that you have to take, and I do this for a living, and when a witness is through, you've just heard his testimony and you've taken your notes and you're ready to cross-examine.

If then you have to go through another eight witnesses and the whole thing before you come back, it's very disjointed. I would prefer, really, anytime to cross-examine the witness after he has testified before going on to the next witness. This is the way it's done in all other situations.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, if I may just put on the

record, for this Board and these proceedings the way it is done is the way that we've described, which is the way the other campus plan cases were handled and even the recent case that Mr. Crockett participated in for St. Mary's.

The experience of this Board has been, as I said earlier, that later witnesses are then -- You get into a situation where you're asking so many cross-examination questions of one witness that are, in fact, answered by a later witness.

CHAIRPERSON REID: You know, I think that, Ms. Dwyer, we do it different ways, but you're right. As to the other campus plans we have done -- I don't know if we had so many people, though.

So as not to -- So as to eliminate perhaps some of the cross-examination questions, if we can't do it, you know, half and half because of the fact that there might be some information, then maybe we should just go ahead and allow you to do your whole presentation within the two hours.

You have two hours to do it. Is that the timeline? Have we gone over the timeline yet? Okay, we'll go over the timeline and just allow you to finish it, and then -- I'm sorry you have to take copious notes and then do the cross-examination of the panels. That seems to be the most expedient, maybe not ideal, but the most expedient way to handle it today.

So the timeline?

MS. PRUITT: Well, actually, you still have to deal

with the request for a continuance -- I mean, you asked for a postponement from Citizens Association of Georgetown and Burleith, now having been granted party status.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Burleith -- Which is Burleith? Okay, now the basis for your asking for a postponement was due to additional time for mediation?

MS. SCOLARO: Yes, it was. We started with what -- in all good faith, with the mediation process, and you have to understand that the people who were involved from the communities were all volunteers. Probably everybody, most of them, had a job and needed additional time, because they were working on their own time for all of these efforts.

From the very first day of mediation until we met a second time, three weeks had passed. By that time, it was -- we were heading into the Memorial Day weekend, and we just didn't feel there was enough time to get all of the information that we needed.

The mediation -- What they refer to as mediations became three two-hour sessions of a rather large group of people. To my way of thinking -- I attended all but one -- it was presentation and not necessarily mediation.

So we felt that we did not have enough time and enough information at that point to continue on.

CHAIRPERSON REID: So your organization feels that with additional time you may be able to come to some resolution of

some of the problems or issues or some meeting of the minds. Is that what your anticipation is?

MS. SCOLARO: My feeling, my personal feeling is that, if the mediation had been conducted as it was originally presented to us, we might have been able to reach, from my point of view, some resolution or some agreement on some issues. But to my knowledge, I don't recall that there was anything that was really agreed to or came out of mediation.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. Excuse me.

So the other one was the Georgetown Citizens Association.

MS. DOWNS: I'm Barbara Downs, President of the Citizens Association. We, too, had felt that there wasn't enough time to complete a thorough discussion of all the issues in the mediation process, and we asked for more time. But now, since the mediation has been completed, such as it was, I don't think we really have any objections to going ahead.

CHAIRPERSON REID: So you're withdrawing your request for postponement. Is that what you're saying?

MS. DOWNS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: So we have only one request for postponement. Okay. You're saying that you did want to ask for postponement due to the need for additional time for mediation, but now you don't think that --

MS. DOWNS: Now I don't see any point. The

mediation process has been completed, and I don't see any point in asking for additional time.

MS. PRUITT: Madam Chair, just for a point of reference, because when we got these requests I did talk to someone from OP, since the Board and staff has not been involved in the mediation process, nor should we be.

I did find out from them that OP has completed their mediation process, and they have no more intent -- There's no intention of reopening it. As Ms. -- I'm sorry, Downs? -- has indicated, the process, as they see it, is over with, not to say that additional mediation can't be done. It just is not going to be done under a formal setting.

So additional conversations and negotiations certainly can carry on, particularly since we have two hearing dates scheduled. But at this point my understanding is that OP will not be doing anymore formal mediation.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. And Ms. Dwyer, you are in opposition to the postponement?

MS. DWYER: Yes. Right. In our letter, we stated that, in fact, the mediation process had ended, and that the University in that process had put a compromise proposal on the table which the organizations were then taking back to take positions on.

While it certainly doesn't rule out between now and the next hearing further discussions, there's no need to delay

today's hearing on the basis of mediation. In fact, the ANC-2E has already taken a position and has voted to support the campus plan based on what the University proposes.

So we feel that we're all ready to go forward today, and that there's no basis or purpose to be served by delay.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you very much. So in regard to the request for postponement, Board members?

MS. ZARTMAN: Madam Chair, there is one other element that might affect your decision. My name is Barbara Zartman. I am an ANC Commissioner in 2E-04.

We have questioned with Corporation Counsel the legitimacy of the vote taken by the ANC in that a majority of the Commission met before the public meeting and developed their motion and agreed to support it in a private meeting before the ANC ever convened or the public had a chance to testify.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Wait, wait, wait, wait one second. The letter that was submitted to us from the ANC -- Is that what you're referring to?

MS. ZARTMAN: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON REID: -- states that there was a vote that was taken and that eight of the Commissioners, 100 percent, were present, and that the vote was five to three.

MS. ZARTMAN: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON REID: That was representatives of the ANC. So what are you saying? Are you saying that that didn't

happen?

MS. ZARTMAN: It did happen. It was a rubber stamp meeting following up on a private meeting.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What does that mean?

MS. ZARTMAN: Corporation Counsel will clarify, as I had written requesting, but in conversations with Corporation Counsel they indicate that ANCs are not permitted to meet privately before a public meeting to pre-decide formally or informally any official business of the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Oh, I see. So you're saying that -- Okay. Here's where I'm confused. Ms. Renshaw, perhaps you can clarify for me.

My understanding is that for the ANC to be able to take a vote they have to have a --

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: A quorum present.

CHAIRPERSON REID: -- a quorum present.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: That's correct. They have to debate the case in public. It must be done in a public meeting.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. This is indicating that there was a special town meeting.

MS. ZARTMAN: Correct. At the time that letter was written --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Is a special town meeting a public meeting?

MS. ZARTMAN: That meeting was legitimate, we believe.

MS. PRUITT: Madam Chair, excuse me, just maybe help for clarification. In your package from the ANC they do include the notice, because the ANC has to give due notice of a meeting, and I believe Ms. Zartman is saying that was done. There was a quorum present.

Her issue is that there may have been a pre-executive meeting or something where -- That's your interpretation. I just wanted --

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, this is an issue between the ANC at this point in time and Corporation Counsel, an internal issue to the ANC that does not affect whether or not we go forward with today's hearing.

The position of the ANC when it's discussed at that point in the hearing process, any questions that Ms. Zartman may have about that or any advice Corporation Counsel wants to give can be done at that time, but it's not a basis for delaying today's hearing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you, Ms. Dwyer. Ms. Zartman, why are you bringing this up as a preliminary matter?

MS. ZARTMAN: Because if this hearing were to be delayed, there would be time for a proper, duly noticed public meeting and a valid decision from the ANC.

CHAIRPERSON REID: But there is no request for a

postponement from you or from the ANC or from yourself. We don't have a request in writing.

MS. ZARTMAN: It's a factor that has developed, as you see from the date of my letter to Corporation Counsel, just late yesterday.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, again we object. If the ANC wants to hold another meeting, there's time between now and the next hearing to do so. There is no basis for delay, no request by the ANC for delay, and I think this is an issue that should not be a preliminary issue or a basis for postponement.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Ms. Zartman, when is your next meeting?

MS. ZARTMAN: Currently, it is not scheduled until the first of August, but we clearly have the ability to schedule a meeting between now and the July meeting.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Just a moment, please.

Okay. Ms. Zartman, the letter that you have submitted to Corp. Counsel basically lays forth some objection to some procedural aspects of the way that the ANC meeting took place. Nonetheless, there was not a request for it.

At this juncture, we're getting ready to take a vote on the request for postponement, and again we do not have a request from you -- a formal request from you for a postponement, and you are representing the single -- you're the single member district commissioner. You're not representing the full ANC.

MS. ZARTMAN: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON REID: As such, the ANC has party status automatically, and they can put forth a motion, but I don't think that you can put forth a motion before this body as a single member district representative. I don't think so.

MS. ZARTMAN: I think the point I was making was that, if the vote was illegitimate, it is vacated. The ANC does not have a position and does not have party status.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No, no, no. No, that's not true. The ANC still has party status, notwithstanding the fact that a vote was or was not taken, but the party status is automatic. Now when we get to the segment of this proceeding that pertains to ANC, then we could raise this issue. Then if you want to challenge -- At that point, if you want to challenge the position of the ANC, it could be done at that point. But that has nothing to do with what we are about to do now, and that is to vote as to the request for postponement from a party in the case.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Madam Chair, if I might state, at the time that the Advisory Neighborhood Commission is called upon to testify, should such issues have been raised to the extent that it cannot be assumed that their approval of the project is legitimate, then their great weight would be discounted, but that doesn't change their party status. It just means that they wouldn't have an effective position.

MS. ZARTMAN: Thank you for clarifying that. On

the St. Mary's case I thought, because the ANC had not taken a position, we were not given party status.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No, you were not given great weight. In other words, if you haven't taken a position, there is -- Party status is automatically granted. I think that right now we should proceed on, Ms. Zartman, and if in fact you want to challenge the ANC's position -- now in that this is a two-day case, if there's something that we find that it is not -- we cannot resolve today, then perhaps we could perhaps postpone that segment until the next hearing, which would then give you an opportunity to try to resolve that, and we can get a more definitive response from the ANC or response to your letter in which you were challenging their position.

Maybe that might be the more prudent way to proceed rather than taking the ANC report today.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Madam Chair, I just want to thank Ms. Zartman for bringing this to our attention, although we are not going to take it up at this time. She did say, and you were in a little mini-conference there, that the ANC's next meeting is August 1, but there may be the possibility of the ANC at the request of Ms. Zartman to call a special meeting, at which time this matter could be addressed.

Also, perhaps Ms. Zartman would bring back some of the information from this day's hearing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Given the circumstances which

you have brought to our attention today, perhaps they could arrange to have a special meeting to address this issue prior to our next hearing date. But I didn't hear you say August 1st. That would be much too long. Okay.

In regard to --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Madam Chair, just let me ask one question of Ms. Zartman. Since you didn't make the statement in your letter, I assume that you were not present in that pre-meeting.

MS. ZARTMAN: Correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. In regard to the request for postponement from the Burleith Citizens Association, is there a motion to --

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Madam Chair, I move that the request for postponement from the Burleith Association be denied.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All in favor? Opposed?

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you very much. Now we'll proceed with the --

MS. PRUITT: May I call back the vote just now, though? Staff would record the vote as motion made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Sockwell to deny the postponement. Ms.

Renshaw in opposition. So it was four to one to deny.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Then now, Ms. Pruitt, can you give us a timeline?

MS. PRUITT: I have one question of the Board. Because we do have two hearings, has the Board determined how long they will meet today and when they will break for lunch? Then maybe we could let everyone know, so we can sort of plan around that or at least try to tentatively plan around that. Then we can go into the individual time frame.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Let's look at the timeline first. The applicants have two hours.

MS. PRUITT: Well, in the past, particularly on campus plans, on the first hearing of the day we usually deal with the applicant's presentation, the Office of Planning report, any other government reports and, if so, if we get to the point timewise, ANC report. That would be today, which means -- which then also indicates that we've given the -- the applicant will get two hours, which means that parties in opposition cumulatively also get two hours to present their case when it comes time, with organizations having five minutes and individuals having three.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Well, it's 10:25. If we allow them two hours for the applicant, I would think that perhaps that might be a good break point for lunch, at 12:25, and then come back for the cross-examination; because if we get into cross-examination, we're going to have to stop and come back. So that

might be a good point. Let's say 12:30. At 12:30 lunch for half an hour?

MS. PRUITT: That's your call. That's why I'm asking.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Forty-five minutes. So we'll reconvene at 1:15 and then go up until -- as long as we can. Basically, we're going to stop at around five o'clock, depending on how far we get to a good stop point, but around that time.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Madam Chair, I assume that at 1:15 there could be questions from the Board of the applicant.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes. Yes, the Board members can -- Well, I guess it would be better to wait until after, unless you had something pressing that you really wanted to ask and you wanted to ask right away. Then you can go ahead and ask that question, but we can have the questioning to start after we come back from lunch, if everyone is in agreement to that. Then we can move forward.

MS. PRUITT: Just to reiterate then, the applicant will -- We'll start with the applicant's case in a few seconds, and that will probably take us to about 12:30, plus/minus. We will break for 45 minutes and reconvene at 1:15, at which time the Board will start with questioning, followed by cross-examination from parties, and then we'll move on to OP report, and we also have a report from DPW.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Is there an OP representative?

MS. PRUITT: I believe Mr. Fondersmith -- Yes. So, yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What about DPW?

MS. PRUITT: We have -- I believe, yes. Okay? So now that -- and I just want parties to understand that you all, all six people who were granted party status have two hours to present a total case.

CHAIRPERSON REID: I thought it was five.

MS. PRUITT: Six out of the seven, I understood. So it will be up to you all to determine how you want to break down that two-hour presentation.

MR. CROCKETT: I understood that it was just cross-examination today, that we're not presenting our --

MS. PRUITT: You aren't, sir.

MR. CROCKETT: This is on the next -- Okay.

MS. PRUITT: Correct, just so that you have an idea of your time frame and can plan.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes. By the time we get done with the cross-examination -- the Board members' questioning, the cross-examination, Office of Planning report, DPW report, the persons in support, that's about -- Hopefully, we can get through all of that first segment, and then come back when we come back on the 18th of July, then start off with your giving your presentation.

MR. BRAUN: Madam Chair, there's one thing that

wasn't clear to me. You said two hours for the opposing six parties, but then it was also said five minutes for each organization. And five minutes for each organization would give us only a half an hour and would place a limit on what we could do -- anyone could do within the five-minute time frame.

MS. PRUITT: Mr. Braun, that's five minutes for organizations that weren't granted party status.

MR. BRAUN: Okay. That clarifies it.

CHAIRPERSON REID: In other words, you all will have cumulatively two hours, and then any other organization that does not have party status, which, hopefully, there are none, will get five minutes and then individuals three.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you.

MS. PRUITT: Okay. The only case on the agenda today is Application 16566, Application of Georgetown University, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104 for a special exception for the review and approval of the University Campus Plan - years 2000-2010, under Section 210 in an R-3 and C-1 District at premises bounded by Glover Archbold Parkway to the west, National Park Service along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal and Canal Road to the south, 35th Street, N Street to 36th Street, and 36th to P Street to the east and Reservoir Road to the north, including Squares 1222, Lot 62, Lot 801, Lot 802, Square 1223, Lots 85, 86, 804, 805, 807 through 810, 812, 815, 821, 824, 826, 827, 831, 843, 846, 847,

852, 853, 855 and Lot 857, Square 1226, Lots 91, 94-101, 104, 105, 803, 804, 806, and 811-815, Square 1248, Lots 122-125, 150-157, 800-802, 804-806, 829-831, 834 and 835 and, finally, Square 1321, Lots 815 and 817.

All those planning to testify, could you please stand and raise your right hand.

(Witnesses sworn.)

MS. PRUITT: Please be seated. Proceed.

MS. DWYER: Good morning, Madam Chairperson and members of the Board. For the record, I am Maureen Dwyer with Wilkes, Artis, counsel for the applicant, Georgetown University. With me today is Paul Tummonds, also with our firm. The other witnesses I will introduce 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, Georgetown University has submitted nine campus plans to the Board for review and approval. The campus plan 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 campus plans. The changes represent further study of issues discussed in earlier plans, and the differences between this plan and the 1990 plan will be addressed by the witnesses. In summary

fashion, they are the following:

One, a lower level of development on the campus than was approved in 1990. In fact, this campus plan proposes one million square feet less development on the campus;

Two, a focus on the University's academic mission and needs. The last academic building on this campus was built in 1980. This plan proposes three academic buildings which are very much needed by the University;

Three, 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;

Four, a modest increase in the undergraduate enrollment cap, 389 students above the current cap, in order to provide the tuition revenue needed to carry out academic programs;

Five, a new housing goal, which means that in the year 2010 the University will be providing sufficient beds on campus to house 84 percent of its traditional undergraduate enrollment; and

Six, a reorientation of the campus back to more traditional design principles through the creation of quads and more active open space on campus for student activities.

Again, all of these issues will be addressed in detail by the witnesses.

At this time I would like to call your 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.

When we filed our prehearing submission, we included a cover letter dated May 30, and attached to that letter was a memorandum dated May 22 which the University distributed to the community during facilitation.

As our letter and that attachment described, the University as a result of its interest in compromise with the community has agreed to do the following:

One, reduce its projected enrollment increase by 111 students, which means that the total increase under this campus plan would be 389 rather than the 500 as originally proposed. This means that the new cap would be 5516;

Two, the University further agreed to 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;

Three, the University agreed to strengthen its off-campus student affairs program; and

Four, the University agreed that as a condition of approval of this campus plan, it would continue to update the BZA in each further processing application on its progress.

We are very pleased that the ANC has voted to

accept the University's compromise and has officially filed its vote in support of the campus plan.

The other exhibits that I'd like to call to your attention are included in the book, this very large binder that we filed. For your convenience, we have also prepared an index to the exhibits, and this index might be helpful, since as the witnesses are speaking they may be referring to some of the exhibits.

The largest exhibit in this book is Exhibit 1, and that is the campus plan document. That is the same plan that was distributed to the community and discussed with the community at many, many meetings.

Another important exhibit is Exhibit 5, and that's the prior BZA order back in 1990 which approved the last campus plan. Again, where appropriate, the witnesses will be referring to this order.

Another important exhibit is Exhibit 12, and that's the letter agreement back in 1990 that established the quarterly meeting process. That was a condition of the Board's approval back in 1990, and as the witnesses will discuss, those meetings have continued over the last ten years.

Exhibit 13 is a chronology of the campus plan working group meetings. In addition to the quarterly meeting process, the University formed a small campus plan working group, and that exhibit includes the participants in that group, the

chronology of the meetings, and all of the materials that were discussed at that time.

Exhibit 14 is a chart. What the University did during the campus plan working group is write down every question that was asked by the community and what the University's response was. No less than 125 questions have been asked and answered. In that exhibit are also materials that were distributed to the campus plan working group, including a housing chart that shows the University's compliance with its 1990 housing commitment.

Exhibit 16 through 26 are outlines of the witnesses' testimony.

I'd like to skip then to Exhibit 29. In that exhibit is a description of the off-campus student affairs program. Again, this was a program that was requested and required by the Board back in 1990, and I think the experience of the University and the community is that it's been a very effective program.

I would also like to ask you to turn to Exhibit 30. Again, this is a very important exhibit. What this shows are all of the renovations and improvements the University has made to its residence halls on campus.

All of the blue, green and white dots are residence halls that have been renovated and improved by the University over the last ten years. I think this map demonstrates the University's commitment to provide and retain its on-campus

housing.

With that brief highlight of some of the exhibits, I am now going to turn to the witnesses. Again, for your convenience we've prepared a list of the witnesses who will be testifying and the order in which they will be presented, which is slightly different than the order we gave in our statement.

You will also note that we have eliminated two witnesses. Mike Barthoff and Steve Sher will not be presenting any direct testimony. They will be reserved for rebuttal, if needed.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Ms. Dwyer, just one question. In your representation of the letter of May 30 which was a response to the mediation, you used the term the University agreed to do certain things.

It is my belief that there was not an agreement, but that in the third paragraph the letter says the University is willing to do the following things, and there is a difference between "agreed" and "is willing to do."

MS. DWYER: Well, what I hoped to convey in the letter is that the University has agreed to do this and to formally amend its campus plan, which it did. Whether the community accepts that and agrees as well is another question.

There wasn't a meeting of the minds in the sense of an agreement reached with the community, but it was an offer that the University put on the table, and it wanted to make clear when

facilitation ended that this offer still stood.

So it formally amended its plan, and all of these are conditions that it will agree to include in any approval of this campus plan.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. In concept, I understand what you mean now. Thank you.

MS. DWYER: All right. I would now like to call the first witness, who is Father O'Donovan, the President of Georgetown University.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Thank you. Madam Chair and members of the Board, good morning. It is a pleasure to be with you here this morning 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 year. We have become one of the ten to 15 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, Luce or Mellon Foundation scholarships since 1990. Currently, 51 of our recent graduates serve 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, this year first.

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 nonprofit 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 15 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 at the future, we have limited ability to borrow money, because we are already highly leveraged; and we have limited ability to rise 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, and on a necessity basis, not a luxury basis. We have invested significantly in our relationship with our neighboring community and the city as a whole. Please let me say a little bit more about that.

In the city: In the past decade we have become 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 $1 million investment 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 own immediate community.

Our multi-faceted 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 have 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. Exhibit 30 to which Ms. Dwyer pointed illustrates these sites.

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 have 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 fundraising 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 community 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's 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 2000 campus plan has three inter-related 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 its 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 academic buildings on campus in more than 20 years. These include a new home for our outstanding School of Business, our first new building for undergraduate science since the 1960s, 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 20 years. For our faculty, our students and our mission we simply 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 proposal. 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, I think it's fair to say that this plan brilliantly integrates those new academic buildings and our 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 spaces. It will recenter student life and culture on our campus and create and even more welcoming environment for the many neighbors who enjoy strolling the 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 proposed.

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 easily already the highest in the District. Under our plan, which we utilize 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? And 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 Southwest 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, as a matter of fact, in 1994.

The second question we sometimes hear is: How come you don't set a goal of having the capacity to house 100 percent of undergraduates on campus, as you did in 1990?

The short answer is that our new goal is to provide housing for 84 percent 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 and renovation of residence halls have cost us over the last ten years, we cannot

foresee having the financial ability to provide on-campus housing for 100 percent 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 addresses 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 percent is realistic, financially sound, and higher than any other institution, easily. We are proud of that.

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 seven 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 $25 million, as I indicated 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 any other university, 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.

Those are my answers to those three questions, but I would like to leave you, too, if I may, with three questions. Do you support the mission of Georgetown University, the oldest Catholic university in this nation, the oldest university in our city? Do you recognize the millions of dollars we have invested in renovating dorms, launching our Southwest Quadrangle, and creating new programs to address community concerns? Do you think a world class university is 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 for our information technology office. We were very disappointed to hear 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 the city and may well 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, give her statement, which goes into greater detail about the academic focus of our 2000-2010 campus plan. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you very much.

DR. BROWN: Thank you, Father O'Donovan. Good morning. I am Dorothy Brown, the Provost and the Chief Academic Officer of the main campus. I've had that responsibility for two years, but I've been a history faculty person at Georgetown since 1966 and a resident of Georgetown since 1975.

My task today is to place the bricks and mortar, the green space, the numbers of the master plan in the context of our academic strategic planning. I will talk about people, faculty and students, and our planning to support them.

This is the view from inside the university. In the strategic planning of the 1980s and Nineties, we built our faculty. We added more than 100 tender track lines, enabling us to reduce class sizes and to reduce teaching loads commensurate with our competition.

Overwhelmingly, we recruited faculty at the junior level. They have now become national leaders in their fields, and to retain them in an increasingly competitive environment, we are implementing a ten-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 recruited and developed.

At the same time, by all measures, we have created a highly talented student body, entering the ranks of the most highly selective universities in the country. For the past 22 years, our financial aid policy has been need blind, which means we don't look at the ability to pay in our admissions.

It is also a policy 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 financial aid from our operating funds.

Our strategic planning is committed to the recruitment, retention of these high quality faculty and students, and now to accomplish this we must concentrate on their support in technology and facilities.

Technology, as you know, is transforming the landscape in teaching and learning and research. We have, as Father indicated, invested 25 million in the past three years in technology enhancements in classroom and infrastructure. We are now facing 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, going to the board next fall,

is now titled "Building the Future." We must now build the facilities to support faculty, students and programs. As Father O'Donovan noted again, we have not built a new academic facility since the Bond Intercultural Center in 1980. We have concentrated instead on construction and renovation of residence facilities, and with the completion of the Southwest Quadrangle, we will have provided 1,083 new beds since 1990.

We must continue to add student recreational and athletic space, but now it's imperative to meet our academic needs. For 20 years our survey data of graduating seniors has indicated that we need to strengthen our facilities and opportunities in the arts and in the sciences.

The Third Century campaign has garnered the funding for a new performing arts center. We have made some progress in fundraising 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 will 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. So to accomplish all of the above, to 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. Our tuition increase last year was the lowest in 25 years, and our increase for academic 2000-2001 is a modest 3.7 percent. Our tuition for next year at $23,952 places us among the highest cost of the selective colleges and universities.

To remain competitive, we must very carefully monitor and contain these tuition increases. In this master plan then, we ask for an enrollment increase of 389 traditional aged 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 American higher education, it would irresponsible to not seek this approved increase to retain flexibility in our planning.

We have also proposed added graduate enrollments. While we do not anticipate major increases in existing programs, with trends in new interdisciplinary programs, globalization and continued innovations in technology, we have to have the ability to respond programmatically.

At least half of the increases we propose would be in the distance learning area or in off-campus locations. Additionally, to create revenue streams, two university committees are developing policies and strategies for enhanced revenue from technology transfer and partnerships. And, of course, we are in

the midst of a $750 million capital campaign.

Many of these dollars are earmarked for specific projects like the Southwest Quadrangle or $63 million in financial aid. Finally, to keep our own house in order, we are looking very hard at reallocation of our existing resources.

In brief, we have a clear sense of our goals and what we need to accomplish them in this plan, and I'd just like to end on a personal note, informed by three decades of watching Georgetown and participating in academic planning and recruitment of faculty and administrators.

I've watched it be transformed from a very good undergraduate college and university to really now a leading American Catholic Jesuit university which does make significant contributions to local, national and international communities. It's worked hard. It's achieved much. It's a special place.

So I'll end with the beginning of our strategic planning, with our new University mission statement which captures that identity and anchors our planning. It's who we are and who we want to be.

Mission statement: 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 and

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 wellbeing 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's a mission we think is worth having and planning together for. Thank you.

MS. DWYER: Thank you. The next witness is Mr. Alan Brangman, and he is going to provide an overview of the physical plan, how the academic mission that you've just heard is implemented in the physical components of the campus.

MR. BRANGMAN: Thank you, Maureen. Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Board. My name is Alan Brangman. I'm the University architect and Executive Director of Facilities Planning for Georgetown University. I reside at 211 South Oak Street in Falls Church, Virginia, and it's a pleasure for me to be before you this morning.

I'm going to change the dynamic of the meeting a little bit, because I need to get up and address you from the board. So if we have a hand mike -- We don't? I need to speak very loudly then from over near the board.

MS. DWYER: No, we do have one.

MR. BRANGMAN: We do? Oh, great. Okay. It doesn't work. Okay.

MS. DWYER: And, Madam Chair, just for the record I'd like to qualify Mr. Brangman as an expert in architecture. He has previously appeared before you and been so qualified.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes. Ms. Dwyer, thank you very much. I think that most Board members are familiar with him, and are mindful of the fact that he has been before us many times. If there is no objection, then we will accept him as an expert witness again today.

MR. BRANGMAN: Thank you. We'll see if I can speak loud enough and you can pick me up on the recording. I'll try and make sure I project appropriately.

This morning I'm going to talk a little bit about Georgetown University and its campus plan for 2000. I wanted to first step back very quickly and give the Board a very quick orientation to backstop, really, the presentation that Ms. Dwyer has given with respect to what our limits are for the campus.

I would refer you to Figure 1 in the book, because it is a little different than the plan I have here with respect to what is currently our open space on campus, but it is essentially the same document.

The main campus, as you well know, is in Northwest Washington. It is on the west side of historic Georgetown. The

campus exists on 104 acres. It is located in an R-3 district with one slight area of the campus being C-1 commercial. The squares, as was mentioned earlier by Ms. Pruitt, are 1222, 1223, 1226, 1228 and then the larger area of 1321.

Georgetown's neighbors: Primarily we're surrounded by institutional, governmental and residential neighborhoods.

We currently had, as I mentioned, or have 1.4 acres. That's roughly about 4.3 million square feet of land area. We're allowed to develop to a 1.8 FAR, which has an allowable buildout of roughly 7.8 million square feet in round numbers.

Our southern boundaries are along WMATA owned land, Canal Road, Prospect Street, along to 35th Street, which is our first eastern boundary. We move north back along N to 36th, and north again to P and then all along a common border with Georgetown Visitation Prep School and also with The Cloisters community.

Our northern boundary is Reservoir Road, and then our western boundary is the Glover Archbold Park land.

As you've heard earlier, there were a number of our community members here who were petitioning for party status. The communities around Georgetown -- and I will pass these photographs around for the Board to look at so that you get a little bit of idea of the extent of communities that border on our boundaries.

Those communities roughly are West Georgetown,

which is located over in this area, Cloisters which is here, Burleith which is here; Hillendale which is here; and then Foxhall which is west of the campus location.

As you've heard mentioned before, Georgetown was founded in 1789. It is America's first Catholic college, and it has been a critical part of our neighborhood since that point in time. One of our original buildings, the Sherry building here, which was built in 1792 and also Old North which was built in 1795, are still critical components of our campus plan, as are many other historic and older buildings on campus.

The community has been increasingly more urban in nature over the years, has grown increasingly more urban, and the fact that those two buildings are still critical to our campus attest to the fact that Georgetown is very deeply rooted in its community beginnings.

The 1990 campus plan organized a new development type for Georgetown, and I'll move for a moment again to that original campus plan. The distinction between this plan and the plan that you have in the book under Figure 1 is that this shows the Southwest Quadrangle. In Figure 1 right now, what exists here is parking lot 3. So that is all just macadam and open parking space there.

In the 1990 plan we had proposed to develop a series of what's called podia buildings. These podia buildings, much like the Leavey Center, were earmarked to march down to the

river in the center of the campus, basically changing the nature of the campus from what was an open ravine or the athletic green space that currently exists there now to a series of buildings that represented primarily mixed use facilities with parking on the lower levels, one floor of classroom and/or other academic support space, a roof that was to be either open space or athletic fields, and then either sides of those buildings, much like the Leavey Center which was the first podium, were to have either residential buildings or other academic or administrative support facilities.

As I mentioned, that was to become the center of Georgetown, the campus. That plan called for some 2.9 million square feet across the entire plan. That was the 1990 plan that was approved.

I mentioned Leavey Center as being the first of those podium buildings. That was completed in 1988. It primarily now still functions as our campus center. There's a dining facility in it. There is a conference center, hospitality center, offices for student affairs as well as the main undergraduate career center.

The 1990 plan also provided for -- as you heard Father O'Donovan and Maureen speak to earlier, provided for the development of some nine buildings which this Board had approved. Seven of those buildings have ben completed to date. You can find those in Appendix D, and they primarily dealt with academic

facilities, residential facilities, as well as some medical facilities.

Two of those have not been completed to date, one of which came before you late last year -- actually, two which came before you late last year, one being -- I'll skip to the new plan for a moment -- the addition to the Leavey Center bookstore which the Board approved, and then the other was the Southwest Quadrangle which you have heard both Father O'Donovan and Dr. Brown talk about, which consists of the 780 bed residence hall, 800 car parking garage, 1200 seat dining facility, new bus maintenance facility, and the Jesuit -- the new Jesuit community and administrative building.

When the Southwest Quadrangle is completed, the University will have added 1,083 beds to its housing stock. That will bring our total number of beds on campus in the fall of 2003 to 5,053. That's 89 percent of our traditional undergraduate population, will be living on campus at that point in time, and those numbers are recounted in Appendix E.

The University has also taken on a commitment for extensive renovation during the last ten years of our residential facilities, and again Father O'Donovan spoke about those.

We have put some $76 million into the upkeep of our existing residential buildings on campus, as well as we are spending $15 million in Harbin, which is getting its full refurbishment this summer and will be open in the fall. So that

we are not putting any students into the community, and they will be back and that building will be completed in time for them to move into that for the fall semester.

In 1992 Father O'Donovan had the vision to really begin to understand that the proposal that called for those podia buildings to become part of our future was probably not the direction that we needed to take our campus plan in.

He was involved in the commissioning of A.M. Robert Stern's office, an architect in New York, to come down, did an analysis of our 1990 campus plan, and began to look at other ways that we might begin to develop our campus rather than the creation of what I affectionately call aircraft carriers marching through the middle of our campus.

What came out of that was a series of planning goals that really moved back to the development of a more traditional campus plan scheme, and that is, in short, the development of quadrangles on campus, which would be more reflective of the Healy Lawn and the Copley Lawn and then also the Healy Quadrangle which, if you haven't been on campus, you should go, because those are very nice spaces.

The feeling was that we really needed to create more opportunities for space like that on campus.

Stern also happens to be the architect for the Southwest Quadrangle. So that is why you begin to see the development, again, of quadrangle development and the benefits

that it brings to the campus plan, as we start to look at transitioning from what our 1990 plan was to what our future plan might be.

The plan also sought to organize those quadrangles based on the extension of the Georgetown grid through the campus. So as you look at the old historic grid of Georgetown and project those lines through the campus, both east-west and north-south, you begin to set up zones through the campus which then can become the planning basis for the placement of future quadrangles in the scheme, and also begin to develop a relationship for both pedestrian connection and for vehicular connection throughout the campus.

Georgetown University stands at a critical junction in its history. To maintain and improve its leadership position in higher education, Georgetown must expand its Catholic and Jesuit tradition for scholarship, service and faith and its 200 year record of achievement to meet the rapidly developing demands of the 21st Century.

Many of the goals that you've heard both Father O'Donovan and Dorothy Brown talk about this morning -- excuse me, Provost Brown talk about this morning are also plans -- or excuse me, concepts that we have tried to make sure that we've kept endeared in the master plan as we begin developing our campus plan.

Some of those are: To secure the University's

position as a premier Catholic and Jesuit academic institution; to realize the University's potential as a global resource; to increase the University's contribution to research and discovery; and to extend the University's commitment to excellence in teaching and its focus on spirituality and service.

In our current environment, the continued success of our academic program is compromised by the lack of sufficient facilities in both quantity and quality. Many of you have heard me speak before, as I did when we were here for St. Mary's, that typically we are housing two to three faculty members and, in some cases, four faculty members, tenured faculty members, in one office, which is not, by any stretch of the imagination, what you would find with many of the institutions that we compete with.

It also makes it very difficult for us as we recruit faculty members to try and commit to spaces that they can have for both research and teaching, when we simply don't have the facilities on campus to be able to provide them with adequate space.

To fulfill the University's academic goals, the campus plan must be able to accommodate development in research, curriculum planning and delivery, information management and communications. We have to alleviate conditions of overcrowding and insufficient suitable space for existing and future academic programs.

We must provide facilities that allow Georgetown to

continue to attract and retain the 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 principles: One, to provide academic -- excuse me, adequate and appropriate space for existing and future programs; two, to reinforce and enhance the campus image based on its historic roots; three, to create a pedestrian campus; four, we must provide for rational vehicular circulation on campus; five, to preserve and enhance vistas within and to and from the campus; six, to preserve and enhance the University's sense of community; seven, to develop a plan sensitive to community concerns; and finally, to create a campus that provides an environment for sacred space.

I'd like to refer you to Figure 3, which is the first representation of the future campus plan, and I'd like to just take a moment to walk through that plan.

In the new master plan, we are proposing to add 1.2 -- 1.3 in round numbers -- million square feet to our existing campus facilities. That's roughly about a 36 percent lot coverage, which is about a four or five percent reduction below where we were in the 1990 plan.

There are essentially four new buildings in this campus plan, as proposed: A new science building, new business school, a new administrative and academic building, and a new

physician's office building.

There are also six, possibly seven, additions in renovations in this plan, depending on how you count St. Mary's, but we are doing additions or proposing to do additions to the Leavey Center, to Lauinger Library, to Walsh which is an academic building, to Dahlgren Library, to Lombardi Cancer Center, and to the Ryan Administration Building which will become the performing arts center.

We are also proposing two major athletic renovations and additions to the campus, one being Harbin Field which will be converted into a multi-sports facility, the other being McDonough Gymnasium which will be converted to a convocation center. Then finally, two parking facilities, structured parking facilities, one on Lot A and one on Lot B.

All of this brings our FAR count to roughly 1.41, which is significantly below the allowable.

I'd like to, for a moment, just step through the campus plan so that I can show you where the new buildings are being proposed in the plan. The first, starting at the southeast corner and will move northwest, is a roof addition to the Walsh Building. This is an academic building. It is primarily the home for fine arts.

The faculty that are there now -- The fine arts faculty, sculpture, painting, drawing, currently do not have studio space, typically which would be research space for them.

So we've proposed a small addition to the roof of that which would provide lab space, studio space with north light to allow them to have the appropriate type of research space that type of faculty should have.

The second is roughly about 100,000 square foot addition to Lauinger Library. This is primarily stack space and, as is the case with this, as you'll see with other additions that we propose in these buildings, any parking that is displaced by the building of this will have that parking added as part of the basement floors of that building.

The Southwest Quadrangle I mentioned already. It is located at the terminus of Prospect Street and Tondorf Drive. This is a 780 bed residence hall, the dining facility, the new Jesuit community.

To the west of that is a new softball field for women's sports. This is in order to meet our Title IX compliance requirements. There is also with that, just below the Southwest Quadrangle, a Canal Road entrance configuration which will allow for left turns out at a signalized entrance and left turns in during non-rush hour in the morning.

This is all new roadway as well that comes down to the south and western part of the campus, which is being done as part of the Southwest Quadrangle plan.

Just north of the Southwest Quadrangle is Harbin Field. This is actually -- If you go back to, again, Figure 1,

you'll see that Harbin Field currently is located about here. We'll be moving north when it becomes a multi-sports complex for football, lacrosse and soccer.

We are also proposing to build permanent seating, which for the first time on Georgetown's campus we will have a structured seating facility with about 60,000 square feet of fieldhouse facilities below that.

This project, in conjunction with McDonough -- This will actually allow for the renovation of McDonough to take place, because all of the coach's offices, the locker rooms, the training facilities, laundry facilities and the like will move out of McDonough and into the lower levels of the multi-sports complex.

This will accommodate roughly about 4500 seats on campus, which is about 13-1400 more than what we can accommodate in that facility right now.

McDonough, which is to the west of that: We'll add a small addition on the back end of McDonough, about 15,000 square feet. We will go into the original structure, lower the basketball floor about a story and a half, gut the entire building, and then build back bleachers within the shell of the existing facility to allow for roughly about 65-7500 seats possibly, and that will become our new convocation center or newly renovated convocation center, and also will be -- for the majority of our basketball games, we'll be able to plan home again on campus, so that our students won't have to go over to the MCI

Center, and we can actually enhance our campus life on campus with that.

To the east of the Harbin Field, this is the Ryan Administration Building which used to be the original gymnasium for the University, if you can believe that. It's a two-story structure which was converted back in the 1960s to an administrative office building.

We're going to gut that, remove the floor that was put in, turn it back to a two-story space. That will become a black box and experimental theater, and then there will be an addition of roughly 25,000 square feet where we will be adding a 350 seat proscenium stage building.

As Father O'Donovan said earlier, for the first time this will be the first real performance venue that we will have on campus, and again we think that this will enhance our student life on campus and provide another opportunity for students to remain on campus for activity rather than going off.

To the north of Harbin Field, this is in the existing plan the baseball field. In the future, that will become the site for a new business school which will develop a quadrangle again in the scheme of moving forward with the Stern plan.

Then to the east of that will be the new science facility which will house chemistry and biology in that new facility, which will also then create a new quadrangle adjacent to the ICC, Rice and the corner of the Leavey Center.

On top of the Leavey Center we still have the ability to add an additional three floors above the bookstore addition that we're doing now there. So that tower will probably end up being student activity space immediately adjacent to the student activity tower that's on top of Leavey.

To the north of Leavey is the medical center. Right now -- and you'll hear some discussion perhaps later from John Green about the new proposed physician's office building. Cover Cogan currently exists here, which is shown on the existing plan here. That building will be demolished, and the new physician's office building will be put in its place.

North of that there's a proposal for structured parking, and the north of that there is also a placehold for a future academic or administrative office building for the main campus.

All the way at the top of the plan, we are also proposing to do structured parking on what is currently a surface lot at St. Mary's. Then the other two placeholds in the plan are the addition above Lombardi Cancer Center, if needed, and then also an addition to the Dahlgren Library, if needed.

As I mentioned, that represents all of the building that we'll be doing in this master plan. It's a little over 1.2 million square feet. There are also other opportunities that come about as a result of doing the Southwest Quadrangle, as a result of doing the new business school and the new science center.

The current dining facility which serves this portion of campus, which is primarily residential down in this area, is in New South. When the new dining facility opens, New South will be decommissioned as a dining facility. That space will be turned into student activity space as well.

Students have been clamoring over the last couple of years that they need an additional student center to augment the facilities that we have in the Leavey Center.

When chemistry and biology move out of Rice and when chemistry moves out of White Gravenor, those spaces will be renovated into additional office space for, in the case of Rice, the sciences that will remain in that building, computer sciences and physics and the science library. The space in White Gravenor will be renovated to additional classroom and administrative space for some of the departments that remain in that area.

Then finally, when the new business school is built, the undergraduate school that currently -- for business is located, and the Dean's office is located in Old North. That will be turned back over to other academic space as well, which will allow us to move some of the departments out of the ICC and relocate some departments from some of the other areas of campus in order to meet one of those critical needs that we've got in some of those buildings, which is allowing those departments that are in those buildings to spread out and get a little elbow room.

Again, this is the bulk of the plan. Very briefly,

I just wanted to touch on the uses that are proposed under the plan.

This is the existing land use document for the campus. What we have done primarily is move from a more global zoning category, which I believe you have also seen in some of the presentations that you may have gotten from other universities in attempt to try to make it more understandable, since there were three campus plans coming forward this year.

We are all using the same type of zoning categories, academic, administration, residential, campus life and athletic, medical/health care, and then commercial.

We are primarily the first three categories. We have very little commercial space on campus. It's primarily Wisemiller 1789 on the corner of 36th and Prospect Street. The balance of the campus are those other uses.

Generally, so that you understand the comparison between what we are proposing now and what we were doing before, academic/administrative space is a combination of what used to be the educational category and the educational mixed use category. So those have been collapsed into one category, as well as the educational support.

The medical/health care has been a collapsing of medical, hospital and clinical with the medical support and parking. It all came under that category, and then resident/campus life is a collapsing of the recreational and

residential into one category.

The only differences on the future plan between what is currently existing and what we propose in the future: St. Mary's previously was mixed use. Under the plan now it is administrative and academic office use.

The New South is a combination of residential and also administrative space. That's where my offices are. In the future we would propose that that would go again to one use, which would be the residential and campus life category.

Then -- Actually, I think those are the only major changes with respect to land use for the plan.

So that brings to a conclusion all of the space and change that we are proposing in the new master plan. As I mentioned, it is significantly less than what was proposed under the 1990 plan.

MS. DWYER: Mr. Brangman, could I ask you just to address one more point, and that is the circulation on campus, the difference between the north and south.

MR. BRANGMAN: I'm sorry, going too fast. Thank you, Ms. Dwyer.

I'm going to go back a moment to the previous drawings, because they are a little easier to read in that respect.

Currently, we have seven entrances, main entrances, on campus, actually eight, although we do not use the historic

Healy entrance as actively as we use the others. There are gates. We keep the gates open, but it is basically a restricted traffic flow for that area.

Prospect Street entrance under the new plan will remain open, and under the Southwest Quadrangle plan will remain open. This is Tondorf Drive, which is the main service and circulation spines for the campus. It goes all the way from the southern portion of the campus to entrance 1, and there's entrance 2, entrance 3, and entrance 4 on Reservoir. Then we also have a minor exit-only right next to the Cloisters. Then the other entrance onto campus is the Canal Road entrance, which I spoke of earlier.

There are -- In the current configuration there are gates at either side of the Leavey Center on the east and on the west. We did these as part of the 1990 campus plan in order to restrict through-traffic on campus at the request of our neighbors. Those gates are still operational. When you hear us refer to North Campus and South Campus, it's generally with respect to the fact that it's separated at the Leavey Center by those gates.

In the new campus plan we are proposing to turn the campus into a more pedestrian area in the heart of the campus. So as part of the redo of Harbin Field as well as the development of the quadrangles, Tondorf Drive will no longer go all the way north through the campus, but will shift to the west and over to a new

north/south service road and access road which will sit between Yates, the power plant and then the new business school and the Leavey Center.

This will still be gated under this plan. That will not change. There will still be a gate over on the east side of the Leavey Center, although as I mentioned, all primary traffic will be going north/south on this center roadway up to what we call Lombardi Circle.

The other change under this plan is that we are proposing to provide a loop road form entrance 4 across the new research building, Dahlgren Library and the Lombardi Cancer Center into Lombardi Circle, and then further east along the Leavey Center and then north up through entrance 1.

We are currently looking at a study to determine whether or not we'll do one-way traffic in from entrance 1 and loop out through 4 or in from 4 and loop out through 1. That's one of the things that we're looking at as part of some of the conversations that we've been having with the community.

The other piece of this is that there will also be a service-only roadway all the way over on the west side of the campus. It only exists currently down to about the bottom of Yates here and up to McDonough, and we are proposing to connect that so that our service vehicles, landscape vehicles in particular, maintenance vehicles for servicing the campus will be able to use this road in order to get back and forth between north

and south and not have to interfere with other service vehicles, as vendors who are coming from outside, taxicabs and parkers who need to get up to the Leavey Center from the south entrance.

These will also be gated at both ends, north and south, just below the loop road connection and just above the new Canal Road entrance down here, again in order to make sure that we don't have traffic that is communicating from Canal Road up to Reservoir Road.

The pedestrian portion of the campus in here -- this will all be turned over to pedestrian traffic. Servicing will be done by spines that come in off of that main road, but the intent again is to try and turn this portion of campus, which is very hectic right now with that main service drive coming through, into a more pedestrian environment like the front lawn is, so that the students will effectively be able to walk freely within that entire portion of the campus, meeting one of the goals, as I had stated, under the master plan.

MS. DWYER: Thank you, Mr. Brangman.

I will now ask the next three witness to come forward and to be as brief as possible in their testimony. The next witness is Ms. Linda Greenan, the Assistant Vice President for External Relations. She is going to discuss the community meeting process that has taken place.

She will be followed by Jeanne Lord, who heads up the off campus student affairs program.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Did you say your next three?

MS. DWYER: Yes. My third witness should be up here, Mr. John Green.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Then after these three there's one more panel.

MS. DWYER: One more panel.

MS. GREENAN: Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the Board. My name is Linda Greenan, and I am Assistant Vice President for External Relations at Georgetown University.

My office serves as the University's liaison to the city as well as to the local community. I report to the President of the University through the University's Chief of Staff.

The office was created in 1994 by Father O'Donovan to provide an ongoing mechanism for the community and the University to communicate and to provide a way in which the community's concerns could be voiced and acted upon.

Last year I purchased a home at 3835 S Street and, therefore, I am a resident of Burleith. I was going to talk a little bit about some of the efforts that my office makes with respect to city-wide matters, but because we are running a little late, I'll skip over that, but just to say, to give you a sense of it, that one of the things that my office recently did was to work with our School of Business which provided a year long technical assistance program to just about every community development corporation in the city.

That's the other type of function that my office serves. The primary office that my office serves is to work with the immediate community. In that regard, my office coordinates the quarterly community meetings that 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 community neighborhood associations that surround the University, all of whom take turns hosting the meetings.

The University maintains the mailing list, which consists of right now about 250 individuals, although attendance is typically more around 25 to 30 individuals representing different organizations around the community.

Representation from the University at these meetings generally includes myself, the University architect, the Assistant Dean of Students, and the Executive Director of Facilities.

The agenda for these meetings -- again, this is the quarterly BZA meetings -- is set by the community, and ranges anywhere from issues that are relevant to BZA matters, such as upcoming cases or things that have nothing whatsoever to do with the BZA such as a report on our capital campaign. In short, whatever the community wants to discuss in these meetings, we do.

These meetings are also attended by the Georgetown

Current, which is the local community newspaper that publishes once a week. They generally always write an article following the meeting. So the larger community is thus kept informed of our meetings and the various issues affecting the community.

The BZA quarter meetings served as a model in the development of our community working group on our campus plan. In June 1999 I wrote to the 14 community groups and asked them to appoint two representatives each to serve on the community 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 BZA quarterly meetings, the Georgetown Current had a representative or had a reporter at every meeting, again writing an article about all of the meetings, thus keeping the larger community informed.

A record of both the BZA quarterly meetings and the community working group meetings can be found in your appendix there.

We began in September 1999, and met eleven times over an eight month period. The community was kept fully informed as the plan was being developed. In fact, throughout that period of time the plan was being developed, and actually helped to shape some aspects of the plan, such as increasing our 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 handouts. This matrix is attached to the binder in Tab 14.

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 of the major issues, one being housing/enrollment, the second being traffic on 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, including DPW, to identify and address area-wide traffic issues along Reservoir Road; and as you've heard earlier, the University suggested a proposal with respect to housing and enrollment which reduced our enrollment goal, delayed the implementation of that goal until the Southwest Quadrangle is occupied in the fall of 2003, and committed to a phasing in of any new enrollment over that period of time.

While this proposal was not accepted by the community groups participating in the facilitation, it was adopted as part of ANC-2E's resolution, which I believe you have in front of you.

As you know, the BZA approved the Southwest Quadrangle project in 1999. 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 1,083 new beds under the existing plan.

At occupancy, we will be housing 90 percent - close to 90 percent, 89 percent, of our traditional undergraduates on campus. If the BZA were to authorize the 389 increase and if we were to reach that number, we would be housing 84 percent of our undergraduates on campus by the end of 2010.

Thus, 84 percent would be a minimum percentage at which we would reach -- which we would reach, and is substantially higher than any university in the city. It is our strong opinion that, with the Southwest Quadrangle, we will have more than fulfilled our housing commitment stated in the 1990 campus plan.

In fact, given that the cogeneration facility was stopped because of community pressure, we question any obligation on our part to such a commitment, the cogeneration facility being a precondition of that commitment. I would point out that the Office of Planning, in connection with the St. Mary's BZA hearing, concurred with this opinion.

Nevertheless, as stated by Father O'Donovan and Dr. Brown, we have increased our on-campus housing, and we will do so by a substantial amount come 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, to listen, to respond. I'm extremely proud of my work and the work that my office does on behalf of Georgetown University, and extremely proud of the work of my colleagues in this regard.

As you've heard earlier, with respect to the BZA quarterly meetings we work as a team. We regularly meet internally to consider carefully, literally, everything that we do that will have an impact on the community, and always with a view to how we might be able to mitigate any such impact, often at great financial cost to us.

As you will now hear from Jeanne Lord, these efforts extend beyond what I have described, and I'm proud to say what she will discuss is often discussed outside of the University as a model of town-gown relations. Thank you.

MS. LORD: Thank you, Linda. Good morning. My name is Jeanne Lord, and I'm the Assistant Dean of Students at Georgetown University. Like Dr. Brown, my family and I have lived within a few blocks of the University for over 20 years now.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What is your title again?

MS. LORD: Assistant Dean of Students.

I thank you for the chance today to talk briefly, and I will abbreviate my remarks, about the work that we do in the Office of Student Affairs at Georgetown.

The function of our office is to enhance the educational mission of the University, and we do that by providing

opportunities for students to learn and grow outside the classroom. Father O'Donovan and some other of the witnesses have already touched on some of this in their testimony, but I'd like to just go briefly through a couple of things that we do.

We have an Office of Volunteer and Public Service that allows our students to work in public service projects internationally, nationally and locally, and it's this local work, the opportunity to reach out and get to know people in the District of Columbia that's so meaningful to so many of our students.

They participate in Habitat for Humanity. They work with children in Best Buddies. They even have a group they sponsor called GU Melody, which provides music lessons for low income students in the District of Columbia, and this is extraordinarily important to them in their time at Georgetown.

Father O'Donovan also mentioned our Center for Minority Educational Affairs and the tremendous work that they do in tutoring programs and to literally shepherding some students from the seventh grade through preparation for college. This is an enormously successful program and has been conducted virtually single handedly by one professional person, Tom Bullock, in that office with help from Georgetown students.

Again, this is, for some of our students, some of the most meaningful part of their time, the most meaningful work they do while they are at Georgetown.

We also have a very energetic and vital Office of Student Programs which, as the name suggests, runs -- helps students run the newspaper, student organizations, drama, musical groups, that sort of thing.

Clearly, they do this because this is an important part of education for students while they are at Georgetown. But it's also in part in response to the oft repeated request from the community that we provide opportunities for our students to become involved in things on campus, that we make our campus a vital and attractive place for Georgetown students.

I hope you can hear from what I've said and from the testimony of some of my colleagues that our students are deeply committed to public service, to co-curricular activities, and to academics.

I will say that I have met some truly extraordinary young people in the time that I've been in Georgetown; but, of course, they are also college students. They are young people, and they face the same kinds of challenges and concerns that people their age face everywhere.

So an important part of our responsibility is to help them meet these challenges successfully. In addition, many of these students live in the community as our neighbors. So it's important that we educate them, we encourage them, and we expect them to be thoughtful and responsible young people.

Father O'Donovan recognized this in 1990 when he

created the Office of Off Campus Affairs, and at that time he acknowledged that Georgetown has a responsibility to its neighbors and strives to be a constructive, responsive, helpful neighbor and a valuable resource.

That commitment is as strong, if not stronger, today than it was ten years ago. We've developed a strategy to carry out this mission, and it's a three-pronged approach that consists of education, accountability, and responsiveness.

The first prong is education, and that starts the week that students -- that first year students arrive at Georgetown. When they arrive on campus in the fall, they are given a student handbook which is sort of their guide to life at the University.

This year for the first time on the cover of that handbook will be an ethos statement, which articulates our expectations of our students at Georgetown. The ethos statement reads in part that 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, which is our way of saying to them that we expect as much of them when they are out in the community as we do when they are on campus or sitting in a classroom.

Another significant part of our educational outreach to students is an off campus orientation which, I believe, is the only program of its kind in the District of

Columbia. It's a mandatory program for sophomore students which exposes them to information about local laws and ordinances, safety, what days trash is collected in the neighborhood, issues of that sort.

The information which is in this program will be reinforced this year for the first time in our newly reconstituted Office of Off Campus Housing, which is going to be located in the Auxiliary Services Department.

This is going to serve two functions. One -- and this is very important -- is to have a wide range of housing available to students so they know of things that are directly outside the area surrounding the University. The second is to provide a series of lectures which will reinforce the kinds of information that we present to them for the first time or the second time in the off campus orientation program.

We also publish a guide to off campus living, periodic newsletters, and a variety of different fliers and pieces of information to reinforce this information.

An extremely important part of our educating our students at Georgetown, too, is our alcohol education program. This also begins during their first year in the residence halls. There are a number of programs that I won't go into in detail right now.

We have in addition programs for students who are recognized as having some sort of problem with alcohol or

substance abuse, run both by health education in our office and by the Department of Psychiatry in the hospital, and these are programs that are available to all of our students, should the need arise.

The second part of our off campus program is accountability. In 1990 we instituted a weekend hotline which allows people in the community to call us on Friday and Saturday nights to report concerns. In 1996 in response to community requests, we added what we call an on-site person who actually goes out to houses to discuss these issues with students on the weekends.

From 1995 to 1999 we disciplined approximately 90 students for off campus misconduct each year. In the most recent 1999 through 2000 year, that figure dropped to 56 students. These students typically receive sanctions ranging from community service and fines to disciplinary probation for these violations.

One change that we're making this year is that the code of student conduct will specifically enable me to suspend students. This was an implied power in the past. For the first time, this year this will be clearly spelled out, and we anticipate that this will send a clear message to our students of how seriously we view their conduct and their misconduct in the community.

The last prong of our program is our responsiveness. We work very hard to be responsive to the

community and to work with the Metropolitan Police Department.

This cooperation takes many forms. Georgetown students participate in community clean-up activities. Sometimes these are voluntary through service organizations on campus. Other times, they are not voluntary. Students are sent out as a part of their sanction to bag leaves, sweep sidewalks, this sort of thing.

Regardless of whether it's voluntary or involuntary, it sends a message to the students that they woe something, they have to give something back to this community, and particularly if they have done something which is disrespectful or inappropriate. This is important.

We also cooperate with the community when crimes occur in the neighborhood. Our Department of Public Safety publishes fliers. Our students hand them from house to house. For example, last year there was a carjacking in the neighborhood, and we worked to make sure that everyone who lives in the area around the University was made aware of this.

Our students reached out to the community this year in a particularly important way when they revived the tradition of G.U. Community Day, which is an activity involving food and games and completely nonalcoholic. They invited all members of the community on and off campus to participate.

Finally, we cooperate with the community when we work with the police. We provided cellphones for police officers

stationed in Georgetown and Burleith so that community residents could call them directly during the week and on weekends as well.

This spring we are participating in the D.C. campus alcohol initiative with Chief Ramsey and with representatives from other local universities to address the issues that we face together as a university group and to try to reach some consensus and achieve some communal standards. These will be quarterly meetings, and we are very hopeful that this will be helpful to us.

Georgetown is one of the few universities that I'm aware of to exercise off campus jurisdiction over its students, and I believe that it's in the forefront of universities in the District of Columbia to do this sort of thing.

We meet regularly with the community, both at citizens association meetings, BZA quarterly and just individual gatherings with concerned citizens throughout the community. We try not only to listen but to be responsive and to adapt our practices wherever we can.

Two examples of this are with our hotline and with the noise policy that was instituted this year. In conjunction with the University's Facilities Department, we operate a bulk trash program at the beginning of the fall and the end of the spring semester to address the particular needs of the community at those crucial times.

This year prior to the program, we met with representatives of the community, of DPW, of a clothing recycling

organization, and I think it's fair to say we had our most successful program ever.

I hope that this overview of the work that the Office of Student Affairs does is helpful to you to understand our continuing efforts to educate our students, to hold them accountable, and to be truly responsive to the community that surrounds the University. Thank you very much.

MS. DWYER: Thank you. The next witness will be Mr. John Green, the Senior Vice President of MedStar Health. He will be talking about MedStar's partnership with the University.

MR. GREEN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and the members of the Board. I will try to be as brief as possible, given the fact that there are three additional witnesses who will appear before you.

First, let me very briefly describe MedStar. We are a large community based, not for profit community owned health care organization. We currently have seven hospitals, including Georgetown, four in the city of Baltimore, and with Georgetown we will have -- we have now the Washington Hospital Center and the National Rehabilitation Hospital.

We employ approximately 20,000 employees. With Georgetown, that will increase to about 23,000, and we also are aligned with approximately 6,000 physicians. So we've had a rich history and tradition of running and managing institutions, and we are extremely excited about this opportunity to become involved

with Georgetown.

We view Georgetown as a very, very important resource to this community, to our nation's capital. It is a world class university with a world class academic medical center, and for MedStar to become aligned with Georgetown is indeed an important step in the evolution of MedStar Health.

We are excited about this opportunity, and we look forward to it. A new, not for profit, nonprofit entity will be established to oversee the clinical enterprise at Georgetown, to include the hospital.

Our goal is to return the hospital to its rightful place in terms of financial viability. You heard Father O'Donovan mention the losses sustained by the medical center over the last four years. We hope to improve upon that, and we look forward to accomplishing that end.

We will continue to have a very strong relationship with the University. The hospital will continue to function as an important teaching and training site for the medical school, and we are excited about the way we have structured the relationship so that we will jointly participate in that particular aspect of the University's academic medical center operations.

Beginning in March, we became very involved with the University in its outreach with the neighboring community. We are very pleased that we had that opportunity. We worked very closely with the University team, and let me add very quickly that

we have great respect for Ms. Greenan, Alan Brangman and the members of that team that we worked with in explaining and presenting the University master plan, campus plan, to the community.

We participated in most of the community meetings around the University plan. We also were involved with the Office of Planning, and we also participated in the mediation process.

We have listened very carefully to the community in terms of its concerns. We know full well that there are concerns surrounding Reservoir Road and the helicopter pad. I could very quickly say to you that we are committed to working with those neighborhoods on the issues of traffic on Reservoir Road, and we have committed to that, and there is a process underway where we are working cooperatively with DPW on that issue.

In terms of the helicopter and the helicopter pad, we do not see that as a major issue. Historically, there have been approximately eight helicopter trips per week to the University. Our projections indicate that, going forward with increased utilization of the hospital, we see no more than 12 flights per week.

In terms of our portion of this plan, Mr. Brangman explained that to you when he was giving his presentation. We plan to construct a 100,000 square foot physician's office building that will house 80 specialist physicians supported by 250 support staff.

We see this as the cornerstone of our efforts to restore profitability to the institution. So it's very important to us that we go forward with that undertaking. The parking garage also represents a portion of the University plan. That is important to us and that we plan to pursue.

Overall, we anticipate or have established as a goal achieving approximately 18,000 admissions annually to the hospital within the next three years. That would only return the hospital to its level of utilization in 1995.

So in terms of impact on the community, our involvement at the hospital -- at no time would we anticipate it exceeding the level of activity at the institution in 1995.

In addition, we have committed to the idea that we would not expand in-patient bed capacity at the hospital during the course of our involvement there. So that is another commitment that we have made.

In closing, we are very excited about this opportunity. We are willing to, and we have demonstrated our willingness to work cooperatively with the community around the issues of importance to them. We think it is in the best interest of this city, our nation's capital, to have a strong and healthy Georgetown University as well as a strong and healthy MedStar-Georgetown academic medical center on that site, and we look forward to working cooperatively to achieve that end. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you.

MS. DWYER: Thank you very much. I'll ask the last three witnesses to come forward. The first of these will be Mr. Lou Slade to discuss the traffic and parking components. He has previously testified before you and has been qualified as an expert, and I'd like him to be accepted as that today.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes. We are very familiar with Mr. Slade and, unless there is any objection, we would accept him as an expert witness.

MS. DWYER: All right. Thank you.

MR. SLADE: Madam Chair, members of the Board, my name is Louis J. Slade. I reside at 3500 Quesada Street, N.W., and I'm a principal with Grove Slade Associates. My firm is responsible for the traffic and parking portions of this campus plan.

Karen Frank is going to follow me, and she is going to talk in some depth about the transportation management plan or TMP which is ongoing, and has been for years, at Georgetown University, and how it's going to be enhanced.

I need to make some opening comments about that, because this is the key to the traffic and parking portion of this plan.

Georgetown University's TMP is notoriously very successful. The number of people using public transportation that come to this campus is very high. The keys to this are an

extensive bus system which the University operates, which will continue to be increased in terms of its capacity and service, the University's commitment to intensive management of its parking system, and the fact that the University has a parking cap imposed by the BZA's last campus plan which will remain unchanged in this current campus plan.

Parking, because it's a finite amount at this University, is an important resource, and the allocation of that resource to different user groups on the campus is very important in campus planning and meeting the campus goals. With this new campus plan and with the management of the hospital and clinical center facilities by MedStar, there is a need to increase the amount of parking which is allocated to the hospital and clinical center.

That means that the remainder of the campus, the academic part of the campus, which we all think of as Georgetown University, the undergraduates and those employees will have less parking, and how we are reallocating that and how the transportation management plan takes care of that change is something that we want to try to get across to you in a few minutes.

Let me talk first about traffic and how the campus plan will affect traffic. In 1998 the Federal Highway Administration and DPW finished its studies of the Canal Road access. That focused on the south portion of the campus and, as

Alan Brangman explained to you, there is a traffic barrier across this campus which divides it into now north and south portions.

The FHWA study concluded that the proposal that dated back to 1971 to improve the access at Canal Road should be implemented. In fact, that project is proceeding ahead. That will take away the restrictions on turning movements on Canal Road, which have historically limited you to turn right in or to be able to come back out and make a right turn onto westbound Canal Road only.

In the future there will be a traffic signal at that location, and you'll be able to make left turns in and out from both eastbound and westbound directions on Canal Road, although there will be some limitations during peak hours.

The FHWA and DPW study which I just mentioned was done before this campus plan. So part of our work was to carefully review the campus plan, coordinate with FHWA to ensure that there were no changes in the campus plan that would affect in any adverse way the plan which FHWA and DPW had developed. In fact, that is the case.

As I'll try to summarize very quickly, you'll see that we are not really going to change the south side of the campus from the standpoint of traffic patterns.

The north side of the campus is a somewhat different story. Since MedStar is coming in, it is going to bring levels back to the 1995 levels. There will be more activity.

There will be more parking demand. There will be somewhat more traffic. However, the parking cap will remain in place. The gates will remain in place, and the allocation of parking to the north part of the campus and the south part of the campus will remain the same.

So inasmuch as the capacity restriction that the parking cap creates to hold down traffic, that will all remain in place as it is today. We looked at traffic along Reservoir Road to understand existing conditions. We did our traffic counts, as we always do.

While you yourselves may have experienced congestion on Reservoir Road, the ability of the intersections to handle the traffic that is there today is very good, and the intersections operate at acceptable levels of service.

This doesn't mean that there can't be improvements made, and John Green just mentioned some work that he is engaged in with DPW involving the University and the community -- this has already started -- to look at the operations, to time the signals better, to make sure they are coordinated with each other better, to adjust some of the curb parking so that traffic moves more smoothly along -- I may have said Canal. I meant Reservoir Road -- and to improve conditions in general. But the capacity on Reservoir Road is adequate for existing traffic.

We forecast traffic on Reservoir, given the changes which MedStar is proposing to get back to 1995 levels of business

there, and the University currently contributes about 30 percent of the traffic to peak hour conditions. The remaining balance of 70 percent is commuter traffic and neighborhood traffic.

We expect the University traffic at the Reservoir Road entrances to increase by about ten percent over what it is today. That means only about a three percent increase to total traffic on Reservoir Road.

So the impact of MedStar's improved business plan is only a three percent increase to traffic on Reservoir Road and, therefore, those intersections will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service.

With regard to parking, the community has always been concerned, and especially Burleith and West Georgetown, about persons who are visiting the University or are employed there parking on neighborhood streets, and this is an existing problem.

We did a survey in the area of Burleith bounded by 37th, 38th, Reservoir and T Streets where there are about 265 curb parking spaces on those streets. We did a survey on a weekday and on a weekend and determined that about a third of those 265 spaces are vacant on weekdays and half of them are vacant on weekends.

Of the 265 spaces, just a little under 40 percent are occupied by cars which do not have Zone 2 stickers, and that's a smaller percentage on weekends. Some of those stickers are undoubtedly related to the University, people who are visiting and who find it difficult for some reason or time consuming to use the

valet parking system on the campus. So they park on the neighborhood streets for a visit.

Because the campus plan that's before you today will allocate more parking to MedStar, and because John Green's organization is committed to a higher quality of service of parking to its visitors especially, by limiting of the valet parking building and new garage, we expect that the impact of hospital and clinical center parking on the neighborhood will diminish significantly.

As I mentioned, the current cap on the entire campus is 4,080 spaces. Several hundred of those are valet spaces, and that will go away. But the valet operation is standard operating procedure in many parking facilities in the District.

The demand for parking is currently about 3600 cars at the peak time, which is about 90 percent of the capacity, which provides an adequate excess capacity for people to usually find a space in the middle of the day.

We developed projections for new demand levels, working with MedStar, their traffic consultants, and the University, as well as for University parking demand levels. The amount of parking demand will increase over what it is today, if there was no improvements in the transportation management plan. But because we will improve the transportation management plan extensively, as Karen Frank will testify, we'll keep the total

demand at the 3600 level, well within the capacity of the cap, the 4080, with that same buffer of excess parking to allow people to usually find a space.

Ultimately, though, the allocation of parking to the hospital and clinical center will increase. It will go up to ultimately 2800 spaces in the year 2010, and the amount of spaces available to University parkers, the academic campus, will reduce.

The reason that that will work is that the transportation management plan will be improved. There will be more options for University employees to get to the University. For those who elect to continue to drive, there will be satellite parking that they will use, and then they will ride the last leg to the campus on a shuttle bus.

I was going to summarize all my conclusions, but I think I've gone through it quickly enough that you'll recall what they are. I think the key here is that the cap remains in place. The gates remain in place. The allocation of parking remains the same.

There's a redistribution of parking, and while some of current parkers at the University will not be able to park in the University because their spaces will be reduced, they will be accommodated by improvements to the transportation management plan and by satellite parking.

So based on these findings, we've determined that the campus plan will not have an adverse effect on traffic or

parking conditions in the area. Thank you.

MS. DWYER: Thank you very much, Mr. Slade.

The next witness is Karen Frank, and she's going to highlight the changes to the University's transportation management program.

MS. FRANK: Good morning -- or afternoon now. My name is Karen Frank. I'm the Executive Director of University Facilities and Student Housing at Georgetown University.

I'd like to describe briefly some of the enhancements to the transportation management program which has been extremely successful to the University and the neighboring communities.

Our transportation management program is based on three central strategies: First, maximizing the use of mass transit systems; secondly, providing and enhancing alternative transportation programs; and third, developing off campus satellite parking locations in nearby Rosslyn with shuttle service to and from the campus.

We believe that through the enhancements to the transportation management program, the impact of the reallocation of parking spaces will be completely mitigated, and there will be no adverse impact to the neighboring communities.

Ours is a comprehensive and multi-faceted plan with numerous options, with financial incentives, and with flexibility for the employee and the student to make his or her own choices to

meet their own needs.

The first enhancement has to do with our GUTS bus system, the Georgetown University Transportation Shuttle. We have grown from 54,000 rides in 1990 to over 828,000 rides in 1999. Yet we will be doubling the size of our fleet of vehicles and will increase the routes so that we can incorporate the satellite parking facilities that are located currently in Rosslyn.

In addition, the hours of operation have been extended. More frequent trips will be made on each route, particularly during the rush hours. At the behest of the community, the size of the buses that we are adding to our fleet are smaller than our current buses.

We will also be enhancing our transportation -- our alternative transportation programs. The University has increased incentives to its students, faculty and staff to utilize van and carpools. Currently, 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 may make arrangements to use University leased vehicles, also then to share the cost of transportation as well as be guaranteed parking on campus. The University's Website will assist employees and students in matching riders so that they can form the carpools.

We will not only continue to sell the WMATA flash passes on campus, but we will also initiate the WMATA Metro check

program, which will allow our employees to purchase mass transit passes through pre-tax payroll deductions. And we are implementing an off-site parking program.

We will create satellite parking options conveniently located in Rosslyn and provide free shuttle bus service every ten to 15 minutes between that site and the campus, and then also provide individual return service to the satellite location in the event of an emergency.

The cost of off-site parking will be 50 percent of the cost of on-campus parking, being heavily subsidized by the University, and employees who voluntarily choose this option will also receive three months of free parking.

The University will study demand and, if appropriate, also seek additional off-campus sites in Maryland or other suburban areas. While commuting students have never been assured of parking privileges on campus, we will offer the satellite parking option to students to avoid their parking in the neighborhoods bordering the campus.

Therefore, as a result of these enhancements to our already successful transportation management program, the University will continue to be a good neighbor and will not adverse affect neighboring communities due to traffic or parking issues.

We will continue to monitor these programs and to develop further enhancements as they may be deemed appropriate.

Let me just make 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 cost of doubling the number of GUTS buses and increasing the number of routes and the frequency of runs, continuing to provide GUTS service at no fare, and subsidizing the cost of off-campus parking for employees and commuter students are all committed, in addition to the programs that already tax our financial resources.

We offer these programs in the spirit of cooperation and good leadership. Thank you for your time and attention, and I'll turn this over to Mr. Bolan.

MS. DWYER: Thank you very much.

Our final witness is Mr. Lou Bolan, who is an economic consultant with Bolan Smart Associates. I don't believe he has testified before you. So I'd like to ask him to give his qualifications, and I'd like him qualified as an expert in his field.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Before going to him, give your name again, the last witness.

MS. FRANK: Karen Frank.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Frank? Okay. Do you have a resume?

MR. BOLAN: I didn't bring a resume with me. No, I

did not.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay, just verbally, just basically talk about your credentials.

MR. BOLAN: Sure. My name is Lewis Bolan. I'm president of Bolan Smart Associates. We are a real estate and economic consulting firm based here in the District of Columbia for the past 15 years, and we provide consulting services to government agencies, to corporations, and to financial institutions.

Some of our clients would include the District of Columbia Government for whom we are working at the present time, General Services Administration, and WMATA, to name several public sector agencies.

I'm also adjunct professor of real estate economics at Johns Hopkins University as well.

I'm here today --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Does that complete your resume?

MR. BOLAN: Yes. I can amplify on that, if you would like.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Board members?

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Madam Chair, perhaps Mr. Bolan would submit his resume for the record.

MR. BOLAN: Yes, I will.

MS. DWYER: We'd be happy to do that.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: And, Mr. Bolan, your

educational?

MR. BOLAN: I have degrees in economics from Columbia, and I have a Master's degree in city planning from the University of Illinois.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Thank you.

MR. BOLAN: I've been in private practice for 28 years.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. I don't think there are any objections, Mr. Bolan, to your being an expert witness. So, proceed, please.

MR. BOLAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm here today to provide testimony on the study that I've 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 residence hall on the University campus which is an integral part of the University's proposed campus plan.

I'd like to state at the outset that my conclusion is that development of that Southwest Quad residential hall 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, and in the interest of time I intend to be extremely brief.

Number one: Residential property values in Burleith and West Georgetown have increased at a significantly faster rate than for the District of Columbia as a whole. That provides very strong evidence as to the desirability of the area for homeowners.

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

Number three: 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, we can find no statistical evidence that adjacency to group housing depresses residential property values.

Number four: We estimate that approximately 680 undergraduates from 175 to 180 group homes in Burleith and West Georgetown will move into the new 780 bed Southwest Quad upon its completion in 2003.

Number five: We project that 75 to 80 percent of those group homes 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 today that they would require on average from $20,000 to $40,000 in renovation and modernization costs before they could be rented for single family occupancy. The student demand, of course, will have disappeared.

Furthermore, despite a very strong city-wide housing rental market, those units would on average after modernization and renovation rent for approximately 20 percent less than what students are paying for them today.

So in other words, what an existing landlord would be faced with was the prospect of spending $20,000 to $40,000 and in return receiving approximately 20 percent less rent than they are receiving at the present time.

Given that very strong sales market -- this is point number six -- limited product offering that is available and a very rapid appreciation in property values, our conclusion is the vast majority of these group homes will be placed on the market and sold for single family occupancy.

In Burleith -- number seven -- we estimate that approximately 70 homes will be converted from their rental housing status to that of owner occupied status. This, in our opinion, will further reinforce the desirability of what is already a highly desirable community.

Number eight: On average this conversion from rental status to owner occupied status will be financially very advantageous to the District of Columbia. We estimate that on average a dwelling unit that goes from rental occupancy to owner occupancy will generate an estimated $7400 per dwelling unit to the District in the form of additional sales tax revenues and income tax revenues that will be generated by new residents moving

into the area.

If a total of 175 group homes in Burleith and West Georgetown are converted to single family owner occupancy from their status right now as group homes, this would generate approximately $1,300,000 annually to the District of Columbia in the form of additional sales and income tax revenues.

We have made no calculation for property taxes, although property taxes would also rise over time with increased assessed valuation. We have only looked at sales tax and at the income tax revenues derived from new residents.

Number 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, and we know that that is a potential concern. Quite the opposite.

Our believe is that a stronger and a more pronounced single family homeowner occupied neighborhood is likely to increase property values, not decrease them, by the increased desirability of the community that will result.

Number ten: While it's impossible to ascertain precisely who these new residents will be, we believe that a very substantial number of them will be drawn from the faculty and senior staff of the University itself, which we view as a very desirable thing.

Finally, from 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 of group rental housing into either Burleith or West Georgetown.

Most of the current group housing inventory will have been renovated and converted to single family homeowner occupancy, as I've described a minute or two ago. This, together with the relatively high housing prices which will only be increasing over the coming decade, will effectively price students out of the Burleith and West Georgetown housing markets. So we do not see a return to that group housing as likely at all.

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

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you.

MS. DWYER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: That's pretty good.

MS. DWYER: It was a race. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: You have two more words? You can use up the three seconds.

MS. DWYER: I'd like to thank all of the witnesses for doing such a wonderful job and staying within the time constraints, and that does complete our direct case.

CHAIRPERSON REID: And we do thank you as well. It's really phenomenal that you were able to do that. I didn't

think that you would be able to hold it so tightly, but that is really great, and we appreciate it.

Okay. Now we going to break for lunch, and return at 1:15, at which time we will then have questioning from Board members, of course, and then cross-examination.

We have been told that Mr. Altman, who is the Director of Planning, would like to participate in the presentation. Well, we have an update on that, okay, that Ms. Pruitt will tell us about.

MS. PRUITT: Mr. Altman was going to try to come and actually present the Office of Planning report. However, it is my understanding from Mr. Fondersmith that he will not be able to do that. So we'll just go in our normal process.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, what I was going to say is that he had wanted to and requested that we indulge him by allowing him to -- since he is in Council meetings this morning, we were going to allow him to break in when he came so that he could give his testimony and then we could question him, and he would leave. But that now is moot, because he's not going to be here.

So we will resume at 1:15. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 12:33 p.m.)

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

(1:26 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON REID: The meeting will please come back to order. We'll start now with questions from the Board members. You've got your first panel up.

MS. DWYER: Yes, we do. We thought the first five witnesses make the first panel, because a lot of the questions you may ask one are addressed by another, and this is the first five.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Sure. Okay. Board members, you have questions of this panel?

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Madam Chair, I have a few.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay, go ahead and start off.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: I don't know whether this is a question for Ms. Lord or Ms. Greenan. It was mentioned that there were 90 undergraduates disciplined for off-campus conduct. What kind of activity leads to that kind of discipline?

MS. LORD: Mr. Franklin, in general when we're talking about off-campus misconduct, we're talking about noise, loud noise at night, noisy parties. There are other kinds of misconduct that come to our attention off campus, but the majority are related to parties and to noise.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Late at night parties?

MS. LORD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: And is there any mechanism whereby the noise can be abated right away or is this something

that is done subsequent to some infraction?

MS. LORD: Well, I mentioned in my testimony that we have a hotline, and this is the number. When someone from the community calls the hotline, one of the options that the operator has, and one we've used with increasing frequency this year, is to dispatch another hotline employee, the on-site person, out to the house that's been reported.

He will go knock on the door and tell the students, you know, that some concern has been expressed about what they are doing. Usually, the first step, though, is for the operator to attempt to call the house. Sometimes that works, and other times it doesn't work, either because people don't answer the phone or, you know, on occasion they are making noise and they don't hear the phone ring.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: The Metropolitan Police don't get involved?

MS. LORD: Yes, they do, and we're working increasingly closely with the Metropolitan Police. I think one thing that's been very influential in helping to work with this problem has been the willingness of the police to issue warnings or noise citations to noisy houses and, of course, they issue these to students, but not always to students.

I mean, this is something that's applied kind of uniformly throughout the community to anybody who is making noise late at night. So that's helpful. These citations come with $300

fines.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: In your guide to off-campus housing or off-campus living, are students warned about these standards?

MS. LORD: Yes, they are.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: I don't know to whom this question should be put, but what is the requirement for undergraduates to live on campus? It is indicated that -- I heard you say that freshmen and sophomores must live on campus.

Now do juniors have an option, juniors and seniors?

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes, they do. Our requirements for freshmen and sophomores are, as you correctly stated, to live on campus required. Juniors and seniors have an option one of those years, if we have housing for them, that they could also live on campus for that year, but it's not required.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Well, what is the normal preference of a junior, to move off campus or to stay on campus?

MR. BRANGMAN: Well, Karen Frank is here, who is our Director of Housing. She may have a sense of what their normal preference is. I can certainly tell you what mine is.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Actually, Mr. Franklin, I can answer that. Since we have a recorded figure of 77 percent, it's more than a quarter of the juniors or seniors, and I don't think it breaks down in any distinctive way between juniors or seniors.

Indeed, we experience increasing desire for

students to live on campus.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Well, let me recast the question in this way. If you were to provide housing for undergraduates that was capable of housing 100 percent of the students, would they want that? Probably not? And what's the difference in the cost between on-campus and off-campus housing?

MR. BRANGMAN: Well, if we were to provide the capability, we're not sure that there is demand for all those students to want to come back on campus. There is, we believe, a healthy percentage who just feel, as part of becoming adults and as young adults, that they would prefer to live off campus.

In terms of the cost of living off or on, depending on what their housing situation is, which has been one of the issues of concern, I guess, in the community, if you're living by yourself or with a number of other people, then the cost can range to being more expensive in being on campus to being less expensive in being on campus.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: So there's no thought given to requiring more students to live on campus? For example, once the Southwest Quad is built, is it your assumption that it will be in great demand and there is no question that it will be filled?

MR. BRANGMAN: One of the mechanisms with the Southwest Quadrangle which has been part of our planning from Day One is that we, in fact, wanted to essentially guaranty that the students that were designated for that facility would, in fact, be

on campus.

What we have done is design that building for second year students, for sophomore students, where the sophomores will be coming out of apartments that they currently occupy many times in their second year and will be living in a more friendly, accommodating environment of the Southwest Quadrangle residence hall.

The apartments that they free up will then be made available to juniors and seniors who either may or currently be living off campus or desire to remain on campus. That was how we were able to pretty much feel confident that, in providing those 780 beds for sophomores, that we would be able to fill that residence hall.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Is there any requirement that somebody who lives off campus must take any meals on campus?

MR. BRANGMAN: No, there is not a requirement, although what we're found is that many of the students who live off still subscribe to our meal plans.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: I think the rest of my questions at the moment probably should be addressed to -- Well, I have one other question. That has to do with the extent of student parking on neighborhood streets.

I heard somebody say that there had been efforts made to reduce the extent of that. Could you be more specific as to what has been done?

MS. GREENAN: Yes, sir. In 1996 the City Council passed legislation repealing the reciprocity for students living in ANC-2E and ANC-2A -- that is, students living in Foggy Bottom near G.W. -- for the purpose of essentially providing an incentive not to bring their car to the District and requiring them to register them.

Initially when that law went into effect, we saw a decline in the community of students bringing their cars to the District, and we think that that has indeed leveled off as a result of that, and the University was supportive of that legislation, much to the dismay of our students. But we worked with the community to see that enacted.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Does the University have any role with respect to parking violations that students may get?

MS. GREENAN: No. It is public space, and regulated by DPW. I should add that there is significant enforcement in the areas, communities, surrounding the University by DPW. They do quite a great job in making sure that folks don't park on the street who shouldn't be there.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: I asked the question, because some years ago my son got a ticket from American University for parking in that neighborhood, and it was a pretty healthy ticket. You don't purport to give such tickets?

MS. GREENAN: We don't do that. My understanding of that was that was in connection with a law school that was

established, and that was a memorandum of agreement that was entered into between A.U. and DPW that allowed them to issue tickets on public space. We don't have that kind of agreement with DPW. They do quite a good job.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Madam Chair, I have no further questions at the moment.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you. Mr. Moulden?

BOARD MEMBER MOULDEN: I guess this question could be directed towards the transportation representative.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Not yet, not in this panel. Do you have any questions of this panel?

BOARD MEMBER MOULDEN: Yes, I have another one for this panel.

Georgetown University is adjacent to the Potomac River, and the Federal government and the District government has been involved in a plan for revitalizing the waterfront. NCPC -- we did a preliminary study, passed on to the District.

Does Georgetown University have any plans related to any concerns or interests for the Potomac River related to development of the University?

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes, we do. They are not related to the campus plan, which is why they aren't shown on the -- or why it isn't shown on the campus plan, but we are currently in discussions with the National Park Service involving the possibility of an exchange of land.

We have land that's further up river than what's shown on these plans here, and we were in discussion with them about exchanging a piece of land that's roughly in here, which is just west of the Potomac Boat Club or Potomac Canoe Club.

We are probably about 75-80 percent through our discussions. We are currently doing appraisals and, in the event that we are able to exchange the lands and also give scenic easements back to the Park Service, then we ultimately will develop a non-motorized boathouse on that site.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: It would also be the intention, Mr. Moulden, to provide services to youngsters in the District. If we are able to do that, not only would we row and sail from there, but we would have programs for inner city kids whom we would try to involve in rowing which, it has been found, is a great way to build them up.

MS. GREENAN: And if I could also add, we've been very involved through our crew coach, Tony Johnson, on the Georgetown Waterfront Commission, which is bringing to fruition a plan for how that waterfront will be developed. It's been a process that's continued under the leadership of Senator Percy and gone on for a couple of years, and it's pretty close to being implemented.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you, Mr. Moulden. Mr. Sockwell, you have questions for this panel?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Yes. My first question

is to Father O'Donovan. In describing the Board's denial of the St. Mary's Hall application's principal feature, you spoke to the loss of gifts, etcetera, as a result of that. Could you give me some more specific description of your intent in bringing that to our attention?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: My concern was, Mr. Sockwell, was that the delay could discourage donors. I didn't say, nor would I intend to say, that we had, in fact, lost gifts. But the delay is very discouraging, and I simply wanted to report to the Board that I hoped it would look more favorably upon the project in the future.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I see. Thank you.

My next question: McDonough gym is being partially converted into another use? No?

MR. BRANGMAN: No. It's actually not another use. It's being -- would end up being a full building renovation, but in that renovation we effectively would increase the capacity of the facility from what it is now, which is roughly to seat about 3400, to 6500-7000, in that range, depending on how deep we drop the main floor and how many seats we were able to add back.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: What was the School of Business construction that you spoke of? I think I have a note here that says something about School of Business.

MR. BRANGMAN: The School of Business -- We are proposing as part of the plan to build a new business school for

undergrad and graduate school. That's the facility that would be located on the baseball field.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. Thank you. Is there any statistic that you have on the age range of the undergraduate student population and/or the percentage of students at various age ranges?

MS. GREENAN: I am not sure I understand.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Well, the reason for my question is that we speak of reaching as close to 100 percent undergraduate students being housed on campus. My own mother did not get her PhD requirements completed until she was well into her forties. So students at that age aren't necessarily the students that the community is seeking to prevent from having in its midst.

What I'd like to know is if the University has any statistics that give an age range of the undergraduate population in any broken down categories? I mean, do you have older students? Yes, you do, but do you know how many there are?

MS. GREENAN: I don't have that at my fingertips, but the numbers and the data that we've provided with respect to the numbers that live off campus are considered largely to be traditional undergraduate students, and the definition of traditional essentially backs out of the overall equation the very populations that you would be talking about, older students returning to the University, commuters, part-time students.

So it takes into account in effect -- that category

traditional, in effect, means students who would need housing.

DR. BROWN: It was our seniors this year -- We had a convocation in McDonough gymnasium, and we were statistically looking at that. There was one member of that class who was 40. Everyone looked around to see who that was, because we are overwhelmingly 18 to 21-year-olds, but you will have occasionally in your class a returning students, but that would be unusual. But we can get those figures for you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay, thank you very much.

Ms. Lord, you mentioned the Office of Off Campus Affairs created by Father O'Donovan. When was that created?

MS. LORD: I believe it was created in 1990. Is that correct?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: And you mentioned the reconstituted -- newly reconstituted Office of Off Campus Housing. When was that brought back on line?

MS. LORD: We have had what we call an off campus housing listing which has been housed in the Office of Student Affairs, and this year effective July 1 that will move physically to the Auxiliary Services Office, and it will be expanded.

What we had before is described literally by the term off campus housing list. That's all it was. We really relied on students to sort of enter data and to man this. But this, as I understand it, is going to be a fully equipped office

with a couple of computer terminals, telephones, and will give our students access to housing outside the immediate area around the University.

So that's new as of this July.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: So it will be reconstituted as of July?

MS. LORD: Correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: With regard to the substance abuse, alcohol abuse programs available on campus, what is the level of activity that those comprise in terms of are they -- How are they implemented, primarily, and under what circumstances does a student wind up having the ability to take advantage of the programs or being recommended to take advantage of those programs?

MS. LORD: If a student should choose to take advantage voluntarily of one of those programs, in general, he or she would go to one of a number of offices on campus, our Health Education Office. We have an office that's headed by a psychologist, Dr. Patrick Kilcarr. That's another option, or sometimes directly to the hospital itself.

Students who go involuntarily, in general, come to our attention because of some sort of misconduct or violation of the code of conduct. We really judge those on a case by case basis, looking at the circumstances surrounding the particular violation and the student's judicial and academic history, and

make a recommendation based on those to send the student.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Is there a chance that you might have statistics that state what percentage of students involved in such programs are from the off campus population and what percentage might be from the on-campus population, just by definition of their housing assignments?

MS. LORD: I'm sure I could get that information for you. I don't have it right now, Mr. Sockwell.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: It might be interesting to have that.

I think that's the last question I have for this panel. Thank you.

MS. DWYER: Mr. Sockwell, if I could just clarify something. In one of your questions -- I just want to make sure you understand what the housing goal is under this plan. The housing goal under this plan is to provide 84 percent --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I understand fully.

MS. DWYER: All right. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: And the exact numbers I also have, based on what you've presented.

MS. DWYER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Ms. Renshaw?

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Several questions. I would like to start with

Father O'Donovan. You made just a passing reference to your successor. Do I remember reading in the paper that you are retiring, and would you clarify, please?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Yes, I am, Ms. Renshaw. I'm stepping down at the end of next year, July of 2001. The reference I made was to the expectation of where we might be in the year 2010, and for many reasons I would be delighted, if as I come before you, to say that we have not used our entire cap at this point, I suspect my successor would likewise be pleased to say something similar in the year 2010, or it might be that successor's successor, but somebody else beside myself, at any rate.

MS. DWYER: Or maybe Father will be back.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: As a consultant. Who knows?

To Dr. Brown, I believe it is, who spoke about the performing arts center drawing more people to the campus: Now that may be a plus, and that may be a minus, depending on where you are, on campus or off campus. But do I understand that you are looking at a 350 seat theater?

DR. BROWN: Yes, that's right.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: And how actively is that going to be used? In other words, do you have a theater on campus now?

DR. BROWN: I'll really pass this on to Alan. We

have two black boxes. We have Gaston Hall, which is mainly a lecture auditorium. We have a 325 seat auditorium in the ICC, but we have no theater with the proscenium arch and this kind of element, but Alan Brangman has really been in on the planning, and is quite up on where they are now. It's primarily an academic facility.

MR. BRANGMAN: Right. Dr. Brown is right, and we have had a number of discussions with the community as we've moved through the master plan about how we would look to operate this type of facility, and Dr. Brown is right. It is primarily for on-campus activities, for the students on campus.

We do have two black boxes on campus. They are highly experimental, meaning that they are nowhere near the type of facility that we're talking about here. But we are not anticipating bringing in Broadway shows and the like. No.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: That's what I wondered.

MR. BRANGMAN: No.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. Is this performing arts center, though, in anticipation that you might have an extravaganza and want to use this 350 seat theater? Are you going to have parking at that theater, or no?

MR. BRANGMAN: We have parking on campus, as we do for all other activities that happen on campus, in the large parking lots that we have available. There is not a lot immediately adjacent to the performing arts center, but there will

be close enough in the Southwest Quadrangle or in the Leavey Center, and there is very close access to the building.

We have thought about that again as part of the master plan and as Lou Slade looked at that analysis as part of his traffic analysis. It took into account what the population requirements would be for a facility like that, and we are meeting those standards.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Don't go away, Mr. Brangman, because the next question is also for you.

You gave a very complete review of the building program that you are proposing over the next ten years. Can you tell us now what kind of staging are you proposing? In other words, this is not going to happen in one year.

MR. BRANGMAN: That's correct.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: I think that the Board would like to get an understanding as to how you are going to stretch out, what the impact is going to be in the community. You're going to be moving a lot of dirt.

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes, we are. One of the things that we have looked at in anticipation of, for Georgetown standards, what we consider to be a fairly aggressive development schedule for the next ten years is we have actually convened meetings on campus with a number of different major contractors in the Washington area to talk with them about the logistics of being able to do a number of different projects, either phased, staged

or at the same time.

Particularly, since we have started -- and I would encourage the Board to visit the campus now, because the Southwest Quadrangle has, in fact, started, and the Harbin Field is torn up, because it's being resodded, and the baseball field is torn up because it will be the site of temporary parking while we are under construction on the Southwest Quadrangle.

At the same time, we are currently doing renovation for Harbin Hall, as we had mentioned earlier. That's a 400 bed residence hall which is right in the heart of campus as well. We also hope to start construction on the bookstore in the Leavey Center.

So we've had to look at how all these projects mesh together, and what our existence might be over the next couple of years. We anticipate that we probably will not get started in earnest on any other projects with the exception of the performing arts facility, which hopefully we'll be able to start while we are under construction on the Southwest Quadrangle which, you will recall, won't be completed until 2003.

So there will be at least those two projects going on at the same time. Once the Southwest Quadrangle is finished, we hope to be able to look at either the science building or the business school or the multi-sports facility, all of which, again, are in the center of campus.

We anticipate very quickly, probably within the

next year to two years, starting the physician's office building, which is the MedStar facility that we spoke about earlier, and then those would primarily be the -- probably the first ones out of the chute.

We hold meetings now currently monthly of all of our project managers. So that the logistics of phasing has become a way of life for us, to make sure that we can carry on our number one mission, which is teaching our students; because even though we are under construction, we still need to make sure that we're able to maintain the quality of life for our students on campus.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: But is this logistic of phasing also shared with the community? Does the community, each civic group, have the schedule of how you're going to or proposing to operate?

MR. BRANGMAN: We have, as of this year and partially as a result of the Southwest Quadrangle, developed a Website. On that Website we are listing key updates of the projects, as well as showing progress photographs for those. We will include project schedules on that Website. We will highlight all of the projects that we're intending to do within the next year.

We also have our BZA quarterly meetings where we talk about any of the potential projects that we will be bringing forward. So our intent is to make sure that we keep the community totally apprised of what actions and activities are going on on

campus with respect to our projects.

As you know, any of those that we propose to do, we're required to bring before you in order to get our final approval, as well as before the Old Georgetown Board and the Fine Arts Commission and the ANC. So we do make sure that we make all of those stops in anticipation of starting a project.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. Thank you.

Mr. -- let's see here. Mr. Green -- Oh, John Green is not here?

MS. DWYER: That will be the next panel.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Next panel? I'll hold it.

Ms. Greenan, does the University keep copies of licenses and registrations of all the students?

MS. GREENAN: Licenses and registrations? I'm not sure what you mean. Do you mean driver's licenses?

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Driver's licenses. Vehicle registrations.

MS. GREENAN: I don't believe we do.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: You do not? Okay. Simple answer. No. All right.

How many nontraditional students do you have at the University?

MS. GREENAN: There are 5516 as of this year.

MR. BRANGMAN: That's our traditional count.

MS. GREENAN: Oh, nontraditional? Sorry. I'll

have to do the math.

MR. BRANGMAN: Yes, and our enrollment this year is 66?

MS. GREENAN: It's around 6300.

MR. BRANGMAN: 6300. So the difference between those.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. Let's see. That would be about it. Ms. Lord, in part of your duties you have -- you said that you have a wide range of offers, and you are promoting the available housing in the community to the students?

MS. LORD: I think I talked about the newly reconstituted Off Campus Housing Office. One of the functions or one of the goals of that office is to make students aware of housing outside what they might anticipate -- you know, the area in which they have traditionally looked close to the University.

We hope, by having a more comprehensive list, they will be made aware of housing, for example, in Rosslyn, Arlington.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right, but do you also make them aware of the housing that might be available on campus, if there is housing available on campus, encouragement of getting these students on campus?

MS. LORD: Well, that would be done through our housing office. I don't work with that office, but I'm certain

that it is done.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Okay. That's it for now.

CHAIRPERSON REID: I just have one question, and I don't know exactly to whom it would be directed. Nonetheless -- I just wondered -- I had not heard any discussion in this regard, but given Georgetown's reputation for basketball -- I see that right outside the gymnasium you have the lot 63 or 65.

My question is: Do you have a traffic management plan -- or parking management plans for instances where you have big games where you exceed your capacity, and have you had complaints of those kinds of activities causing people to park overflow into the neighboring communities?

MR. BRANGMAN: We have -- As part of again our traffic study for the master plan, we looked at special events on campus. Mr. Slade can speak to that in more detail as part of the report, but we looked at football games on the weekends, soccer games in the evening, women's lacrosse, performing arts venues.

We looked at the particular times when we were having events in those, and we actually created a schedule and a matrix for the entire year, so that we could get an understanding of where we had crossovers of events going on on campus and what our parking requirements would be for those.

Even for, you know, "big game" on campus, we were able to meet our parking needs for those types of activities, because typically they were happening, you know, early evening to

late evening hours when the normal population of the University was gone, and those parking spaces would then become available.

That was a critical part of our study as we continue to look at what the impact would be as we propose -- as we looked at the proposed changes under the new plan.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Madam Chair, I have one further question before the panel is discharged, and it's to follow up Ms. Renshaw's question, because I had made a note of it.

The statement was made by one of the panel that, because the District changed the law with respect to reciprocity, the number of out-of-state students bringing automobiles to the University had reduced. What's the basis for that conclusion?

MS. GREENAN: Information from the neighbors. In fact, there was actually an article and several letters that appeared in the Georgetown Current saying that things had gotten a lot better in the community, and people just knew it because they could suddenly park in front of their house.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: If a student does bring a vehicle to the University and you provide off-campus parking --

MS. GREENAN: No, we do not.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: You do not provide any on or off-campus parking for a student who brings an out-of-state vehicle or an in-state vehicle, for that matter?

MS. GREENAN: The students who live on campus are

not allowed vehicles. So we do not provide parking for those students. Only students who have a special need of some sort are provided parking.

The students who live off campus are really the ones to whom that change in the law was addressed.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Right. How do you know that a student living on campus doesn't have a vehicle?

MS. GREENAN: We send down to DPW -- We don't know precisely, but the only way they could maintain a vehicle in the community and park on the street would be to get a Zone 2 sticker, and the way they would do that would be to go to DPW to get that.

We send down to DPW every year the list of our resident halls. For example, there is a residence hall located on 36th Street. So that a DPW clerk might not know offhand that that is -- because there happens to be residential parking around there, but that listing would include that address, and therefore, DPW would not issue a Zone 2 parking sticker.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: For a student who is living off campus then, you have no knowledge whatsoever about their vehicle registrations?

MS. GREENAN: We do not. They are required by law to register them in the District as a result of that change in the law.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: And you do not ask them to supply any information to you with respect to their vehicle?

MS. GREENAN: We do not.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Would it be of any concern to you if they were habitual violators of the D.C. parking regulations?

MS. GREENAN: Sure. We would be concerned.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: How would you find out that they were?

MS. GREENAN: I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Is it no longer the case that the University is in loco parentis in terms of this issue? Maybe universities are no longer in loco parentis, period. I date myself, I think.

Well, I just think it's something for you to consider in terms of -- We request a great deal of information from entering students, and it seems to me that one of the items of information you might request is, if they have brought an out-of-state vehicle and are living off campus, that you know what that plate number is, and that there be the periodic check with MPD or DPW, probably MPD, as to the extent to which violations are piling up on any of those vehicles.

Would that be an onerous thing to do?

MS. GREENAN: I'm not sure how we would do it. It would have to be directed at the students living off campus as opposed to those new students coming in, because the new students coming in would be living on campus.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Right.

MS. GREENAN: At least for the first two years. So we would have to think about how we would do that. Offhand, I'm not sure, other than going literally through the neighborhoods or maybe through the information that we get during the off-campus orientations we could also require information about vehicles as well. We could probably add that to the list of information that we gather.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Mr. Franklin, just one question. What kind of violation information are you referencing specifically?

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: I would say mostly parking but, of course, moving violations would be more serious, but parking is --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I mean, would we be talking about strictly parking violations within the District of Columbia?

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Oh, of course. Yes. Right.

MS. GREENAN: Well, I presume that the students -- The law is now that the students need to register their cars in the District, and that would be what the issue would be. If they register their cars in the District, then presumably they're not getting parking tickets, because they would have a Zone 2 sticker.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: But, of course, you might be able to find out those who aren't registering their cars in the District, if you had a list and made that available to the appropriate District authorities.

MS. GREENAN: Well, that would be one way that we could go at it. What we would certainly do is inform the students of the law.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. We'll move now to the cross-examination. I don't know how you all want to -- Let me ask you this. Of the people who have been granted party status, which of you will need to or wish to question this panel? One? Just one? Two, three, four, okay. All right.

MR. CROCKETT: Father O'Donovan, good afternoon. I would like to ask you some questions on one of the most debated subjects in our community, which is the enrollment factor, the enrollment status, the number of people who are enrolled, what the University agreed to in 1990 with respect to the number of people who would be enrolled, the number of housing units that would be created, and the financing of that.

I would like to ask you first to take a look at the three documents that I put in front of you.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I'm going to object. I think the cross-examination should be limited to the witnesses' testimony, and if Mr. Crockett is going to ask this witness to

interpret documents, I think that should be made by Mr. Crockett in his direct case as to what he thinks his interpretation is.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Sustained. Mr. Crockett --

MR. CROCKETT: I would be happy to do that in my direct case if Father O'Donovan agrees to appear for that purpose when we put on our case. My understanding was that we don't have a subpoena power. We can't make anybody attend. I'd be happy to do it that way, if --

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Mr. Crockett, why don't you tell me what the issue is, and then I can respond to that. Why don't you just tell me what the issue is that you're concerned about?

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right, before we go any further, let's have a further clarification. Mr. Crockett, you're an attorney. That is correct?

MR. CROCKETT: Right.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. Now as such, then you are aware of the fact that whatever cross-examination questions that you direct have to be predicated upon the testimony that was given here today. I don't want to have to keep stopping to clarify that. Let's just abide by the rules.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, I'm not so sure. I am not so sure that -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes, abide by the rules.

MR. CROCKETT: I don't agree with that in this particular situation. In a normal litigation where the parties

are all there, I think it's fine, but we're having this on a different day. If I am assured that these same witnesses will be present when we put on our case, then I have no problem.

CHAIRPERSON REID: I don't understand. What are you saying?

MR. CROCKETT: I mean, if Father O'Donovan doesn't attend on the 18th, then I don't have any opportunity to ask him the questions that I want to ask him.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, but you want to ask him questions regarding some testimony that hasn't occurred yet?

MR. CROCKETT: No. I want to ask him questions about his testimony this morning.

CHAIRPERSON REID: His testimony, certainly; but not on -- You can't present him with documentation and ask him to respond to the documentation that's irrelevant --

MR. CROCKETT: Well, the only documents that I've given him are the campus plan and some statistical information from his own Registrar, which we were provided with. I mean, these are not new documents.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No, we don't. But did he testify to that today?

MR. CROCKETT: He testified with respect to the numbers, yes, and that's what I want to cross-examine him on.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, if it is something that he testified to, yes, but you cannot give him a document that has

statistics on it and ask him to respond to that, because that is not in keeping with the rules here.

MR. CROCKETT: The three documents that I gave and I was going to have him identify them: Number one, the Board's previous order, including -- and then the separate document, which is Appendix H, which is also part of the Board's order. Those are the two documents, primary documents, that I want to ask questions about, particularly Exhibit H, the enrollment and housing cap that the parties agreed to.

The other document is for the purpose of asking questions about what the current enrollment is.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. The documentation that are already a part of the record, is that what you're referring to that you were asking him about? I would permit that, but not anything other than what is a part of the record.

MR. CROCKETT: I assume that the entire previous order that was issued by this Board is part of the record in this proceeding.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes, it would be.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Then that's fine. I don't need to go into the other, but -- today, but that's on the assumption that Father O'Donovan will be in attendance so that we can pose those questions to him as part of our --

CHAIRPERSON REID: You can't -- This is it. I mean, this is the only time you're going to have to cross-examine

him. He's not going to come back up.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Madam Chair, if it's all right, I would like for Mr. Crockett to proceed. If I don't like the direction he's going in, I will question it. And if I don't agree with the direction he's going in, we will stop it.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. Very well.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Father O'Donovan, you do recognize those two documents, the BZA order for the existing campus plan and Exhibit H thereto?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I'm going to say for the record, those are part of the record. Father O'Donovan did not testify to those documents in terms of any interpretation of them.

If Mr. Crockett has a general question about Father O'Donovan's testimony, then why doesn't he ask the question? If it requires him making some interpretation of those documents, that's better made in his direct testimony.

MR. CROCKETT: I haven't asked the question yet.

MS. DWYER: Why don't you ask the question without referring to the documents?

MR. CROCKETT: Oh, I am going -- I would like to conduct the cross-examination my way, not your way. This is my cross-examination, not yours.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Proceed, Mr. Crockett. Mr. Crockett, proceed. Don't argue with her. Proceed, and ask Father

O'Donovan your question, and let's just move along.

MR. CROCKETT: Father O'Donovan, as I read Exhibit -- I'm going to ask you the question now.

As I read Exhibit H and the BZA order together, seems to me that the University made four basic commitments, and I think they are as follows: First --

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair --

MR. CROCKETT: This is a question. Let me ask my question.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Mr. Crockett, do me a favor, please, sir. Exhibit H of what?

MR. CROCKETT: Exhibit H to the BZA order for the current campus plan.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. I want you to be very specific when you refer to these documents.

MR. CROCKETT: That's why I wanted to identify them up front.

As I read that document, the University made basically four commitments: First, that its undergraduate enrollment would increase by no more than 340 in the ten-year period; second, that it would immediately free up 200 beds that were currently being used by graduate students and utilize them for undergraduates; third, that it would construct 925 additional beds for a total of 1125 beds by 1987 -- '97, excuse me; and fourth, it would complete the program by 1997 at which time, under

the then existing enrollment cap and anticipated increase, you would have essentially 100 percent of the undergraduates living on campus.

Now is that your understanding of what was promised in Exhibit H?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: My understanding, Mr. Crockett, is we made the commitments that I indicated in my testimony: First, that we would require all freshmen and sophomores to live on the campus, and we have done that; that we would move graduate students off campus to make room for undergraduates, and we did that.

We likewise agreed to create an off campus student affairs program, and we did that, as the Board has heard. We agreed to extend our code of conduct to cover all our students, on campus or off, and we have followed up that.

We also agreed at very significant cost, it turns out, to renovate existing campus housing. That is, as I indicated in the testimony -- It turned out to cost $76 million, and we're investing another $50 million this summer. That is indispensable to provide first rate housing for the students, to keep the campus attractive, to keep it competitive, and we also agreed to provide 925 new beds on the campus, which we will have exceeded with the Southwest Quadrangle.

We have fulfilled all these commitments, even though they were originally conditioned very clearly on our

financial capacity and the building of the cogeneration project. We have gone ahead with these commitments, because we thought they were good for the campus and also for our neighboring communities.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. I understood you to say that you were going to free up the 200 graduate beds for undergraduate use. Is that correct?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: I don't recall the exact number, Mr. Crockett. We did move graduate students off campus.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Perhaps I could just, to refresh your memory, have you refer to page 25 of the BZA order.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Why don't you just tell me what's there, MR. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: All right, glad to. On page 25 the BZA order reads as follows: "After several sessions compromise was reached as follows. The University would commit to the enrollment projections in Appendix H which show an addition of 340 undergraduate students, undergraduate FTE students. 2. The University would make on-campus housing currently used by graduate students available to approximately 200 undergraduates. 3. The University would construct an additional 925 beds on campus by 1997."

Now does what the Board wrote in that order comport with your understanding of the agreement?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: I admit there were some other agreements we made which we fulfilled -- or commitments we made

which we fulfilled, but I would insist, Mr. Crockett, that the commitment was then conditioned on the financial capacity to do this and the approval of the cogeneration project, which was to have provided, incidentally, not only cleaner energy but jobs in the District, but also an income stream that would make the housing financially viable for us.

We moved ahead to develop the cogeneration project, and for four years worked to make that possible. It became, however, clear in 1994 that the project would fail, and that is the largest single reason for the delay in the housing provision of 925, which as I indicated we have, nevertheless, gone ahead with and will surpass by a good number.

So I believe we have fulfilled our commitments to the community and to this Board.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, thank you, sir, but you didn't quite answer the precise question that I wanted a response for, which is that on page 25 of the BZA order that the number of new campus beds that the University committed to was 1125, the 200 that were freed up from graduate students and the 900 that were to be built. Now isn't that a fact, that that's what the University committed to?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I would object, because I think Mr. Crockett is making an assumption there, and I think what the witness testified to is a commitment to provide 925 beds, not the 1100 number. If Mr. Crockett believes that's the number,

that's something he can present in his testimony.

MR. CROCKETT: I would just like the witness to answer the question, not have the attorney do it.

CHAIRPERSON REID: I'll sustain her objection. I don't see on this page anything about 1125 beds. So, therefore, we don't --

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, I'm just adding the two figures.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, that's his interpretation that the figures are to be added.

CHAIRPERSON REID: That's exactly why I said I was sustaining that, and if you want to bring something out in your testimony, you can. But we don't want you to ask -- I don't want to see you ask him an assumptive question at this point. It's unfair for him to answer something like that.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, let's go on to another subject, and I'm now going to refer to paragraph 9 of Appendix H. I would ask you, Father O'Donovan, did you participate in the negotiations that resulted in Appendix H, the agreement between the University and the community?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Mr. Crockett, would you tell me what issue you're referring to, instead of referring me to a document, please?

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. In this particular document, one portion of it is entitled "Housing Needs." There is a

calculation on page 9 which shows, first, that there were 5287 full time undergraduates in 1989-90, and then it adds the 340 anticipated enrollees to come up with the total cap in 1994, which would be 5627.

From that was deducted 300 people who are not considered full time students, that are commuters and that sort of thing, to come up with the total figure of 5327, which would be the number of beds required to house 100 percent of the students on campus.

Are you familiar with those figures?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I'm going to object. This is beyond the scope of the witness's testimony. Again, I think this is more appropriate for Mr. Crockett to present in his direct case.

MR. CROCKETT: As I understand it, this is my only chance to get responses from this witness. So I would ask that --

MS. DWYER: The questions are limited to his testimony, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: He testified, as I recall, that the University is under its cap, and that is what I am attempting to explore with these questions, and I believe I'm entitled to do it.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay, Mr. Crockett, then why not just specifically ask him that question rather than referring to the previous order. In your testimony you can make the assertion as to how you have come up with your own conclusions.

Nonetheless, at this point just ask him -- Just ask him have you exceeded your cap or will you exceed your cap or whatever you want to find out ultimately. Just ask him.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, I have to object to that, Madam Chair, because that is not the way that we can get this done with cross-examination. I mean, I have to ask him the questions that are going to get me to the answer.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: In other words, what you're trying to do is weave your situation very tightly before you ask him for the kicker.

MR. CROCKETT: That's right.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: And while we appreciate your courtroom drama position on this, we'd rather you be able to ask it like you might in conversation, if you wanted to know if two and two is four. You just ask how much is two and two. You don't say, well, I've got one over here and one over there, and if I pull out this third one over here, does that add up to three, and maybe if something drops out of the sky and puts another one on the table, what do we come up with then? And the answer would then be four. But the direct answer is how much is two and two.

MR. CROCKETT: All right, I will ask the question. What is the current cap on enrollment for undergraduates?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: The current cap, Mr. Crockett, is 5627, and as I testified, we are under that cap. The number of current students is 5516.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. There was a condition on that 340 additional students, was there not? Wasn't there a condition in the Board's order that there had to be a bed on campus for each of the new students, 340, before they -- in the semester that they were to come on, there had to be a bed for them before they could be enrolled?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: I'm not sure what your inference is, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, I'd again have to refer back to the BZA order, but I do believe it was conditioned on the fact that the University could take on the 340 new people over the ten-year period, provided that when any of those were added, there was a bed on campus for them.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: I'm puzzled by the questioning, to be honest, because I indicated that we have added beds, over 300 in number, that we plan to bring our total to over the number that we originally committed to, and I don't really see what your concern is.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, let me try again. My understanding of the testimony is that -- and the documents, and perhaps I could refer to one of your exhibits, which is Appendix --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Mr. Crockett, please direct us to which page and which condition you're referring to. Are you speaking of page 36, condition five?

MR. CROCKETT: Oh, in the Board's order?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Is that what you're referring to?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. Now direct us to where there it stipulates 340 beds, because I'm not following this. I see 340 full tim equivalent undergraduate students. Then it speaks to the University commitment to provide new beds, but I don't see where it's stating 340 new beds. I'm not following this conversation. So please --

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. I will just read the particular sentence. "Further" -- and this is paragraph 5 on page 36 -- "Further, any actual increases in undergraduate enrollment shall be conditioned upon and subject to the provision by the University of additional beds on campus to accommodate that increase." That's what I'm referring to.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. So --

MR. CROCKETT: And then it says the University may provide beds by, number one, moving graduate students and faculty off campus --

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. So your question is, number one, to be able to establish what the increase is, and then to determine whether or not the adequate number of beds was added?

MR. CROCKETT: Right. Now as I heard the testimony this morning and looked at the exhibits, I believe that the University's figure is that there are between -- Over the past ten years there has been a net increase of 303 beds. Is that correct?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Yes, that is.

MR. CROCKETT: So if -- My reading of this is that, if you've created 303 beds, that you can add the 303 to the 5200 figure to come up with your cap. Is that how you calculate your cap, by adding the 303 to the enrollment figures in 1990?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I think this calls for a legal conclusion as opposed to testimony from this witness. The cap is 5627, which was established by adding 340, which was the enrollment increase permitted back in 1990, to the enrollment numbers at that time.

In every case before the Board in the last ten years we have updated you on our progress with this, and the cap has always been 5627.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, where the confusion is coming, Ms. Dwyer, is the number of beds and the number of enrollment and the increase in enrollment and the ratio of the increase in enrollment to the number of beds. Okay? That is what I think Mr. Crockett is trying to establish, but it's kind of confusing. So we need to kind of get that straightened out.

Are you speaking of the increase in the number of beds or the increase in enrollment?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, I'm just -- They make a statement that their cap is 56-something.

CHAIRPERSON REID: 5627 enrollment.

MR. CROCKETT: But that assumes that they have provided 340 beds when, in fact, they by their own documents here show that they have only created 303 beds. So the cap actually, in terms of what they can have on campus right now, would be 37 less than they are claiming.

MR. BRANGMAN: Madam Chair, may I respond to that, please? The cap of 5627 is a hard cap. It's 340, as Ms. Dwyer just said, added to what our enrollment number was in 1990. The passage that Mr. Crockett is referring to here is referring to any additional students that come on campus after we have reached that cap.

Once we have reached the cap of 5627, we are supposed to provide a bed for each student that goes over that cap of 5627, which is why that has always been an important number to the University as we've looked at it, because it changes our bed -- Obviously, we would have to change our bed count numbers in order to bring more students in.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Any enrollment in excess of the 57-what? 5627 -- then that is when the requirement for the 340 beds kicks in, up to 340 beds? Is that what you're saying?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, if I could address this, because this has been something that has to have been interpreted

over the years each time we've come before you.

The 5627 is, as Mr. Brangman said, a hard cap, and it means that as an outside number what it represents is that over the last ten years the most the University was permitted to add was 340, which gets you up to the 5627.

In addition, what the Board said is, even though we're allowing you to go up to 5627, in order for you to add students during this ten-year period we want you, for every student you add, to provide a bed on campus, which is why the Board provided a number of ways that those beds could be provided.

You could either move graduate students off campus, you could renovate existing buildings to add more beds, or you could do new construction. So the 5627 was an outside cap, and in addition, there was a second requirement that for every student added up to that cap, there was a bed on campus.

That was done, because back in 1990 the University didn't have a lot of the things it had today. It was just starting, had just proposed as an idea this Director of Off Campus Student Affairs program. It hadn't done yet or hadn't agreed to yet to apply its code of conduct off campus.

All of those things have taken place in the last ten years. So the Board wanted to make sure that, in order to allow time for the new construction to go forward and to make sure that while these new programs were being implemented, there would be no impact. It had this requirement of substituting a bed for

every student that you wanted to add.

The University did that. It added 303 beds, and as we indicated, it is currently 111 below its cap. So it means it's added 303 beds, whereas it's only 229 students. So it has added a bed for every student over the last ten years.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. I think the testimony by counsel really answered my question, and I think she's right and accurate.

Now, Father O'Donovan, you said that the University's commitment to build the new dormitories, the 925 was conditioned upon being able to obtain financing. Is that accurate?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Yes, I did, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Were you able to obtain the financing? Did you get the bonds, the bond money that you anticipated?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: The conditions were twofold, as you recall, financial feasibility in terms of bonds and also in terms of the cogeneration facility. We did obtain the bonds, but we did not obtain the cogeneration facility, which was a very significant loss, I might add, to the District as well as to the University.

MR. CROCKETT: Was the cogeneration facility approved by the BZA?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Yes, as you remember well.

MR. CROCKETT: I was not involved at that time.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Well, I'm sure you've read the documentation carefully.

MR. CROCKETT: The cogenerator -- What was the reason that the cogenerator project didn't go through?

MS. DWYER; I think I can answer that.

MR. CROCKETT: I didn't ask Ms. Dwyer.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Was there any --

MR. CROCKETT: I'd like an answer from the witness.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Let's keep it with the testimony, Mr. Crockett.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: I'll respond, Madam Chair, because I can give a response to it, but it's very clear that I did not testify on this. It's very clear that I did not testify on it, and I have to remark that, if Mr. Crockett wanted to discuss the issue, he could simply ask for understanding of it rather than making this so adversarial situation which is certainly not what the University intends.

MR. CROCKETT: Can I have an answer, please as to what happened with the cogenerator, why it didn't come to fruition?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I would object, because the issue is not why it did or didn't happen. The fact of the matter is it didn't happen, and it was a condition.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Sustained. Move on to the next

question, Mr. Crockett, please.

MR. CROCKETT: Father O'Donovan, as I said, I was not engaged in these activities back in 1990.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: We missed you, Don.

MR. CROCKETT: I was engaged in some other litigation involving the community, but not this one.

I would refer you to page 22 of the Appendix H, and as I say, I wasn't present there, and all I can do is read the document and attempt to see what the parties agreed to.

The middle paragraph in that conclusion reads as follows: It said, "The programs and goals described herein, including the construction of new dormitory space on campus, are necessarily predicated on approval of the University's campus plan by the Board of Zoning Adjustment, financing, approval of the current and future bond applications in order to provide the money for the new construction, and finally, approval of the University cogeneration project to provide utility capacity to support the new beds."

Now what I have just read to you is part of the Appendix H, which was the agreement between the University and the ANC at the time as to what was going to happen. My question to you is: Did the -- I think you just mentioned that you expected a stream of income from the cogeneration as well as to provide utility capacity.

So my question to you is: What stream of income

did you anticipate in 1990, and did you communicate that to the people who were negotiating with you?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I would object. It's beyond the scope of his testimony today, and again what was said in hearings ten years ago on cogeneration is not germane other than the fact that it did not happen, and it was a condition precedent.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Sustained. Mr. Crockett, if you continue along that line of questioning, then I'm going to have no choice but to stop you and let the next person come up to cross-examine, because this is taking a lot of time, and we keep going around in circles.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, let me ask you this, Father O'Donovan. Did you get the money necessary to build the dormitory projects that you had in mind from the bond issues?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: We received the bonds, Mr. Crockett. We did not receive the money we needed, and we have had to go to find other funding to provide for the Southwest Quadrangle to which we are committed, as I said earlier, both for the University community's sake and for the neighboring community's sake. We've had to raise additional money to make this possible.

MR. CROCKETT: Now in Appendix H, as I read it, the University committed to creating these additional beds by 1997 at which time the document says that matching up the projected

enrollment against the projected increased beds you would have 100 percent undergraduate student housing on campus.

Was that your intention at the time?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Let me distinguish two issues. First of all, no one would be happier than I myself if we had received approval for the cogeneration project and could have opened the Southwest Quadrangle earlier, because that would mean that we could address the other absolutely urgent, critical academic needs which have been discussed in other testimony, especially Dr. Brown's and Mr. Brangman's.

No money would have been -- No one would be happier than I would if we could have done that earlier, but we were not able to, because in 1994 we had to start planning over again in order to see how we could finance a large new residence hall; and as you know, we first committed to the community that, despite the fact that the larger commitment had been conditioned and we were not bound by it, we would, nevertheless, go ahead and build a 500 student residence hall.

We decided to go further beyond that, because I thought it would be good for everybody, the University and the community.

As for the capacity to house 100 percent of the students, that is not the goal we are putting before you. We did not think that that is a realistic goal. We know that realistically we can house by the year 2010 84 percent of our

student body. We know that this is fiscally sound, because we've had ten years of experience in renovating dorms and recognizing the cost of housing.

We also know that there will be juniors and seniors who will choose to live off campus, though we expect that number to be greatly, significantly reduced, as the earlier testimony has made clear, and it's also the case that it's realistic for us to aim at 84 percent now in order not to be at a competitive disadvantage with the schools with which we compete for students, schools like Penn and Columbia and Brown which did not have these requirements.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you. Do you also recognize that allowing 16 percent of your undergraduate population to continue to live off campus and retreating from your 100 percent commitment in the last campus plan that you are continuing to impose a burden on those who --

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Madam Chair, this is argumentative, in my judgment. This is not a question.

MR. CROCKETT: I will take that. Let me go on to another subject.

If the BZA required you to put more undergraduate beds on campus, where would you put them?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: We could not afford to put more beds than we have planned to do, Mr. Crockett. We are pressed financially. We are significantly pressed financially to provide

the housing that we have committed to, but we have committed to it straight out, flatly, and will do it.

It is indispensable for this university, if it's to remain a world class university and the asset to the city that it is, for us to build the other buildings that have been indicated, and we believe that our blueprint for the campus plan gives us a marvelous way to strengthen ourselves academically, to provide a campus that will be attractive to students and faculty, to provide a campus of which the community will be proud, and a university that will work closely with the community.

We believe we have realized the commitments of our 1990 plan, the commitments, and we are also committed to working with the community, as I think we've shown abundantly in many instances over the last ten years.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Madam Chair, may I ask Father O'Donovan just to, in a physical -- or perhaps Mr. Brangman would want to do it -- just absent the issue of financing, which is a principal issue that has been the bulwark of much of the ability that the University has expressed to do or not do, physically where would housing go?

MR. BRANGMAN: I'll take that one. I think one of the issues that the University has to deal with is whether or not it is physically possible to accommodate any additional building beyond what we have shown in the current plan, the campus plan 2000.

We believe that the only way that we can accommodate any changes with respect to the types of uses that we have proposed are to effectively take some of the uses that we're proposing, either future buildings or existing buildings, off line those, convert those to housing, if that's what the question is directly, in order to accommodate those types of needs.

In reality, what that means is we would -- As Father O'Donovan testified to earlier and I also mentioned as part of my testimony, we would have to make major changes to the University in terms of hampering our ability to remain competitive.

We also have significant problems with respect to swing space or lack of it on campus. So there is no ability to vacate buildings in order to then make those buildings available for renovation.

So it is, as mentioned, a significant hardship for us to look to try and create additional facilities on this campus when, in fact, as you look at the plan, we are pretty much built to the limit of what we can build on this campus, short of changing height limits and the like which, of course, we know in this community is not something that we can do easily, if at all.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER MOULDEN: I apologize. I have to leave early to go back to the Planning Commission, but I will read the testimony for the record. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you, Mr. Moulden.

MR. CROCKETT: Perhaps I could follow up with one question, Mr. Brangman.

What would prevent, aside from financing -- prevent the University from moving the planned office space, the office space you have planned at St. Mary's off campus, to some commercial district in the District of Columbia such as up on Capitol Hill or somewhere like that?

MR. BRANGMAN: Well, if you're talking about taking three-quarters of that building, two-thirds to three-quarters of that building, which are academic functions for undergraduate students, off campus and moving those across town, that effectively renders those programs undoable; because, obviously, undergraduate students need to have access to the professors and need to have access to other activities on campus, and it does not make sense to move those off campus.

MR. CROCKETT: What other office facilities do you have on campus that could operate off-site like technology, computer types and that sort of thing?

MR. BRANGMAN: Most of the programs that we have on campus are student centric, if I could use that as a word. I'm not sure it is. And we have looked at the possibility of moving various activities off campus. We have done that in many locations already in many situations already, and we think that we are very quickly reaching our maximum capability to continue to

move administrative functions off campus.

As I believe you well know, for instance, we are slated now to move our treasurer's office off campus in order to make room for the performing arts center, but that is not something that we can continue to do with all of our offices, because again they are critical to the functioning needs of the students and faculty on campus, as is the case with many of the IS offices.

MR. CROCKETT: I have one further question along that line. What would be the disadvantages of moving the business school off campus, like the law school, into another area, and then using that space for additional student housing?

MR. BRANGMAN: Unlike many other business schools, Georgetown's business school happens to be taught -- operated, if you will -- by the same faculty, meaning they teach both undergrads and graduates. If we were to move the business school off campus, again it's a situation where undergraduate students are being separated from their main lifeline, which is the campus, and that, we don't believe, makes logical sense.

MR. CROCKETT: Of course, one other thing you could do in that event would be to --

MS. DWYER: Is this a question?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. -- would be to apportion the professors between undergrad and grad, and have a portion of the professors go all the way to teaching grad school. Isn't that --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Mr. Crockett--

CHAIRPERSON REID: You're testifying.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: -- absent your direct relationship with the University, making suggestions out of context seems to be something that is beyond the scope of your knowledge and capability.

MR. CROCKETT: I'd like to ask a question as to whoever can answer it here with respect to the MedStar agreement.

Under the agreement, who will own the buildings?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: MedStar will, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: And who will own the land?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: The University.

MR. CROCKETT: And what are the terms of the lease of the land?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I would object to that. It's beyond the testimony, beyond the scope of this hearing.

MR. CROCKETT: Once again, Madam Chair, this is my only opportunity to ask these questions of these witnesses.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What is the question?

MR. CROCKETT: What are the terms of the lease to MedStar?

MS. DWYER: The terms of the lease have no relation to this.

CHAIRPERSON REID: I don't think that's relevant. Mr. John Green was the one who testified in regard to the MedStar,

and if you'd like, you could direct the question to him. But the terms of the lease, I don't think, are germane to these proceedings. There was nothing in the testimony that spoke to the lease terms.

What are you getting at, Mr. Crockett?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, again --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Did you have a question of Mr. Green?

MR. CROCKETT: No, he's not on this panel. I can direct that to him later. I'd like to address this question to Ms. Greenan.

I'm not sure I understood your response to the question on student parking, and I wanted to ask you again, particularly, whether you have any information as to how many students had cars in Georgetown before the reciprocity was revoked, and how many have them now?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I think the witness has already answered that.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Wait a minute. Repeat the question. How many --

MR. CROCKETT: How many students had automobiles in Georgetown before the reciprocity was revoked, and how many of them have them now? How many cars are on the street?

MS. DWYER: The witness already testified that the University does not keep records and that what Ms. Greenan said

was that she knows from the community that there was a reduction, but they do not have those numbers or those records.

CHAIRPERSON REID: She can say that.

MS. GREENAN: The University does not have those records.

MR. CROCKETT: And again, just a general question as to what plans, if any, the University has to alleviate the problems that the residents have between the bars and the University campus late at night with boisterous students waking them up?

CHAIRPERSON REID: That -- Again, that's an argumentative question, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: No, it's not argumentative at all, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes, it is.

MR. CROCKETT: I'm just asking what plans, if any, they have to address that.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, there's an assumption there that is contained in the question that there is a problem, and there was not any testimony to that effect. However, at the time that you testify, if you want to then give us that information, you can do that, but not contain it in an assumptive type of question. That's like a question like do you still beat your wife. What are they going to say to that?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Madam Chair, I think

that Mr. Crockett's question would have great relevance if the bars that are in question were student-only bars, but since they are not, since they are public places, then there's no way to make the determination that the source of the noise is always from the students.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Mr. Crockett, incidentally, how many more questions do you have?

MR. CROCKETT: I have no further, which I'm sure you'll be happy to hear.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Thank you. Next questioner, please come up.

MR. RIXEY: Hello. I'm Douglas Rixey, and I'm representing Citizens Association of Georgetown.

MS. PRUITT: Excuse me, Mr. -- Say your name again, sir.

MR. RIXEY: Rixey, R-i-x-e-y.

MS. PRUITT: I'm sorry. Then, Mr. Crockett, who were you representing? Cloisters?

MR. CROCKETT: Georgetown Residents Alliance.

MS. PRUITT: And, sir, you're representing who?

MR. RIXEY: The Citizens Association of Georgetown.

MS. PRUITT: Thank you. I just wanted to keep that clear.

MR. RIXEY: To Father O'Donovan, just to make sure I understand, the University has abandoned its goal of housing 100

percent of its undergraduates on campus, and it has no intention of providing any sites for future dorms on campus?

CHAIRPERSON REID: That question has been asked already.

MR. RIXEY: I just wanted to make sure I understood the answer.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No. There is not to be any repetitive or redundant questioning. Now let me say this. At the time -- Let's establish some rules. At the time that you do that, then that will then make you forfeit your opportunity to question any further. Thank you. Not just you; that goes across the board. We have to have some type of organization here.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. There's been a lot of discussion about a modest increase in student enrollment. To Father O'Donovan, I would ask, do you consider a 50 percent increase in graduate students modest, comprising 1284 additional students?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: I addressed chiefly the undergraduate enhanced larger number of 389, Mr. Rixey, and it was Dr. Brown who spoke more of the graduate students.

I would add, however, from my point of view that graduate students are in almost cases much older. They live more on their own, and have not been brought to our attention as the concern that neighbors have about younger people occasionally. But perhaps Dr. Brown would like to comment.

DR. BROWN: As I said, we don't have any plans now

to markedly increase our graduate programs. I'll give you an example, though, of looking at things.

We have a graduate program -- it's a Master's program in communication culture and technology. That's doing very well. It probably won't grow a great deal. We are in the process of phasing out a program in demography.

As we look at programming coming in, what we are seeking here is the ability to flexibly plan. When you look at what's happening in higher education, and our business school is starting a distance learning program with caliber, we will have some financial FTEs, which is how you look at them on the graduate level, how they are counted, and so that might make the picture look different, though these students may be in Utah kinds of things.

So some of that. We were trying, really, to keep some flexibility as we look down in the planning. We would not anticipate having actual bodies in masses coming onto the campus, but it is that ability. We think maybe in terms of 800 or so.

It's very hard to say. What we are trying to do is to keep the ability to plan, but again these are people who would not be probably living in the area or probably graduate students tend to not have as much money and live in Rosslyn and across the river and places like that.

MR. RIXEY: To Father O'Donovan: Do you expect the University to continue to expand to the neighborhoods via

purchasing more townhouses for student housing and things like the Wormley School and occupying commercial space like the car barn?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I would object. The purpose of today's hearing is campus plan and not what occurs outside the campus plan boundaries. It's beyond the jurisdiction of the Board.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Sustained.

MR. RIXEY: May I explain my question, why I asked the question?

CHAIRPERSON REID: You can.

MR. RIXEY: During the discussions that the community had with the University, the University admitted that they have included single family dwellings that they had converted into student housing that are off campus in their on-campus numbers.

So I'm trying to ascertain how many -- Where the question is leading and what I will ask Mr. Brangman when I have the opportunity is how many residential units the University actually owns off campus, how many students occupy those residences. And what I was asking Father O'Donovan was how many more of those do they intend to purchase, because it has an effect on the neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. You have -- I understand. That's about three questions that you rolled into one.

MR. RIXEY: So the first question was do they

intend to continue to expand into the neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, again I would object, to the extent that there can be clarification about properties that the University has owned over the course of the last many years.

CHAIRPERSON REID: The first question is do they intend to expand into the community. Now the thing about that is that the danger in that question is this. If today you don't have any plans and you say no, then if in the next five or ten years that changes, then -- So I caution you.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: It is also a very vague question, Mr. Rixey. It could mean anything from a house to a project that you would all welcome. So I really think you would have to be more specific to be helpful to us.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Do you know? The question is do you know -- The question is asking you do you know the answer to it, Father O'Donovan?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: If there were a significant plan to do any purchase of property in the immediate neighborhood, Madam Chairman, I would have included that in my testimony.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, the question -- It required a yes or no answer.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: No.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Madam Chair, there's embedded within the question the premise which I would like to

have clarified, and that is: In stating your on-campus housing, does that include any housing that is not within the boundaries of the campus as we see it?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Now that's the second question.

MR. BRANGMAN: No.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: And there is a third question. You were asking three. So what's the third question?

MR. RIXEY: I'm not sure what the third question was.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Maybe it was just two. The first one was do they intend to expand.

MR. RIXEY: I'm surprised by that answer, because it's contrary to what the University told us.

CHAIRPERSON REID: But that's testifying, and you can tell us when you testify.

MR. RIXEY: I'm sorry. I'm just surprised. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON REID: If you're not sure -- If that answer is not satisfying to you, then you could ask a follow-up question that could perhaps clarify it.

MR. RIXEY: I will try and do that with Mr. Brangman.

The community asked in the question matrix that the University disclose how many buildings they own off campus in the community, where they are located, how large they are, what they

were used for, how many students occupy them, how many faculty occupy them, how much traffic is generated by those facilities, where the people that drive or how the people get to those facilities, where those who drive park, etcetera, etcetera.

The question was not answered, because the University contended it was not part of the plan. In the mediation session the Office of Planning took the position that, even though it may not technically be within the boundaries of the campus, it was relevant discussion to the review of the plan, because those off-campus facilities have a significant impact on the community, which is really the only reason any of us are here.

So again I ask the University if they would disclose that information.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I would object to any requirement that the University list properties off campus. The University, through its medical center and other facilities, has properties all over the District of Columbia.

To the extent that anyone comes to the campus, whether it's from a property that is off-site or their home, anyone who comes to the campus is included in the traffic analysis. So the traffic and transportation analysis included any impact of any visitor to the campus, from whatever location.

So to the extent there were any impacts on the campus, those have been considered in the traffic and transportation analysis.

CHAIRPERSON REID: That's not the question he's asking. As I understand it, he's asking -- His question is germane to off-campus housing that, if I understand correctly, he's saying is being counted as on-campus housing.

MS. DWYER: No. The University answered that and said none of the -- The housing that they include in their on-campus numbers is on-campus housing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Only on campus?

MS. DWYER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Then the facilities that you're referring to are -- Are you saying that these are houses that are deemed to be owned by the University that may have some impact on the community? You're saying that those -- I guess those houses are not counted as on campus housing. Now that's off campus. So you're referring to off campus housing, the impact of the off campus housing? Is that what you're referring to?

MR. RIXEY: Yes, the impact of off campus housing, off campus classroom buildings, off campus faculty offices, any facility the University owns or operates within the immediate community that could have an impact on the community.

MS. DWYER: And, Madam Chair, I would say again it's beyond the scope of this hearing. Any use that is beyond the campus plan boundaries is in that zone district and exists as a matter of right. Those matter of right uses are not the subject.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Do you understand what she's

saying?

MR. RIXEY: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON REID: If, in fact -- because we had this with another campus plan. If, in fact, there are uses that the University has purchased housing or buildings outside of the University that are purchased as a matter of right, meaning that anyone could purchase these properties, those properties are not contained within the offices of the campus plan.

So it goes beyond the scope of this hearing.

MR. RIXEY: May I ask a question of the Board?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes.

MR. RIXEY: Is the Board concerned about the impact that the University has on the community?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: The Board is concerned, very much so, but the Board is bound by the requirements of the ordinance.

MR. RIXEY: Does the Board -- Just so that I can determine whether it's worth continuing the questioning, when the traffic consultant comes up to be questioned, there is information in the traffic study that supposedly covers the impact of off-campus facilities on the community. Their attorney just said so.

In fact, it doesn't address at all the impact on the community. It only addresses supposedly the impact on the campus itself. It's very carefully worded. When Mr. Slade comes up, we'll discuss that as well.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: See, the issue -- if I might interrupt, Mr. Rixey, the issue that might make this more difficult is the fact that -- Let's assume the University owns property throughout the District. Some of that property has absolutely no effect directly on the Georgetown community. Some of it may have a great deal of effect on downtown traffic or the George Washington community or even the Howard University community. But because you can't separate all those properties out to determine which is which and which should be bound in, which should not be bound in, it would be very difficult to use that information effectively.

Therefore, I think that it would be less than relevant to bring it in, because then it requires you to do a lot of separating of pieces of property that are, by matter of right, not part of the campus plan evaluation. Yet the impact of those properties is definitely one upon the community.

MR. RIXEY: And how would that impact be evaluated if we can't discuss it in this hearing?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Unfortunately, it won't be evaluated.

MR. RIXEY: To Mr. Brangman: Is there anything in the plan that would allow for accommodating the deficit of 1157 cars that's projected in the traffic study? That is, is there anyplace to put those 1157 cars?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I think that's a question

for the next panel.

MR. RIXEY: I think it's a planning question, Madam Chair, because it has to do with physical planning. I don't think the traffic consultant can tell the University where to put the cars on campus.

MS. DWYER: But the traffic consultant can tell the University how many cars it would have to accommodate, and that's a question for the next panel in terms of the transportation management program and parking management.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Can you defer that question and direct it to the traffic consultant?

MR. RIXEY: Well, it's similar to concern about future housing on campus. If there is no possibility of accommodating 1157 cars on campus --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Now you're testifying.

MR. RIXEY: I'm trying to explain my question so that you would see why I'm asking this.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Go ahead.

MR. RIXEY: If there is no possibility of accommodating those 1157 cars, then I think it's rather relevant in the overall plan of the campus. They have told us they are shy of 1157 cars. I'm asking if they have tried to figure out any way to accommodate those on campus.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. So what are you saying, that you want to direct that question to this panel?

MR. RIXEY: Yes. I was asking the architect of the University where they might plan to put 1157 cars.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, you can ask him. If he can respond, then so be it; and if not, then the traffic consultant can.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I would just object, because it's speculative. What the University has said is it's not increasing its parking cap below -- above the 4080. So there is no planning in terms of adding additional parking.

If that's the cap, then the question is how will the University be managing its people, and that's the next panel, the transportation management program.

MR. BRANGMAN: Madam Chair, I was just simply going to say that I concur with what our counsel has said. As part of our plan, we recognize that there was a deficiency in our transportation plan and, therefore, we have put in place a transportation management plan to deal with those issues.

Lou Slade and, more importantly, Ms. Karen Frank can deal with the particulars of that plan. But, no, we do not intend to increase the cap.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Just to clarify, the cap relates only to parking provided on campus?

MS. DWYER: That is correct.

MR. RIXEY: Then may I ask anyone at the panel, is there a traffic consultant authorized to guaranty that the 1157

cars will be accommodated in some way?

MS. DWYER: I think it's a question for the next panel, but I think the University is committed to ensuring that its faculty, staff and employees are able to come to the campus, whether it's through cars and parking on campus, satellite parking, GUTS bus or any of the other measures they are putting in place.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. To Linda Greenan: I think I understood that the University provides someone at the District with a list of student residences so that they will not be issued Zone 2 permits. Does that include all University owned housing off campus?

MS. GREENAN: Yes. It includes all University owned housing in our campus boundaries.

MR. RIXEY: No, I said does that include all University owned housing off campus?

MS. GREENAN: I think the answer to that was we don't have any.

MR. RIXEY: You do not have any University owned housing off campus?

MS. GREENAN: That's what I understood Mr. Brangman to say.

MR. RIXEY: I see. Does the University own 1408 through 1424 36th Street?

MS. GREENAN: I don't know the answer to that.

MR. RIXEY: Well, in the matrix you all answered question number 87. You said you did, and that it was being used as student residences administered by the Student Housing Office, but it's outside of the boundaries.

So is that owned by the University or not?

MS. PRUITT: Excuse me, sir. I believe the Board has already ruled that buildings -- I'm speaking here -- I'm sorry -- that properties outside the University, while they are important and germane, based on the ordinance they can't consider that.

MR. RIXEY: I understand that. But I just asked Ms. Greenan if they provide the District with a list of all student residences that the University has in order to keep those students from getting Zone 2 permits.

MS. PRUITT: And she answered, yes, they do. So for on campus housing and --

MR. RIXEY: She just answered -- And then she also answered that they did not have any properties off campus. I just asked them if these properties were owned by the University. She --

MS. PRUITT: And the Board has already made a determination that off campus properties -- properties owned by the University off campus outside the boundaries were not going to be germane to this case. I just wanted to reiterate, so that we're not going over issues that have already been discussed.

MR. RIXEY: I'm sorry. I may be out of line, but this was an answer that was in the matrix that was given to us in our public meetings. Is this not germane?

MS. PRUITT: Part of mediation?

MR. RIXEY: Excuse me?

MS. PRUITT: Was that part of mediation? I'm just trying to understand.

MR. RIXEY: No. This was part of our public meeting process with the University that we --

MS. PRUITT: Was that testified here today?

MR. RIXEY: Excuse me?

MS. PRUITT: Was it testified to here today? Today?

MR. RIXEY: This matrix was referred to in their presentation today, yes.

MS. PRUITT: That's the Board to determine whether or not they can --

MR. RIXEY: So does the University own those properties?

MR. BRANGMAN: Madam Chair, I would just like to correct the statement that we made with respect to some of the townhouses that are on 36th Street. In fact, the University does own those, and if it is a case where they are housed with students, because not all of them are -- some of them have faculty members in them -- then I suspect that we would treat those houses

the same as we treat the townhouses that are within our campus boundaries, i.e., on campus.

So we don't necessarily make a distinction between those.

MR. RIXEY: To Ms. Lord: What hours does the hotline operate?

MS. LORD: The hotline operates between 9:00 p.m. and 3:00 a.m.

MR. RIXEY: On which days of the week?

MS. LORD: Fridays, Saturdays and certain designated days. For example, if St. Patrick's Day is on Monday, the hotline will operate on Sunday.

MR. RIXEY: I see. But not on a regular basis on Thursdays and Sundays?

MS. LORD: No, that's correct.

MR. RIXEY: And which months of the year or which overall time?

MS. LORD: From the -- The hotline resumes operation at the beginning of the fall semester, which typically is the end of August, early September, and concludes its operation, oh, about the end of May. It operates all through Senior Week every day of the week and certain days -- I could give you a schedule. It operates certain reading days prior to exams. It may not operate the week of Easter.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. And I think, if I understood

your testimony, you said that in previous years there were up to 90 students disciplined as a result of hotline complaints, and then 50 or so in this academic year.

MS. LORD: Approximately 90, and then approximately 60. I think 56 was the exact number.

MR. RIXEY: If those are the number of disciplinary actions, how many actual complaints were received on the hotline in those periods?

MS. LORD: I don't think that was part of my testimony. I don't have that information with me right now. My sense would be probably twice as many, but I would want to get the exact numbers before I tell you that exactly.

MR. RIXEY: It's unfortunate, because this again is another question, question number 84, that was asked of the University that we still don't have an answer to. But as a continuing part of that question -- I assume you won't have this information either -- how many complaints overall, hotline and otherwise, have you received or do you typically receive per year?

MS. LORD: Are you talking -- What do you mean other? Other than hotline?

MR. RIXEY: Well, presumably your contacted by means other than by the hotline for people that make complaints about student behavior.

MS. LORD: That people contact me directly? Is that what you're asking?

MR. RIXEY: Or any means that the University employs to gather complaints from the neighborhood.

MS. LORD: Again, I'd have to look for that information, but I would say anecdotally probably two a week. But I would be happy to get that data for you.

MR. RIXEY: Two a week total or two a week in addition to the hotline?

MS. LORD: In addition to the hotline.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. Those were all my questions for this group.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you. Next cross-examiner. And after this cross-examiner, how many more? Just one? Two more? Okay.

MS. ZARTMAN: And my questions are very brief, Madam Chairman. Barbara Zartman from Cloisters.

One mechanical question for Mr. Brangman. I understand that the campus plan submission is required to include information about the size and scope of all existing buildings on campus. I don't believe there are data on square footage for anything except proposed new buildings. Is that correct?

MR. BRANGMAN: Depending on how one defines size, there is an indication of what the story heights are for all of the existing projects or -- excuse me, buildings on campus. But we do not have square foot allocated for all of those buildings. It is accounted for in the total allowable built area on campus.

MS. ZARTMAN: But would it not be helpful in checking the FAR numbers and other things to have all of the square footage for all of the buildings, so that we can all have comparable numbers and we can know the ones on which you are relying?

MR. BRANGMAN: It might be.

MS. ZARTMAN: Since it's a requirement of the plan, I thought it would be useful.

Jeanne, in terms of the newly activated off campus student housing information, will you be requiring that all of the properties listed in that service be legal with certificate of occupancy apartments?

MS. LORD: I don't have the answer to that information. As I said, that's going to be in the Office of Auxiliary Services. So I'd have to inquire of them. This has never been our practice in the past.

MS. ZARTMAN: So that illegal apartments are advertised on the University communication system for occupancy by students.

MS. LORD: I don't know, Barbara.

MS. ZARTMAN: I won't testify by saying what I know of historical listing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: You'll have your opportunity.

MS. LORD: Excuse me. Linda brought up a good point, which is we do -- When this was in our office, the form

that the landlords signed said that they were -- you know, they complied with local ordinances, with the zoning ordinances, that sort of thing. I don't know what is going to be done in the new office. I would assume it would be equally as good.

You know, people all over Burleith and West Georgetown put their names on these, and I'm assuming that they are doing it in good faith and in compliance with the law.

MS. ZARTMAN: But you make no requirement for seeing any documentation that there's -- For the safety of your own students?

MS. LORD: Well, just the form that we have the landlords sign, Barbara.

MS. ZARTMAN: The second parking garage that's included in the plan for north campus -- is that a decision that will be made by the University, by MedStar, jointly?

MR. BRANGMAN: That is a decision that will be made by the University, if you're referring to the parking garage that would be on Lot B.

MS. ZARTMAN: This is the parking lot that directly fronts Reservoir Road and is right behind the Cloisters townhouses. Am I correct in understanding that you've done no sampling, you have no idea what the size of that garage might be?

MR. BRANGMAN: That's right.

MS. ZARTMAN: So it could be multi-levels above ground, but it could be entirely, virtually all underground?

MR. BRANGMAN: That's right.

MS. DWYER: It will be the subject of a further processing or second stage case when it's ready to be constructed.

MS. ZARTMAN: And my last question is really a fundamental one for Father O'Donovan. Let me say, I have the greatest respect for Father O'Donovan and Dorothy Brown who, I know, are working to do the very best in very pressured situations.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Ms. Zartman, just ask your question.

MS. ZARTMAN: I wanted to set a context for asking a very fundamental question.

The documents that recently were submitted by your counsel offered to ensure that a whole variety of consequences will flow from the actions you take. One of the members of the Board last month challenged a colleague for overpromising, for being too zealous in advocacy and thereby harming credibility.

Is it in the University's power to ensure that these things will happen and that these consequences will be the consequences?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I think the question is overly broad. I'm not certain what consequences or what --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Your question -- You have to be broken down. There's too much contained therein, Ms. Zartman. Just take it --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Ms. Zartman, are you asking the question generally, whether or not the University is making a truly good faith effort in its assertions here?

MS. ZARTMAN: No. I guess I'm questioning whether the words were as carefully chosen as I think these colleagues would normally use. Just shortly, a few minutes ago, it was again said that the University can ensure that things will happen. There is a statement in the Wilkes Artis letter ensuring that there will be no harmful impacts.

I wonder if that is something that doesn't need greater quantification in order to be the respectful advocacy that I think the Board asks for and that we need as assurances.

MS. DWYER: I would state that I think it's up to the Board in its conditions of approval to include whatever conditions it feels would help ensure no objectionable impact. It's a Board decision as to how to do that.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, I see no reason why that question cannot be answered. Who do you want to answer the question?

MS. ZARTMAN: I'll put it to Father O'Donovan.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Basically, what you're asking, if I understand it correctly, is are they standing behind their word. If they have proffered to us that they are ensuring that certain things will happen, can you rely on that assurance. Is that what you are asking?

MS. ZARTMAN: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes or no?

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Can't I say something about how much I admire and respect her? The answer is, of course.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Next part of your question?

MS. ZARTMAN: The next part of the question was: In fact, your own testimony that indicated that when you came to the University, the newly adopted campus plan had features that you believed were objectionable for the character of the University and the quality of student life, and you set your hand to correcting them, and we are eternally grateful for the absence of anymore podia building. But will it not also be true that your successor will have the opportunity to change this campus plan drastically, if it is his wont to do so? Hence, the need for some quantification, some ability to ensure.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: I am sure you will be there to prevent that, Barbara. The plan, I think, is there for all to see. It is a far more beautiful, far more community friendly plan. It integrates academics and living conditions. It meets -- It picks up, as Alan pointed out and Bob Stern designed for us, the plan of the surrounding villages.

I think any subsequent administration that wished to make very substantial plans -- and it would, first of all, be very unwise, but secondly, it would have to come before this body.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Absolutely, and that's what we

were kind of discussing up here, and we would defer to corporation counsel to give us an answer. But my read on that is that, once we have approved a campus plan or denied or whatever that it cannot be changed.

That's the whole point of being here, that your successor can't arbitrarily just decide, oh, well, I don't like that; so we'll just do that, because it will be contained within the order that will be promulgated from this body. That's my read.

Now, Mr. Corp. Counsel, is that -- Okay. So, no, I don't think we should have to worry about that.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: That, and the fact that the community is so vigilant.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Is that it?

MS. ZARTMAN: I thought Dr. Brown was going to say something.

DR. BROWN: I was just going to piggyback and say, on campus we talk about the big hole. So the Southwest Quadrangle big hole has gone in, and you heard our urgency about the other major buildings, science, the business school, performing arts.

So we will work as hard as we can to make all of that happen.

MS. ZARTMAN: My last area of questioning deals with the issue of the increase in graduate students. Repeatedly, we have been told that there are no plans for significant

increases. Nonetheless, the impact of a requested 50 percent increase strikes fear in the heart of people who care about their community.

Father O'Donovan's testimony today did reference off campus developments that would be required for the graduate student expansion. I would just ask that we get whatever degree of clarification you can give us.

If there are no current plans, would it not be reasonable for you to cut that number back to something that is far less threatening to the immediate community?

Are you aware that during the course of mediation --

CHAIRPERSON REID: That's a second question. Let him answer that question.

MS. ZARTMAN: Okay.

DR. BROWN: Yes.

MS. ZARTMAN: Thank you. During the course of mediation one of the options that was presented -- and I don't know, since you were not -- We missed you during mediation. It would have been infinitely better, were you there -- was to, in light of the amount of change in the leadership of the University and the inability to know precisely what the impact of Southwest Quad and the other measures will be, if there to be no increase beyond your current allowed enrollment and in five years after Southwest Quad is up and running we would agree to reopen the

campus plan with you and consider both the increases in undergraduate and graduate enrollment at that time as well as the expansion of facilities on north campus.

MS. DWYER: I can say that the University answered that during mediation and said that it needs a ten-year plan in order to plan for the future, and that a five-year plan would be totally unacceptable.

MS. ZARTMAN: Then I guess you were aware of it.

FATHER O'DONOVAN: Oh, yes. I don't want to give my successor a five-year plan, nor would you, Barbara. You would want to argue with him immediately.

MS. ZARTMAN: Now President Rubenstein on leaving said that he wouldn't give his successor --

CHAIRPERSON REID: You are now testifying, Ms. Zartman. Do you have any other questions to ask?

MS. ZARTMAN: No, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Thank you very much. We have two other people to do the cross-examination, and then we will have a recess for about ten minutes, and then we'll start back up with the second panel.

MS. SCOLARO: My name is Patricia Scolaro. I'm the President of the Burleith Citizens Association, and my questions are directed to Ms. Greenan.

I'd just like to clarify when you were hired by the University. You know, what date, what year?

MS. GREENAN: August '94.

MS. SCOLARO: So that was just after the cogenerator was denied. Okay.

When was the community handed the complete plan, the complete plan?

MS. GREENAN: I think it was January 11.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. And following that date, January 11, how many what you referred to as the working group meetings were held?

MS. GREENAN: I don't know precisely. We met pretty much bi-weekly from that point forward until the last meeting was May 18.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay, but May 18 -- was that not when MedStar -- When did MedStar make its presentation? That would have been the April --

MS. GREENAN: Well, their first presentation was March 7.

MS. SCOLARO: By MedStar?

MS. GREENAN: Yes.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. So we don't know exactly how many meetings in addition to the questions the community had to question or respond or hear your presentations, following the time we got the plan. That's what I'm working toward.

MS. GREENAN: Well, we could count them. I mean, it's in the book. I mean, I'm guessing it's about five or six or

seven, but we can -- and we consider MedStar as part of our campus plan.

MS. SCOLARO: So that word MedStar never appears in your campus plan.

MS. GREENAN: It may not, but their proposals do.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. All right. But I would like to clarify the exact number of community working group meetings were held after we were given the plan, and we can do that later. It doesn't have to be done right now.

As the presentations were made, did you feel they were for the purpose of information, for discussion and, if there was discussion, and resolution, or were they strictly presentational?

MS. GREENAN: Well, it was always our hope that they were for purpose of dialogue, and I think that you were in several of the meetings where we discussed how to facilitate dialogue and that many of the agendas that we began meetings with allowed for discussion of materials that had been presented in the previous meeting.

It was to our disappointment that there was very little discussion.

MS. SCOLARO: I don't know. I seem to think -- I recall a lot of discussion and --

CHAIRPERSON REID: You're testifying.

MS. SCOLARO: I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Just ask your questions, please.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay, next question then. With the exception of the enrollment amendment and, I think, from one of the traffic studies I noted there is now a small island on 38th Street which is -- 38th Street and Reservoir Road, what other changes were made in the plan as a result of the community discussions?

MS. GREENAN: Well, of course, the enrollment issue and, as we saw it, enrollment/housing was the major issue, and traffic relating to the MedStar proposals was the other second major issue. And of course, Burleith always brought up the 38th Street issue.

We saw those as pretty much the primary.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. But the traffic issue still has not been truly resolved, from the study that -- the last study -- the last word I had was in your amendment.

MS. DWYER: Is there a question here?

MS. SCOLARO: Oh, gosh. Do you feel -- Are you satisfied that all of the traffic and parking issues have been addressed and are firm?

MS. DWYER: I think that's maybe a question for the next panel.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. We can do that. I'd like to clarify also the enrollment amendment was presented at a mediation session, but was there consensus? Was consensus reached?

MS. GREENAN: No.

MS. SCOLARO: No. Why not? I mean, what happened? Did it come to a vote? I know -- I remember you presented it, and then I don't know -- can't quite recall what happened after that.

MS. GREENAN: Well, we had a follow-up meeting, and the community was asked to return to that meeting with its response, and that meeting, most of it, focused on the traffic issues. But there was an opportunity, as I recall, provided by the facilitator to elicit response from the community, and we never got it.

MS. SCOLARO: About how much time was allowed on the agenda for that?

MS. GREENAN: Oh, there was a lot allowed on the agenda, but as we proceeded with the meeting it really became focused on traffic issues. But there was an opportunity that the facilitator asked if people wanted to discuss that, and it didn't seem like people wanted to.

MS. SCOLARO: Did they not want to or was time running out?

MS. GREENAN: Nobody responded.

MS. SCOLARO: As I recall, Mr. Fisher -- Sorry. Okay.

Again, I need clarification on something, and I hate to bring up the question of enrollment again, but I keep

hearing the figure 84 percent of the students will be housed on campus. Can anybody give me a definitive number of students who will still be out in the community, first in the year 2003 and then in the year 2010?

MS. GREENAN: I think what we've been saying is that on the year 2003 it would be a little over 400, I believe 427. I will tell you, we have been back and forth over the last several days looking at these numbers. So I'm doing this from memory, but it's around -- I believe it's around 427, maybe 450.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. And in the year 2010 when we have 84 percent?

MS. GREENAN: I believe we came up with a number that was around 800.

MS. SCOLARO: Eight hundred? Okay, based on like a present-day enrollment?

MS. GREENAN: That's right. Using the same proportions that exist today, we made the same assumptions based on those proportions that exist today.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay, and how many less would that be than are in the community today?

MS. GREENAN: It's around 250, I believe.

MS. SCOLARO: Around 250?

MS. GREENAN: By 2010.

MS. SCOLARO: By 2010?

MS. GREENAN: Yes.

MS. SCOLARO: You will be 250 short of what we are now? Okay.

MS. SCOLARO: Yes, but in 2003 it would be around 600.

MS. DWYER: Let me just say, this assumes that the University reaches the projected enrollment cap, which it may not.

MS. SCOLARO: I understand. Now Ms. Renshaw asked a question, so that I feel it has been introduced into testimony, and she asked about the nontraditional students. When I did the calculations with what -- you said there are 5516 current full tim undergraduate students, and Mr. Brangman, you popped up and said there are 63 total. So if you subtract that, that would mean there are 784 nontraditional students. You know, I know it was done very quickly.

MR. BRANGMAN: Right, but of that number there are also -- When you go to our full enrollment numbers or head count numbers -- and in order to get from head count down to the traditional students, which is a definition that we have under the BZA order, you have to also then back out part-time students, full time -- You know, you're only counting full time heads, but you also have to back out non-degree students out of those numbers.

That's what eventually gets you down to a nontraditional -- excuse me, to an undergraduate full-time degree number of 5682 in round numbers, and then the difference between that and the average full-time traditional undergraduate was the

5516 number.

The number you wanted or the number we should have given was 166, to answer Ms. Renshaw's question, and we will submit this chart into the record.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. But on a chart that was provided by the University in terms of housing in ZIP Code 20007, it calls for approximately 300-plus students, nontraditional students in ZIP Code 20007. That would be in addition to the regular undergraduate student enrollment.

MS. DWYER: Is this a question? I'm trying to understand is there's a question here or if this is testimony.

MS. SCOLARO: Did your information provided at the working group meetings indicate that there were -- or show that there were approximately 300-plus nontraditional students living in ZIP Code 20007?

MS. GREENAN: I don't remember the numbers precisely off the top of my head, but I think, to our credit, we handed out information to the community that specified what our numbers were, both with respect to traditional and all graduate, medical and all undergraduate students living in ZIP Code 20007.

MS. SCOLARO: Yes, you did.

MS. GREENAN: And the number that we have focused on is the number of the traditional undergraduate students. So I don't know precisely what -- you know, what you're asking in --

MS. SCOLARO: Well, if I said, I guess I would be

giving testimony. But I will ask you, and anyone can answer this, in addition to the nontraditional undergraduate students, are there not other Georgetown University nontraditional and graduate students living in ZIP Code 20007?

MS. GREENAN: There are, and our data show that they are living in a huge percentage, roughly 75 to 80 percent, by themselves, not in group homes. As a matter of fact, I do recall the information in respect to Burleith, and that is that there were, out of 119 homes, 90 of those homes were group homes.

So the numbers in terms of the nontraditional showed that they were living not in group homes but by themselves.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay, but they are still living in the community. Right.

In the current plan -- and elsewhere I have written down what the number was -- you talked about some enhancements for the off campus program, but no specifics were given. Can you cite one or two or three things that you are going to do to enhance the plan that enhance the off campus program?

MS. LORD: I'd be happy to talk about that. There are a number of things that we're going to do next year.

As you know well, we have a discipline review committee that meets every year to review and assess our disciplinary processes. One of the decisions that they have made this year and submitted to the Dean for his approval is that there be complete parity between on and off campus sanctions. That was

not the case in the past, and a couple of other things having to do with alcohol regulations, that sort of thing.

All of this has gone to the Dean right now. He's looking at it, and it's dependent on his approval.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. Can you share with us, and is it appropriate, what are some of the possible sanctions?

MS. LORD: Well, the same sanctions that exist on campus right now.

MS. SCOLARO: I don't know what they are.

MS. LORD: Okay. They run the gamut. There's a range between community service, fine to suspension or expulsion from the University.

MS. SCOLARO: All right. I have one final question, and this is for Ms. Greenan.

In your view, does the community have an obligation to accept a certain amount of disruption from the University operations for students in the neighborhood?

MS. DWYER: I would object. That assumes that there is disruption. Enough said.

MS. LORD: Let me respond, though, to your first question. Since January 11 there have been seven meetings, seven community working group meetings.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right, thank you. The last cross-examiner.

MS. HARDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. My name is Bonnie Hardy. I'm with the Burleith Citizens Association, and I'm sorry, I was out of the room for a few moments there running down the halls. So if I repeat myself, just quickly tell me, and I'll withdraw the question.

MS. DWYER: I'm sorry. Which association are you representing?

MS. HARDY: Burleith Citizens Association.

MS. DWYER: We just got the cross-examination from Burleith.

MS. HARDY: Right, but Pat is President, and I'm past President. We're both members of the board.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, there's one representative from an association to give cross-examination.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes, that is correct. That is correct.

MS. SCOLARO: Our party status listed the entire board of directors.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Ms. Scolaro, you are pretty much familiar with our process here and, as you know, we accept generally one --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Party status was given to Burleith Citizens Association, and I asked for the representative, and each of these associations proffered there was a representative. Now we did not grant party status to several

members of any organization.

MS. HARDY: Madam Chair, we just found it easier just to try to divvy up some of this. Some of the issues I feel more comfortable. Some of the issues Pat feels more comfortable with. We were just trying to spread this out amongst a couple of us.

CHAIRPERSON REID: I can understand what your intent was. Nonetheless, we already had a problem with having so many people getting party status. Now if you then start taking party status as an organization having several people in the organization cross-examine, that's just not acceptable.

MS. SCOLARO: But the question -- Excuse me. The question is being directed to --

MS. PRUITT: Excuse me, ma'am. You're not on the record if you're not on the mike.

MS. HARDY: Would it be proper if Ms. Scolaro comes back and asks these questions, if she can read my writing?

CHAIRPERSON REID: How many questions do you have?

MS. HARDY: About three or four.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right, yes. Let her do it. We want one representative from each organization, because once you open that door, then you're going to have other people from other organizations saying, well, you let two people from one -- You know how it goes, on and on and on ad infinitum.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Madam Chair, would you

--

CHAIRPERSON REID: Let's just put a pin in that at this point and let one person from each organization do the cross-examination.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. These are addressed to Jeanne Lord. How long have you been with the University, and how long have you been --

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right now. That question was already asked.

MS. SCOLARO; No, I asked her --

CHAIRPERSON REID: That was the first question that was asked by the last person from the organization. So make sure that these three or four questions are not redundant of the questions that have already been asked. All right? Go ahead.

MS. SCOLARO: Okay. Jeanne, when were you promoted to Assistant Dean?

MS. LORD: A year ago.

MS. SCOLARO: So that was in --

MS. LORD: 1999.

MS. SCOLARO: 1999? At that time -- Prior to that, you had been -- you headed up the Office of Off Campus Affairs. Correct?

MS. LORD: That's right.

MS. SCOLARO: When you became Assistant Dean, how did your duties change?

MS. LORD: I retained the duties that I had previously, and assumed a couple of new duties.

MS. SCOLARO: A couple new duties? What about your staff? Did your staff grow at that point, and could you describe the staff that you have and that you work with currently?

MS. LORD: Yes. As a matter of fact, I can. I have a part-time assistant, and this is a graduate student who works 20 to 30 hours a week. In addition to that, I have a number of work-study students who supplement what she does. And, of course, the hotline staff which consists of 11 people.

MS. SCOLARO: But your office staff in addition to yourself, approximately how many hours -- how many full tim equivalents do you have?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I would object. I'm not sure what relevance this has to the campus plan hearing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, where are you going with this line? Are you leading up to something? Just ask the question.

MS. SCOLARO: Well, our concern is the staffing that is going to be able to handle the Office of Off Campus Affairs with Ms. Lord's appointment, her promotion, the University's strong, strong commitment that there is nothing wrong in the communities, that everything is fine, and yet they have an Office of Off Campus Affairs who is responsible for the six surrounding communities and some of the problems they face.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What's your question?

MS. SCOLARO: How much attention are they going to be able to give to all of the 90 phone calls that come in and the student sanctions and things of this sort. Will they have the staffing?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Exactly. Do you have sufficient staff to fulfill --

MS. SCOLARO: Their commitment that they put forth in the plan.

MS. LORD: I would say that our commitment and the time that we devote to the community have not wavered and have not diminished. But I also think it's important to remember what you've heard in previous testimony from other people, which is that the University is experiencing financial constraints right now, but our commitment has not wavered at all.

MS. SCOLARO: So there is no increase in budget for the next year, I would presume. You are not going to get any additional staffing. I hear a head back there shaking, no.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, if the question could be rephrased to ask Ms. Lord whether she feels she has sufficient staff and budget to handle the office and respond to the community.

MS. SCOLARO: She asked the question. Jeanne, why don't you respond to it?

MS. LORD: And I think the answer to that is, yes,

I do. I think that there is not a person on the face of this earth who wouldn't prefer to have more money and more staff, but I do think that at this moment we are adequately staffed to --

MS. SCOLARO: Well said. Well spoken. I'll leave it at that. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Madam Chair, I have just one brief question for Ms. Lord before the panel departs.

When the hotline is not in operation, is there a recorded announcement? Is there a voice mail that is received?

MS. LORD: Yes, Mr. Franklin, there is. At this point I have given my direct line to any number of people, and the number of my assistant as well.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Ms. Pruitt, how long did it take for that cross-examination, approximately?

MS. PRUITT: An hour and we have two more panels. No, we have one more panel.

CHAIRPERSON REID: This is five, and then -- It's nine, and we have four together. All right. Then let us take a ten-minute break, recess, and then resume in ten minutes and try to conclude -- at least conclude the cross-examination for the applicant before we adjourn here today. At least, let's get through that. Then we can start with the Office of Planning reports and all of that for the next time.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 3:48 p.m. and went back on the record at 4:05 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON REID: We will now continue the afternoon session.

MS. DWYER: We are ready for questions. This is the final panel.

CHAIRPERSON REID: This is the final panel. Board members, questions? Mr. Franklin?

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Mr. Slade, I know there was some dialogue regarding the parking for the performing arts center earlier. Could you describe with greater particularity how the parking management plan addresses the parking for events at the new sports facility and the performing arts center, which I assume will, from time to time, attract traffic from outside the University community?

MR. SLADE: Yes, Mr. Franklin. The simple answer is that events which will attract from the outside community and, therefore, automobiles are scheduled to occur either weekday evenings after the peak period when there is abundant parking on the campus or on weekends.

So there's always adequate parking available. The longer answer is we looked at last year's calendar, at all events -- and I can't remember how many there were, but it was an amazingly high number, 150 events, sports events, performance events and other gatherings that occur on the campus.

I think we only found one event -- that was a men's soccer game that is scheduled each year on a weekday afternoon -- that could cause a problem. I should mention that this was not only looking at the data but also talking to the Athletic Department and the Drama Department and so forth.

That particular game draws 500 people. No matter how many seats we have, there's plenty of capacity in terms of seating capacity, and it doesn't draw any people outside of the campus or those players who are coming for that game. If that game were more popular and drew people from the community or from the other university, it would simply be moved to a time when there was adequate parking.

So the plan basically -- The management plan basically is to schedule things so that they occur at a time when there is plenty of parking on campus.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: So the representation you are making is that events would not be scheduled at a time when there was inadequate parking for those likely to attend?

MR. SLADE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Okay. With respect to the -- should I refer to it as the GUTS program? Is that the way it's referred to, that particular acronym? -- we've already been told that there will be an expansion of hours of operation, an addition to the fleet of vehicles, and the vehicles will be smaller, as I recall.

Will there be a change in routes contemplated?

MS. FRANK: The routes that we currently have will be continued, and the additional routes added would be to service the satellite parking facilities.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: And at what frequency in terms of intervals?

MS. FRANK: During the peak periods we are anticipating the buses running every ten to 15 minutes.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Now who has access to that transportation service? Do they have to show a student or faculty ID to get on the bus?

MS. FRANK: The service is available to those people who have some affiliation, whose destination is Georgetown University. So if it's a student, a staff member or a faculty member, they would show an ID card, and if it were a hospital patient, for instance, we basically would believe them. If we ask for their destination and they tell us the medical center, we would not exclude them.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: And no fare is charged. Is that correct?

MS. FRANK: Currently, there is no fare charged.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Is there anticipation to charge a fare?

MS. FRANK: We charged a fare some years ago, and we discontinued, because we wanted to be sure that the service

would be utilized.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Do you have any estimate of the increase in number of passenger trips that will result from these changes? Ballpark?

MS. FRANK: I don't remember. We did calculate it.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Is it substantial?

MS. FRANK: Well, if we have been traveling every 20 minutes and now we do every ten or 15 minutes, there would be that difference in the amount of travel. During the off-peak hours, we would maintain the 20 minute schedule. So it would be during the peak hours that we would get one or two extra trips per hour.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: And how is the route and schedule publicized?

MS. FRANK: It is part of our campus directory. It is on fliers that are posted in the student center. It is on materials that are located in the transportation office, and this year we will be holding a fair that will give people information at that time as well.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Thank you. Mr. Green, just one question having to do with the helipad.

You indicated there would be, in your estimate, 12 trips per week.

MR. GREEN: Week. And, Mr. Franklin, that is from the normal traffic there now, which has been approximately eight

per week for some period of time.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: And could you describe who uses that helicopter service?

MR. GREEN: I can get that for you.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: I mean, is it used for people arriving at the emergency room?

MR. GREEN: For the most part. They are trauma patients.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Is it ever used by people who are not patients?

MR. GREEN: Not that I'm aware of. In our organization we have not used it for that purpose.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: I see. Would it be in any event usable by others who are just using it as a convenience to get to the north campus?

MR. GREEN: Oh, no.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: So it's confined to medical emergencies?

MR. GREEN: That is correct, medical transport.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I have just a couple of questions. Mr. Green, this question is directed to you.

The 12 weekly trips -- that's take-offs and landings? That's round trips?

MR. GREEN: Yes, that's a round trip.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. So that's 24 total take-offs and landings versus, you said, eight now?

MR. GREEN: Right. But that's --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Sixteen take-offs and landings. The pad that's to be used is an existing helipad?

MR. GREEN: That's correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. So there's no new construction?

MR. GREEN: No.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: And that's designed to meet the requirements of FAA Circular Number whatever-it-is?

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. Where will the -- - Where are the craft or is the craft currently kept, stored? Is it stored on the pad at the facility or is it stored elsewhere?

MS. PRUITT: Ma'am, you have to speak -- You can speak on the mike.

MR. GREEN: This is Dr. Joy Drass who is going to be the President of the medical center.

DR. DRASS: The hospital. Georgetown University currently, to my knowledge, does not own a helicopter of its own vehicle, and we would anticipate that these would be helicopters from other services that would land, drop a patient off, and then go back to their home base, whatever that home base might be.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. And the craft

are not fueled at the University either?

MR. GREEN: No.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. And the craft that are currently using this facility would not be replaced with larger or generally different craft?

DR. DRASS: The answer to the question is they would be crafts that would be appropriate to their medical use for patient transportation. By definition, that would be dependent upon the type of patient being transported.

Some craft currently in use in the metropolitan area are larger than others, but we would anticipate that --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: That's true.

DR. DRASS: -- they would be whatever the state of the art technology would be for patient transport and how it would evolve over this ten-year period of time.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: All right, because there are a variety of different craft from a variety of different manufacturers, from small Bell craft to larger Sikorskis or we can name models, in fact.

DR. DRASS: That's right.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: But there are also those that are turbo prop versus others, and the noise factors presented by various craft increase or decrease based upon what powers them, the number of rotors, etcetera. One of the issues that the community would certainly have would be the noise factor.

DR. DRASS: I would say that the current--

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Probably the principal issue would be the noise factor.

DR. DRASS: I would say that in medical transport generally, the smallest and most fuel efficient that will meet the patient needs would be the craft that would be utilized, for all of the usual safety and financial reasons.

I would not see this helipad landing, say, the Sikorski that you mentioned, which is sort of the larger size utilized by the military. We're talking about helicopters that can transport one patient, two at the most.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Is there any buffering designed in the helipad at this time for idling craft, craft that are powering up prior to take-off?

DR. DRASS: I don't know the answer to that question. We can get the answer for you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: That would be important to know, or if anything is planned. And have there been, to your knowledge, Mr. Green, any complaints from the community about helicopter noise?

MR. GREEN: To be very honest with you, I'm surprised that this has become an issue, because at several of the community meetings several of the residents did not know that it was there.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. That's great.

MR. GREEN: And it has become an issue and has been raised by certain community representatives, but several representatives were unaware of the flights.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay. Well, that's interesting. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Yes. I have questions for Mr. Green also, but first I'd like to know if Dr. Joy -- and I did not get your last name.

MR. GREEN: Drass, D-r-a-s-s, Dr. Joy Drass.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. If Dr. Drass had been sworn in?

MR. GREEN: Yes, and cards -- they filled out cards.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Very good. Thank you.

MR. GREEN: Members of our team all filled out cards.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All raised the hand?

MR. GREEN: In the event that there were questions that were broad, both clinical or regulatory, those people were sworn in.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. I'd like to know who is MedStar's president for health, if you are the Senior Vice President for MedStar Health.

MR. GREEN: John P. McDaniel.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: John P. McDaniel. All

right. Is Mr. McDaniel, as President, ultimately responsible for all the negotiation and anything having to do with MedStar? What I'm getting at is Mr. McDaniel -- should he be the one to be testifying today on behalf of MedStar?

MR. GREEN: Well, I'm certainly delegated the authority to represent the organization.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: You have been delegated?

MR. GREEN: By the President and the board, and I have consistently appeared before the State Health Planning and Development Agency, the City Council, the Zoning Commission, and the BZA to represent our organization, and I can speak for the organization.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right, thank you. I wanted to clarify that, because it was not clear.

Would you give us some information as to the board set-up? In other words, you have authority from the board to speak on behalf of MedStar.

MR. GREEN: The Chief Executive and the board.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Chief Executive and the board, and the board is comprised of how many individuals, please?

MR. GREEN: The MedStar board is comprised of 19 individuals.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: And would you supply the BZA with a listing of those individuals, please, and of course, information about Mr. McDaniel as President and CEO?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Excuse me a second. Ms. Renshaw, what is all this necessary for? We're not asking for the hospital to give all of its information.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: This is -- No, but the hospital -- The Medstar is part of this campus plan, and I'm just getting some information for the record.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: But we would need all that from the hospital and from the University and from everyone else. We're not asking for that. I think it's unfair.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: And it is just a matter, Mr. Sockwell -- Mr. Sockwell, it is not unfair. It's on the record, and all Mr. Green has to do is supply the information, and it's listed. So it's just a Xerox. That's all.

Are the number of beds staying the same for the hospital? Do you plan to increase, thus increasing more traffic to the hospital?

MR. GREEN: We do not plan to increase the licensed capacity of the hospital.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: And the licensed capacity is 535 beds?

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. Do you plan to increase the number of employees to the hospital, and how many employees at the present time?

MR. GREEN: It is conceivable that we will increase

the number of employees consistent with the increase in in-patient admissions. As I said in my earlier testimony, we hope to increase admissions to approximately 18,000 admissions over the next two to three-year period.

The University will admit approximately -- We'll have about 13,000 admissions this fiscal year. So we anticipate an increase of about 5,000, and there will be a concomitant increase in the employee workforce over that period of time.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: And the employee workforce right now is?

MR. GREEN: For the hospital, 2600. Is that right? I believe it's 2600 today in terms of the FTE number, but we will give you specifics. We can pull them for you.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Would you. As you take the number of 2600 employees today to 2010, would you also give some indication as to whether or not you are going to be able to accommodate those employees in the parking arrangements of the hospital. In other words, to keep the cars off the street.

MR. GREEN: We will give you --

MS. DWYER: Ms. Renshaw, that has already been addressed. The traffic consultant's report includes the employee projections for the medical portion of the campus, as well as the academic portion. So all of those numbers are in the traffic report, and the traffic consultant can testify to those. They are already in the record and in the report.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. And perhaps Mr. Slade then would just key in for us exactly where this information is in this voluminous amount of material that we have before us.

Before Mr. Green leaves the microphone, so to speak, and we get to Mr. Slade, I'd like to go back to the helicopter trips. Am I right in saying that you really cannot promise the number of helicopter trips to and from the hospital?

MR. GREEN: I cannot nor would I, because we are a medical facility, and we would certainly not put ourselves in the position of denying a patient access to the hospital who has a life threatening condition.

So what I'm giving you is our projection based on historical experience of the hospital, and that's the best I can do.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: But the question is really for the community, because whereas they are going into mediation and they are getting some understanding of the new arrangement of the hospital, we -- you cannot promise them that the cutoff is 12, because being a medical emergency facility, you have to accept anyone, and we are not even looking at catastrophic disasters that could happen in the nation's capital and, of course, that would open up your facility --

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: -- to a great deal more, shall we say, trips back and forth to the hospital.

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

MS. DWYER: I would submit that that is for the community, because the whole purpose of the helipad is to allow the community, in the event of a catastrophic situation like that, to have access to medical care.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Indeed. But I just -- Again, we are looking at the impact on the community. So it's just necessary to make sure that there is an understanding that there is no brackets around the number of helicopter trips to and from.

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. And, Mr. Slade, could you just pinpoint for us the information on parking, please?

MR. SLADE: Ms. Renshaw, our traffic study is one of the tabs in your binder, of course, and it is Exhibit 27. I think there are three tables that speak directly to the questions you were asking about people and parking spaces. They are Tables 7, 8 and 9, page 26, 26 and 29. I'm sorry, I've got to correct myself. Must be Table 6, 8 and 9.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Table 6, 8 and 9, pages 26, 28, 29?

MR. SLADE: Yes. Table 6 is on page 20, sorry. Table 6 on page 20, Table 8 on page 28, and Table 9 on page 29. If you like, I'll just give you a brief description of each of these.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Go aheads.

MR. SLADE: Table 6 summarizes on-campus population projections for the main campus or the academic University campus, the undergraduates and graduate students. Then the bottom part of that table is the north campus, the hospital and clinical facilities and so forth.

It shows existing and future estimates of populations, and then a growth percentage for each of those. So I think that was the first part of your question.

Then when I go to page 28, this is the allocation of parking spaces north and south of the gates that bifurcate the campus. Along the top of the chart it says north campus, and then south campus. That means north of those gates and south of those gates. Then there's a total for the entire campus, and the bottom righthand corner is that 4080 cap.

Let me just stop there for a second to point out that at the present time under the existing total spaces, it says 4029. That's at this moment the University is not using its entire cap, the difference there being about 51 spaces. But those numbers do go to the cap for a 2002 estimate and a 2010 estimate.

Then the horizontal divisions in the chart show the allocation of spaces for the hospital and clinical center versus the academic campus today and out into the future.

Then Table 9 tries to reconcile those first two tables and show how this all comes together. Again, the top is

the academic campus, and the bottom is the hospital clinical center portion of the campus, and then the columns, of course, are different years, existing conditions and out into the year 2010, the ten-year plan.

These are our estimates of parking requirements for each of those categories of users, faculty and staff, undergraduate students and so forth on the academic campus, and then in this lower half faculty, physicians, physician's office building, physicians and staff, hospital visitors and patient visitors and so forth, showing our estimates of parking demand by each of those categories.

So that's -- I wish it were a small little table with just a few numbers, but unfortunately, it's a big campus with a lot of activities.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Well, it's helpful to have you clarify it. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you, Ms. Renshaw. Let's see. I had a few questions for Mr. Bolan, Lewis Bolan, in regard to -- You testified in regard to the impact on really when the students are moved from Burleith back to campus, and I think you testified that there would be 500-some houses that would be affected.

My question is: These houses are going to be vacated. Is this going to be a phasing type of thing? Over what period of time?

MR. BOLAN: Yes, you are correct. That will be phased over time. As best as we can estimate right now, that would be over a minimum of several years. I believe the number -- There are right now 90 group homes in Burleith, and we classify for purposes of definition, occupied by two or more people. In other words, there are a number of single student households.

CHAIRPERSON REID: I'm sorry. Ninety homes, 500 students?

MR. BOLAN: There would be a little under 500 students. There would be a total of, we estimate, 680 students would come from Burleith and West Georgetown combined and would move into the new residence hall. Of those, 680 students would move into the new facility.

We estimate that slightly more than half of those would come from Burleith and about 40 to 45 percent from West Georgetown. So in round numbers, somewhere between 300 and 350 students would be moving from Burleith into the new residence hall, and there are a total of 90 group homes right now in Burleith. We define that as having two or more students.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. And you're anticipating that all of those homes are going to be sold, on the market, once the students move out?

MR. BOLAN: We are assuming that 75 to 80 percent of those units will be sold as the students move out. It will not --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Why?

MR. BOLAN: -- be sold at one time. It will be sold for a very simple reason. The economics will no longer work. Right now those units would require, I testified this morning, $20-40,000 per dwelling unit to bring them up to the standards that would be necessary, because you can no longer rent them for student housing. You now got to be renting them in the normal residential market to typical people who rent houses.

We think that they are going to need at least $20-40,000 per dwelling unit, and that the rents would actually decline, odd as that may seem, from where they are right now; because when you have three or four or five or even six students, in some cases, occupying a single home, they are paying quite a substantial rent in total to the landlord.

If you were to rent that house as a single family house, it would not warrant that kind of rent, even with modernization. So essentially, landlords would be faced with a situation where they would have to spend $20-40,000, and in return they would get approximately 20 percent less rent than they are getting at the present time.

So there's very little economic incentive.

CHAIRPERSON REID: I heard you say that, but my question then becomes: With the projected increase in housing value in Burleith over that period of time, wouldn't that offset the additional -- Wouldn't that offset the loss that you're

proposing in the rental income? And would it also not -- the increased value in the properties would then justify a higher rental income, wouldn't it?

MR. BOLAN: Well, we don't think so. We think it's quite the reverse, that that higher value is going to -- and the strong housing market is going to encourage present landlords to sell to take advantage of those very high sale prices that can be achieved, and it makes much more sense as a rational economic decision for them to do that rather than, say, to invest $20-40,000 only to get less rent than they are getting right now.

So it's an odd situation.

CHAIRPERSON REID: It is, and this type of situation would -- It would depend on a lot of different factors. One is what about the faculty and staff at Georgetown then occupying some of these houses, because 92 houses seems to me to be quite a few houses to come on the market?

Now I would also think that, even though you are projecting that some of them would be sold, I don't think that all of them would be sold.

MR. BOLAN: No, we don't think all of them would be sold either. We think about three-quarters of them would be sold. Our best estimate is that 70-75 of those units would be sold, and they would not all be sold all of a sudden on one day, but they would be phased in over a period of a year or two or three, depending upon the strength of the housing market.

We think that a number of those buyers are very likely to be Georgetown faculty and senior staff.

CHAIRPERSON REID: To your knowledge, is there any incentive for the Georgetown senior staff and faculty to purchase those homes?

MR. BOLAN: Well, certainly, there is the advantage of just the proximity to work and living in a very desirable and a very attractive community.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, that's a given. But I mean over and above --

MR. BOLAN: But over and above that, I'm not aware of any incentives that the University itself offers other than just the desire -- the attractiveness of the community.

CHAIRPERSON REID: That is, of course, assuming that we're going to continue to have a brisk housing market. Now if it starts to reverse, starts to decline, then the other side of it is that you are going to have these houses that are going to be on the market. That might have an impact -- That could possibly have an impact on the housing values in Burleith.

MR. BOLAN: That's a possibility, but we don't think that that's likely, simply because desirable and strong communities such as Burleith and West Georgetown both are the ones that hold up best. So that even if we were to have an economic setback at some years in the future, it's strong, stable communities like Burleith that always do the best.

CHAIRPERSON REID: So you are anticipating that over time, over the next, let's just say, ten years that those 92 houses will be absorbed in the marketplace without any appreciable depreciation in value or cause any appreciable depreciation in value for the surrounding community.

MR. BOLAN: Absolutely. Not only will they not depreciate in value. We think the reverse is likely to happen, that they are more likely to appreciate in value, because all of a sudden you're going to have an even higher concentration of owner occupied housing units, which makes a community more desirable. We think the impact of that is likely to be an increase in housing values, not a decrease in housing values.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, yes, you had said that you anticipate that the housing values would go up 14 percent in the next year, and you are saying that you anticipate or you think that that would be the trend over the next few years?

MR. BOLAN: Well, I wish I could say that values were going to increase that much. Clearly, the past year or two have been particularly healthy years for the Washington, D.C. housing market. Whether they will continue to be that strong in the years to come is, frankly, anyone's guess. But a stable, desirable community like a Burleith or a West Georgetown will always do well.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Just a question about the

figure 20-40,000. Where did that figure come from?

MR. BOLAN: That was an estimate that we provided based on our own surveys. We did an inspection of a random sampling of student occupied housing units, and we looked at those units ourselves, and my staff and I made those estimates.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: And it could be the case that grad students could move into those houses?

MR. BOLAN: It's technically possible, but we think that's not likely, because grad students don't have nearly as much money as undergraduate students who are usually still supported by their parents. So they are really relying on their parents' income.

The graduate students, however, are usually not in such a fortunate case, and they are often on their own, and they are quite a bit older. My understanding is that the average age of a graduate student is approaching 30 years, and so we think that a fair number of them are married, although we don't have the precise number on that, which again would suggest that their incomes are not going to allow them the luxury of either renting or buying. So we don't think that they really represent a prime candidate for the Burleith housing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: So you're saying that you anticipate that the rental market in Burleith as far as student housing is concerned will just completely dry up?

MR. BOLAN: We think it's going to largely dry up,

and is unlikely to return; because the economics are such that it will no longer warrant it.

COMMISSIONER FRANKLIN: I can think of some graduate students still supported by their parents.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Mr. Franklin, I was going to say the same thing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right then. Mr. Crockett, would you like to lead off again? No? This is the section for cross-examination, just for the record.

MR. BRAUN: My name is Charles Braun with the Hillendale Homeowners Association. My first questions are for Mr. Green.

Following up on the helicopter pad, do I take it that the flight path of the helicopters can't be limited, because of patient need?

MR. GREEN; That is my sense at the moment. Now we have not looked into that carefully, and I certainly would be willing to do that. But we think that that's governed by FAA in terms of the flight patterns, and that the helicopters do utilize those patterns.

Now whether or not there is the ability to deviate any from that, I'm not sure.

MR. BRAUN: If there's a possibility that there is further information, would that be developed before the next hearing?

MR. GREEN: We can certainly look into it.

MR. BRAUN: Would you be willing to submit it for the record in advance of the next hearing so that we can read it before we get here?

MR. GREEN: Absolutely.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you very much.

MR. GREEN: Tell me specifically, Mr. Braun, what you would like.

MR. BRAUN: Well, we're looking for -- I mean, am I allowed to answer that? He's asking me questions, and I heard you ruling people out of order for --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, can you do that after --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: May I suggest that the path of a helicopter is based upon the clear flight path at a certain angle from the point of departure. I just happen to be involved with one heliport, the only public use heliport in D.C.

So it's something that would not necessarily be subject to change, depending upon the location of the pad, the obstacles within the certain flight path. So the craft have to take off in certain directions, and those things are not subject to change. Helicopters don't take off vertically.

MR. BRAUN: So it's really -- He can't really produce any further information.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: He can produce information as to the existing situation, but he may not be able

to produce information that would be subject to change.

MR. BRAUN: Okay. And I take it also -- Let me try to move on. And I take it also that the time of day is also dependent on patient need as well.

MR. GREEN: That's correct.

MR. BRAUN: So would it be fair to say that MedStar needs unlimited helicopter usage in a residential neighborhood?

MR. GREEN: No, I don't think that would be fair. I think -- No, I don't think that would be fair. MedStar doesn't need unlimited helicopter usage. We are responding to community need for helicopter usage, and we will take care of the patients that are brought to us. We are not out promoting helicopter transport.

MR. BRAUN: Is helicopter usage associated with certain types of medical care?

MR. GREEN: Yes. I would --

MR. BRAUN: Is it associated with trauma center care?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: And is it associated with transplants?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: And could it be associated -- Are there practices of medicine with which it's not associated very strongly?

MR. GREEN: Routine, secondary care, it would not be associated with, and it would also be associated in some instances with cardiac care.

MR. BRAUN: Now is it completely out of your control how much the medical center goes into one branch of medicine or another?

MR. GREEN: No, it's not completely out of our control, but we have certainly made the decision that the hospital -- we will continue its tertiary orientation. We have testified both before the community and here that our emphasis will be on specialty care, that physician's office building that we plan to construct will house 80 specialists.

So the orientation will continue of a specialist hospital, a tertiary, regional center.

MR. BRAUN: Concerning the 80 specialists and the 250 support staff in the building, can MedStar live with a Board order that limits the use of that building to 80 physicians and 250 support staff?

MR. GREEN: No. We would prefer not being placed in that position. As you well know, Mr. Braun, and Father O'Donovan testified this morning, the University experienced significant losses over the last four years.

We are interested in this relationship because of our commitment to the District of Columbia and our commitment to Georgetown University to try and restore profitability to the

institution and to continue it as a fine medical center.

We do not want to be hampered in pursuit of that goal by virtue of restrictions that will prevent us from achieving that goal.

MR. BRAUN: So it would be fair to say that, although the 80 doctors and the 250 support staff are your projection, that you would not want to be limited to that if you could -- if it might otherwise be desirable to have more doctors and more support staff in that building.

MR. GREEN: Well, we are constrained in some ways by virtue of the size of the institution, and we've committed to not increasing the overall licensed capacity. So we are constrained, but the practice of medicine is changing very rapidly. It is very difficult to project eight, ten years out what will happen, where the practice of medicine will be.

We certainly don't want to be in a position of saying something today and coming back five years from now and, because conditions have changed, being accused of not being forthright.

So what we would prefer to do is to say this is what we plan today, and give us some flexibility in the future. There are plenty of opportunities to control us going forward. For new services we have to get a certificate of need.

For other changes we would have to come back to this body, and we plan to have an ongoing working relationship

with you, and I doubt seriously if we would, under the most extreme circumstances, come forward with something that the community was very, very much opposed to.

MR. BRAUN: The limitations and the license that you refer to -- aren't those the limits in the hospital license for the certificate of need, and aren't they limits that would not apply to the physician's -- the new physician's office building that's proposed?

MR. GREEN: That's correct.

MR. BRAUN: So is there any numerical limit that you could agree to on the number of physicians or the number of support staff in that physician's office building or are there no limits, because of the need for flexibility?

MR. GREEN: We would have to think about that. We would have to think about that. I'm not prepared today to reject the idea, but I would want to spend some time with our people thinking about it.

MR. BRAUN: And if you had further thoughts, could you get them in, in writing, into the record and with copies to us before the next hearing?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, if I could just say, the physician's office building is going to be the subject of a second stage of further processing. So a lot of those details would be addressed in that second case and not in the more conceptual campus plan.

So in terms of the number of physicians and the use of that facility, I think those might be more appropriate during the further processing case than at this hearing.

MR. BRAUN: I don't agree with that suggestion, but I'll just continue. I'd like to turn my attention to Mr. Slade.

Mr. Slade, did you assume in your traffic review that the number of physicians and the number of support staff in the new office building would be limited to 80 and 250, as MedStar had projected?

MR. SLADE: We assume that in the year 2010 it would be 80 and -- I thought the number was not 250 but --

MR. BRAUN: 240 maybe.

MR. SLADE: -- 240. Yes.

MR. BRAUN: It's bounced around.

MR. SLADE: That's the assumption we made.

MR. BRAUN: And so if, in fact, you just heard Mr. Green testify that they need the flexibility to have more physicians and more support staff. Wouldn't that alter the results of your projections in terms of traffic?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, if I can just say again, in the further processing case if there are additional numbers that are going to be associated with this building, the University would have to make a case at that time that those additional numbers would not have any objectionable impact.

MR. BRAUN: May I be heard? I mean, this is a

matter -- This is the plan, and this is where we have the chance to question the overall plan.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes and no. Yes, in that there is a plan, and then there is a further processing plan.

MR. BRAUN: I understand that.

CHAIRPERSON REID: And at this particular hearing, we are looking at the campus plan. So questions that are germane to the campus plan can be addressed here. However, those that are germane to the further processing plan would be better asked at that time.

MR. BRAUN: Yes, but in this case we're dealing with an issue that actually affects the accuracy of the traffic report that's part of the plan application.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, the traffic report is reflective of this campus plan, and then the further processing -- there will be a further traffic plan.

MR. BRAUN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Now I think that what Ms. Dwyer is saying is that they don't have sufficient information here before them today to be able to respond to your question adequately.

MR. BRAUN: If they don't have the answer, then the answer is they don't have the answer, and they don't know. That's fine. That's the messy answer.

MS. DWYER: Can I qualify that? What we have said

-- The campus plan is based on projections, as are all campus plans, and the projection today is that there will be 80 physicians and 240 staff. If in five years or two years when the actual building is constructed there is a difference, it will be addressed at that time. But the best knowledge we have today -- and this is a forward looking, ten-year document -- is that number, but it can't be conditioned or restricted, because we don't know until we actually build the building, just like with the Southwest Quad.

It was 500 in the last plan, and it ended up being 780.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, the answer -- What she said would be acceptable to him is that you really don't know.

MS. DWYER: We do know, based on -- I don't want to leave the assumption that we don't know. Based on the projections and information today --

CHAIRPERSON REID: I thought you just said that you don't know what it will be in five years.

MS. DWYER: We are projecting today what it will be in five years. In five years the either building-specific design may indicate a different number of physicians or staff. It may mean that physicians and staff in other areas of the campus are lessened and, therefore, more can be accommodated in this area.

All I'm saying is that the projections that we've made today include total projections for everyone on campus with

our best estimate of what's going to happen in this building. But the actual specifics would have to wait until the actual building is designed.

CHAIRPERSON REID: But doesn't that say that you don't know?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I think what it says, Madam Chair --

CHAIRPERSON REID: That's -- Go ahead.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Well, I think what it says is that, lacking even a schematic plan of buildings, these studies have been more massing studies, volumetric studies, and generalized accommodation of employees and staff, and maybe the parking areas are a little bit more defined, because you can actually easily postulate a number of spaces.

Their numbers are the numbers that are relevant to proposing a plan for a ten-year period but are not so specific that they could actually be quantified as final numbers. And I don't think there's a problem with that.

I think that it is probably the best one can expect when one hasn't designed a building even to the level of schematic detail.

CHAIRPERSON REID: So what you're saying is that those would be projected numbers, and leave it at that.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: They're good numbers for the day, and when they come back with the further processing,

they will have better numbers, because those numbers will be based on a specific location, a specific design, and will warrant a specific approval.

CHAIRPERSON REID: And today the only thing they can do is to project.

MS. DWYER: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON REID: That's it.

MR. BRAUN: That's true, but the Board has to assess the impact of what they are projecting.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Correct.

MR. BRAUN: And you take into account what the limits are also to get the outer range of what's within the scope of what they are planning and projecting. I think there's a difference in terms of potential neighborhood impact in whether they are planning a building which is definitely limited to a certain number of staff people and a building that could have twice as many staff people if circumstances change, because that's going to generate more traffic.

Something is going to slip through the cracks here if this kind of objection is sustained, because on the one hand, we've got a traffic report that's projecting a neighborhood impact based on these projections; but then the witness who knows how the building is actually going to be used says, well, actually there's a lot more flexibility that we need on this building in terms of its capacity and how many people will be using it.

That would affect, I think -- I don't want to testify on cross-examination, but that would affect whether the projections take into account all the possibilities that they want to reserve for planning purposes.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, if I can just say, the purpose of the campus plan is to project, and all we can do today is do projections. The University has projected the total number of employees that are going to be on the campus, and of that number the projection is there would be 80 physicians and the 240 staff in this building.

It may be that, as I said, there are 85 physicians and 200 staff. Those specifics will be the further processing, but the overall number is the projection of what is going to happen on this campus. And I would just point out that the last time when we were here for a campus plan, which was 1990, the University projected having 7500 staff and faculty on its campus.

In the last ten years that number has gone down. They are down to 6750. So the projections may operate the other way and be favorable. All we can do today is say, on the basis of what we know and the business plan for the hospital, the business plan for the University, their academic needs, these are what we project our numbers to be in the future.

The courts have said that even if you approve, as campus plans are, the conceptual plan and say based on these

numbers no objectionable impact, for each further processing you get the chance a second time to look at that and say does this specific building have that impact. That is when these specific issues are addressed.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I think one thing that might be a little different here is that, because you have MedStar as a co-partner in this relationship, there is a more specific connection between the use and the user; whereas, normally the University is just speaking in its generalized land use plans.

You wouldn't have the MedStar person here where that facility is sort of a more real item. Even though it's not on the table, the community representative is looking for numbers that would not normally even be available, because you wouldn't have the MedStar person here. That building would be just another mass. It wouldn't have an operator.

In this case you actually have an operator whose interests are being conveyed here, and I think that's the difference. If you didn't have Mr. Green to interview, you wouldn't have those questions answered. You wouldn't have the questions raised, but because he's here the question comes up, more so than it would if you just had a generic situation, because you're not asking about the gym.

You're not asking about any other building on the campus except that one. You have limited your question to the one that you have a specific person to address it to.

MR. BRAUN: It's not just a matter of having a specific person to address it to. In order to assess the traffic impacts, we need to know what the building is and how it's going to be used.

We have a building which is -- We've submitted our own traffic consultant's report on the record, and in the record you will see that he indicates that such a building of such a size could be used for many more physicians.

They have trip generation ratios, and there are ways of projecting what the worst case might be, and this is a building where the number that is projected is considerably smaller than the way the building could actually be used, and the traffic -- We're not talking also about a difference of plus or minus five or ten doctors or a small percentage of the whole, but we're talking about a considerably larger impact like double.

So the concern is how is this going to affect this. That's what this hearing is about, and we're asking the questions not because MedStar is here but because the assumptions that were generated, whether by MedStar or the University or whatever, are in the traffic report purporting to assess the impact on us.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, when it's your turn to testify, you can make that -- you can argue that.

MR. BRAUN: I was just defending myself from the objection to my line of questioning.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Right. But at --

MR. BRAUN: I didn't want to testify today. I didn't plan to.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Oh, you're not going to testify in opposition?

MR. BRAUN: I didn't plan to testify today. I thought that was reserved for the next hearing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No, no, not today. I wasn't saying today. What I'm saying is that you proffered your question, and you've gotten an answer. It may not be the answer that you want. Nonetheless, it's an answer.

When it's time for the opposition to put on their case, at that juncture you can then argue or make a case for the position that you've taken here today. Let's move on to the next question.

MR. BRAUN: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you.

MR. BRAUN: I'd like to ask Mr. Slade to look at the technical appendix of his traffic report, which is Exhibit 45 in this proceeding. Do you have a copy with you? Could you get a copy, please?

Could you turn to the traffic count for the A.M. for April 26.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What page?

MR. BRAUN: The pages are not numbered, but I counted about the seventh page in, maybe the eighth.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Why aren't the pages numbered? Mr. Slade, how come your pages aren't numbered?

MR. SLADE: I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON REID: I mean, you have at least about two or three hundred pages here, don't you? It would be most helpful to us if you would heretofore make sure that they are numbered, because it's very difficult to leaf through and follow.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Did your printer somehow start spewing out stuff?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. I think we have the right -- What's the caption of the page?

MR. BRAUN: It says at top Intersection Traffic Volume Counts and Peak Hour Volume A.M., Peak Hour Georgetown Campus Plan, Reservoir Road. Below the double line: Northbound approach, French Embassy.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What's the date?

MR. BRAUN: The day and date is April 26.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. All right, we have it.

MR. BRAUN: Do you have it, Mr. Slade?

MR. SLADE: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: What is the through traffic in front of the French Embassy, according to this count?

MR. SLADE: It's zero.

MR. BRAUN: Eastbound and westbound?

MR. SLADE: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Now how is that possible?

MR. SLADE: When we did this count, we only counted the turning movements in and out of the French Embassy, because we had estimates of through traffic on Reservoir Road.

MR. BRAUN: Didn't you want to know what the -- Was it not possible to count the through traffic?

MR. SLADE: Yes, it was possible.s

MR. BRAUN: But you chose not to?

MR. SLADE: Correct.

MR. BRAUN: Now when turning to the traffic study itself, which is BZA Exhibit 46A, Tab 27 -- It's your traffic and parking analysis, date May 30, 2000 --

CHAIRPERSON REID: What page?

MR. BRAUN: If you go to page 9 and May -- Page 9 and Figure 4, existing traffic volumes -- Do you have it?

MR. SLADE: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: Is there a number for through traffic eastbound and westbound?

MR. SLADE: Yes, at the French Embassy.

MR. BRAUN: At the French Embassy?

MR. SLADE: Yes.

MR. BRAUN: And I take it, that's not based on a count but rather an extrapolation from other data.

MR. SLADE: From counts.

MR. BRAUN: But not of that intersection.

MR. SLADE: But not of the French Embassy. We only counted the turning movements of the French Embassy, just to see what was turning in and out of the French Embassy.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Now, Mr. Slade, while he's looking for that, when you did your traffic counts at the French Embassy, did you take into consideration Maison Francaise's programs which are primarily evening?

MR. SLADE: No, we were, Mr. Sockwell, focused on the commuter peak period. So we would not have included an evening traffic count.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: They usually coincide with the end of peak hour.

MR. SLADE: We selected a day, and I don't know if that day would have had that activity taking place.

I should point out that this question came up that Mr. Braun is asking in the community meetings, and we happened to video tape at the French Embassy. We went back and picked those through movements off that video tape, and they were submitted to Mr. Braun's consultants. We think they confirm that our estimates of through traffic are accurate.

MR. BRAUN: I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay, thank you. All right, next cross-examiner.

MR. RIXEY: I am Douglas Rixey with Citizens

Association of Georgetown. A couple of quick questions for Mr. Bolan.

You outlined two scenarios where the houses in Burleith would be vacated. Under one scenario, if I understood it correctly, they would be renovated for $20-40,000 and re-rented at a higher rate or possibly a lower rate. What was that?

MR. BOLAN: No, I don't believe that. I think it was just really one scenario. Our numbers suggested that re-renting it made very little sense, and for that reason we felt that most of those units that were going to be taken off the market were going to be sold and not re-rented.

MR. RIXEY: Re-renting made little sense because of the cost of renovation?

MR. BOLAN: The cost of renovation and the lower rent that would result.

MR. RIXEY: What about the scenario where the students would move out and the house would just be re-rented to more groups of students without any renovation? Isn't that possible?

MR. BOLAN: It's technically possible, but the question is where would those students come from. The demand would no longer be there.

MR. RIXEY: Well, the University has -- What would the current -- Let's say, when the dorm comes on line in 2003, if it does come on line in 2003, and let's say all those students

happen to be absorbed out of the immediate neighborhood, which hasn't been established.

There's still a fair number of Georgetown University students that are living in the D.C. metropolitan area. Isn't there a possibility they would want to move in closer to the University?

MR. BOLAN: There's a possibility, but I think many of those students live elsewhere because they want to live elsewhere, whether they are living with family, whether they are living with friends, whether they are living in something that's less expensive --

MR. RIXEY: What do you base that on?

MR. BOLAN: Based on our own just observations of universities and students and what they want. They want a variety of things. They don't all want one set of locational criteria.

MR. RIXEY: So you think students would rather live further from the university than closer to it?

MR. BOLAN: I think students have very different locational requirements.

MR. RIXEY: I see. The $20-40,000 construction estimate cost to renovate these buildings -- they would be renovated to be re-rented or sold or why would they be renovating them for $20-40,000?

MR. BOLAN: No. We are suggesting that, if -- if, and I underline the word if -- a landlord was interested in re-

renting to a tenant, the most logical tenant for that would not be a group of students but would be a more conventional renter of a single family house.

MR. RIXEY: In your opinion.

MR. BOLAN: That's right. And in order to achieve that, they would need to spend that $20-40,000.

MR. RIXEY: I see. And what is your business?

MR. BOLAN: We are a real estate consulting -- economic consulting firm.

MR. RIXEY: Economic consulting. So do you have construction experts on staff?

MR. BOLAN: Yes, we do.

MR. RIXEY: And their analysis of the existing condition of the buildings was that they needed $20-40,000 worth of renovation?

MR. BOLAN: That's an average figure. Don't forget that there are many buildings in the Burleith and West Georgetown area.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. Thank you. To Mr. Green -- Oh, I'm sorry, one more question about the housing.

How many of those -- I think you said there were 90 rental group houses in Burleith. How many group houses are there in West Georgetown?

MR. BOLAN: There are between 85 and 90 in West Georgetown.

MR. RIXEY: And in at least the ones in Burleith, how many of those rental properties are owned outright by the landlords? Do you know?

MR. BOLAN: No, I do not know.

MR. RIXEY: So you don't really have any idea what their economic incentive is to re-rent or to sell or anything else, because you don't know what the ownership condition is.

MR. BOLAN: I do not know the financing on the buildings.

MR. RIXEY: I see. To Mr. Green, there's been a lot of discussion about this helicopter, and I hear lots of -- I live on 35th Street. I hear lots of helicopters flying over. I don't know whose they are, but I think I've heard you say that the hospital is meant to serve the community. Do you mean the immediate community or do you mean the community of the entire D.C. metro area?

MR. GREEN: Both the immediate community and the metro area.

MR. RIXEY: Okay, because I was just trying to figure out when someone in the community would need to take a helicopter ride over to the hospital.

MR. GREEN: I never said that.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. So you have two other hospitals in the D.C. metro area, don't you?

MR. GREEN: We have two others in Washington, D.C.

MR. RIXEY: Do they have helicopter pads?

MR. GREEN: The Washington Hospital Center has a helicopter pad.

MR. RIXEY: So why would we need to have any helicopters come to Georgetown?

MR. GREEN: Well, because they are serving different markets.

MR. RIXEY: What are those markets?

MR. GREEN: Well, Georgetown serves the immediate northwest community, Montgomery County, northern Virginia. Washington Hospital Center draws much more heavily from Prince Georges County, southern Maryland, and from northwest Washington. So they are separate markets that we draw on.

MR. RIXEY: But it's more market driven rather than services provided?

MR. GREEN: It's both. It's both.

MR. RIXEY: Is one more dominant than the other?

MR. GREEN: I think the services and the quality of the services provided certainly has an impact on market reaction. So if you've got an excellent reputation, you provide high quality services, then I think you will draw patients from markets that are contiguous to your location.

MR. RIXEY: But you don't draw patients that need helicopter transport, do you?

MR. GREEN: At the Washington Hospital Center?

MR. RIXEY: Or anywhere. I mean, isn't that more an emergency situation? I mean, someone doesn't elect to take a helicopter ride, do they?

MR. GREEN: Well, there are certain cardiac patients who are transported by helicopter. I wouldn't say that their condition is emergent at the moment, but there is a need for timely transport and clinical support during the transport. So there are those patients who come by helicopter, and that is a fairly significant portion of the volume at the Washington Hospital Center.

Approximately 50 percent of the flights that come to the Washington Hospital Center are for coronary related conditions.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. The only other question I have for you was regarding the fact that MedStar is, in fact, entering into some relationship with Georgetown University, whatever that may be. I guess my question is: The doctors and staff that work for MedStar or that will be working for MedStar at the Georgetown University Hospital -- they will be working for MedStar. Is that correct?

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

MR. RIXEY: Not the University.

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

MR. RIXEY: So they then are not part of the University.

MR. GREEN: They will be working for MedStar, that is correct.

MR. RIXEY: I see. Well, doesn't that sound to you like a -- I mean, the University is allowed to have a hospital in a residential neighborhood, because it's a university hospital. If your staff is not working for the University, aren't they, in fact, not allowed by special exception in a residential neighborhood and so, therefore, requires a -- I'm sorry, I'm just trying to finish my sentence -- therefore, requires a variance rather than a special exception?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I think I'm the one to address that. The test is the use of the facility, and the use here will continue to be a university use, a university teaching hospital, very much tied in with the academic mission of the University.

It's not unlike what this Board recently approved on the George Washington University campus. So the fact that the employees are employed by MedStar does not change the use or the zoning.

MR. RIXEY: In what way will the new MedStar employees contribute to the University?

MR. GREEN: There will be the teaching and faculty relationship. The hospital still continues as a training site for the medical school. So there would continue to be that relationship.

MR. RIXEY: So your doctors and staff will be actually educating the students at Georgetown. Okay.

MR. GREEN: Let me also raise one particular issue here. In the District of Columbia, Madam Chair, there is a certificate of need process, and in the certificate of need process issues of the deal structure and the relationships were contained in the certificate of need application.

That has been approved, the deal structure, the relationships, etcetera. So it seems to me that questions that are addressed to relationship, the elements of the deal, all the agreements were part of the certificate of need application. The lease agreement, the academic affiliation, all of that was there.

There was a public hearing held. It seems to me that questioning now is a repeat of the questioning that took place during the certificate of need process.

CHAIRPERSON REID: And also it's a matter of public record, isn't it?

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON REID: So then you didn't obtain that information?

MR. RIXEY: I'm sorry. I wasn't involved in that hearing. I thought we had our own hearing here.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes. Nonetheless, the issue is -- It doesn't do to continue that line of questioning with that information that is more germane to the hearing that pertained to

the certificate of need. That information is available to you. Also, that is not what was testified here today.

So rather than to continue that line of questioning, you can obtain that information, and use this time --

MR. RIXEY: Okay, thank you. That was my last question for Mr. Green.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay, thank you.

MR. RIXEY: To Mr. Slade, I have a variety of sort of detail oriented questions about the traffic study. On page 13 of your study in the middle paragraph there is a discussion of the Georgetown University GUTS system. About in the middle of the paragraph you say that all GUTS buses enter the University by way of Canal Road and Reservoir Road.

Does that mean that they don't drive through the neighborhood to get to those two entrances?

MR. SLADE: No, this is just referring to the entrances.

MR. RIXEY: So the fact that they enter in those two locations has nothing to do with where they actually traverse the neighborhood. What I'm getting at is I was very surprised to see this, because I live on 35th Street. Some of the members of the community group --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Don't testify. Just ask.

MR. RIXEY: Well, the reason I was surprised is because we've all seen GUTS buses driving through the neighborhood

and --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Again, you're not supposed to be testifying at this point, sir.

MR. RIXEY: I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Ask your question, and then when you have your opportunity to testify, you can tell us all of that.

MR. RIXEY: I'm sorry. Do the GUTS buses ever use the Prospect Street entrance?

MR. SLADE: I don't know.

MR. RIXEY: So this statement that they use these two entrances only -- you don't know if that's true or not.

MS. FRANK: I can answer that. The GUTS buses do enter the campus only via Canal Road and Reservoir Road. I believe there is one that leaves by Prospect Street. Since we can't make a left turn out of Canal Road, we go down Prospect Street.

MR. RIXEY: Oh, I see. This says they enter. It doesn't say about how they leave. Is that what you're saying?

MS. FRANK: Yes.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. The next question I have for you is about the parking study on page 15, on-street parking, in the middle of the page again. You apparently did a parking study in person where you counted parking spaces and things for a five-block area in Burleith.

MR. SLADE: Correct.

MR. RIXEY: And one of the days was March 4th, Saturday, March 4. Wasn't that over spring break?

MR. SLADE: I don't recall. I'll tell you what I do recall, that this question came up at a community meeting that I was present at, and we promised to collect the data as quickly as we could and get back to you on it.

MR. RIXEY: Well, in your professional opinion, if you were trying to do an accurate parking study, would collecting data on a Saturday during spring break be a reasonable representation of what the parking condition was?

MR. SLADE: We were specifically asked for Saturday data, first of all. Second of all, I think the consensus in the room, including community members, was that since the issue had to do with the hospital, which does not go on spring break, that we would -- by doing the survey when we did, we were capturing the impact of the hospital employees and visitors on the neighborhood.

MR. RIXEY: I see. Did you do a parking study of West Georgetown?

MR. SLADE: No.

MR. RIXEY: Why not?

MR. SLADE: The issue was focused on the hospital and clinical center and the impact on Burleith.

MR. RIXEY: Isn't the University supposed to show no negative impact, if anything a positive impact, on the surrounding communities?

MR. SLADE: Yes.

MR. RIXEY: So how could a plan presented with no traffic study for West Georgetown be -- answer that question as to whether there's negative impact?

MR. SLADE: From a traffic standpoint the traffic implications of the campus plan were addressed in great detail by the Federal Highway Administration study for Canal Road. The question about parking, on-street parking in West Georgetown was not raised as an issue, but that's no excuse not to study it.

We felt that the campus plan for the academic campus was not going to create -- and for the medical center campus -- was not going to create conditions that would adversely affect the encroachment of University parkers in West Georgetown.

MR. RIXEY: When was the Federal traffic study done?

MR. SLADE: It was completed in '98.

MR. RIXEY: And when was the Georgetown University master plan generated?

MR. SLADE: This current plan, the draft was submitted to the community and was generally ready for circulation in January of this year.

MR. RIXEY: So how is a traffic study generated in '98 relevant to a master plan submitted in the year 2000?

MR. SLADE: We carefully looked at all the elements of this campus plan to see if there was anything that would change

the basic assumptions or any other bases of the Federal Highway Administration plan, and it was our determination that they did not. We discussed that with the Federal Highway Administration as well.

MR. RIXEY: Is that documented in the Georgetown University master plan submission?

MR. SLADE: The master plan, Appendix L, enumerates the plan points on page 5 that are expected to change traffic and our conclusions about each of those points. That was really the core of the determination that the Canal Road plan was still valid.

MS. DWYER: I would just like to add that a copy of the Federal Highway study was submitted with the campus plan application.

MR. RIXEY: So you're satisfied that the Federal Highway study was fully cognizant of the 1,400,000 square feet of increased square footage, the increased use of sports and entertainment facilities, the increased number of undergraduates, graduates, faculty, support staff, etcetera, etcetera.

MR. SLADE: The Federal Highway study focuses on specific issues, and we wanted to make sure that the plan changes -- the changes that this plan proposes would not affect any of those issues that the Federal Highway Administration study addressed, and that's what we were satisfied with.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. If I understood correctly, you

have represented that the increase in sports facilities and the performing arts center are -- the impacts of the increase of those facilities are absorbed via scheduling methods.

MR. SLADE: Correct.

MR. RIXEY: Where -- I've seen in your technical appendix a schedule for '99-2000. Is there a schedule for 2010?

MR. SLADE: No.

MR. RIXEY: So you do not have a projected schedule that reflects the new facilities that the University is proposing.

MR. SLADE: Correct.

MR. RIXEY: So how can you ensure without having done that study that there won't be any impact?

MR. SLADE: The assurance is that the nature of the events causes them to be -- currently, causes them to be scheduled outside of peaks and at times when there's adequate parking, and it is the policy, so to speak, of the University to schedule these events when people who are going to come with a car will be able to park.

So we just think it's common sense and logical that that's going to continue, and, you know, if nothing else, we alerted the University to the fact that they should continue with that policy and continue to be alert to their scheduling policies and how they relate to parking and --

MR. RIXEY: But it's not guaranteed in the plan

that that will occur.

MR. SLADE: I don't know what you're looking for and --

MR. RIXEY: Well, when I asked this question of the previous panel, I was deferred to you because you're the traffic consultant, and I asked at that time if the University had authorized you to guaranty that they would do these sorts of things to control traffic. Can you guaranty that?

MR. SLADE: No.

MR. RIXEY: Okay, thank you. Now of the two big categories of use, the sports facilities --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Excuse me. While they are doing that, approximately how many more questions do you have?

MR. RIXEY: This is the last line of questioning I have, just specifically related to the impact of the south campus development.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, we would be agreeable to a condition requiring the scheduling of those events to be at non-peak times, and the University will commit to that as a condition in the Board's order.

MR. RIXEY: If I understand the plan correctly, there are two big categories of increased usage. One is the performing arts center. What is the occupant capacity of the performing arts center?

MR. SLADE: Without looking up the numbers, my

recollection is the new facility will have 350 seats, and then there will be a black box theater with 100 or 150. Is that right?

MR. RIXEY: A hundred or 150?

MR. SLADE: Hundred.

MR. RIXEY: So there are, in fact, two facilities. Could they operate simultaneously?

MR. SLADE: I don't know. Yes.

MR. RIXEY: They could operate simultaneously. What is the current capacity of the performing arts facilities on campus?

MR. SLADE: I don't know.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I think that question was asked and answered by the earlier panel. Alan Brangman answered that.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, you said -- When you asking capacity, what do you mean?

MR. RIXEY: I'm trying to determine -- I'm trying to measure increase in usage and load. If the new facility has a capacity of 450 occupants --

CHAIRPERSON REID: I thought there were 350. Seating?

MR. RIXEY: 350 in one theater plus 100 in the second theater, which could operate simultaneously. So there's a current capacity of 450, how does that compare to the current performing arts capacity on campus?

MR. SLADE: And I answered that I don't know.

MS. DWYER: Mr. Brangman, I think, testified earlier that it's about equal to what the University has on campus now, about an equal number of seats.

MR. RIXEY: So currently, the University has 450 performing arts seats on campus.

MS. DWYER: That is correct.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. Then the other big question is regarding sports facilities, and it seems that there's some sort of a stadium that's going to be expanded that's going after greatly increased capacity. What is that capacity?

MR. SLADE: If I recall the numbers again, I think the current capacity is in the low 2,000 range, and the potential capacity is about 3500.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. So I guess what I'm trying to get at -- my bottom line of my question is: You have ensured us on page 16 that, due to all of this development on site, the performing art centers, the increased athletic capacity, all the academic buildings and everything, that there will be no adverse impact on the community. Is that correct?

MR. SLADE: The insurance is that the traffic system and the parking system will be adequate to handle these events, because they will be scheduled at times when there's --

MR. RIXEY: Adequate or no adverse impact?

MR. SLADE: Adequate and, therefore, no adverse

impact.

MR. RIXEY: Okay. The last question I have then is regarding the deficit of 1157 parking spaces.

MR. SLADE: Yes.

MR. RIXEY: How do you propose to resolve this loss of parking spaces? I mean, that is -- The south campus is increasing in square footage and public use, sports events and performing art center and all this stuff, and yet they're losing parking spaces to MedStar, resulting in a loss of 1157 parking spaces. How is that going to be absorbed? Where are those people going to park?

MR. SLADE: The estimate of over 1,000 spaces -- and we've corrected those calculations. It's slightly less than 1157, but the ballpark is correct. That is an estimate of the need, the parking need that would not be fulfilled if there was no improvement in the transportation management plan.

So that's the numerical goal that the transportation management plan will have to achieve by the year 2010 if all of our projections, which are on the high conservative side, are reached in terms of enrollment, in terms of business by MedStar and so forth, and as well as some factors built in to make those estimates conservatively high.

Separate issue from sports and performance, because those parking spaces will be available in the evening when everyone in the University has gone home. But the 1100 in round

numbers -- what you're calling a deficit is what would occur if the transportation management plan were not improved, including the satellite parking.

The point is that the satellite parking is replacing some of those spaces that are created through this higher level of demand.

MR. RIXEY: And -- But you cannot guaranty that the University will be able to improve their transportation system and ensure that these 1150 parking spaces won't flow into the neighborhood. Neither you nor the University can guaranty that their so called improve transportation system will solve this problem. Is that correct?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, if I can just refer back to the testimony by the witnesses and in the record shows that the community parking is controlled by metered parking and the residential permit, and the University has also said that, with each further processing application, it would provide an update on its transportation management program, which is what it's been doing with this Board over the last ten years.

MR. RIXEY: Thank you very much. Would you answer my question, please?

MR. SLADE: The University has a very tight transportation management system. By that, I mean that the opportunity for people to park in the neighborhood is limited by the existing ordinances which restrict parking in the community,

number one.

The University is maintaining its cap that the community and everyone has as a consensus agreed to. That's beneficial all the way around. The University has shown very good success with its transportation management plan, particularly the GUTS bus utilization. A student simply has always as his best alternative the use of GUTS bus rather than driving and paying for parking. That's easily seen in the numbers of students who parking, which is extremely low.

Likewise, there are economic incentives which Karen Frank spoke to which are going to make -- continue to make using alternative transportation very attractive, and extreme economic incentives -- if you pay for parking, you realize this -- three months of free parking and half-price parking to park in satellite parking.

I think it's as close as any institution can come to a guaranty, you know, given that we're dealing with human behavior. Will people drive and park in the neighborhood? I think it's a very well controlled situation now, and it will be better in the future.

MR. RIXEY: How long is a typical athletic event or performing arts center event?

MS. DWYER: Do you know the answer to that? I think that may be beyond Mr. Slade's --

MR. RIXEY: Well, I would suggest it would be

within a two or three hour duration. How long is one allowed to park in the neighborhood without a permit?

MR. SLADE: Two hours without a permit.

MR. RIXEY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right, thank you. How many more cross-examiners do we have today? Okay, come on. Then after you, Ms. Zartman, and is that the last one? That's the last one. Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: For the record, Don Crockett.

Mr. Slade, could you tell us what the parking restrictions are in Georgetown on the evenings and on weekends?

MR. SLADE: I haven't looked in a while, but I believe it goes to 10:30.

MR. CROCKETT: Do you know whether that's enforced?

MR. SLADE: It's sporadically enforced in Georgetown as well as in other neighborhoods.

MR. CROCKETT: Do you have any reason to believe that tickets are issued after seven o'clock in evenings and on weekends in Georgetown?

MR. SLADE: I know, in working with the city parking office, that there are periods of time and seasons when -- I don't want to use the term meter maids, but you know who I mean --

MR. CROCKETT: Parking enforcers.

MR. SLADE: -- parking enforcers are paid overtime

to work beyond seven o'clock.

MS. DWYER: For those of us who live in Georgetown and get tickets after seven o'clock.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you again for your testimony.

Are you aware of any restrictions on Sunday?

MR. SLADE: No, I'm not.

MR. CROCKETT: In fact, there are no restrictions on parking spaces on Sunday. Is that correct?

MR. SLADE; Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you. Okay. Last cross-examiner, Ms. Zartman.

MS. ZARTMAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I have just a couple of questions for a few of the panelists.

Mr. Bolan, you indicated in your study the amount of revenue that the city would gain if the group homes were returned to the private residential market. Did you do any calculations of how much the city has lost over the last ten years by those houses being group homes and not on the private market?

MR. BOLAN: I'm not sure I understand the question. I don't know what you mean by lost. Lost in what respect?

MS. ZARTMAN: Well, you made calculations based on the difference in income tax and other revenues that the city would gain if the group homes became private residential markets

and people paid income taxes. Did you do any calculations back over the life of the current plan to see how much the city had lost because the University was not able to house more of its students on campus?

MR. BOLAN: Well, once again, I'm not sure I quite understand your question. What I have done is I have calculated the income tax revenues that would be generated from new residents and the sales taxes that would be generated from new residents. That's all I've attempted to do and to indicate that that number was approximately $7400 per dwelling unit that would represent new net revenue to the District.

MS. ZARTMAN: So reasonably one could go back and use the same calculation over the past ten years.

You also offered the opinion that there would be no incentive for additional renters to occupy housing, once the Southwest Quad was built. You are aware the Southwest Quad is to be occupied by sophomores. It's not people from the community who will move directly into Southwest Quad.

MR. BOLAN: My understanding is that, whether they move into the Southwest Quad, they will be moving on campus. That's the important issue.

MS. ZARTMAN: Correct. And because it's not a single large building to which the community residents, student community residents, would be relocating, it would be a phased effort.

You have nothing other than your opinion to justify why other students would not come and occupy the housing?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Ms. Zartman, that question has already been answered. Remember?

MS. ZARTMAN: I was simply asking if there were any other data that might be made available.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Yes, but it's the same question just framed differently. That has been already asked.

MS. ZARTMAN: Karen, with regard to University employees, can you tell me whether your data include all contract employees as well as full and part-time employees who regularly come to the campus?

MS. FRANK: Yes, it does.

MS. ZARTMAN: Have the number of contract employees changed over the period of the last -- of the current campus plan?

MS. FRANK: They would have changed when the bookstore changed management. That would be the only change.

MS. ZARTMAN: Okay. Lou, you indicated that you relied upon the Highway Administration's Canal Road study in assessing that there would be no negative impacts with the traffic mitigation plan. I know you said the plan was completed in 1998. Are you aware when the traffic counts were done for that Highway Administration study?

MR. SLADE: I don't recall.

MS. ZARTMAN: If I told you they were 1993 traffic

counts, would you have as much confidence in their relevance for today?

MR. SLADE: I know that they are old traffic counts but that FHWA looked at the growth of traffic on Canal Road and took growth into account.

MS. ZARTMAN: Did they take into account the surrounding development that has been approved since 1998 for the M Street corridor, for example?

MR. SLADE: Only in that in their estimation their growth factors would adequately have covered, you know, things that cause growth, such as new development.

MS. ZARTMAN: John, these questions will sound familiar. Some of them were asked at the ANC meeting. But to put on the record, you indicated to us that MedStar has no intent to bring its corporate headquarters onto the Reservoir Road site. Is that correct?

MR. GREEN: That's correct. Yes.

MS. ZARTMAN: You also indicated that you were planning no substantial increase in the level of trauma care beyond that which the University currently has now.

MR. GREEN: I don't recall saying that. I indicated that we -- We indicated that we saw growth of up to 18,000 admissions --

MS. ZARTMAN: Correct.

MR. GREEN: -- and that that was our goal. Some

percentage of that will be a growth in trauma, I would imagine, to correspond with the 5,000 increase in admissions. So I think there would be some corresponding growth.

MS. ZARTMAN: But proportional to the current caseload?

MR. GREEN: That would be my assumption, yes.

MS. ZARTMAN: Okay. Much has been indicated about the corporate identification of MedStar. As I understand it, MedStar is a holding company.

MR. GREEN: That's correct.

MS. ZARTMAN: And has subsidiaries that are both profit making and nonprofit making.

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MS. ZARTMAN: Are any of the profit making entities involved in the management of any of the operations on the north campus?

MR. GREEN: No.

MS. ZARTMAN: A few other facility questions on the north side. In addition to the physician's office building and the first ramp garage, there is in the campus plan allowance for roughly 100,000 square feet of additional space at both Lombardi and at the hospital.

Would MedStar be able to accept an order from the Board that limited the ability to backfill once those new facilities are built with further physician office space?

MR. GREEN: I think that's similar to the question that Mr. Braun raised in terms of capping the number of physicians at 80 and support staff at 240. At this point in time, we are opposed to limitations on flexibility and, out of respect for you and the Board, I'd just like to take a minute to say why.

I mean, this is a fairly daunting task that MedStar is taking on, and this is an institution that -- and a medical center complex that Father O'Donovan raised this morning during his testimony, losses of approximating $200 million.

So we are going into this with our eyes wide open, because we have great confidence that this is a fine academic medical center and that we have had some experience in managing institutions. However, in order to give ourselves a chance, we are respectfully requesting of the community and the Board that our hands not be tied in terms of our ability to try to achieve a profitable operation.

MS. ZARTMAN: Are you familiar with the precedent or the normal behavior of this Board that, if you were allowed to build the new space on Lombardi and on the hospital, the citizens would have absolutely nothing to say about how you utilize the backfill space?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MS. ZARTMAN: Would you understand why we might think that our hands were being tied if we lose control of 200,000 square feet?

MR. GREEN: But I might add that it depends on the kind of control that you're looking for. I mean, if we're talking about major construction, we will have to go through a certificate of need process, and it will not be the 60-day process that we just went through in terms of a merger or acquisition.

So the community would have ample opportunity to involve itself in that process. We would probably also have to come back here for further processing, I would imagine, in terms of additional uses of that space.

So it seems to me that there would be ample opportunity for the community to have an impact on our decisions with respect to that space. Then lastly, I mean, at some point I think we're going to have to have the kind of working relationship where we can sit down and talk about these things and try to reach some resolution on them.

We don't want everything to be adversarial, and we are working very hard to establish the kind of relationship that will show people that we are forthright and that we want to work with the communities. But on the other hand, I mean, I can't say often enough that we are probably the last chance for that institution. If we don't make it work, then I don't know what the community has left in terms of that whole campus as it relates to the medical complex.

We have to be able to make it work, and we need a chance to make it work, and we ask you and we ask the Board to not

tie our hands in terms of our ability to achieve that end.

MS. ZARTMAN: I will be tempted to testify, if I say anything further.

My last area of inquiry is just to follow up on something that Douglas Rixey mentioned in terms of the authority for a private corporation to run medical facilities and a hospital.

I think you indicated that the George Washington case was -- or perhaps it was Ms. Dwyer -- that the George Washington University Hospital case set a precedent.

Madam, I believe I'm correct, that's an R-5 zone. This is R-3, and in R-5 there is matter of right ability to operate a hospital. I don't believe that in R-3 there's matter of right for anyone but the University to run the hospital and facilities.

MS. DWYER: What the Board determined in that case was that the University was part of the campus plan and met the requirements to be part of the campus plan as a university hospital. The same factors that the Board looked at here are met in this case.

So both under that precedent, under the interpretation of the zoning regulations, the use continues, and it is very much a part of the campus and very much an academic hospital, a medical center with a teaching facility associated with it, and it is definitely part of the campus plan and meets

the zoning requirements.

MS. ZARTMAN: Your opinion is registered.

Madam Chair, may I ask a question of you? If there are other matters -- because we have only today received the Office of Planning report and the DPW report, if there are areas of inquiry, may we in writing get them in advance of the July hearing so that we'll have an opportunity to, in fact, have all of our ducks in a row before that presentation?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Let's see. If you have the reports today and you have an opportunity to look over them, and then when they give their verbal report, there may be some additional information. So you'll have an opportunity to cross-examine them. So why do you want --

MS. ZARTMAN: Well, if we need more information from any of the University's experts in order to make sense of what the DPW or OP reports are, may we obtain that without running afoul of your process? The record is open. We can get additional material.

CHAIRPERSON REID: If you need more information from someone on the applicant panel, then you would have to do that through Ms. Dwyer. Would that not be so?

MS. DWYER: That would be so. It would be most unusual. I mean, we presented all of the information for our case in the record. It would seem that any questions they had would be better directed at the Office of Planning or DPW or, as you said,

part of the cross-examination.

MS. ZARTMAN: Well, there is also a very large binder that none of us have had a chance to see, and you are the only authorities for what is in that submission.

MS. DWYER: Well, I would just submit, this is the end of cross-examination today, which --

CHAIRPERSON REID: So you said you have not had a chance to read the material that is here?

MS. ZARTMAN: Not the latest submissions at all, no.

MS. DWYER: Well, the materials were filed two weeks before the hearing, and the materials are the same materials that have been discussed with the community, the campus plan document, the traffic report, at the quarterly meetings, the campus plan meetings, the facilitation meetings and the ongoing traffic meetings. So there is nothing new in here that has not been discussed.

CHAIRPERSON REID: You've had the report for two weeks?

MS. ZARTMAN: No. Mr. Crockett just received a binder, I think, last evening.

MS. DWYER: Our materials were filed two weeks before the hearing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Did you --

MS. DWYER: No, we did not distribute them to every

member of the community. A copy was given to the ANC, which is automatically a party. So they had that before they had their meeting.

The purpose of filing is for anyone who is interested to come down and look through the material, but separately the community has gotten the campus plan, the traffic report.

Certainly, our documentation includes the Q&A list which has been discussed in part of the facilitation. So none of this is new material, and none of this has changed from what was discussed and reviewed even in the facilitation meetings. This is not new material.

MS. ZARTMAN: Not to quibble, Madam Chair, but we did have someone come and copy what was then available in the file just within the last few days, and there were pages missing from the Wilkes Artis submission. There was an incomplete recap of the experts who would testify, and until Mr. Crockett -- I think it was just last evening -- got a complete fresh set from Ms. Pruitt, that was the best we had, you know, absent page 12 and 13, absent attachments. It was far from a complete -- It certainly precluded our ability, even if we had been willing to stay up all night.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, I don't think that anything would preclude you from requesting information from Office of Planning or DPW or from the applicant, if there's something that you don't have that you need. I don't have a

problem with it. I don't know how other Board members feel about it.

MS. ZARTMAN: That's what we shall do. The applicant can decide to grant it or not.

MS. DWYER: Right. All I want to make clear is that we're not -- this panel is not coming back for further cross-examination, that that is done today.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No, this is it.

MS. DWYER: And we continue -- As both John Green and the University has stated, there are ongoing meetings with the community on traffic issues and a lot of sharing of information there. So we'll be happy to --

MR. GREEN: And can we have these requests funneled through one person? I mean, we don't want --

CHAIRPERSON REID: That's Ms. Dwyer. I prefaced my statement with having it channeled through Ms. Dwyer, if there is something. There really should not be, but if in fact there is some point of clarity or something like that, given the fact that we do have another hearing date which is the 18th of July, 9:30 a.m., in the interim you can have your questions answered.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Pardon me, Madam Chair. I need to ask Ms. Zartman a question. I am still not quite sure what she was talking about with backfill space. You said backfill space, and I don't know what you're talking about, because I look at backfill as one thing, and you're obviously looking at it as

something entirely different. So I was trying to put together my definition and compare it to what you were seemingly saying.

MS. ZARTMAN: I'm sure yours is a fare more professional approach to backfill space. The way it has been used over the course of considering this campus plan would include adding an additional story or more to a building, moving facilities or replacing facilities from some old floors in that building, and then having available through floors no longer needed for the outdated, antiquated equipment that was there, which are available to be backfilled with purposes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay, that situation. All right.

MS. ZARTMAN: And when those occur in 100,000 square foot increments, they become significant elements for evaluating Mr. Slade's traffic study, for evaluating the impact in the neighborhood, for assessing what, in fact, will be nextdoor.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Yes, okay. Generally speaking, those things would still have to come to some review agency before they can be occupied perhaps. As long as they are the so called designated uses approved by this Board, depending upon what type of change is intended, they would certainly have to come back here, I think.

MS. ZARTMAN: This is parallel to the experience we have with historic preservation. Sometimes an applicant will come and add a new rear addition to a building and then, because the

old back wall is no longer the back wall, the historic back wall disappears.

In this case, the concern that members of the community have is that additional floors will be added to the top of the building. The addition of those floors will go through this process with all of the approvals, the architectural reviews, but the backfill space will be unspecified. What will happen to the existing radiation treatment centers that are needful of being replaced?

MR. GREEN: If I may, on that point a certificate of need application would be required, which would define the future use as well as what would be done with the space that was being vacated, and there would be a budget associated with the entire project.

So, I mean, you have the opportunity to look at that very carefully during the CON process, if that were to occur, in addition to coming here if it's a large major project.

MS. ZARTMAN: Although what I was trying to say is that under the rules that I believe this Board usually follows, the backfill would not come before you.

MR. GREEN: That's why I said that would be picked up by the planning agency in terms of the project through the CON process, and it would not be the 60-day process.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Madam Chair, I have one quick question for Mr. Green, and we appreciate your very specific

answers that you've given us.

You mentioned that the Washington Hospital Center and Georgetown have two separate market areas, and you related what those were. You said that --

MR. GREEN: I said there's, obviously, some overlap.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Some overlap, but you mentioned that Georgetown is going to -- or you're looking toward -- MedStar is looking toward increasing admissions by 5,000 over two to three years.

Now my question is: Are we getting sicker in this part of Washington or are you going to -- is MedStar going to be diverting patients from Washington Hospital Center over to Georgetown?

MS. GREEN: I don't think that we're getting sicker into Georgetown's community than anywhere else in the city. We're getting older. That's probably true.

I think the important thing here is that -- I mean, what we're seeing occur is that the role of a hospital is changing fairly significantly, in that the very sick patients are the patients that are now ending up in hospitals. So much has moved to an out-patient basis.

So the need for secondary, routine hospital beds is declining, and managed care has certainly had an impact on hospital utilization. So what you're seeing are patients going to

hospitals for more specialty care, more tertiary needs. So, consequently, we anticipate as a regional referral center and as an academic medical center and a teaching hospital that Georgetown will attract not only from its immediate community but from the broader region.

Our anticipation is that our utilization will increase as a result of recapturing patients that used to come to the institution from Montgomery County, from the Maryland suburbs, and from northern Virginia, and also in recapturing some of the managed care volume that the institution lost over the last two or three years. That's where the volume will come from.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: But is Georgetown less used than the Washington Hospital Center? Is Washington Hospital Center overused?

MR. GREEN: I don't know if the Washington Hospital Center is overused. The Washington Hospital Center is at pretty close to capacity. That is true. And certainly, some of the physicians who have practice privileges at both institutions may very well admit patients to Georgetown that in the past they have admitted to the Washington Hospital Center, because most physicians admit to at least a couple of institutions.

So there is some of that that could happen, because the Hospital Center is fairly well utilized. That's correct.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: So the answer is, yes, there will be patients diverted from Washington Hospital Center over to

Georgetown.

MR. GREEN: I don't think I would say diverted. I think that it would be another practice location for physicians who currently admit to the Washington Hospital Center. I would characterize it that way.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. We'll leave it at that.

MR. GREEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: That will then conclude our hearing for today. Let's just kind of reiterate where we are and to get the perspective of where we will start the next time.

We have now completed the cross-examination for the applicant, and we'll commence with the Office of Planning report, the ANC report, DPW reports and cross-examination of them, persons and parties in support, persons and parties in opposition, and then, of course, closing remarks by the applicant.

Hopefully, we'll be able to conclude at the end of the July 18 next scheduled date, reconvening at 9:30 a.m.

There was one other thing that was brought to my attention. For those of you who are granted party status for the organizations, Ms. Pruitt said that there was not an authorization letter, a letter of authorization in the file for your representing the organization. So would you please in the interim submit those to the file.

I don't know. Is there anything else that is

requested?

MR. HART: Yes, Madam Chair. For clarification, the Board requested from Mr. Green a list of the Board members for --

CHAIRPERSON REID: A list of what?

MR. HART: A list of the Board members for Med Inc. Mr. Green.

MR. GREEN: MedStar.

MR. HART: MedStar, I'm sorry. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Who requested that?

MR. HART: I think Ms. Renshaw did.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Ms. Renshaw, did you request that?

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right.

MR. GREEN: And the resume of John McDaniel.

MR. HART: Yes. To the best of my notes here, that's the only --

CHAIRPERSON REID: That's the only other issue?

MR. HART: -- issue. It will be good to get that in by the 11th of July.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Board members, did you have any other comments, questions or what have you?

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, if I can just ask, is there any feeling by the Board that it would be helpful to either

you to review it beforehand or to us to have any of the opposition parties file their materials in advance of the July 18 hearing?

CHAIRPERSON REID: They always do.

MS. DWYER: No. There's no requirement for the opposition to file in advance of the hearing. The only burden has been in the past on the applicant. So it's up to the Board if it wanted to suggest that the parties who are going to be testifying the 18th submit materials in advance of that hearing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: While there is no requirement, as I said, Ms. Dwyer, they usually do submit to us their materials prior to the hearing date. Usually, that's on the Friday -- We receive it usually on that Friday before, and it's submitted by when?

MR. HART: 11th of July.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Now are you saying -- and even though it's not required, they do. However, you're saying that you want to request it as well?

MS. DWYER: Yes. And if they are going to filing that, if they could provide us with a copy as well.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Is there any problem?

MR. GREEN: Madam Chair, just one other point, Madam Chair. We owe Mr. Sockwell a bit more detail on the helipad and also on any buffering that may exist now, and if we have any plans for that. So we will submit that as well.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. Okay. And in

regards to Ms. Dwyer's request for any submission that you will have in this office to the Board, she's requesting also to have a copy of it. Is there any problem with that? That would be then due what date, please, Mr. Hart?

MR. HART: The 11th of July.

CHAIRPERSON REID: By the 11th of July. By the 11th of July, please.

MR. RIXEY: Just so that I understand, are you saying that, if we submit to the Board, we should copy the applicant?

CHAIRPERSON REID: I can't hear you.

MR. RIXEY: Are you saying that, if we submit to the Board in advance, we should copy the applicant?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Copy the applicant? Oh, yes. Yes. Make sure that they --

MR. RIXEY: But you're not saying that we have to submit in advance.

CHAIRPERSON REID: -- serve on them the information, the submission. As a party, typically parties make sure that the other side receives information that they are submitting to us.

MR. RIXEY: But you're not saying that we have to submit in advance.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: It would be appreciated

if they are submitting things to you that you reciprocate. If you choose not to, that's your business.

MR. RIXEY: We certainly will, if we can. But you do realize that we're all volunteers and have spent an enormous number of hours on this, and we'll do everything we can do to --

CHAIRPERSON REID: Whatever you submit to the Board, when you bring it here, then the copying machine is made available to you. You could then just -- And if it becomes laborious, then you could bring it here and ask staff to send it.

MR. RIXEY: Well, I just wanted to make sure I didn't have to meet a deadline that was difficult to meet.

CHAIRPERSON REID: July 11th is the date, which is almost a month?

MR. RIXEY: So we are, in fact, required to submit before the hearing?

CHAIRPERSON REID: You don't -- Let me put it like this. There is no requirement, but it's just an accommodation, and we would appreciate it if you would. Let's leave it like that.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, Don Crockett, one further question. You mentioned the summation by the applicant. We would like to wrap up our ideas for the benefit of the Board. We can either do that orally or in writing.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, actually, you can't. The procedure does not allow you to do that, Mr. Crockett. After the

opposition has given their case, then the applicant has time to closing remarks, and then there is no other rebuttal allowed.

MR. CROCKETT: I wasn't speaking of rebuttal. I was speaking of the fact that we're going to put on our affirmative case, and usually in the proceedings I've been in --

CHAIRPERSON REID: For redirect, you mean?

MR. CROCKETT: No. Just a submission to the Board as to what we're asking the Board to do on our behalf, and in essence our closing argument, what we think the evidence shows and what we're asking.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, that's what I'm saying. There is no -- In this proceeding, unlike regular courtroom proceedings, in this hearing proceeding there is no provision for the opposition to have any closing remarks.

Once the applicant has their closing remarks, that then ends the case. There's no provision for you to have a closing argument.

MR. CROCKETT: I would point out that we've been provided the opportunity to do that in several other cases. I suppose it's at the will of the Board, and as to whether or not the Board thinks it would be helpful, we would be happy to do that. If not, then we won't. We'll just submit the --

CHAIRPERSON REID: You've not been afforded that at this Board. It's not within the regulations.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Is this the findings of

facts that you are --

MR. CROCKETT: No.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No.

BOARD MEMBER RENSHAW: Conclusions of law? No?

CHAIRPERSON REID: No, he wants to have an opportunity to have closing argument after the applicant.

MR. CROCKETT: I'm not suggesting that we -- it be before or after. I'm suggesting that it may be written and it's not by way of rebuttal or anything. It would just be submitted simultaneously.

CHAIRPERSON REID: But once the applicant -- One second, Mr. Sockwell. Once the applicant gives their closing remarks, the case is then closed.

MR. CROCKETT: I understand that. So we could do it before as part of our case. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON REID: When you submit your materials to us, then anything that you would like -- any arguments you would like to make, certainly, you can do that.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Well, that's what I'm asking.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Sure, in writing. Sure. You can do that. There's nothing that would preclude you from being able to do that. I was just saying that orally you don't have another opportunity to come back after.

MR. CROCKETT: Right. That I understand. Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Thank you.

MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I had a couple of other things that I think we were supposed to file for the record. One was we were asked to provide data on the breakdown in terms of the ages of the undergraduates. I think that was one of the things we were asked, and also more information or statistics on the alcohol abuse program.

So in going through my notes, there may be a couple of other things that we'll file in the record.

CHAIRPERSON REID: As you go through your notes. Ms. Pruitt had to leave, and Mr. Hart has been taking notes. Hopefully, there's not been anything omitted. Nonetheless, if there is something that you know that is supposed to be submitted, please do so. We appreciate it.

MR. BRAUN: Madam Chair, will we have a transcript to see of this hearing before the next one or will the transcripts become available only after the second hearing?

CHAIRPERSON REID: The transcripts are usually available after about ten days.

MR. HART: Not really. Approximately three weeks. It's going to be really close.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Unless they are expedited.

MR. HART: We can try for two weeks. We have been getting them between two weeks and three weeks. But it's something we can't guaranty.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Well, that being the case, even -- See, this being the --

MR. HART: This is the 13th.

CHAIRPERSON REID: -- 13th, it will be awfully tight unless we request it -- unless we request that it be expedited?

MR. HART: Yes. We're talking about -- You see, here is another problem. There's a cost involved for an expedited. So, you know, we have to go through channels to get that okayed. But it's not impossible.

CHAIRPERSON REID: The procurement process. That within itself is --

MR. BRAUN: It would be helpful to have the transcript so that we were fully aware of what has all been said today. I mean, we've listened as carefully as we can, but I think --

CHAIRPERSON REID: I understand.

MR. BRAUN: -- the best dialogue is when you hear the other party as well.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Sure. I think that what staff will try to do is -- If we request that they expedite it without necessarily --

MR. HART: Put it this way. Within the next couple of days I can tell the people who are interested if the expedited request will work and, if so, how soon. Today being the 13th,

that's going for maybe approximately ten days from now.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Okay. Well, two weeks -- if it's two weeks --

MR. HART: Two weeks would be the 27th.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Is that prohibitive?

MR. HART: That might -- That's doable.

CHAIRPERSON REID: All right. Well, two weeks. We're going to try to have it back in two weeks. So check with staff, and then you can receive copies of the transcript, hopefully.

MR. BRAUN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REID: If Murphy doesn't get involved.

MS. SCOLARO: Madam Chairman, we really would appreciate that. If you are asking us to submit, even if it's on the volunteer basis, information by the 11th, that would not give us very much time to review the transcript.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What would not ?

MS. SCOLARO: If we don't get it in three weeks.

CHAIRPERSON REID: No, two weeks.

MS. SCOLARO: If we get it in two weeks, I'm saying that would be fine.

CHAIRPERSON REID: That's what we're trying to do.

MR. HART: Madam Chair, excuse me. Let me say this. There's always the option of making a direct request from

the recorder and paying for it yourself. That's paying for it yourself. That's another option.

MS. SCOLARO: Madam Chairman, I have another question, and I guess I need clarification on what time frame is going to be allotted to the -- what do we all it, the opponents, the opposition on the 18th, since we have so many communities involved.

CHAIRPERSON REID: What time frame is going to be allowed -- what?

MS. SCOLARO: Allowed for the opposition to present its case.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Two hours.

MS. SCOLARO: Two hours, total?

CHAIRPERSON REID: Total, equal time. Two hours for your presentation, and I don't think there are any other organizations that are going to testify. Are there any other organizations here today that will be testifying --

MS. SCOLARO: Other than the five or six?

CHAIRPERSON REID: -- than those that have got party status? Then we have persons in opposition. How many people here today are going to testify in opposition? Well, it just depends on how many people. They have three minutes each, and we hope to be able to get through.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: There is one other piece of information that was requested of the applicant, and that

was a breakdown on the substance abuse on and off-campus, sort of percentage of --

CHAIRPERSON REID: I don't think that that's germane to these proceedings.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Well, it's germane primarily because --

CHAIRPERSON REID: I don't know why that came up.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: -- of the issue of off-campus housing and the off-campus student contingent, and it could be limited, if you have a statistic that shows the ones that were in Georgetown, basically. I'm not interested in the ones that live outside of the city or outside of the general area, just sort of numbers, breakdown on/off campus as it pertains to the general area in question.

It would be like a crime statistic, but not exactly, and it may not be particularly relevant, but it is not particularly irrelevant either.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Well, if you have it and you can submit it, fine.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: If you have it.

CHAIRPERSON REID: Does that conclude with this evening? All right. Then that concludes this evening's session at six o'clock.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 6:03 p.m.)