June 13, 2011

Anthony Hood
Chairman
Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia
441 4th Street, Room 210S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: The University of the District of Columbia Campus Plan and
Student Center Zoning Commission Cases No. 11-02 and 11-02A

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission:

At the close of the second and final hearing on the Campus Plan and new Student Center for the University of the District of Columbia ("UDC"), UDC was asked to provide additional information concerning traffic, housing and other issues. The purpose of this submission is to respond to all outstanding issues. Revised plans providing more details about the Student Center are being filed under separate cover.

I. Traffic

Since the hearing on May 25, UDC's traffic expert, Dan VanPelt of Gorove Slade has been in communication with the ANC's traffic expert, David Fields of Nelson\Nygaard. UDC has reviewed in detail each of Fields' suggestions. As set forth in the document attached as Exhibit A, UDC has already incorporated many of measures suggested by Fields into its TMP. Although UDC has given serious consideration to all of the suggestions, certain suggestions have not been adopted. For example, UDC is not willing to consider a morning peak hour trip generation cap. The four main reasons supporting that decision are:

1) UDC is not increasing the parking supply on the campus, which is a highly effective way to limit trips to the campus;

2) No other university in the District of Columbia has been required to track and limit its morning peak hour trips. This is an onerous condition given UDC’s status as the city’s only public university;
3) UDC is located on one of the most significant arterials in the District of Columbia; the trips generated by UDC represent an extremely small fraction of the peak hour trips on Connecticut Avenue; and

4) UDC has agreed to more targeted and effective limits to address potential traffic impacts, such as the restriction on ballroom rentals which cannot begin between 5pm and 7pm on weekdays.

II. Off-Campus Leasing

The Commission requested information about the practice of master leasing by other universities. The matter-of-right use of off-campus apartment houses in high-density residential zones to accommodate student housing demand, including through master leasing, is a recognized part of the housing plan of the major DC universities. Examples of leasing activity include American University, which master leases 200 units in the Berkshire at 4201 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, The Catholic University of America, which leases 40 units in the Cloisters at 100 Michigan Avenue, NE, and The George Washington University which leases the entire building known as City Hall at 950 24th Street NW. As the Commission is aware, universities have also acquired all or partial ownership interests in off-campus apartment buildings for housing as well, and this matter-of-right use has been affirmed by both the Z.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment and the D.C. Court of Appeals.

Commissioner May asked for more information on whether ANC notice was required or provided prior to UDC’s leasing of units at Van Ness South. We have been unable to confirm whether the ANC was provided with formal notice of UDC’s intent to lease units at Van Ness South 30 days prior to the effective date of the lease. We note, however, that residents of the building, including the ANC representative who lives in the building, were aware of the lease prior to its effective date. At the BZA appeal hearing, the Deputy Chief Building Official for DCRA testified that he had met with the ANC representative and other Van Ness South tenants in “mid-July” to discuss the construction related to UDC’s pending use of the units. (BZA Tr. Mar. 15, 2011 at 300). The lease took effect on August 15, 2010. Therefore, the ANC had constructive, if not formal notice, approximately 30 days prior to the effective date of the lease.

As a result of community input and as discussed at the hearing, UDC has agreed to cease any additional master leasing in Van Ness South and to phase out the leasing entirely when the new dormitories are constructed.

III. Students by Ward

We have attached as Exhibit B a table that shows the distribution of students by Ward.
IV. Neighborhood Use of Athletic Facilities

As discussed at the hearing, UDC allows neighborhood use of the newly renovated tennis courts, for an annual charge of $250. Other universities similarly allow neighborhood use of their facilities, generally for a fee that is much greater than UDC’s. For example, George Washington charges $500 annually for the use of its Mount Vernon Campus pool and tennis courts. Georgetown University charges $996 annually for the use of the Yates Center, which includes the use of the tennis courts. Nonetheless, UDC understands the need for enhanced availability to the community. For that reason UDC will agree to offer an hourly rate for the use of the tennis courts and the natatorium for non-university users who do not want to purchase an annual membership.

V. Massing and Buffering of Proposed Housing

The studies attached as Exhibit C depict three housing options within the proposed Student Housing and Athletic zone. This combined zone was created to address community comments about the need for flexibility in the siting of the proposed dormitories. Also included is an analysis of the four additional sites that were suggested by the Van Ness Residents’ Association (“VNRA”).

As shown by the studies of the options within the proposed Student Housing and Athletic zone, there will be more flexibility to accommodate UDC’s athletic field and to set back and buffer the proposed student housing from Van Ness Street and the International Chancery Center if a building height in excess of four stories is permitted. Nonetheless, UDC is not seeking approval for that additional height at this time and the dormitories referenced in Campus Plan continues to include a four story limit. UDC understands that an acceptable housing proposal will involve a balancing of interests that will occur in connection with the further processing case for the proposed housing.

In addition, while UDC’s architects and planners have strongly considered each of the four alternate sites suggested by VNRA, each presents substantial challenges. Many of these options were studied by UDC in connection with the original planning process. These challenges led to the selection of the designated zone. During the course of these hearings, UDC has expanded the originally designated housing zone in response to the concerns of VNRA. That adjustment will provide an opportunity to address VNRA’s concerns about setbacks from Van Ness Street.

VI. Conclusion

UDC has proposed a modest plan that will allow for a reasonable level of growth as the University strives to realize its vision. The campus has already experienced enrollment at levels beyond that which is currently being requested. With the addition of a detailed TDM measures, the impact of the additional students will be minimal.
The new University Center will become a central and defining feature on the campus. It will help the University attract new students and better serve their needs. While any change can be challenging for a community, UDC has made every effort to manage potential impacts. We encourage this Commission to endorse UDC’s Campus Plan and proposed Student Center.

Sincerely,

Allison C. Prince

David M. Avitabile
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 13, 2011, copies of the attached letter and enclosures were delivered by hand to the following:

Paul Goldstien  
D.C. Office of Planning  
1100 4th Street SW, Suite E650  
Washington, DC 20024

Adam Tope  
ANC 3F  
4319 Reno Road NW  
Washington, DC 20008

Jeff Jennings  
District Department of Transportation  
55 M Street SE, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20003

David Wilson  
Van Ness South Tenants' Association  
3003 Van Ness Street NW  
Washington, DC 20008

Brenda Viehe-Naess  
Van Ness Street Residents Association  
3625 Van Ness Street NW  
Washington, DC 20008

Allison Prince

[Signature]
MEMORANDUM

To: Erik Thompson
   Steve McKenzie
   Alison Prince
   David Avitabile

From: Daniel B. VanPelt, P.E., PTOE
       Robert B. Schiesel, P.E.

Date: June 13, 2011

Subject: Z.C. Case No. 11-02 / 11-02A - UDC Campus Plan
         Response to Nelson\Nygaard Draft Report dated June 6, 2011

Gorove/Siade has reviewed the draft report prepared by Nelson\Nygaard and dated June 6, 2011. On behalf of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3F, the Nelson\Nygaard report reviews the Gorove/Siade Campus Plan Transportation Report dated April 6, 2011 and the Revised Transportation Demand Management Commitments dated May 24, 2011. This memorandum contains responses to the recommendations contained in the Nelson\Nygaard report. Excerpts from the Nelson\Nygaard June 6, 2011 report are presented in red text with responses from Gorove/Siade immediately following in **bold italics**.

1. Travel Surveys

   The campus has extensive transit access and limited vehicular parking, thus the Transportation Plan's assumption that the majority of staff and students walk or ride transit is fair and most likely accurate. However, a travel mode survey of these existing users should be conducted to validate these assumptions, as well as provide a baseline for future changes to the demands on the transportation network. In addition to mode, the survey should also include data on weekly trip patterns (how many days does each University member travel to/from campus and at what times); this data will be used to calculate the total number of UDC-generated peak hour auto trips and can be inform development of additional TDM programs (see “Student SmarTrip Cards” below).

At the May 25, 2011 Zoning Commission Hearing, DDOT reported that they had received a UDC Travel Mode Survey based on 322 participants (the survey was not dated) with the following results:

- Transit = 56%
- Drive/Carpool = 35%
- Walk = 4%
- Bicycle = 2.5%
The May 25, 2011 Proposed Conditions of Approval commits the University to providing “Information of implementation of the transportation demand management plan detailed in condition 13, including mode split data” (Housing.2.c.iii.1). While the above mode split data and on-going commitment is useful, UDC should provide total auto trips generated.

With two-hour parking available on-street at meters and in permit areas, and class durations of one hour and twenty minutes, parking offers a direct opportunity to driving, which should be determined to ensure increases do not occur. To assist in determining transportation trends, UDC should conduct a survey of parkers who currently use the University’s parking facilities and on-street spaces to identify who they are (faculty, staff, employees, residents, others), their specific travel times/days, and their other potential travel modes. This is an item offered by UDC in the May 25, 2011 Proposed Conditions of Approval and should be conducted prior to Plan approval and then annually.

Without definition of these existing travel conditions, the Plan’s assertion that “Over the course of the Campus Plan, it will not generate significant changes to roadway traffic volumes, operations or geometries.” cannot be confirmed. Since the methodology about the traffic operations cannot be confirmed, the Report’s conclusions about specific intersection operations are also in doubt.

As UDC looks toward a future focused on sustainable practices, the University is committing to implement a comprehensive TDM plan. As part of the TDM plan, UDC is committing to annual monitoring, which is a commitment that goes beyond the “two years, five years and eight years after the Zoning order has been written,” as DDOT is requesting in the April 20, 2011 staff report. UDC is essentially seeking a student enrollment cap that is at a population level the campus has historically supported without a TDM plan. Additionally, there will be no growth in the faculty and staff populations over current levels and therefore we do not believe it is necessary to conduct monitoring prior to the approval of the Campus Plan.

The annual monitoring will begin with the fall 2011 semester and the report will be shared with DDOT and ANC 3F no later than one year after the Zoning order is issued. It will be provided to other interested parties on request. The monitoring will include the following:

- Mode split surveys of the campus population, broken down by students and employees
- Current parking inventory and occupancy on a typical weekday
- Number of permits sold per year
- Parking availability on surrounding neighborhood streets
- Statistics on the Good Neighbor Program
- Number of registered carpools
- Zipcar and Capital Bikeshare usage data
- Number of people signed up for SmartBenefits
2. Additional Trip Generation Factors

One of the primary features proposed as part of the UDC Campus Plan is construction of a new Student Center at the intersection of Connecticut Avenue and Van Ness Streets NW. If the Student Center hosts events of interest to the greater Washington DC population, trips should be anticipated from the region, and not necessarily from transit-accessible locations. Therefore, additional auto trips should be expected on the local roadway network and additional parking demand generated. The May 25, 2011 Proposed Conditions of Approval outlines a permitted schedule for events (Transportation and Parking #15) which should be included in the Plan’s commitments.

As noted in the Proposed Conditions dated May 25, 2011, UDC is committing that weekday non-University event attendees will be instructed that there is no parking on campus or in the surrounding residential community and the use of alternate modes will be encouraged. The intent is to discourage weekday attendees from driving to the new Student Center. Additionally, the University is committing that no non-University events will begin between the ours of 5 pm and 7pm to eliminate any impact on the PM commuter peak period. The University will also coordinate with other area institutions with regards to scheduling special events.

3. Transit Capacity

The Transportation Plan specifies that “...the Campus Plan will lead to a significant amount of growth in alternate modes of transportation. It is expected that student, faculty and staff use of Metrorail, Metrobus, Capital Bikeshare, and walking and bicycling in general will all increase over the life of the Campus Plan.”

Accommodating additional trips via alternate modes is both in line with the District’s goals and minimizes impacts to the community. What is unclear is the available capacity of the existing transit system, especially during peak travel periods. The available capacity of the Metrorail Red Line, Van Ness/UDC station capacity, and Metrobus routes should be documented. WMATA should be included in the project planning process to obtain their concurrence on their ability to accommodate the additional ridership.

WMATA’s Office of Long-Range Planning was contacted with regard to the capacity of the Van Ness/UDC station. WMATA predicts stable growth for the Van Ness-Tenley area and the 2008 Metro Station Access and Capacity Study indicates the station should have adequate capacity to accommodate present and 2030 projections. The current daily ridership is above 8,000 and projected to be 11,400 in 2030. Due to some operational issues on the Red Line, there could be crowding issues from time to time, especially during the peak of the peak. Recently, Metro has changed run time and headways which has improved service reliability. By 2025, Metro plans to eliminate the turn-back at Grosvenor, operate the entire line at 2.5-minutes peak frequency and use only 8-car trains, which will increase the Red Line capacity for the Van Ness segment by 37%.

The WMATA study did not show capacity issues with vertical transportation elements of the station, but there could be issues associated with escalator break down and peak surge. Because Red Line trains can arrive during
peak periods at 1 minute headways and not the scheduled 3 minute headways, this can cause a surge in the station which will cause users to experience delay.

UDC population arrives and departs in the reverse direction of local resident commuters, which diminishes the impact of new UDC riders. Student travel patterns are also dispersed throughout the day and do not follow typical commuter patterns thereby minimizing impact on the peak of the peak periods.

4. Pedestrian Analysis

The unsignalized crossings at Van Ness Street and both the UDC Garage and International Drive operate at Level of Service F for pedestrians. UDC should work with DDOT to conduct warrant analyses to determine whether these unsignalized crossings should be signalized to improve pedestrian crossing conditions.

Traffic signal warrant criteria was reviewed and a signal at this location is not warranted based on existing volumes. The HCM pedestrian LOS is an indication of pedestrian risk taking behavior with respect to taking gaps in traffic to cross. However, according to DC Law, motorists must stop for a pedestrian in a crosswalk. This is not considered in the LOS analysis. UDC will interact with DDOT regarding the implementation of “Stop for Pedestrians in Crosswalk” signage and/or pavement marking improvements at the crossing.

5. Roadway Analysis

Beyond the earlier questions about the roadway analysis assumptions, there are additional questions about Plan’s conclusions.

The Transportation Report identifies Level of Service E or better on each approach as the minimum desirable and specifies that “All intersections operate at acceptable conditions.” The intersection of Connecticut Avenue and Tilden Street is reported to currently operate at LOS F in the AM Peak Hour with 100.4 seconds of delay; this would not be considered acceptable. East-and westbound approaches each operate at LOS F in both hours with between 110 and 303 seconds of delay. While these approaches are noted as operating under unacceptable conditions, the calculation of over 5 minutes of delays Westbound in the AM peak hour; a queue analysis at this location should be conducted.

In addition, overall delay at Connecticut Avenue and Van Ness Street during the AM peak hour is projected to increase from 29.2 seconds (LOS C) to 79.8 seconds (LOS E). Southbound delay at this intersection will increase from 24.8 seconds (LOS C) to 115.0 seconds (LOS F). If the Campus Plan is not increasing driving rates, these conditions may stem from regional growth, though additional analysis necessary to confirm that. If not, mitigations to these conditions should be identified.

The traffic signals and reversible lane configuration on Connecticut Avenue are set up by DDOT to process mainline volumes, which are much heavier than the side street volumes. This bias toward the mainline penalizes the side street approaches and as a result the side streets experience high delay. This is not uncommon on major commuter corridors in the District and DDOT will not seek to improve the side street delays and therefore no mitigations measures would be sought. Doing so would impact the mainline which could potentially have significant implications on the Connecticut Avenue regional corridor. The heaviest movements operate at
acceptable levels of delay. The delay at Tilden westbound at Connecticut was revisited and found to be correct in the analysis. It is attributable to the mainline biased signal timings.

The increases in future delays noted by Nelson\Nygaard are not generated by regional growth, and are due to proposed changes in intersection operations from the CAPA and RCW2 Livability studies. The recommendations, including installing Leasing Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs) and lengthening east-west crossing times, have a negative impact on vehicular levels of service.

6. Establish a Peak Hour Auto Trip Generation Cap

DDOT has recommended that UDC conduct transportation performance monitoring studies at two years, five years, and eight years after the Zoning order has been written. To maximize the benefit of the survey and ensure UDC is achieving its objectives, the University should go beyond a monitoring program and commit to a maximum auto trip generation goal. This would guide the need for TDM programs based on a quantifiable measure. Since the Transportation Report (and hence any approvals of the Plan) builds on the assumption that UDC’s expansion will not generate significant changes to roadway volumes, the recommended maximum should match the University’s existing total auto trip generation rates, even with the additional development. This should be confirmed by annual surveys, with data submitted to the District for confirmation and available to the public for review. This is an approach pioneered by Stanford University which would offer UDC to be the model for sustainability in Washington DC.

The University should also commit to a process for increasing TDM activities should the mode share goal not be achieved. Tracking the actual auto trips generated and the TDM measures implemented will provide the District, the neighborhood, and the University with clear information on the results of the Campus Plan and transportation commitments.

One opportunity to confirm the auto trip cap is working is to phase in the University’s proposed “Population increases in students, faculty, and staff that support the change to a selective admissions flagship institution.” Phasing will allow each new class of students and hires to utilize the TDM programs provided by the University, and provide the University time to adjust those programs based on response rates.

**UDC is committing to a TDM plan with annual monitoring that goes beyond the DDOT staff report recommendation and that will be shared publically. As previously stated above, a component of this monitoring will be trips generated by UDC. Since UDC is essentially seeking a student enrollment cap that is at a level previously supported on campus without a TDM plan and there will be no growth in the faculty and staff populations over current levels, we do not believe a trip cap is necessary. The annual monitoring will be used to seek positive transportation trends and adjust the TDM practices and policies accordingly.**

7. Personalized Commute Assistance

Yale University has spearheaded an initiative to provide “commuter counseling.” Employees complete a simple form, providing home and work locations, and modes each employee is willing to use. Yale’s Sustainable Transportation Systems uses a standard trip matching software to provide commute options personalized to the
employee, including comparisons of travel time and cost. Employees who are aware of their travel options are more likely to travel by alternate modes. UDC should consider implementing a similar system.

**UDC’s TDM coordinator will provide commuter counseling services.**

8. Student SmarTrip Cards

The April 6, 2011 Transportation Report stated:

UDC is exploring the implementation of a Transportation Sustainability Fee subject to Board of Trustees approval. The University is committed to the advancement of sustainable practices. The fee will cover the cost of the following to be provided to each student at the beginning of the academic year or at enrollment:

- Annual Zipcar carsharing membership (or other appropriate carsharing provider)
- Annual Capital Bikeshare membership
- SmarTrip card with at least $20 preloaded

As written, this commitment is for every student to receive all three elements. However, in the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Commitments for UDC Campus Plan – Revised (May 24, 2011) and UDC testimony at the May 25, 2011 Zoning Commission hearing, this commitment has been revised to:

UDC will dedicate at least $25 of the Sustainability Fee paid by students each semester to be used toward any of the following transportation options:

- SmarTrip card with at least $20 preloaded
- Annual Zipcar carsharing membership (or other appropriate carsharing provider)
- Annual Capital Bikeshare membership

The University should be required to provide all three transportation options as originally documented. In additional, since $20 will pay for about one week’s worth of bus or rail trips, this is not anticipated to be enough to establish a transit mindset. The SmarTrips should instead be preloaded with the equivalent of one month’s worth of rides for the average UDC student (calculated based on the results of the travel survey described above).

**UDC is committed to a sustainable future and as such is the first University in the District to commit to a Transportation Sustainability Fee. While the University recognizes Nelson\Nygaard would recommend a higher fee, $25 is the current limit of what can be implemented with a firm commitment at this time. Adjustments to the fee will be evaluated with the annual TDM monitoring.**

9. Reduce Long Commutes

“Live Where You Work” programs provide low-interest mortgage loans or a cash payment to be applied at closing to homebuyers working in a certain area and looking to buy a home in that same area. Programs like this result in an increase in residents who work close enough to home to allow for commutes by walking and biking. UDC should
commit to sponsoring such a program, thereby encouraging investment in the local community and reducing the potential for impacts on the transportation network.

**UDC will research current programs presently being explored for the District to see if there is an opportunity for the University to participate, however, the University has no such plans to sponsor an independent plan at this time.**

10. Bicycle Facilities

Bicycle Parking - The Transportation Report confirms that “Over the course of the Campus Plan, UDC will add short and long-term spaces to enhance supply.” The Revised Transportation Commitments state “The utilization of bicycle parking will be evaluated with the TDM monitoring and additional parking will be added when the bike parking is consistently occupied and there is a demonstrated need.” The University should commit that this processing be based on peak hour demand for space, identified through surveys of both students and employees (not limited to on-campus students) and coordinated with the recommended transportation performance monitoring studies.

Support Facilities - To encourage bicycling, support facilities are also necessary. The University should commit to providing showers and changing rooms within a short distance of the long-term bicycle spaces. These facilities should be available to all members of the UDC community as part of the Transportation Sustainability Fee.

* Bike parking will be monitored for peak occupancy when evaluating the need for additional parking as suggested. Long term bike spaces will also be provided in proximity to shower facilities that will be available to all members of the UDC community.*

11. Parking Management

Allow Travelers to Choose their Mode Each Day - UDC currently offers a semester-long parking permit. Students and staff who purchase this permit have invested in a four-month choice to drive and have no incentive to choose a different mode on an individual day. Paying to park each individual day, however, requires drivers to decide each time whether driving is worth the expense. This strategy has been effectively implemented at the University of Wisconsin, University of Oregon, and Utah State University to “help prevent the ‘all you can eat’ syndrome that is often enabled by long term permits.”

UDC’s semester-long parking permit should therefore be eliminated. Coupled with the University's commitment to adjusting the parking rates to maintain a peak occupancy of 80-90%, plus providing SmarTrip cards that offer a lower-cost alternative to driving, eliminating the semester fee is anticipated to significantly reduce student SOV rates.

Some faculty members currently receive a parking permit as part of their employment benefits. “Free” permits further the trend of incentivizing driving. UDC should eliminate the practice of providing this “benefit”. One option is to shift from a pre-paid permit to a cash allowance (“cashout”), which allows each traveler to apply the financial benefit to whatever mode they choose (paying to park, paying for a transit fare, or just money they keep if they...
walk). If eliminating free parking is not legally permissible for existing faculty members, it should at least not be offered for new hires, especially since additional faculty will be needed to instruct the additional student body.

The primary benefit of parking cash-out programs is their proven effect on reducing parking demand. Figure 2 illustrates the effect of parking cash-out at eight different employers located in and around Los Angeles, with a direct correlation between a greater financial incentive to the employee and a reduction in parking demand. At $3.00 per day to park in the UDC facility (before increasing rates per UDC’s commitment), parking could translate into a $60 monthly cash-out. Cash-outs of this amount have resulted in a 10% to 25% reduction in parking demand; an equivalent reduction would be a valuable benefit to the community.

UDC is presently evaluating all of its parking policies and pricing structure. The new revenue control system will completely eliminate after hours free parking and will allow much more effective control and management of the main parking garage. The Nelson\Nygaard report presents some interesting strategies for effectuating change that will be considered by the University as it works towards its commitment to discourage auto trips.

12. Assist in Managing the Parking System

Increasing the financial disincentive of driving is only effective when outlets for illegal parking are eliminated. According to DCOP (April 29, 2011), UDC has committed to supporting the District’s on-street and residential parking regulations. “To accomplish these purposes, the University shall employ a system of administrative actions, penalties, and fines for violations of this policy.” These commitments are very valuable and an excellent approach to minimizing impacts on the local community. UDC should codify this commitment into the academic code and their dorm contracts, expanding on their commitments offered in the May 25, 2011 Proposed Conditions of Approval (Student Conduct, 7 and 8).

Two examples of universities with similar programs for UDC to learn from are American University (private institution in Washington, DC) and Georgia Tech (a public institution in Atlanta, GA).

American University’s "Good Neighbor Policy" prohibits University members from parking on the residential streets surrounding the AU’s Main Campus, Tenley Campus, and the Washington College of Law. All members of the University community, including students, faculty, staff, visitors and guests, are required to park on campus with a parking permit, purchase hourly/daily parking using the Pay-As-You-Go machines, or to use public transportation. Compliance with the Good Neighbor Policy is a condition of enrollment and/or employment at American University.

Georgia Tech students that receive parking citations for parking on public neighborhood streets are subject "to collection and/or institutional policies" which is then followed by the citation fees added directly to their student account. If these fees are left unpaid, students can be placed on a form of probation. Instead of merely a financial disincentive, students at Georgia Tech must consider their academic standing, a more significant deterrent.

The proposed language in the commitments related to the Good Neighbor Policy is the same as in the American University and George Washington Mt. Vernon Campus approvals. The intent is for UDC to implement the same policy to discourage the University population from parking on residential streets.
13. Guarantee the Commitments

The Transportation Report recommends implementation of a Transportation Sustainability Fee which is an excellent mechanism to both fund TDM commitments and provide incentives for students to utilize the services. However, the Transportation Report conditions this commitment “subject to Board of Trustees approval.” DCOP recommended (April 29, 2011) that “UDC provides a more solid commitment to providing any conditioned TDM measures.” UDC should offer and the Zoning Commission should require all commitments without conditions, with ongoing confirmation that each commitment has been implemented.

All of the elements in the May 24, 2011 TDM Commitments are firm commitments. There are no longer any commitments conditioned on Board of Trustee approval.
University of the District of Columbia
Facilities & Real Estate - Capital Construction Division
Campus Master Plan: Community Demographic Information Responses

Student Enrollment by DC Ward:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Flagship</th>
<th>CCDC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Information is extrapolated from the most recent University factbook, prepared by the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment & Planning.

Note: The enrollment statistics by DC Ward exclude the UDC David A. Clarke School of Law.

Note: Student enrollment by Ward is not the same as enrollment by residency status. The Ward information was extracted based on student addresses.
Note: The Athletic Fields will be established above geothermal wells area

UDC Campus Master Plan - Campus Zones

STANDARD REGULATION SOCCER FIELD REQUIREMENT:

STANDARD REGULATION SOCCER FIELD DIMENSION:
= 70 YARDS (210 FEET) BY
115 YARDS (345 FEET)
= 72,450 SF
Proposed NSH:
Total Area = 280,000 SF
Height of Building = 43 Feet / 4 stories
Setback from Van Ness Street = 3 Feet
Athletic Fields / Geothermal Wells Area = 53,530 SF

Disadvantages:
- The 4 story building's footprint results in inadequate room for a standard regulation soccer field
- Very small setback of 3 feet from Van Ness Street, thereby offering no space for a landscape buffer
- Very small setback of 8 feet from International Drive, thereby offering minimal insufficient space for a landscape buffer

Note: The Athletic Fields will be established above geothermal wells area

UDC Campus Master Plan - Proposed New Student Housing - Option 1, View 1
Disadvantages:
- The 4 story building's footprint results in inadequate room for a standard regulation soccer field
- Very small setback of 3 feet from Van Ness Street, thereby offering no space for a landscape buffer
- Very small setback of 8 feet from International Drive, thereby offering minimal insufficient space for a landscape buffer

Note: The Athletic Fields will be established above geothermal wells area

UDC Campus Master Plan - Proposed New Student Housing - Option 1, View 2
Disadvantages:
- The 4 story building's footprint results in inadequate room for a standard regulation soccer field
- Very small setback of 3 feet from Van Ness Street, thereby offering no space for a landscape buffer
- Very small setback of 8 feet from International Drive, thereby offering minimal insufficient space for a landscape buffer
Proposed NSH:
Total Area = 280,000 SF
Height of Building = 63 Feet / 6 stories
Setback from Van Ness Street = 23 Feet
Setback from International Drive = 20 Feet
Athletic Fields Geothermal Wells Area = 72,670 SF

Advantages:
- Sufficient setback of 23 feet along Van Ness Street to incorporate a landscaped buffer
- Sufficient setback of 20 feet along International Drive to incorporate a landscaped buffer
- Adequate room for a standard regulation soccer field

Note: The Athletic Fields will be established above geothermal wells area

UDC Campus Master Plan - Proposed New Student Housing - Option 2, View 1
Proposed New Student Housing
Existing Embassy Buildings
Existing Single Family Neighborhood Residential
Proposed New Student Center
Extent of Athletic Fields / Geothermal Wells

Advantages:
- Sufficient setback of 23 feet along Van Ness Street to incorporate a landscaped buffer
- Sufficient setback of 20 feet along International Drive to incorporate a landscaped buffer
- Adequate room for a standard regulation soccer field

Note: The Athletic Fields will be established above geothermal wells area

UDC Campus Master Plan - Proposed New Student Housing - Option 2, View 2
Advantages:
- Sufficient setback of 23 feet along Van Ness Street to incorporate a landscaped buffer
- Sufficient setback of 20 feet along International Drive to incorporate a landscaped buffer
- Adequate room for a standard regulation soccer field
Proposed NSH:
Total Area = 280,000 SF
Height of Building = 73 Feet / 7 stories
Setback from Van Ness Street = 402 Feet
Setback from International Drive = 20 Feet
Athletic Fields / Geothermal Wells Area = 72,670 SF

- Proposed New Student Housing
- Existing Embassy Buildings
- Existing Single Family Neighborhood Residential
- Proposed New Student Center
- Extent of Athletic Fields / Geothermal Wells

Advantages:
- Sufficient setback of 402 feet along Van Ness Street
- Sufficient setback of 20 feet along International Drive to incorporate a landscaped buffer
- Adequate room for a standard regulation soccer field

Note: The Athletic Fields will be established above geothermal wells area

UDC Campus Master Plan - Proposed New Student Housing - Option 3, View 1
Advantages:
- Sufficient setback of 402 feet along Van Ness Street
- Sufficient setback of 20 feet along International Drive to incorporate a landscaped buffer
- Adequate room for a standard regulation soccer field

Note: The Athletic Fields will be established above geothermal wells area

UDC Campus Master Plan - Proposed New Student Housing - Option 3, View 2
East-West Site Section

- Proposed New Student Housing
- Existing Embassy Buildings
- Existing Single Family Neighborhood Residential
- Proposed New Student Center
- Landscaped Buffer

Advantages:
- Sufficient setback of 402 feet along Van Ness Street
- Sufficient setback of 20 feet along International Drive to incorporate a landscaped buffer
- Adequate room for a standard regulation soccer field

East-West Site Section - Detail

North-South Site Section

UDC Campus Master Plan - Proposed New Student Housing - Option 3
Alternative Sites for the New Student Housing on UDC Campus suggested by the Van Ness Residents Association

Site Alternative 1 - Building 52

Proposed NSH:
Existing Conditions - Building 52
Ground Level Area = 18,500 SF
Upper Level Area = 24,700 x 3 = 74,100 SF
Total Existing Area = 92,600 SF
Accountable Existing Area = 80% x 92,600 SF
= 74,080 SF
Total Required Area = 280,000 SF
Additional Required Area = 205,920 SF

Proposed High Rise Component above Existing Building 52
Proposed Footprint = 19,600 SF
Proposed Additional Height = 11 Floors

Advantages:
1. Athletic field preserved in original condition

Disadvantages:
1. Cost of renovation for existing Building 52 and a 11 story high rise component very expensive
2. Proposed design with 15 stories exceeds permissible height

Site Alternative 2 - Site 3

Proposed NSH:
Total Area = 280,000 SF
Height of Building = 63 Feet / 6 stories
Setback along Connecticut Avenue = 33 Feet
Setback along Yuma Street = 33 Feet
Athletic Fields / Geothermal Wells Area = 146,860 SF

Advantages:
1. Athletic field preserved in original condition

Disadvantages:
1. 6 story building incompatible with Yuma Street residential
2. Disrupts newly enhanced tennis courts
3. Disrupts preserved tree area
4. Steep slopes for construction result in higher construction costs
5. Disrupts pathways leading to amphitheatre
6. Building very close to amphitheatre
Alternative Sites for the New Student Housing on UDC Campus suggested by the *Van Ness Residents Association*

Site Alternative 3 - Quad Site A

**Proposed NSH:**
- Total Area = 280,000 SF
- Height of Building = 73 Feet / 7 stories
- Setback along International Drive = 0 Feet
- Setback along Van Ness Street = 360 Feet
- Athletic Fields / Geothermal Wells Area = 56,155 SF

**Disadvantages:**
1. New building very close to existing Building 46 West
2. Insufficient space for a standard regulation soccer field
3. Rain Garden design for Dennard Plaza disrupted

Site Alternative 3 - Quad Site B

**Proposed NSH:**
- Total Area = 280,000 SF
- Height of Building = 73 Feet / 7 stories
- Athletic Fields / Geothermal Wells Area = 56,155 SF

**Advantages:**
1. Athletic Field preserved in original condition

**Disadvantages:**
1. New building proposal disrupts existing Building 46 West
2. Rain Garden design for Dennard Plaza disrupted