



**Meeting Minutes for Mount Vernon Campus Plan Neighborhood Working Group
Community Engagement**

Wednesday September 8th, 4:00 pm – 5:30 pm

Attendees (In-Person/Online):

Mark Diaz, GW, Executive Leadership
Brian Snyder, GW, Facilities Planning, Construction and Management
Tanya Vogel, GW, Athletics
Kevin Days, GW, Community Relations
Gabriela Sosa, GW, Government Relations
Greg Rheault, GW, Student Affairs
Andrew Lundt, GW Athletics
John Square, GW, Athletics
Sherry Rutherford, Consultant
Destiny Jackson, GW, Transportation & Logistics
Natalie Addison, GW, Facilities Planning, Construction and Management
Stephen Penhoet, Perkins Eastman
Ana Nicolich, Perkins Eastman
Shaelyn McCarthy, GW student?
Maureen Moran, MCLA
Katie Brennan, MCLA
Chuck Elkins, ANC 3D
Steve Gardner, community member
Pierre Oury, community member
Maxine Weinstein, community member
Derrick Oracki, community member
Dave Roberts, community member

AGENDA

- Overview
- Student Enrollment
- Development Plan
- Athletic and Recreation Facilities
- Universal Accessibility
- Transportation and Parking
- Sustainability Integration
- Next Steps

MEETING ITEMS:

Welcome and Introduction

- Brian Snyder welcomed meeting participants
- Meeting participant introductions (on-line/in-person)
- Brian reviewed the meeting agenda and stated that the university's intent is to work in collaboration with the community and added that comments/questions are welcome on each section as the meeting progresses

Overview

- Brian reviewed key goals of the Strategic Campus and Facilities Master Plan – enjoyment of Mount Vernon campus as an urban retreat and as a student recreation and wellness hub, and achieving universal accessibility with connected landscapes
- Brian pointed out that the 2021 Mount Vernon Campus Plan proposes a reduced development program compared to the 2010 Mount Vernon Campus Plan

Student Enrollment

- Brian stated that the student headcount would not exceed 1,725 and the Mount Vernon FTE would not exceed 1,000 on a daily basis
- Steve Gardner asked if all student enrollment numbers mirror the 2010 campus plan to which Brian confirmed is the case
- Steve Gardner asked for the definition of FTE
- Greg Rheault responded that FTE is defined in the regulatory filings and that he will look it up to confirm

Development Plan

- Brian reviewed the overall intent of the development plan – to have a balanced and thoughtful approach that limits future campus development to specific university needs
- Brian highlighted that the 2021 development plan includes only three new development sites representing a large reduction from the development program approved by the Zoning Commission in the 2010 Campus Plan
- Brian reviewed Exhibit 1: Proposed Development Sites which identifies three development locations: Site 1, a 100 bed residence hall – he noted that the 2010 Campus Plan showed an extended building footprint; Site 2 consisting of an open air loggia that extends from West Hall to the proposed traffic turn-around drop-off circle, and a Wellness Building; and Site 3, consisting of a pool enclosure to allow for year-round use of the pool and support facilities for the pool and proposed track

Athletics and Recreation Facilities

- Brian introduced the topic of current outdoor athletics facilities and proposed improvements
- Brian identified field lighting considerations that were discussed during the August 11th meeting:
 - Field Lighting Considerations
 - Defined Scope of User Groups

- Controls on Athletic Field Use
- Light Mitigation Strategies
- Sound Mitigation Strategies
- Communication and Engagement with Neighbors
- Brian identified current GW athletics groups that use the outdoor facilities: Varsity Sports – Women’s Soccer, Men’s Soccer, Women’s Lacrosse and Women’s Softball; 36 different club sports teams, 18 of which are outdoor programs that currently compete for very limited remaining field time on campus resulting in club teams having to rent and travel to non-GW facilities in excess of 250 field hours each year;
- Brian conveyed that GW also supports an active intramural program which does not currently have access to the Mount Vernon facilities because of the extremely limited availability
- Steve Gardner questioned the meaning of extremely limited availability
- Brian clarified that the goal is to accommodate more club sports on the field and the university’s hope is that we can meet in the middle
- Maxine commented that she does not see the permanent installation of sound/noise level equipment on the list of proposed improvements and requested the timeline for installation
- Brian stated that it is in the draft document, just not on the presentation
- Maxine stated that she has had to write letters several times regarding noise
- Greg recalled the time when he tested the sound at Maxine’s house with a decibel reader and commented that once an acoustical engineer is on board – equipment will be mounted to determine how sound will travel
- Brian concurred that a professional engineer will be engaged
- Maxine added that studies should have been completed by now
- Brian reviewed Exhibit 2: Athletic and Recreation Facilities which identifies the following:
 - A: Existing Soccer/Lacrosse Field to Remain with 6 new light fixtures and new bleachers to replace existing seating
 - B: Track/Multipurpose Field to replace existing tennis courts; track to be lit with 6 light fixtures
 - C: Softball Field to Remain with 4 new light fixtures and new bleachers to replace existing seating
 - D: Lloyd Gym to Remain
 - E: New Pool Enclosure and Support Facilities
 - F: New Wellness Building

Field Lighting Concepts

- Brian reviewed a site section that shows approximately 225 ft. from the property line of the closest Berkeley Terrace residence to the soccer/lacrosse field lights
- Maureen Moran commented that the intention is to direct lighting down onto the field, that light fixtures would have glare shields, and that the duration/timing of lighting would be controlled
- Maureen emphasized that the lighting is focused on the field with the least amount of visibility from surrounding areas
- Brian mentioned that the possibility of renting portable fixtures was researched but those fixture types would not be a sufficient comparison

- He added that the tennis courts lights shut off time is 11pm according to the 2010 Campus Plan
- Pierre Oury asked for photometric data on the lighting – Kelvin, lux, glare, dimmability
- Pierre mentioned that W Street lighting is being replaced with DC’s standard new, LED light fixtures and that those fixtures put out a lot of flare
- Pierre stated that the source of light shining into homes is a concern and added that he has not seen the technical information on the lighting system
- Brian responded that DC’s standard globe street light does not direct light down and directs the light 360 degrees.
- Brian stated that GW Athletics will have brighter settings required to meet NCAA standards and that club sports would have lower light preset levels
- Brian pointed out that 12 special events in the 2021 Campus Plan would have similar provisions as in the 2010 Campus Plan
- Brian suggested that there could be pre-set lighting according to activity types
- Maureen stated that she can send lighting specifications to Pierre
- Pierre recommended that lighting data be included in the proposal
- Maureen stated that field lights color temperature would be in the 3000K – 4000K range and that DC street lights are 2700K
- Paul Bonner expressed that that color temperature is much cooler than the DC standard
- Maureen responded that the temperature is slightly cooler
- Paul Bonner stated his desire for a warmer color temperature
- Brian pointed out GW’s standard light color temperature for classrooms is 4000K and 3000K for residence halls
- Brian summarized that 5000K lighting has a purple hue while 2700K – 3000K provides a campfire glow

Field Lighting - Outline of GW Proposal for MVC Athletic Facilities Under the 2021 Campus Plan (Shown on 8/11/21)

- Brian provided an overview of current typical athletic field use (non-Covid times) vs. the proposed use of the fields
- Brian stated that the university’s desire is to expand and enhance the student experience with improved use of the field
- Brian presented a new lighting concept proposal that would mitigate and limit the use of lights
 - lights would only be on (2) hours past sunset from August 16th – May 1st and would be off at 10:00pm May 1st – August 16th (adds 210 hours per Semester / 420 hours per Academic year)
- Pierre asked if night time lighting is intended only for clubs/intramural sports
- Brian clarified that the extra 2-hour window includes clubs/intramural sports and allows flexibility for scheduling GW Athletics programs highlighting that this proposal adds 210 hours of field time per semester and 420 hours of field time per academic year
- Steve Gardner spoke on the proposed lighting concept on behalf of adjacent neighbors –
 - He spoke of his involvement in past campus plans with the university and not having any contention or issues
 - He stated that the W Street and Berkeley neighbors are adamantly opposed to the proposed lighting, noise and increased traffic associated with lighting and that they would go to the Zoning Commission to voice their opposition

- He stated that there is currently a letter circulating in the neighborhood in which the majority (~20) of the neighbors state their opposition to the proposed lighting
- He highlighted sections of the letter including: 1) when the issue of lighting was raised during the 2010 campus plan development, lighting was withdrawn from the plan; 2) the issue is not just light – it is the significant noise associated with it and there is already a problem with amplified sound - neighbors including a 2-year old who needs to sleep at 8:00pm, a 6 year old and a 70 year old would be negatively impacted; 3) the problem of off-campus parking would be exacerbated as people would park in the neighborhood – not on campus – in the event of at 750 – 1000 visitors attending an NCAA game
- He added that there is an aesthetic issue with the height of the lights – that neighbors would see light poles when they look out of their windows
- Steve reiterated that lighting is the only contentious issue and added that although the neighbors treasure their relationship with GW they cannot accept this part of the proposed plan
- Pierre Oury followed up and concurred with Steve that the current lighting proposal is unacceptable because lighting brings people, pollution, parking, noise and portable restroom facilities
- Pierre added that the vast majority of Berkeley Terrace neighbors oppose the lighting
- Pierre shared some history with West Hall development that it was not the presence of the building but the construction/pile driving that caused difficulty
- Pierre expressed his desire for a collaborative effort
- Brian thanked Steve and Pierre for their comments and stated that GW team will discuss next steps with university leadership
- Brian clarified that 750 people attending an event would only happen for a conference tournament and that the typical attendance for varsity events is ~150 people
- Tanya added that hosting a conference tournament event has been a once in a decade occurrence so far
- Steve inquired about the capacity of the stands
- Andrew responded that currently ~300 people and would increase to 500-600 people depending upon the bleacher configuration
- Pierre shared his analysis of the event schedule matrix that was presented in the August meeting from which he determined there would be 61 nighttime events with amplified sound in September – August; he added that does not include events with unamplified sound
- Tanya clarified that the matrix was a starting point to show maximum, possible potential for events and that there is the potential for 11 athletic events if GW is selected to host a conference tournament
- Brian added that there would be 12 special, non-athletic events and 18 games
- Brian asked if there is a number of events with lights and noise that would be acceptable to the community
- Paul Bonner responded that even 30 occurrences of events with light/amplified noise would be too much
- Paul added that there is a noise issue now and wonders how adding more events would work

- Paul stated that an NCAA/conference tournament event in a residential neighborhood is a non-starter and added that GW is going beyond what the 'school down the road' is proposing

Universal Accessibility

- Brian presented the overall goal to have universal accessibility across the campus open spaces, landscaped areas, athletic facilities, and campus buildings; he mentioned making paths from West Hall to the east quad accessible

Transportation and Parking

- Brian reviewed the current traffic plan and the proposed traffic plan
- He noted that the proposed plan focuses traffic on the turnaround/drop-off area which will accommodate shuttles, Uber/Lyft, and bike racks
- Brian noted that only service vehicles will use the service access road
- Brian added that there are discussions with GW Office of General Counsel on actions to enhance enforcement of the off-campus parking policy
- Steve voiced support of the campus vehicular plan stating that is a vast improvement
- Steve noted that community use of the campus shuttle is not indicated in the plan and that it is a significant community amenity
- Kevin responded that use of shuttles will be reviewed after winter break
- Brian added that the policy will be included in the campus plan
- Steve noted that visitors language prohibiting off-campus parking on adjacent neighborhood streets was removed from the parking enforcement plan and added that it is a significant issue for neighbors that required a letter to the university
- Brian confirmed it was an omission and would be added to the plan
- Steve commented that there has never been enforcement of the parking plan and that the community seeks true enforcement; he mentioned that neighbors would like the approach shown in American University's enhanced enforcement policy
- Pierre commented that there are already problems with parking enforcement during construction of a retirement home on the old Safeway site and they would like to avoid exacerbating the problem
- Maxine proposed that the next meeting be held either in-person or online due to difficulty hearing speakers
- Kevin will send out a survey to determine the next meeting mode
- Steve mentioned that there will be a small supermarket on the old Safeway site that will be much appreciated by the community and would be a benefit to the students

Sustainability Integration

- Brian highlighted key performance targets and strategies identified in the proposed plan to build upon and strengthen the foundation and vision for sustainability that GW has developed over the last decade:
 - Campus Buildings
 - Transportation
 - Stormwater Management
 - Green Space
 - Campus Community Behavior
 - Regulations and Other Considerations

- Steve commented that the plan did not include codification of green space as included in the 2010 Campus Plan
- Brian responded that the intent is to keep the green buffer, enhance it and maintain it

Next Steps

- Brian reviewed the schedule and preparation for the upcoming meeting on September 22nd which includes a review of the second draft of the plan
- He added that the hybrid meeting scheduled for September 22nd will be either in-person or online
- Brian thanked the meeting participants

Next Steps continued

- Steve requested that a section on student off-campus behavior be added to the plan and pointed out that Chuck Elkins is an expert in that area
- Greg Rheault said he will assist with development of a plan
- Brian reviewed important online resources
- Brian reviewed GW Community Engagement contact information