

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with approval of Specific Design Plans pursuant to Part 8, Division 4 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on September 9, 2004, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-0203/01 for Maryland Science and Technology Center, Lots 2 & #, Block 2, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The purpose of this specific design plan is for two research and development (R&D) office buildings consisting of 40,800 square feet each on Lots 2 and 3, Block 2. The lots are located in the northern area of the development (Pod 2 of the CDP). The lots have been graded, based on a specific design plan for infrastructure approved by the Planning Board in February 2003.
2. **Development Data Summary**

		EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)		E-I-A	E-I-A
Use(s)		Vacant	Office
Acreage	Lot 2	10.51	10.51
	Lot 3	9.14	9.14
Lots		Lots 2&3, Block 2	Lots 2&3, Block 2
Parcels		N/A	N/A
Square Footage/GFA		0	81,600
Dwelling Units:		N/A	N/A
	Attached	0	0
	Detached	0	0
	Multifamily	0	0

Other Development Data:

		REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Parking Spaces:			
	Lot 2	105	178
	Lot 3	105	175
Of which are HC spaces			
	Lot 2	5	6
	Lot 3	5	6
Loading Spaces:			
	Lot 2	1	1
	Lot 3	1	1

3. **Location:** The subject property is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Crain Highway (US 301/MD 3) and John Hanson Highway (US 50). The site is bounded to the north by Sherwood Manor, an existing subdivision of single-family detached dwelling units in the R-A Zone, and the Patuxent River Park; to the east by the Patuxent River and the US Air Force transmitter station located in Anne Arundel County; to the south by the US 50 right-of-way; and to the west by the MD 3 right-of-way.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

4. **The Approved Basic Plan:** On January 25, 1982, the District Council approved zoning map amendment application and Basic Plan A-9401 for the subject property, with ten conditions (Zoning Ordinance 2-1982). The zoning map amendment rezoned the property from the R-A and O-S Zones to the E-I-A Zone. The specific design plan is in general conformance with the approved basic plan.
5. **The Approved Comprehensive Design Plan:** On July 7, 1986, the District Council approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8601, affirming the prior Planning Board decision (PGCPB No. 86-107), for the Maryland Science and Technology Center, with 27 conditions and two considerations. The proposed specific design plan (SDP) is not in conformance with all aspects of the approved comprehensive design plan (CDP). Specifically, the SDP is not in conformance with the design principles of the CDP text as described below:

Lots 2 and 3, Block 2, are both located in Pod 2 of the CDP. The two lots are approximately 10 acres in size each and approximately one half of the area of the lots is developable. The front part of the site along the street is relatively flat, while the back part consists of steep wooded slopes that fall to a stream that is a tributary of the Patuxent River. The proposed two-story office buildings are generally sited toward the front of the lots, with parking lots surrounding the buildings. Each building is comprised of individual office spaces that have their own separate entrances. The first-floor units have their entrances at the front of the buildings at grade with the parking lot. The second floor units have elevated walkways that extend from the back parking lots to the buildings. In order to access the second-floor level, the rear parking lots for each building have been raised approximately 10 feet above existing grade.

The CDP text prescribes that certain uses be located in certain development pods. Page 39 of the CDP text describes the “Thematic Pods and Land Uses” as follows:

“The concept plan lends itself to featuring seven thematic zones which identify with particular users. These zones are described as ‘pods,’ a clustering of parcels to service a targeted user.”

For example, Pod 1 is the “core area” where a mix of uses are intended to create a “village” character, modeling itself on Melford and the charm of the estate.

Pod 2 is “a remote pod intended for users who may be security conscious, high security users for offices and laboratory space.” Pod 2 was to be marketed to federal contractors and, in fact, the

lots in this application are directly adjacent to the Institute for Defense Analysis, one of the first buildings to be constructed in the center. That building is a 4-5-story office building consisting of 117,000 square feet and is the kind of large office building intended for the lots in Pod 2. The type of office proposed by this application is a small, incubator or start-up-type office, which is allowed in Pod 4 of the development. The applicant revised the plans to provide a central lobby in each building with space for a potential elevator in order to accommodate larger office users, however, the Planning Board determined that the plans were not in conformance with the CDP because the applicant did not revise the architecture to make the buildings larger. The Planning Board felt that this type of office building proposed by the applicant was more appropriate for Pod 4 or Pod 6. The CDP text describes Pod 4—Technology Support Campus as follows:

“Provides technology support services and incubator settings for smaller offices, sub-offices of larger users on the site, and start-up entrepreneurs. It is expected that the proximity to the Core Area will reinforce the intended services function of the zone. The buildings and lots will be smaller than in other parts of the project.” (p.45, CDP text) and;

“The Technology Support Campus is separated from the rest of the UMSTC for several reasons. It is expected that the buildings will be smaller and less expensive than those in the rest of the site. There will also be significant truck traffic and parking which should be separated from the areas, which will be more office-like. Since this area has an abundance of small users and a greater number of visitors, additional signage will be required. Clustering also leads to greater possibility of shared facilities for smaller firms.” (p.94, CDP text) and;

“The Technology Support Campus is flexible in size. The intent is to expand into parcels to the east if demand is high.” (p.95, CDP text, referring to Pod 6.)

The office buildings proposed in the subject SDP are the type of small office buildings described above and appropriate for Pod 4. The applicant made several changes to the plans, such as providing a central lobby with the potential for a future elevator, a drop-off area with special paving and pedestrian sitting areas in front of each building. Also, in an effort to maintain the density prescribed for Pod 2, the applicant proffered a condition that transferred the unused densities of Lots 2B and 2C to Lot 2C. However, the Planning Board determined that the architectural and site changes did not fully satisfy the requirements of the CDP for larger office buildings in Pod 2.

The CDP text also prescribes distinct design guidelines for architecture and parking. The following design guidelines warrant discussion:

“Building form should compliment [sic] land form and extend an architectural relationship to adjoining structures, through shared form, materials, landscaping, common roadways and pedestrian spaces.” (p.74, CDP text.)

The original layout proposed artificially raised parking lots in the front of the buildings with elevated walkways connecting the parking lot to the second floor of the building. Because of this

configuration, very little of the building would be visible from the street. The applicant revised the site plan so that the raised parking lot was to the rear of the buildings, allowing two full stories of the buildings to be completely visible from the street. Two stormwater management facilities that were located along the street were relocated to the rear of the site in order to move the buildings closer to the street. The buildings as revised, conform to the above requirement.

“Incorporate drop-off and visitor parking zones near building entry. Specialize these areas with changes in pavement to materials such as brick, granite sets, or other depending on building.” (p.62, CDP text); and

“Visitor parking and drop-off zones should be located independent of employee parking, preferably along the entry drive before the parking area.” (p.66, CDP text.)

“Parking areas are generally hidden behind the larger structure and are to be screened from roadside views.” (p.67, CDP text.)

The applicant made other improvements to the plan from the original application. The site plan incorporates a front visitor drop-off area with special paving and a pedestrian sitting area for each building. Parking has been reduced to accommodate these features in the front of the buildings. A total of 25 parking spaces have been eliminated from the original parking count. Adequate landscaping was provided to screen the front parking lots. The buildings were provided with a central lobby with space for a future elevator if a user were to occupy a large portion of the second floor.

“Throughout the center, parking is to be located behind the buildings in order that buildings will have a continuous frontage on the primary roads throughout the project. The only exceptions to this rule are for those parcels in the southwest corner of the site, adjacent to Route 50 and Route 3, and their interchange, and Pod 4....” (p.65, CDP text.)

Figure 11 on p. 42 of the CDP text clearly demonstrates that large office buildings are intended for Pod 2. The amount of square footage designated by the CDP for Lots 2 and 3 of Pod 2 is 77, 907 square feet and 84,158 square feet, respectively, for a total of 162,065 square feet. The subject application is for a total of 81,600 square feet, which is less than half of the square footage designated for the lots. The total amount of density slated for Pod 2 is 554,345 square feet. This density cannot be achieved with small office buildings. To allow small-office use in Pod 2, or in other pods designated for large office buildings, will result in a drastic reduction in density for the overall development, which is not consistent with the vision for the center considering the amount of public investment that has already been provided. The appropriate area that is designated by the CDP for smaller offices is Pod 4. The CDP also states that Pod 6 is designated as a “transition” pod that could be converted into a second phase of the TSC (Technology Support Campus) should demand warrant. The CDP also states “the eastern boundary of Pod 4 is adjustable in possibly including parcels 6A and 6B (of Pod 6).” Pod 4 currently has one vacant lot to be developed that would be an appropriate site for the type of office building proposed. Pod 6 has no development and also would be an appropriate location for the type of office being proposed. The master plan for the development on p. 54 of the CDP text does not designate small offices uses on Pod 2 and

furthermore specifically designates Pods 4 and 6 for small office uses.

The applicant proffered to apply the unused density of Parcels 2B and 2C to Parcel 2A. Also, the Institute for Defense Analysis, which is adjacent to the subject site, has requested by letter dated June 29, 2004 (Greenstein to Chairman Hewlett), that the subject development be limited to “approximately two stories”. However, the Planning Board determined that the amount of density proposed by the applicant was insufficient and did not comply with the densities prescribed by the Comprehensive Design Plan. Furthermore, the Planning Board determined that the CDP prescribes that the type of office buildings proposed by the applicant are small and are designated for Pod 4 or Pod 6. It is for these reasons that the Planning Board denied the Specific Design Plan for Lots 2 and 3, Pod 2.

6. **The Approved Preliminary Plan, 4-98076:** The preliminary plan was approved by the Planning Board on September 28, 2000 (Resolution PGCPB No. 99-28(A)). The specific design plan is in conformance with the preliminary plan. For further discussion of environmental conditions of the Preliminary Plan and transportation-related issues, see Findings 10 and 11 below, respectively.
7. **The Zoning Ordinance:** The specific design plan is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-501 of the Zoning Ordinance governing development in the E-I-A Zone and the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
8. The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development. See Findings 11 and 12 below for a discussion of transportation and public facilities adequacy.
9. Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties. The lots have an approved stormwater management concept plan (FWA 88390.60) by the City of Bowie.
10. In a memorandum dated May 17, 2004 (Shirley to Wagner), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

Background

The area included in this application was previously reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section in 2002 in conjunction with SDP-0203 for the planned infrastructure improvements for the subject lots for the construction of stormwater management facilities. The Basic Plan, A-9401, and the Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-8601, have also been previously reviewed. The lots included in this application were also previously reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section in conjunction with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-98076; Specific Design Plan SDP-0201; and Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/44/98. All of these plans were approved.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/36/99) was approved for the entire site in response to a clearing violation that occurred on a portion of the site in 1999, which is not the subject of this

application. The approved TCPII was intended to show all of the environmental features or existing features on the site associated with the scope of review in 4-98076 (generally the area west of Curie Drive). A TCPI/II that encompasses the entire site was reviewed with Preliminary Plan 4-02093 in relation to proposed stormwater management facilities on the eastern portion of the site. The current SDP application is for two lots; the previous SDP included three lots (the subject two and Block 4, Lot 4). This application is for the placement of a two-story building on each lot.

Site Description

Lots 2 and 3 are located on the north side of Science Drive and west of Curie Drive. Lot 2 has a total area of 10.51 acres and Lot 3 contains 9.14 acres, for a combined total of 19.65 acres in this application. The subject lots are part of a larger property totaling 466.62 acres in the E-I-A Zone. This larger property is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of US 50 and US 3/301. A review of the available information indicates that streams, 100-year floodplain, and severe slopes are found to occur on this property and many of the subject lots. Although US 50 and US 3/301 have been identified as transportation-related noise generators, there are no adverse impacts to the uses included in this application because they are a considerable distance from the roadways. The predominant soils found to occur, according to the Prince George=s County Soil Survey, include the Adelpia, Collington, Mixed alluvial land, Ochlockonee and Shrewsbury. The Mixed alluvial land and the Adelpia soils have limitations with respect to high water tables and impeded drainage. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. Based on information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program publication entitled “Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George=s Counties,” December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic and historic roads in the vicinity of this property. This property drains to an unnamed tributary located on the site that is in the Patuxent River basin and is in the Developing Tier in the 2002 adopted General Plan.

Environmental Conditions of Approval to be Addressed at Specific Design Plan

The approval of the comprehensive design plan by the District Council, and the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision by the Planning Board, included numerous conditions, several of which dealt with environmental issues to be addressed during subsequent reviews. The environmental conditions to be addressed during the review of the Specific Design Plan are addressed below. The respective conditions are in **bold** type and the associated comments are in standard type.

Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-8601

- 10. The Phase III (SDP) submittal for Pod 7 should determine the extent to which nontidal wetlands in this area will be disturbed and how this disturbance can be mitigated by wetland replacement and/or enhancement projects.**

Pod 7 is located adjacent to the Patuxent River and is not included in this application.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-98076; PGCPB No. 99-28

4. With the approval of specific design plans, a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/36/99, was approved for the entire 466.62-acre property following a clearing violation that occurred on a portion of the site, which is not the subject of this application. At that time, generalized limits of disturbance were identified for each of the parcels included in this application and not all of the environmental features for the entire site were identified. The limits of disturbance identified at that time avoided disturbances to the conceptual location of the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA).

The needed revisions to TCPII/36/99-02 for this application are addressed in the Environmental Review section of this memorandum.

5. **Prior to the issuance of any permit which impacts wetland buffer, streams, waters of the U.S. or waters of the State, the applicant shall provide the Natural Resources Division with evidence that all Federal and State approvals have been obtained.**

No wetlands, wetland buffers, streams, or waters of the U.S. are proposed to be disturbed by this application.

6. **A minimum buffer of 50 feet in width shall be shown along the banks of all streams within the property and shall be expanded to include the 100-year floodplain, non-tidal wetlands, steep slopes of 25 percent and greater and slopes of 15-24 percent having soils erodibility factor 0.35 and greater. Such a buffer shall be reviewed by the Natural Resources Division prior to the Specific Design Plan approval.**

The features described by this condition compose the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA). A stream is located along the northern boundary of Lots 2 and 3. The stream, the 100-year floodplain, and the severe slopes are correctly shown on the plans. The 100-year floodplain is based on a DER-approved floodplain study. This condition was addressed in revisions during the previous review of SDP-0203. However, all features within the PMA (i.e., floodplain) must be correctly shown on any subsequent revision to the SDP as it is shown on the approved TCPII. See additional comments below in Section 2 of Environmental Review.

Environmental Review

1. A forest stand delineation (FSD) was submitted and reviewed for these lots in conjunction with the review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076.

Discussion: No additional information is required for the FSD.

2. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodlands on site, more than 5,000 square feet of woodland disturbance is proposed, and there are prior tree conservation plan approvals. A Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII) is required with the approval of a specific design plan. This application represents the second revision to TCPII/36/99.

The specific design plan as submitted with this application is generally consistent with TCPII/36/99 as previously approved; however, revisions to both TCPII/36/99-02 and the SDP are needed. The SDP does not show the proposed limits of disturbance and the floodplain as these were shown on the current TCPII in relation to the proposed buildings. These limits of disturbance and PMA features must be correctly shown on the SDP as these are shown on the proposed TCPII for Lots 2 and 3 of Block 2. The proposed building footprints for the two buildings have different configurations on the proposed SDP compared to what is shown on the proposed TCPII. The proposed building footprints must be the same on both the SDP and the TCPII.

In addition, there is an area of proposed clearing at the rear of the buildings that does not show any proposed grading. This is an area of PMA that is not appropriate for disturbance if not necessary for the proposed development. It is noted that the limit of disturbance proposed is consistent with the TCPI; however, the TCPI was based on conceptual grading. Now that the actual grading for this area is known, the limits of disturbance should be tightened if these areas have not already been cleared.

Recommended Conditions: Prior to certification of the Specific Design Plan, if approved, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be revised as follows:

- a. *Prior to certification of the SDP, show the proposed limits of disturbance and all features of the PMA (i.e., floodplain) on the SDP as these are shown on the proposed TCPII for Lots 2 and 3 of Block 2.*
 - b. *Revise the SDP so that the proposed building footprints are the same on both the SDP and the TCPII.*
11. In a memorandum dated May 24, 2004 (Masog to Wagner), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the specific design plan (SDP) application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 19.65 acres of land in the E-I-A Zone. The property is at the northeast corner of US 301/MD 3 and US 50 within the City of Bowie. The plan updates a previous infrastructure and grading and proposes 81,600 square feet of space on Lots 2 and 3 of Block 2.

The transportation staff has reviewed issues regarding the development of the subject site and the larger Maryland Science and Technology Center (total of 466 acres) in conjunction with A-9401,

CDP-8601, and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-88030. Since those plans were approved, there has been considerable development within the Maryland Science and Technology Center. The preliminary plan and CDP approvals established a square footage cap for the initial phase of 1.95 million square feet. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076 affirmed a trip cap of 2,200 AM and 2,605 PM peak-hour vehicle trips for all remaining development on the site.

There are a number of transportation-related conditions on earlier development review stages; these are reviewed in detail below:

CDP-8601:

- Condition 3. Required upgrading of MD 3/Belair Drive/Melford Boulevard prior to development, up to a maximum of 400,000 square feet. The intersection has been replaced with an interchange. OK.
- Condition 4. Required an interchange at MD 3/Belair Drive/Melford Boulevard for development beyond 400,000 square feet and up to 1,950,000 square feet. The interchange is complete and open to traffic. OK.
- Condition 5. Required a new traffic study after 1991 or after completion of improvements to US 50. A new traffic study was prepared in 1998 and reviewed in conjunction with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076. OK.
- Condition 6. Established dedication widths for internal streets. All streets have been dedicated in accordance with this condition. OK.
- Condition 7. Required that the impact of development along Belair Drive be minimized. This has been done by limiting access to Melford Boulevard. Neither of the lots discussed in this application has frontage along Medford Boulevard. OK.
- Condition 8. Required the completion of documents establishing legal access to the property. This was done prior to the initial development on the property. OK.
- Condition 9. Required setbacks to accommodate planned US 50 improvements. All improvements to US 50 have been constructed. OK.
- Condition 20. Established requirement for a new traffic study prior to Stage 2 development. The subject development is within Stage 1B, and therefore this condition does not apply.
- Condition 21. Restricted the Beech Tree Lane access to a right-in/right-out. This condition is complete.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076:

- Condition 17: Established a trip cap for remaining development, based upon roadway improvements that existed in 1998 and 240,000 square feet of then-existing

development, of 2,200 AM and 2,605 PM peak-hour trips. Since that time, the following approvals have occurred:

<i>SDP</i>	<i>Development Quantity</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>AM Trip Generation</i>	<i>PM Trip Generation</i>
Pre-1998	240,000 sq. ft.	Built	119	112
SDP-0103	153,250 sq. ft.	Built	112	115
SDP-0104	300,000 sq. ft.	Approved	600	555
SDP-0201	83,680 sq. ft.	Built	127	118
SDP-0310	300,980 sq. ft.	Pending	602	557
Total	1,077,910 sq. ft.		1,560	1,457

The subject application is for 81,600 square feet of office space. The resulting peak-hour trip generation would be 163 AM and 151 PM trips. With the subject application and the previous approvals, the site would generate 1,723 AM and 1,608 PM peak-hour trips. This remains within the cap; however, the applicant should be mindful that the level of approved development is beginning to approach the AM peak-hour cap.

Vehicular and pedestrian access within the site is acceptable. Adequate right-of-way in accordance with the master plan exists along MD 3 and US 50.

As noted previously, the subject property is part of a larger project that has completed Stage 1B roadway improvements in the area pursuant to a finding of adequate public facilities made in 1988 for Preliminary Plans of Subdivision 4-88030 and 4-98076. Insofar as the basis for those findings is still valid, and in consideration of the materials discussed earlier in this memorandum, the transportation staff finds that the subject property will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with transportation facilities that are existing, programmed, or that will be provided as a part of the development if the development is approved. Furthermore, the submitted plans are in conformance with previously approved plans, including the approved comprehensive design plan.

12. In a memorandum dated March 30, 2004 (Harrel to Wagner), the Public Facilities Planning Section offered the following comments:

Fire and Rescue

The existing fire engine service at Bowie Fire Station, Company 39, located at 15454 Annapolis Road has a service travel time of 6.28 minutes, which is beyond the 3.25-minute travel time guideline.

The existing ambulance service at Bowie Fire Station, Company 39, located at 15454 Annapolis Road has a service travel time of 6.28 minutes, which is beyond the 4.25-minute travel time guideline.

The existing ladder service at Glenn Dale Station, Company 18, located at 11900 Glenn Dale Boulevard has a service travel time of 11.09 minutes, which is beyond the 4.25-minute travel time guideline.

The existing paramedic service at Bowie Fire Station, Company 43, has a service travel time of 5.85 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute travel time guideline.

The adopted and approved FY 2004-2009 Capital Improvement Program contains project LK510650 for a Bowie-New Town EMS facility. This proposed station is planned to open in 2007, and will serve this site within response time standards

The above findings are in conformance with the *Approved Public Safety Master Plan (1990)* and the "Guidelines For The Analysis Of Development Impact On Fire and Rescue Facilities."

Police Services

The proposed development is within the service area for District II, Bowie. The Planning Board's current test for police adequacy is based on a standard for square footage in police stations relative to the number of sworn duty staff assigned. The standard is 115 square feet per officer. As of 1/02/04, the county had 823 sworn staff and a total of 101,303 feet of station space. Based on available space there is capacity for 57 additional officers. The staff concludes that the existing county police facilities will be adequate to serve the office uses.

13. In a memorandum dated August 3, 2004 (Mayor Robinson to Chairman Hewlett), the City of Bowie recommended approval of the Specific Design Plan, subject to conditions. The city had originally recommended disapproval of the application. The city finds "the changes to be a satisfactory improvement over the original approval." The city's conditions have been incorporated into the Recommendation Section below.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and DISAPPROVED the Specific Design Plan for the above-described land.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the Circuit Court.

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Squire, Vaughns, and Harley voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioners Eley and Hewlett opposed to the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 9, 2004, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 30th day of September 2004.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:GW:rmk