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Commission Meeting
Open Session Minutes
April 15, 2015

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission met on April 15, 2015, in the Montgomery Regional Office in Silver Spring, Maryland.

PRESENT

Prince George’s County Commissioners
Elizabeth M. Hewlett, Chair
Manuel Geraldo
Dorothy Bailey

Montgomery County Commissioners
Casey Anderson, Vice-Chair
Natali Fani-Gonzalez
Marye Wells-Harley

ABSENT

John Shoaff
A. Shuanise Washington

Amy Presley
Norman Dreyfuss

Chair Hewlett convened the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

ITEM 1  
APPROVAL OF COMMISSION AGENDA
Chair Hewlett moved Item 7 – Closed Session - Collective Bargaining Update to follow Item 4 – Committee/Board Reports.
ACTION: Motion of Bailey to approve the agenda
   Seconded by Geraldo
   6 approved the motion to approve the agenda

ITEM 2  
APPROVAL OF COMMISSION MINUTES
March 18, 2015 – Open Session
March 18, 2015 – Closed Session
ACTION: Motion of Wells-Harley to approve the minutes
   Seconded by Bailey
   6 approved the motion to approve the minutes

APPROVAL OF COMMISSION SPECIAL CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES
April 2, 2015 – Open Session
April 2, 2015 – Closed Session
ACTION: Motion of Wells-Harley to approve the minutes
   Seconded by Bailey
   6 approved the motion to approve the minutes
ITEM 3  GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS
Chair Hewlett made the following announcements:

a) Upcoming Employee Fitness Week – Will be held May 12th through May 15th, with events occurring in the Montgomery County and Prince George’s County departments of the M-NCPCC.

b) Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month is in May. A One-Commission event will take place at the Prince George’s Ballroom on May 18th.

c) April 15th holds significance for milestones such as Tax Day, Jackie Robinson Day, and Titanic Remembrance Day.

ITEM 4  COMMITTEE/BOARD REPORTS – (For Information Only)

a) Minutes – Executive Committee Open Session – April 1, 2015

b) Minutes – Executive Committee Closed Session – April 1, 2015

c) Minutes – Regular Board of Trustees Meeting – March 3, 2015


ITEM 7  CLOSED SESSION (Taken out of order)
Pursuant to Section 3-305(b)(7) and (b)(9) of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, at 10:00 a.m., Chair Hewlett requested a motion to move to closed session for purposes of consultation with counsel and to discuss collective bargaining negotiations.

ACTION: Motion of Geraldo
    Seconded by Bailey
    6 approved the motion to move to closed session

At 10:27 a.m., Chair Hewlett requested a motion to move to open session.

ACTION: Motion of Geraldo to move to open session
    Seconded by Fani-Gonzalez
    6 approved the motion to move to open session

ITEM 5  ACTION AND PRESENTATION ITEMS

a) Recommendation to Approve Selection of New Small Cap Value Investment Manager (A. Rose)

Employees’ Retirement System Administrator Andrea Rose stated that the Employees’ Retirement System (ERS) Board of Trustees and the ERS’ investment consultant, Wilshire Associates, recommend Chicago Equity Partners as the new U.S. Equity Small Cap Value Manager for the ERS.

ACTION: Motion by Geraldo
    Seconded by Fani-Gonzalez
    6 approved the Recommendation to Approve Chicago Equity Partners as the new U.S. Equity Small Cap Value Manager for the ERS

b) Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) System Demonstration (Montgomery County Parks Project Manager John Schlee and Prince George’s County Parks and Recreation Project Manager Michael Snyder)
EAM Project Managers John Schlee and Michael Snyder introduced the Enterprise Asset Management System (EAM) project team and thanked the sponsors for their support:

**Project Team Members**
- Senior IT Support Specialist/Supervisor Todd Johnson
- IT Business Analyst Gregory Angus
- IT Programmer/Data Analyst Erica Castellon
- Asset/GIS Analyst Peter Lostritto
- Business Analyst II LaToya Austin

**Project Team Sponsors**
- Montgomery County Parks Director Michael Riley
- Prince George’s County Parks and Recreation Director Ronnie Gathers
- Prince George’s County Parks and Recreation Deputy Director Darin Conforti
- Prince George’s County Parks and Recreation Division Chief Bill Henaghan

Mr. Schlee presented an overview of the EAM system. He stated the EAM system is a web-based application used to manage the agency’s resources better. The system, which was launched on November 13, 2014, replaces the current SmartParks System in Montgomery County and will be the new Park Stat System in Prince George’s County. Mr. Schlee explained the benefits of the EAM system stating it:

- Provides real-time information
- Aligns business processes through the organization
- Standardizes processes and practices across the Commission
- Helps to quickly and easily run system transactions
- Improves efficiency in completing tasks
- Collects costs related to parks and amenities

Mr. Schlee and Mr. Snyder discussed the EAM project status noting what has been completed, what is in progress, and upcoming tasks as listed in the handout. With regards to instructor-led training classes, Mr. Schlee stated over 500 staff have been trained thus far, and a second-phase is being planned. A number of training classes are posted on InSite.

Mr. Snyder provided a brief demonstration of the EAM Dashboard software, which M-NCPPC purchased from Infor.

Prince George’s County Parks and Recreation Deputy Director Darin Conforti commented that the EAM project team worked on the project for three years. He stated this system is the future of administration in government services everywhere. This is a fully integrated system in which the user can automate tasks, gather data on those tasks, assign tasks, and inventory the work that is being done simultaneously. He stated there is a significant amount of data that can be harvested so M-NCPPC can understand the patterns of work, and plan for the resources needed to do that work better to maintain the parks. With regard to the infrastructure, the EAM software will
help M-NCPPC to understand the total costs and efforts to maintain the agency's entire system.

The Commissioners thanked the EAM team for their efforts.

ITEM 6 OFFICERS' REPORTS

a) Executive Director (Barney)
   Employee Evaluations Not Completed by Due Date (March 2015) (For Information Only)
   Executive Director Barney asked that Directors review the report and submit the evaluations.

b) Secretary-Treasurer (Zimmerman) (For Information Only)
   Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Briefing (Zimmerman)
   The project is still progressing.

c) General Counsel (Gardner)
   Litigation Report - (March 2015) (For Information Only)
   The report is in the packet. No comments were made.

   Legislative Update (Not listed on the agenda)
   General Counsel Gardner stated this was a good year for M-NCPPC. The agency met every major challenge and accomplished most of its goals.

   - The legislative Bill to extend the term limits for Commissioners in Montgomery County passed.
   - General Counsel Gardner stated that M-NCPPC was instrumental in moving Program Open Space forward and gaining significant additional funding. He shared that the Governor's budget proposed approximately $14 million in POS funding. During the legislative session, M-NCPPC gained support for a commitment to pay back funds that had been borrowed from previous years that directly affected Prince George’s County. The Legislative Services staff suggested adding another $8 million, of which $1.8 million would be recommended for Prince George’s County. The Senate supported the Legislative Services staff’s recommendations. At the Conference Committee, the House added another $9 million. General Counsel Gardner stated that between what the Governor recommended and what passed on Sine Die was almost double what the Governor planned. General Counsel Gardner said that M-NCPPC’s efforts made a significant difference and the agency has created a new cadre of advocates. He thanked the Commissioners for their support and stated he will present the Legislative Report at the next Commission meeting. Chair Hewlett congratulated General Counsel Gardner and his team on their efforts.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

Gayla T. Williams, Senior Technical Writer/Senior Management Analyst
Commission Meeting
April 15, 2015

Patricia Colihan Barney, Executive Director
Commission
Special Conference Call
Open Session Minutes
April 30, 2015

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission met via teleconference at 12:30 p.m., from the County Administration Building in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, the Montgomery Regional Office in Silver Spring, Maryland, and the Executive Office Building in Riverdale Maryland.

PRESENT

Prince George’s County Commissioners
Elizabeth M. Hewlett, Chair
Dorothy Bailey
Manuel Geraldo
John Shoaff
A. Shuanise Washington

Montgomery County Commissioners
Casey Anderson, Vice-Chair
Natali Fani-Gonzalez
Amy Presley
Marye Wells-Harley

ABSENT

Norman Dreyfuss

Pursuant to Section 3-305(b)(7) and (b)(9) of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, at 12:40 p.m., Chair Hewlett requested a motion to move to closed session to consult with counsel for legal advice and conduct collective bargaining discussions or consider matters that relate to negotiations.

ACTION: Motion of Washington to move to closed session
Seconded by Geraldo
9 approved the motion

Chair Hewlett reconvened the open session at 1:27 p.m.

ITEM 1 COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
Executive Director Barney presented Resolution #15-06 - Approval of the Collective Bargaining Agreement with the United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1994, Municipal and County Government Employees Organization (MCGEO). The Resolution was presented for ratification of the tentative agreement which covers the Service/Labor, Office and Trades units.

Executive Director Barney reviewed the economic terms of the agreement as contained in the meeting packet. She provided the following for FY16:
* 1.75% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) effective the first full pay period following September 1, 2015.
* 1.75% Merit increase effective the beginning of the pay period in which the assigned anniversary date occurs. Current longevity provisions remain in effect.
* 0.5% lump sum payment to top of grade bargaining unit members who are actively employed on July 1, 2015. The lump sum payment shall be implemented the first full pay period following July 1, 2015.

For FY17, the same terms apply. She shared that there are a number of non-economic terms that were discussed in closed session as contained in the meeting packet. She added that the contract is within the FY16 proposed budget compensation marker.

MCGEO members will vote on the contract next Thursday and the results should be available before the bi-county Council meeting.

ACTION: Motion of Washington to approve Resolution #15-06
Seconded by Shoaff
9 approved the Resolution

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

Gayla I. Williams, Senior Technical Writer/Senior Management Analyst

Patricia Colihan Barney, Executive Director
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
May 6, 2015

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission’s Executive Committee met in the Merit System Board Conference Room, in Riverdale, Maryland. Present were Chair Elizabeth M. Hewlett (participated via teleconference), Vice-Chair Casey Anderson, and Executive Director Patricia C. Barney. Also present were:

Department Directors/Deputies/Presenters/Staff
Adrian Gardner, General Counsel
Joe Zimmerman, Secretary-Treasurer
Ronnie Gathers, Director, Prince George’s County Parks and Recreation
Fern Piret, Director, Prince George’s County Planning
Mike Riley, Director, Montgomery County Parks
John Nissel, Deputy Director, Montgomery County Parks
Rose Krasnow, Deputy Director, Montgomery County Planning
Anju Bennett, Division Chief, Corporate Policy and Management Operations (CPMO)
William Spencer, Human Resources Director
Janis Thom-Grate, Policy and Corporate Records Manager (CPMO)
Lisa Dupree, Senior Policy Analyst (CPMO)

Sustainability Committee (for presentation of Item 3b only)
Anthony Nolan, Sustainability Committee Chair/Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation
Ellen Bennett, Co-Sustainability Coordinator/Montgomery County Parks
Geoffrey Mason, Co-Sustainability Coordinator/Montgomery County Parks

Executive Director Barney convened the meeting at 9:40 a.m.

ITEM 1a - APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA (Executive Director Patricia Barney)

Discussion
The following topic was added to the agenda:
Closed session Items
• Collective Bargaining Update
• Compensation adjustments for non-represented employees

ITEM 3b – SUSTAINABILITY REPORT (Nolan/Bennett/Mason) (taken out of order)

Discussion
b) Sustainability Update (Nolan/Mason)
Sustainability Chair Nolan introduced Montgomery County Parks Co-Sustainability Coordinators Ellen Bennett and Geoffrey Mason, and Central Administrative Services Sustainability Representative Lisa Dupree. He also introduced in absentia: Prince George’s County Planning Sustainability Representative Michael Zamore and Montgomery County Planning Sustainability Representative Christine McGrew.

Mr. Nolan stated an agency-wide biennial Sustainability Report was developed by the M-NCPPC Sustainability Committee to share information on past and ongoing efforts to meet the goals of Practice 6-40, M-NCPPC Sustainability Standards. The
Report contains initiatives implemented throughout the agency and it provides recommendations for new or revised goals to ensure M-NCPPC remains at the forefront of sustainability practices.

Sustainability representatives from each department are represented on the Sustainability Committee. One representative serves from Central Administrative Services which includes the departments of DHRM, Legal, Finance, Internal Audit and the Office of the Chief Information Officer. Together, representatives developed a two-year agency-wide report, as well as two-year departmental Sustainability Plans. Mr. Nolan explained that while the Practice calls for each department to submit its own two-year plan to the Executive Committee, Sustainability Committee representatives agreed that two-year plans should be developed on a regional basis rather than departmental basis because of the overlap in operations and maintenance in each county. CAS plans and achievements are incorporated into the Prince George’s County regional plans as CAS is physically located in that County.

Mr. Nolan reviewed the six goals that guide implementation of the Sustainability policy and the efforts made on an agency-wide basis to achieve those goals. These goals were presented through PowerPoint and were as follows:

- Utility and Energy Conservation
- Sustainable Acquisition and Use of Agency Supplies
- Recycling and Solid Waste Management
- Sustainable Infrastructure and Natural Areas
- Health and Wellness
- Employee Education & Training

Mr. Nolan also stated that the Sustainability Committee’s overall priority recommendation is to have a permanent sustainability coordinator in each county.

Utility and Energy Conservation – the agency is meeting the goals of reduction of energy consumption, eliminating waste and improving efficiency. The agency has already exceeded the goal of obtaining 40% of electricity from renewable energy sources (i.e. wind power). As part of the Montgomery County Clean Energy Buyers Group, the agency currently purchases 50% of its electricity load via wind power. Energy conservation projects in both counties generally result in energy savings that pay for themselves within three years. Priority recommendations are to continue to increase the amount of energy acquired from renewable energy resources, and to continue to implement a broad range of energy efficiency improvements.

Sustainable Acquisition and Use of Agency Supplies – the agency is meeting its goals with regard to purchasing office supplies, furniture, and printing and copying. Departments are consolidating printers and reducing the number of printing/copying by shifting to greater online document review. One area that requires additional focus is procurement. Each department prefers certain vendors; however, there is no shared database for green vendors. Recommendations also include working with Procurement to develop an on-line surplus listing of equipment, furniture, etc.; embracing electronic documents for meetings; and developing standard lists of “Preferred Green Products” and “Green” vendors.
Recycling and Solid Waste Management – the agency is close to reaching an overall rate of 90% of recyclable materials. Recommendations include expanding/promoting greater recycling at area parks, reducing wastes at events, and exploring food waste composting.

Commissioner Anderson asked if M-NCPCC has made efforts to separate waste from ordinary trash that is collected in the parks. Ms. Ellen Bennett responded that Montgomery County requires waste to be separated in regional and recreational parks. Waste will be separated in the new parks as well in Montgomery County. Separate containers have not been placed in local parks at this point because of the lack of funding for manpower and equipment.

Mr. Nolan stated that implementing a pilot project in the regional parks and on some of the trails can boost the agency’s numbers. There will however, be a cost associated with the project. Chair Hewlett shared recycling containers are being placed by each door of the Planning Board conference room.

Sustainable Infrastructure and Natural Areas - the agency is implementing sustainable building standards for Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) silver or equal. The agency is meeting goals for natural resources management, and Community Planning and Development through planning documents, regulations, and smart growth principles which are already in practice. In Prince George’s County and Montgomery County, a trails master plan is being developed for connectivity and where the trails can be extended. At the Bicycle Trails Advisory Group meeting, Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) discussed a pilot project to allow trails to be established on their power right-of-ways. This effort would extend overall connectivity.

Mr. Nolan and Mr. Mason highlighted the Montgomery County Rock Creek Maintenance’s administrative building which has achieved LEED gold standard, and the Prince George’s County Southern Regional Technology Center which is currently going through the certification process to get LEED silver status. The Sustainability Committee recommends developing standards on incorporating LEED standards into operations and smaller projects; evaluating LEED and SITES pilot projects to provide guidance on future projects; and expanding funding for invasive management. Montgomery County Co-Sustainability Coordinator Mason shared that a LEED-style certification pilot program has just begun for outdoor sites. It is necessary to expand funding for this program because M-NCPCC depends on volunteers to remove invasive species.

Health and Wellness - the agency meets the goals tied to supporting healthy communities; raising awareness of workplace health, safety and wellness; mitigating workplace hazards; and developing actions based on accident reviews. Prince George’s County offers the Passport to Wellness which is available for all agency employees. A Memorandum of Understanding is being pursued in Montgomery County departments with the Montgomery County Recreation Department to allow employees to receive discounts at County Recreation facilities.
Employee Education and Training - recommendations include developing educational resources to provide information, tips and reminders to staff regarding sustainability efforts on inSite, via UPDATE, and broadcast emails; expanding training opportunities with a focus on LEED certifications for both design and operation of buildings, and “Building Wellness” training and certification programs; and working with the Department of Human Resources and Management on the development of an essential job function focusing on Sustainability.

Corporate Policy and Management Operations (CPMO) Division Chief Anju Bennett recommended having Director meetings at various agency sites that were featured for their sustainability efforts. It was suggested that the May 26th Department Directors’ meeting be held at the Riversdale Mansion to view some of the new sustainability initiatives implemented at that site.

The Executive Committee agreed that M-NCPPC needs to promote the Sustainability initiatives being implemented by the agency. CPMO Division Chief Bennett shared that she had spoken to Chair Nolan about featuring a regular column in the employee newsletter, UPDATE that could include monthly submissions by the Sustainability Committee on various efforts and their impact including conservation outcomes and financial savings. Co-Sustainability Coordinator Ellen Bennett shared that Montgomery Parks Director Mike Riley includes sustainability tips in his Monday morning report. Additionally, the Montgomery County members of the Sustainability Committee have created a website entitled “Sustainability Central” for staff working on the Montgomery County Sustainability Plan which will be available in the future to any staff who wants to follow the Montgomery County departments’ sustainability activities. CPMO Division Chief Bennett suggested that the achievements be linked to the agency-wide website so the public and employees could understand the work being done throughout the agency.

Mr. Nolan noted that today’s presentation was a snapshot of efforts as an agency on meeting the sustainability goals. The agency-wide report will be presented to the Commission on May 20th. Presentation of the 2-year departmental plans will be added to the next month’s Executive Committee agenda for adoption. These reports were provided by handout but not reviewed at this meeting.

The Executive Committee thanked the Sustainability Committee for their efforts.

ITEM 1b - APPROVAL OF COMMISSION MEETING (Executive Director Patricia Barney)

Discussion

Executive Director Barney reviewed the May 20, 2015, Commission meeting agenda. The following amendments were made:

- Add closed session item to discuss compensation regarding non-represented employees. The outcome of the closed discussion will be used to develop Resolutions that will be presented at the June Commission meeting for approval.
- Remove collective bargaining update.

General Counsel Gardner noted that depending on the length of the meeting, the Legislative Report can either be a presentation or be placed in the General Counsel’s Report. The Legislative Report will be distributed by the Legal Department in advance of the Commission meeting.
ITEM 1c - ROLLING AGENDA FOR UPCOMING COMMISSION MEETINGS (Executive Director Patricia Barney)

| Discussion | Executive Director Barney reviewed the Rolling Commission Agenda for the upcoming four months. Montgomery County Parks Director Mike Riley inquired if the discussion on July agenda, Practice 2-16 – Seasonal/Intermittent, Temporary, and Term Employment would include the IRS Audit discussion on contractors. General Counsel Gardner responded that the agency is working with outside counsel. The Internal Revenue Service has accepted M-NCPPC’s settlement and the agency is currently developing a strategy with outside consultants as there is a lot of work to be done. Executive Director Barney expects to have this resolved by the last pay period in December 2015. She noted that she recently received a proposal on benefits. |

ITEM 2 – MINUTES

| Provided for Information Only | April 1, 2015 Executive Committee Minutes |
| a) Open Session | b) Closed Session |

ITEM 3 – DISCUSSION/REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

| Discussion | a) Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Briefing (Zimmerman) Secretary-Treasurer Zimmerman provided an update on ERP. Employees continue to be paid correctly. Additional controls have been implemented to detect low hours and missing timesheets. The major concentration in the Human Capital Management module is getting the data feeds to the Employees’ Retirement System correctly. Some obscure pay components such as Emergency compensation have caused some issues and corrections are in process. The payroll system is having difficulty calculating the contribution on pensions for base pay in excess of the FICA limit. New features are on hold while operating issues get stabilized. DHRM and the Finance Department will submit a request to use salary lapse to support the ERP project. |

At 10:43 a.m., Chair Hewlett requested a motion to move to closed session to discuss compensation for the non-represented employees. ACTION: Motion of Anderson Secended by Barney 3 approved the motion

At 10:48 a.m., the Executive Committee reconvened the open session. |

| c) Administrative Leave for Bike-to-Work Day (Not listed on agenda) Deputy Director Rose Krasnow inquired about providing Administrative Leave for employees who are participating in Bike-to-Work Day. The Executive Committee agreed to provide one hour of Administrative Leave in the morning. |

Follow Up/Action Items

- CPMO Office will schedule the May 26th Department Directors’ meeting at the Riversdale Mansion.
- Sustainability Committee should work to develop a Commission-wide “Sustainability Central” website and add a column to employee Newsletter, UPDATE. |

The meeting adjourned at 10:57 a.m.
The meeting adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

Gayla K. Williams, Senior Technical Writer/
Senior Management Analyst

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

VIA: Fern Piret, Planning Director
Ivy A. Lewis, Chief, Community Planning Division
Teri Bond, Planning Supervisor, Community Planning Division

FROM: Chad Williams, LEED AP BD+C, Acting Master Planner, Countywide Planning Division

SUBJECT: The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission Resolution of Adoption for the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan

Attached for your review and approval is the Full Commission Resolution Number 15-03 to adopt the Approved College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan and its associated Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment (Parts of Planning Areas 66 and 68). Also attached for your information are the Prince George’s County Council Resolution CR-7-2015, dated March 17, 2015, and the Prince George’s County Planning Board Resolution PGCPB No. 14-61, dated July 17, 2014. Together, these resolutions compile the revisions and amendments to the preliminary transit district development plan as directed by the County Council (sitting as the District Council) and the Planning Board, respectively.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Full Commission approve the resolution of adoption.

Attachments

1. Full Commission Resolution Number 15-03
2. Prince George’s County Resolution CR-7-2015
3. Prince George’s County Planning Board Resolution PGCPB No. 14-61
M-NCPPC No. 15-03

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, by virtue of the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, is authorized and empowered to make and adopt, amend, extend and add to a General Plan for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, held a duly advertised public hearing on May 29, 2014 to consider the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan and its associated Proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment (TDOZMA), being also a replacement to the 1997 Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone and portions of the 1989 Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Master Plan and 1990 Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66, and 67; and the 1994 Planning Area 68 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment; and being also an amendment to the 1983 Functional Master Plan for Public School Sites; the 2005 Countywide Green Infrastructure Functional Master Plan; the 2008 Public Safety Facilities Master Plan; the 2009 Countywide Master Plan of Transportation; the 2010 Historic Sites and Districts Plan; and the 2010 Water Resources Functional Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board on July 17, 2014, after due deliberation and consideration of the public hearing testimony, adopted the transit district development plan and endorsed the TDOZMA with revisions, as described in Prince George's County Planning Board Resolution PGCPB No. 14-61, and transmitted the plan to the District Council on July 28, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Council, sitting as the District Council for the portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District lying within Prince George's County, held a duly advertised public hearing on September 16, 2014 to consider the Adopted College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan and the endorsed TDOZMA; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Council, sitting as the District Council, adopted Council Resolution CR-98-2014 on October 14, 2014, proposing eleven potential amendments to the adopted plan and endorsed TDOZMA and further directing that a second public hearing be held before the District Council to take public testimony on the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Council, sitting as the District Council, held a duly advertised public hearing on January 13, 2015 to consider the eleven proposed amendments to the adopted plan and endorsed TDOZMA; and

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the testimony received through the hearing process, the District Council on March 17, 2015, determined that the adopted plan should be approved as the transit district development plan and associated TDOZMA for the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District (portion of Planning Areas 66 and 68) for Prince George's County, Maryland, subject to the modifications and revisions set forth in Resolution CR-7-2015.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission does hereby adopt said transit district development plan and its associated TDOZMA for the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District (portion of Planning Areas 66 and 68) as an amendment to the General Plan for physical development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District within Prince George's County as approved by the Prince George's County District Council in the attached Resolution CR-7-2015;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Recitals are hereby incorporated into this Resolution by reference; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of said amendment shall be certified by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, as required by law.

* * * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner X, seconded by Commissioner X, with Commissioners X, X, X, and X and Commissioner X being absent, at its regular meeting held on May 20, 2015 in Riverdale Park, Maryland.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director
Prince George's County Council
Agenda Item Summary

Meeting Date: 3/17/2015
Reference No.: CR-007-2015
Draft No.: 1
Proposer(s): Glaros
Sponsor(s): Glaros, Franklin, Davis, Taveras, Harrison
Item Title: A Resolution concerning the College Park – Riverdale Park Transit District Overlay Zone for the purpose of approving, with revisions, as an Act of the County Council of Prince George's County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council, the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment (TDOZMA), thereby setting forth and adopting detailed zoning proposals in Planning Areas 66 and 68 for the area generally bounded by the College Park Airport to the north; the Metrorail / MARC / CSX tracks to the west; the residential portion of the Town of Riverdale Park to the south; and the Northeast Branch Stream Valley Park to the east.

Drifter: Karen T. Zavakos, Zoning and Legislative Counsel
Resource Personnel: Chad Williams, M-NPPC
Aimee Olivo, Chief of Staff District Three

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:
Date Presented:
Committee Referral:
Committee Action:
Date Introduced: 3/17/2015
Public Hearing:
Pass/Fail:
Remarks:

AFFECTED CODE SECTIONS:

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/FISCAL IMPACT:
(Includes reason for proposal, as well as any unique statutory requirements)
This Resolution will approve, as an Act of the District Council, the College Park – Riverdale Park TDDP and TDOZMA, with revisions.

CODE INDEX TOPICS:

INCLUSION FILES:
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Prince George’s County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, pursuant to Sections 27-213.02 and 27-213.04 of the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George’s County, held a duly advertised public hearing on the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan on May 29, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan is proposed to supersede the 1997 Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone and amend portions of the 1989/1990 Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66, and 67; 1994 Planning Area 68 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment; the 1983 Functional Master Plan for Public School Sites; the 2005 Countywide Green Infrastructure Functional Master Plan; the 2008 Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan; the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation; the 2010 Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan; and the 2010 Approved Water Resources Functional Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the planning area of the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan is generally bounded by the College Park Airport to the north; the Metrorail/MARC/CSX tracks to the west; the residential portion of the Town of Riverdale Park to the south; and the Northeast Branch Stream Valley Park to the east; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan is to develop a comprehensive plan that sets policies and strategies to build on the policy guidance of the 2014 Plan Prince George’s 2035 Approved General Plan for regional transit districts and the innovation corridor by establishing a refined vision and realistic approach to implementing the county and community vision to promote transit-oriented, mixed-use development to realize the countywide and municipal economic benefits of a major Metro station and two proposed Purple Line stations; recognize the historical importance of the natural environment and the College Park Airport and incorporate best planning and development practices to ensure a comprehensive and sensitive approach to environmental stewardship, floodplain and stormwater management, future growth, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, transportation management strategies, and economic and community development; and incorporate the county’s first health impact assessment conducted for a comprehensive planning effort to create a healthier community; and

WHEREAS, the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan contains a comprehensive rezoning element known as the Proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment intended to implement the land use recommendations of the transit district development plan for the foreseeable future; and

WHEREAS, on June 26, 2014, the Planning Board held a public worksession on the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan to examine the transcript analysis of testimony presented at the May 29, 2014 public hearing and exhibits received before the close of the record on June 13, 2014; and
WHEREAS, the Prince George’s County Planning Board voted to include one item of late testimony into the record as Exhibit 31 and to continue the public worksession to July 10, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George’s County Planning Board considered staff recommendations pertaining to late testimony during the public worksession on July 10, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board determined to amend said Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan, in response to said public testimony, and to adopt the transit district development plan, endorse the transit district overlay zoning map amendment, and transmit both the plan and the transit district overlay zoning map amendment with further amendments, extensions, deletions, and additions in response to the public hearing record, as follows:

I. GENERAL CHANGES

1. Adopt the recommendations and incorporate the staff errata presented during the Joint Public Hearing on May 29, 2014 (entered as Exhibit 4; see Attachment A).

2. Revise the transit district development plan (TDDP) as necessary to reconcile and incorporate policy guidance from the 2014 Plan Prince George’s 2035 Approved General Plan. Revise density references from “medium- to high-density” to “moderate- to high-density” throughout the TDDP to ensure consistency with Plan 2035 terminology for Regional Transit Centers.

3. Revise key maps, including Map 8: Proposed Land Use, throughout the TDDP to more clearly depict the 100-year floodplain. Revise map legends as appropriate to indicate which floodplain is demarcated: the FEMA floodplain or the county 100-year floodplain study.

4. Provide language to accompany both the Proposed Open Space Network and Proposed Street Network maps to read: “This concept map is for illustrative purposes only and may serve to guide the location, configuration, and provision of urban open spaces and the street grid but is not intended to mandate them. The TDDP supports a rich urban open space network within a grid of walkable, connected streets, but the exact location of these facilities should be determined through the development review process.”

5. Revise the discussion of the urban conservation park concept throughout the TDDP to make it a more generalized concept and eliminate all specific references to the Litton property as the preferred location for an urban conservation park.

II. FOREWORD AND PLAN HIGHLIGHTS

1. Revise the plan highlights in accordance with approved changes to other sections of the TDDP, as may be necessary and appropriate.

III. CHAPTER TWO: PLAN VISION

1. Revise the neighborhood boundaries, maps, and discussions throughout the TDDP, including the transit district standards and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment, to:
   - Rename the TOD Core to the Metro Core
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- Delete the Greenway Corridor neighborhood
- Extend the Metro Core east to 52nd Avenue
- Extend the Research Core north to Paint Branch Parkway, east of 52nd Avenue.
- Clarify that the TDDP consists of four neighborhoods rather than five

2. Shift and/or delete text from the description of the Greenway Corridor on pages 31 and 192 as appropriate to reflect the removal of this proposed neighborhood. Relocate and/or delete text from Policies 1 and 2 on pages 55-57 as appropriate. Some of this text will move to the Metro Core discussions and other text will move to the Research Core discussions.

IV. CHAPTER THREE: CORE TDDP ELEMENTS

Achieving the Vision

1. Add the College Park City-University Partnership (CPCUP) as one of the major entities listed under keystone three on page 36 and to the "Potential Parties Involved" column of the TDDP's action plan for objective MB3 on page 146.

Land Use and Urban Design

1. Include a diagram of the approved Litton Property preliminary plan of subdivision (4-12014) on or in the vicinity of page 56. Include a caption or description that recognizes the diagram as the currently approved plan and that it is recognized as such by the TDDP. Retain the alternate development approaches on page 56.

2. Revise Map 8: Proposed Land Use to change the portion of the College Park Aviation Village currently shown as mixed-use land use to mixed-use, predominantly residential land use.

3. Revise the illustrative drawing of the proposed transit plaza on page 49 to add labels depicting the Purple Line, bus bays, hardscape plaza, lawn area, and retail locations.

4. Revise Strategy 1.2 on page 57 to read: "Allow for a broader mix of uses west of University Research Court with an emphasis on office development. [Focus any proposed residential uses along] Encourage proposed residential uses to concentrate along River Road close to the M Square Purple Line Station.

5. Revise Strategy 2.2 on page 60 to read: "...and that impacts to the [Field of Dreams (a ballfield) town-owned community park (at the intersection of Tuckerman and Lafayette Streets)]..."

Transportation and Mobility

1. Fix the header styles/sizes of the sub-sections within the background discussion on pages 61-68.

2. Add references to the circulator bus required as part of the development of the Cafritz Property to page 63 and the last bullet of Strategy 3.4 on page 76.

3. Add additional discussion of the aviation policy area requirements impacting portions of the transit district area in the background discussion of aviation on page 68.
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4. Add a new bullet to the key approaches discussion under the transportation demand management text on pages 66-68 to read: “Establishing minimum bicycle parking requirements and encouraging bicycle use through methods such as employer participation in the bicycle commuter check program and provision of bicyclist shower and changing areas.”

5. Label the Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Trail, Paint Branch Trail, and Northeast Branch Trail on Map 10 on page 67.

6. Revise Strategy 2.2 on page 70 to read: “Provide [adequate] generous sidewalks on both sides of existing and new streets....”

7. Revise Strategy 3.3 on page 70 to read: “...Work with WMATA and MTA to address funding, maintenance, security, and liability concerns and make physical improvements to existing tunnel crossings....”

8. Add a new Strategy 1.9 on page 81 to read: “Explore opportunities to construct a public parking structure, perhaps via a public-private partnership, in proximity to the College Park/U of MD Metro Station to serve as a centralized parking hub that can provide additional capacity to development within the transit district.” Renumber remaining strategies.

9. Remove the minimum SmarTrip card amount recommended in Strategy 2.7 on page 82.

Environmental Infrastructure

1. Revise Table 11 to add the following programs identified in the Northeast Branch Subwatershed Action Plan located in the vicinity of the TDDP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>SITE LOCATION</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Intersection of Riverdale Road and the northeast corner of the Northeast Branch bridge, Riverdale</td>
<td>Aquatic community</td>
<td>Modification of a fish blockage area to remove barriers to fish migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5000 Riverdale Road, Hyattsville, MD</td>
<td>Stormwater management</td>
<td>Stormwater retrofit; utilize bioretention, filters, and bioswales to add controlled acreage to the subwatershed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Intersection of Queensbury Road and Taylor Road, Hyattsville</td>
<td>Aquatic community</td>
<td>Modification of a fish blockage area to remove barriers to fish migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Intersection of Queensbury Road and Taylor Road, Hyattsville</td>
<td>Riparian corridors</td>
<td>Riparian reforestation and invasive species management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyattsville</th>
<th>Riparian corridors</th>
<th>Stream restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Intersection of Baltimore Avenue and Wells Parkway, Hyattsville</td>
<td>Riparian corridors</td>
<td>Stream restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 6517 Baltimore Avenue, Riverdale</td>
<td>Stormwater management</td>
<td>Stormwater retrofit: utilize bioretention filters, and bioswales to add controlled acreage to the subwatershed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Revise Map 15 to indicate the location of the six additional programs identified above.

3. Add text to the title of Map 15 on page 87 to read “(See Table 11)” and text to the title of Table 11 to read: “(See Map 15).”

4. Correct the page reference to Map 15 on page 87 to reference the correct page where the map appears.

5. Revise the first paragraph on page 87 to read: “Although the physical environment of the transit district area has been affected by years of development, many environmental assets remain. These include forest interior dwelling species (FIDs) within the floodplain, nearly 8,400 linear feet of known streams.”

6. Add text to the end of the first full paragraph in the second column of page 93 to read: “Map 15 on page 90 and Table 11 on page 97 identify projects recommended by the Northeast Branch Subwatershed Action Plan which are supported by the TDDP as priority stormwater retrofit projects that will provide high return on low investment.”

7. Add a new paragraph to the end of the Forest and Tree Canopy Coverage discussion on pages 93-94 to read: “Habitat for forest interior dwelling species (FIDs) has been identified in the vicinity of the transit district, particularly within the Anacostia River Stream Valley and 100-year floodplain area associated with the Northeast Branch. FIDs habitat should be viewed similarly as human residential areas in terms of environmental considerations of noise and light pollution.”

8. Revise the background discussion on Page 95 of the TDDP to read: “…The easternmost portion of the Litton Property [is an appropriate site to locate an area of open space] is the best site within the transit district identified to date that can serve multiple functions, including improved water quality.”

9. Revise the discussion of the urban conservation park on page 96 to reduce the recommended size from 6 to 10 acres to 4 to 5 acres of property.

10. Revise Policy 4 on page 98 to read: “Minimize the impacts of noise on forest interior dwelling species (FIDs) in the vicinity and on residential uses within the transit district.”

11. Add a new Strategy 4.3 on page 98 to read: “Use appropriate measures to reduce or eliminate noise impacts to FIDs within the 100-year floodplain such as tree buffers and other techniques.”
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12. Revise Strategy 5 on page 98 to read: "Reduce overall sky glow, glare from light fixtures, and spillover of light to adjacent properties including FIDs habitat within the Anacostia River Stream Valley east of the Research Core."

13. Revise Strategy 5.2 on page 98 to read: "Utilize muted lighting fixtures, and install full cut-off optics for all lighting on properties within the transit district area, especially within the Research Core adjacent to FIDs habitat within the Anacostia River Stream Valley."

14. Add a new Strategy 1.3 to Policy 1 on page 99 to read: "Continue work with the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement, the University of Maryland, and other stakeholders to identify additional locations where compensatory floodplain storage is most feasible and appropriate. Coordinate with the TDDP Task Force and property owners if property acquisition is necessary to accommodate compensatory storage and other regional stormwater management approaches."

**Healthy Communities**

1. Revise Map 16 on page 106 to incorporate the proposed trail connection shown on Map 10 between Rivetech Court and Hailig Drive.

2. Revise the color scheme of Map 16 on page 106 to provide additional distinction between parks and open space categories.

3. Revise Strategy 4.2 on page 107 to clearly indicate the construction of an extended 52nd Avenue through the College Park Aviation Village should occur concurrent with the recommended construction of pedestrian and bicyclist facilities.

**V. CHAPTER FOUR: ADDITIONAL GUIDING ELEMENTS**

**Economic Prosperity**

1. Add a table to the text box on page 112 that compares the two alternate market analyses to the projected development yields modeled by the TDDP as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Alternate 1</th>
<th>Alternate 2</th>
<th>TDDP Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office and Institutional (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>2,225,000</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td>4,277,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>68,100</td>
<td>86,300</td>
<td>97,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (Rooms)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Dwelling Units)</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>5,312</td>
<td>5,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Neither Alternate 1 or Alternate 2 include existing development—they indicate new growth only. The projected buildout of the TDDP includes both existing development and anticipated new growth. All projections include properties outside of the transit district boundaries within identified Traffic Analysis Zones, which are geographic areas used for analysis purposes.
2. Revise the first paragraph under “Residential Development” on page 118 to read: “...The primary residential opportunity for the transit district is medium-high to high-density multifamily development [(typically between four to eight stories in the transit district area)] (>8 to >20 dwelling units per acre) perhaps with integrated....”

3. Revise Strategy 1.3 on page 119 to read: “Ensure flexibility in lane use, design, and transportation recommendations to allow a diversity of housing options and development approaches throughout the transit district.”

**Housing and Neighborhoods**

1. Relocate Strategy 1.3 on page 124 as a new Strategy 1.4 on page 119 to reflect a more broad application and recognition of the nexus of development costs and importance of identifying development incentives. Renumber the remaining strategies on both pages accordingly.

**Community Heritage and Culture**

1. Add text to the TDDP to remove historic resource 68-022 from the county’s Historic Sites and Districts registry.

**VI. CHAPTER FIVE: IMPLEMENTATION**

**Implementation**

1. Add language to Step One on page 138 prior to the last paragraph in this section to read: “One of the first challenges that should be addressed by the TDDP Task Force is the elimination or revision of the Riverside Covenants to ensure the TDDP vision can be implemented as described throughout this plan.”

2. Revise the first sentence of paragraph two under Step One on page 138 to read: “For this task force to be effective....”

3. Revise the action table on pages 142-152 to add the Corps of Engineers and the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to the “Potential Parties Involved” column for action steps ES6, ES13, ES14, and ES15, which all deal with stream stabilization/restoration and the Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Plan.

4. Revise the proposed action step for objective TR3 on page 142 to add a new second sentence to read: “Work with WMATA and MTA to address funding, maintenance, security, and liability concerns.”

5. Add a new objective TR26 on page 144. The proposed action step should read: “Explore opportunities to construct a public parking structure, perhaps via a public-private partnership, in proximity to the College Park/U of MD Metro Station to serve as a centralized parking hub that can provide additional capacity to development within the transit district.” The potential parties involved include Prince George’s County; City of College Park; Town of Riverdale Park; Developers; Property Owners; and University of Maryland, and the time frame should be Short-Term.
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6. Add a new Economic Development, Marketing, and Branding (MB) objective to the table on page 146 as MB1. The proposed action step will read: “Eliminate or revise the Riverside Covenants.” The potential parties involved will include Town of Riverdale Park, Property Owners, and Other Pertinent Parties, and the timeframe will be Ongoing. Renumber all other MB objectives.

7. Add the following language as a new proposed action step for a new objective ES12 in the action step table on page 148: “Continue work with the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement, the University of Maryland, and other stakeholders to identify additional locations where compensatory floodplain storage is most feasible and appropriate. Coordinate with the TDDP Task Force and property owners if property acquisition is necessary to accommodate compensatory storage and other regional stormwater management approaches.” The potential parties involved include the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement, the University of Maryland, M-NCPPC, DNR, City of College Park, Town of Riverdale Park, Property Owners, and Developers. The timeframe will be short-term. Renumber remaining ES action steps.

8. Revise the proposed action step text for objective ES15 on page 148 to read: “Pursue the implementation of priority stormwater retrofit project sites identified by the Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Plan and stream restoration project sites identified by the Northeast Branch Subwatershed Action Plan.”

9. Insert a new State of Maryland program on page 157 to read:

“Regional Institution Strategic Enterprise Zone (RISE)

“In May 2014 Governor O’Malley signed Senate Bill 600 into law, establishing the Regional Institution Strategic Enterprise Zone (RISE) program. This program is intended to facilitate economic development and revitalization in areas immediately adjacent to institutions of higher education and certain non-profit organizations. The RISE program offers tax credits and permitting and licensing assistance to businesses locating to the RISE zone.”

Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment Changes

1. Revise Zoning Change Number 1 on pages 167-171 and 177 to delete the following properties from the proposed zoning change:
   a. 5018 College Avenue (Tax ID 21-2309367)
   b. 5012 College Avenue, Lots 25-29 (Tax ID 21-2309383)
   c. 5014 College Avenue (Tax ID unknown)
   d. 5108 College Avenue, Lots 31-33 (Tax ID 21-2309268)
   e. 5100 College Avenue, Lots 36-40 (Tax ID 21-2309300)
   f. 5110 College Avenue, Lots 28-30 (Tax ID 21-2309250)
   g. 5109 Litton Avenue, Lots 4-5 (Tax ID 21-2309235)
   h. 5011 Litton Avenue, Lots 8-18 (Tax ID 21-2309096)
   i. 5111 Litton Avenue, Lots 6-9 (Tax ID 21-2309243)
   j. Litton Avenue, Lots 34-35 (Tax ID 21-2309276)
   k. 7415 Corporal Frank Scott Drive (Tax ID 21-2309284)
   l. Corporal Frank Scott Drive, Lot 41 (Tax ID 21-2309284)
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m. Corporal Frank Scott Drive, Lots 42-44 (Tax ID 21-2309292)

2. Revise Maps 18 (Proposed Zoning Changes) and 19 (Proposed TDOZMA Zoning) on pages 164 and 165, and Table 18 (Existing and Proposed Zoning Inventory in Acres) to reflect the changes listed above.

3. Evaluate Map 19: Proposed TDOZMA Zoning on page 165 to determine if the zoning map should be corrected so as not to reflect M-U-I Zoning within the right-of-way of River Road.

**Transit District Overlay Zone Applicability**

1. Revise the exemption statement for nonresidential development on page 186 to read: “...if the addition (and the cumulative sum of all additions since approval of the TDOZ) does not increase the GFA of a building [by more than 15 percent or 5,000 square feet, whichever is less.] as follows.

   - For an existing building with less than 50,000 square feet of GFA: not more than 25 percent.
   - For an existing building with greater than or equal to 50,000 square feet of GFA: not more than 15 percent or 10,000 square feet of GFA (whichever is less).

**Transit District Standards**

1. Add a new third paragraph to page 194 to read: “Both surface and structured parking areas shall be set back from the build-to line to minimize the visual impact of parking from the street and to provide space for liner buildings or landscape areas to further screen parking areas. This set back is indicated by the parking setback line, which shall be placed at least 30 feet behind the build-to line for surface parking and 50 feet behind the build-to line for structured parking. Under no circumstances may parking areas be located in front of the parking setback line or between the parking setback line and the build-to line within the transit district.”

2. Add a caption to the top diagram on page 194 to read: “In general, the length of the block should be measured from the build-to lines along streets as shown above. Note also the parking setback line.”

3. Add a caption to the bottom diagram on page 194 to read: “Open spaces such as an urban park or plaza may be provided within blocks and placed adjacent to buildings, but the length of the open space shall be subtracted from the block length to ensure distances between side streets remain walkable and convenient to pedestrians.”

4. Revise Map 21 on page 197 and the accompanying legend to combine “existing streets” and “proposed streets” into one category, and provide clarification that they also refer to “primary streets” by consolidating the label as: “Existing and Proposed Streets (Primary Streets—see page 195).”

5. Amend Map 22 on page 199 to adjust building height areas to property lines where necessary.

6. Amend Map 22 on page 199 to match the 5 to 12 story building height area to the extent of the
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TOD/Metro Core located east of River Road.

7. Delete page 202 and any references to the Greenway Corridor neighborhood contained within the transit district standards.

8. Replace the top right image on page 206 with a more appropriate photograph that shows architectural stepback design on a building within the TDDP's supported height range, and add a diagram or photo and accompanying caption to pages 206 to 207 that offer an example illustrating the type of height transition supported in the TOD/Metro Core toward existing single-family communities.

9. Revise the second parking requirement standard on page 208 to read: “The maximum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for non-residential, residential, and hotel land uses (regardless of neighborhood) are specified in Table 19 below. These parking maximums are phased with a more generous allotment of parking available until 2025 (5 years after the anticipated opening of the Purple Line, when the transit district should begin to achieve a self-sustaining market and development pattern) when parking maximum ratios are reduced. A third parking ratio is established for each major land use type in the event the Purple Line does not achieve operation as anticipated. The indicator “no PL” is used to identify the applicable parking ratio if this scenario comes to pass.”

10. Replace Table 19: Maximum Parking Ratios for Off-Street Parking Spaces on page 208 and the associated footnotes with the following table and language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19: Maximum Parking Ratios for Off-Street Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2 mile of College Park/U of MD Metro Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2 mile of College Park/U of MD Metro Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2 mile of the M Square (River Road) Purple Line Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Within ¼ mile of the M Square (River Road) Purple Line Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.50 / 1.000 GSF</th>
<th>3.00 / 1.000 GSF</th>
<th>2.50 / 1.000 GSF</th>
<th>2.0 / 1.33 / DU</th>
<th>2.0 / DU</th>
<th>1.00 / 0.75 / 1.00 / room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NOTES:** GSF=gross square feet, DU=dwelling unit

1. At the time of Planning Board adoption of the TDDP, 11 properties are impacted by both ¼ mile parking “rings” from existing and proposed rail transit stations. The most restrictive ratio shall prevail on Parcel 1, Parcel A, and Lot C since these properties have the most direct relationship to the College Park/U of MD Metro Station. The eight properties south of the east to west stream channel bisecting the transit district shall be subject to the least restrictive ratio.

2. Hotel maximums may include up to 10 additional parking spaces for each 1,000 GSF uses for ballrooms, meeting rooms, and other similar places of assembly.

11. Revise the bicycle parking standards on page 209 to incorporate a phased increase in the required amount of bicycle parking over time to reflect the presence of the Purple Line and reduced reliance on single-occupant automobiles.

12. Delete the last sentence on page 210 under the heading Transportation Adequacy.

13. Revise page 211 to indicate that the setback distance for surface parking lots and parking structures shall be set back from the build-to line, not the property line.

14. Revise Table 21 on page 213 to increase the minimum percentage of fenestration for both Ground Floor Residential and Upper Floor Residential from 15 to 25 percent.

15. Revise the second standard under Streetscape Amenities on page 226 to read: “All street furnishings that are part of the streetscape shall be constructed of metal such as aluminum, stainless steel, or cast iron; stone; or masonry.”

**Transit District Overlay Zone Tables of Uses Permitted**

1. Revise the tables of uses permitted on pages 233-290 to prohibit gas stations in all underlying zones.

**VII. OTHER CHANGES**

1. Change the plan and map(s) to incorporate mapping, typographical, grammatical, and rewording corrections, as necessary.

2. Change the plan and map(s) where appropriate to correspond to the aforementioned amendments, revisions, extensions, deletions, and additions.

3. Revise the Agency Engagement text box on page 27 to change “Maryland Transit Authority” to “Maryland Transit Administration.”
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4. Revise Strategy 2.1 on page 59 to replace the reference of a traffic circle to a roundabout.

5. Delete the first 12 properties in the zoning change table on page 168, since they are duplicates of the 12 properties listed on page 167.

WHEREAS, an objective of the proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District is to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of all citizens in Prince George's County; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District is an amendment to the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, being an amendment to the Zoning Map for that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George's County; and

WHEREAS, the Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment includes zoning changes enumerated and transmitted herein, accounting for varying acreage and zoning categories; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 27-213.02(f) of the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, the acceptance and processing of Zoning Map Amendment and Special Exception applications within the subject planning area shall be postponed until after final action by the District Council on the Map Amendment; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 27-157(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, the conditions and findings attached to previously approved zoning applications are considered part of the endorsed Sectional Map Amendment where the previous zoning category has been maintained and noted on the Zoning Map.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission does hereby adopt the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan, said plan superseding the 1997 Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone and being an amendment to portions of the 1989/1990 Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66, and 67; 1994 Planning Area 68 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment; the 1983 Functional Master Plan for Public School Sites; the 2005 Countywide Green Infrastructure Functional Master Plan; the 2008 Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan; the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation; the 2010 Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan; and the 2010 Approved Water Resources Functional Master Plan; this said adopted plan containing amendments, extensions, deletions, and additions in response to the public hearing record; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan, as herein adopted, is applicable to the area within the boundaries delineated on the plan map and consists of a map(s) and text; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the adopted transit district development plan comprises the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan text as amended by this resolution; and
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BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in accordance with Section 27-213.02(e) of the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, copies of the adopted plan, consisting of this resolution to be used in conjunction with the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan, will be transmitted to the County Council for another public hearing and final action;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an attested copy of the adopted plan, and all parts thereof, shall be certified by the Commission and transmitted to the District Council of Prince George's County for its approval pursuant to the Land Use Article, Annotated Code of Maryland; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Prince George's County Planning Board finds that the transit district overlay zoning map amendment has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Part 3, Division 2, Subdivision 5 of the Zoning Ordinance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Prince George's County Planning Board finds that the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment, as heretofore described, is in conformance with the principles of orderly comprehensive land use planning and staged development, being consistent with the Adopted College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan, and with consideration having been given to the applicable County Laws, Plans, and Policies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, pursuant to Section 27-213.04 of the Zoning Ordinance, endorses the proposed transit district overlay zoning map amendment for the College Park-Riverdale Park transit district by this resolution, and recommends that it be approved as an amendment to the Zoning Map for that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George's County.
This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution, as revised, adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Shoaff, seconded by Commissioner Washington with Commissioners Shoaff, Washington, Hewlett and Bailey voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Geraldo absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 17, 2014 in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 17th day of July, 2014.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By

Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator
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ATTACHMENT A to PGCPB No. 14-61

Preliminary College Park – Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan and Proposed Transit District Zoning Map Amendment Technical Changes

Plan-Wide: Add references to MARC where other forms of mass transit (such as Metro and the Purple Line) are referenced.

Abstract Page: Update number of pages to reflect correct page count. Add 1990 to the title of the Approved Master Plan for Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt and Vicinity Master Plan to reflect the approval date of the accompanying sectional map amendment.

Page iii: Remove bold text for “1st District” following Councilmember Mary Lehman.

Page vii: Correct typo in heading for “List of Figures” at top of page. Reflect consistent capitalization in the title of Map 5. Remove end bracket from title of Table 14.

Page x: The date for the Planning Board Public Hearing should read Thursday, May 29, 2014.

Page 7: Add 1990 to the title of the Approved Master Plan for Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt and Vicinity Master Plan to reflect the approval date of the accompanying sectional map amendment.

Page 7: Revise the first sentence to read: “... is being updated to replace the [16]17-year-old....”

Page 7: Revise the second paragraph to read: “Although the 1997 College Park-Riverdale TDDP was partially successful in implementing an employment center, [no residential development has been realized, and the TDDP has fostered a suburban office park] its suburban office park character is very much at odds with [current and] best practice planning approaches [toward] for major heavy rail-served locations best suited[able] to medium- to high-density, mixed-use, transit-oriented development. [The 1997 College Park-Riverdale] This is underscored by the fact that the TDDP explicitly prohibits residential development in the majority of the transit district area. Furthermore the TDDP is extremely complicated[, it explicitly prohibits residential development in the majority of the transit district area,] and [it] fails to address numerous and very aggressive amendments to county and state laws that will help ensure the restoration and protection of an environmentally-sensitive area. This update will address these flaws, set the stage for proactive development, and better position the area to fully capitalize on the Green Line and future Purple Line.”

Page 8: Revise the last bullet to read: “Sets policies that will guide future development in the sector plan transit district area.”

Page 9: Revise the text box to read: “...to the town will be to Riverdale Park or the Town of Riverdale Park.”

[Brackets] indicate deleted text
Underlines indicate inserted text
Page 11: Revise the text box to read: “Challenges and Opportunities: Planning and implementing future transit-oriented development within the transit district is complicated by a number of factors, including the [increasing] heightened emphasis of M-NCPPC and the Maryland Aviation Administration on the need to preserve the continuing operation of College Park Airport[, which is] increasingly viewed as threatened by development within and immediately adjacent to the aviation policy areas]; ....

Many of these challenges simultaneously constitute strengths and opportunities[, from elements of place-making that contribute to the unique identity of the transit district to multiple rail transit lines:] For example, historic communities contribute to the unique identity of the transit district [with commitment to preservation and compatibility to a] while limited property ownership [pattern that] can facilitate redevelopment opportunities and collaborative projects. Very few rail transit-served locations in the country are immediately adjacent to a general aviation airport, particularly one with a rich [and unique] history, and the addition of the Purple Line will greatly enhance transit accessibility and connectivity. The College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District is well poised to capitalize on its location and economic assets and leverage its strengths to emerge as a new leader in the county and regional transit-oriented economic [sphere]engine.”

Page 13: Change chapter numbers in paragraph two from Roman to Arabic numerals.

Page 13: Revise the first paragraph to read: “This transit district development plan is the result of a joint planning effort with the City of College Park and Town of Riverdale Park[, Policies and strategies were established in light of Plan 2035 and other] and was prepared in response to the county’s Plan 2035 general plan update, recent studies, changing markets, and community needs. [The new TDDP] It makes comprehensive planning and zoning recommendations to implement development of a compact, pedestrian- and transit-friendly, mixed use center consistent with the recommendations of Plan 2035. Planning studies and other guidance at the city, county, and state levels also contribute to the format and recommendations of this TDDP.”

Page 13: Add a new subheader called “Plan Organization” above the second paragraph.

Page 15: Revise the last sentence of paragraph three to read: “…Innovation Corridor, and in conjunction with the University of Maryland, College Park campus, the transit district area acts as the southern anchor to this economically vital portion of Prince George’s County.”

Page 17: Add a reference to Map 6 at the end of the first sentence at the top of the page.

Pages 17-18: Revise the last paragraph to read: “…This study provided insight into the future retail demand along a corridor already lined with numerous retail establishments. (While not directly linked to the transit district area, its findings were evaluated as part of the TDDP market analysis and incorporated within the broader market analysis conducted for the preliminary TDDP.) The study assumed the pending Cafritz Property development application would be approved, including more than 100,000 square feet of new retail development on the US 1 frontage of the Town of Riverdale Park, and evaluated the remaining market potential] was evaluated]. [This study] It concluded [found] that approximately 55,000 additional square feet of grocery/convenience store space and 40,000 square feet of restaurant space was supportable
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along the six-mile portion of US 1 included in the analysis. [While not directly linked to the transit district area, this study was evaluated as part of the TDDP market analysis, and its recommendations were incorporated within the broader market analysis conducted for the preliminary TDDP.]

**Page 19:** Add the following text before the first paragraph: “There have been several changes to the Prince George’s County Code that are relevant to the update of the TDDP.”

**Page 19:** Revise the last sentence on page 19 to read: “Paint Branch Parkway has been recommended for a complete and green streets treatment...”

**Page 20:** Move Map 5 closer to its reference on page 23.

**Page 23:** Add the following text to clarify the name of the Formula 2040 master plan in the first full paragraph in the second column: “…Formula 2040: Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space...”

**Page 31:** Include a reference to the image on page 32 in the second paragraph starting with: “Five new...”.

**Page 32:** The last sentence of bullet four in the shaded text box should be a stand-alone sentence, and is not part of the bullet.

**Page 35:** Put in bold and revise the second paragraph to read: “To achieve the community vision, it is essential to understand and address the five keystones necessary to bridge the gap between today and tomorrow. These keystones underlie and inform every aspect of the TDDP and the plan’s recommendations. The persistent and dedicated focus on addressing the keystones is essential to the success of the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District. [The five keystones are critical to achieving the mix and type of development envisioned for the area.]”

**Page 35:** Revise the first sentence under 1. The Riverside Covenants to read: “The set of covenants (see Appendix D for the properties subject to the covenants) between various property owners in the southern half...”

**Page 36:** Revise the first sentence under 4. Creating the Market to read: “A traditional approach to development, i.e. waiting...”

**Page 39:** Include a reference to the illustrative plan on page 37 in the first paragraph.

**Page 40:** Revise the second paragraph in the first text box to read: “It is the intent of the County Council to continue implementing the Science and Technology Business District [through the creation] by creating [off an investment tax credit, [collaboration] collaborating with the Maryland General Assembly to make the state’s research and development tax credit permanent, [provide] providing an expedited review and approval process for qualified science and technology projects within the business district, [pursue] pursuing the full range of economic
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incentives necessary to support development, and [apply] applying the Prince George’s County Economic Development Incentive Fund to qualified businesses.”

Page 40: Revise the second text box to read: “In 2005 Prince George’s County established aviation policy areas (APAs) around its general aviation airports. The APAs are intended to ensure the protection of airspace around airports, essential to [as well as] the success of airport operations, and the safety of [protect] people and structures around airports ....”

Page 41: Add a notation to the caption for the three scenario diagrams from the Urban Land Institute Technical Assistance Panel to read: “Images courtesy of City of College Park.” Add a reference to the diagrams in the second paragraph.

Page 43: Revise the subheader “Description of Land Use Categories” to “Land Use Pattern.” Add a sentence at the end of the first paragraph to read: “Table 1 reflects the acreage for each existing land use in the TDDP area.”

Page 45: Switch pages 45 and 46 so Map 8 follows its reference in the proposed land use categories discussion.

Page 45: Add the dashed lines (proposed secondary streets) to the legend on Map 8.

Page 46: Replace Table 2 with the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Space (includes Recreation)</td>
<td>63.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>77.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use, Predominantly Office</td>
<td>60.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use, Predominantly Residential</td>
<td>39.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>25.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>267.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>21.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>289.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 46: Add text below the subheader “Proposed (Future) Land Use Categories:” The proposed (future) land use categories envisioned in this TDDP are described below and shown in Map 8 on page 45. Table 2 reflects the acreage for each future land use envisioned in the TDDP area.”

Page 46: Add a new subheading immediately following Table 2 that reads: “Future Land Use Interpretation” and include the final two paragraphs on page 46 under this subheading.

[Brackets] indicate deleted text
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The last bullet in the shaded text box should be stand-alone text following the list of LEED® programs; there should only be four bullets in this text box.

Add a reference to the illustrative transit plaza graphic on page 49 in Strategy 3.1.

Label the transit plaza and proposed new buildings.

Replace the map reference in Strategy 3.2 with a reference to the image in the right column. Revise the second page reference in Strategy 3.3 to reference page 101 rather than page 92.

Add a text box near Map 9 on page 52 to read: “Map 9 shows elements of the recommended TDDP development pattern, including the transit hub at the Metro station, gateways marking major entry points into the transit district, and the proposed street network.”

Correct the photo caption to read: “… and FDA stormwater…”

Replace the image in the bottom right hand corner with an image that more clearly depicts townhouses.

Revise the caption of the image to read: “The primary open space within the Research Core along the proposed extension of Rivertech Court toward the NOAA building can easily become a major selling point.”

Capitalize Riverdale Park in the photo caption.

Correct the photo caption to read: “Large surface parking lots with low levels of utilization characterize the transit district today.”

Move Map 10 so that it follows its reference on page 69 and revise the map reference accordingly.

Switch the captions to match the correct photos.

Correct the map reference in Strategy 3.1 to reference the new location of Map 10.

Delete end parentheses in comment section for River Road/River Road Extended. Add the following bikeway/trail facility:

| Haiig Drive | Hard surface trail | River Road to Anacostia River Stream Valley Park Trail | Continuous sidewalks along Haiig Drive transitioning to hard surface trail connection to regional trail facility |

[Brackets] indicate deleted text
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Page 73: Add a reference to the intermodal zones graphic on page 75 in Strategy 2.1.

Page 75: Delete graphic and caption of proposed transit plaza; this graphic appears elsewhere within the TDDP.

Page 78: Revise the second bullet under Strategy 1.2 to read: "..Reclassify Rivertech Court from an industrial street (I-208) to a two-lane collector (C-217) with a right-of-way of 70 feet. Extend Rivertech Court west to Lafayette Street." Revise Table 6 to clearly indicate the travel lanes for River Road are recommended for 2 lanes in the short- to medium-term to increase to 4 travel lanes in the long-term.

Page 79: Delete the duplicated instances of the "Strategies" subheading and Strategy 2.1."

Page 80: Correct the mention of M-NCPPC in Strategy 3.4.

Page 81: Revise Strategy 1.8 to read: "...(with the exception of WMATA or county-constructed facilities, including facilities constructed under public-private partnerships with these entities)...."

Page 85 to 100: Change all references of ARWRP to ARP to reflect the correct abbreviation of the Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Plan.

Page 86: Replace Map 12: Hydrologic Features Within and Adjacent to the Transit District with the correct map featuring the county 100-year floodplain study (see attached map). Correct typo in the word "Hydrologic" within the map title and revise table of contents listing.

Page 87: Revise the reference to Map 15 in the second column from page 92 to page 90.

Page 90: Revise the label for the asterisks in Map 15 to read: "[ARWRP]Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Plan (ARP) Candidate Stormwater Retrofit Sites."

Page 90: Correct the legend in Map 15 to reflect all the elements of the map, including the TDDP boundary and the Purple Line.

Page 91: Add a notation of the last sentence of the paragraph at the top of the page to read: "...poor air quality and high temperatures (see Table 7 Subwatersheds Countywide and Within the Transit District Area and Table 8 Hydrologic Features Within the Transit District Area)."

Revise the last sentence of the first paragraph under "Floodplains" to read:

"Floodplain studies (as delineated by Map 12 on page 86) usually result in a larger area of floodplain delineation than the FEMA floodplain because their analysis is based on ultimate development or build-out, [(see Table 8 Hydrologic Features Within the Transit District Area below and Map 12 on page 86).]"

[Brackets] indicate deleted text
Underlines indicate inserted text
Page 93: Correct the caption for the upper left photograph to read: “Large surface parking lots and concrete drains [the]that....” Correct the caption for the bottom right photograph to read: “Riparian forest near the American Center for Physics west of River Road.”


Page 105: Correct reference in Strategy 1.2 from Map 13 to Map 16.

Page 106: Revise Map 16 to better distinguish the types of open space.

Page 111: Revise the second sentence of the vision statement to read: “As part of Prince George’s County’s [primary employment area]innovation corridor,....”

Page 115: Delete end bracket from title of Table 14.

Page 119: Correct the caption to read: “…can help shape an [identify] identity…”

Page 120: Add a caption to the photograph to read: “The presence of the Purple Line light rail will offer new economic development opportunities if the stakeholders are able to fully capitalize on its potential.”

Page 126: Label the Riverdale Park Urban Village graphic as Figure 3: Riverdale Park Urban Village. Revise the table of contents to include this figure.

Page 128: Correct the second paragraph under Background to read: “…The [Clarence] Clarice Smith…”

Page 133: Correct typo in the legend for the College Park Volunteer Fire Station.

Page 161: The shaded text box refers to legislation that was to be proposed which may revise procedures pertaining to rezoning from the M-X-T Zone within a TDOZMA area. This bill, CB-15-2014, has been introduced by the District Council and discussed by the Council’s Planning, Zoning, and Economic Development Committee following publication of the preliminary TDDP. The Committee moved favorable on the bill on May 7, 2014 but removed the provision referenced in this shaded text box. Therefore, property owner consent to rezone property out of the M-X-T Zone will still be required pursuant to Section 27-213.03 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Page 161: Revise the reference to Map 18 in the last paragraph to page 164 rather than page 193.

Page 162: Place Map 17 and 19 on facing pages. Renumber maps and correct references accordingly.

Page 164: Revise Map 18 to show Zoning Change 7 (the addition of the TDOZ).
Page 165: Revise title of Map 19 to read: “Proposed [SMA] TDOZMA Zoning” and revise table of contents listing. Correct the erroneous parcel northwest of Physics Ellipse shown in the M-X-T Zone to the M-U-I Zone in accordance with proposed zoning change 4.

Page 187: The second and third paragraphs under “Valid Detailed Site Plans” were inadvertently split. They should be combined following “…only if the proposed revisions fall within….”

Page 191: Change the map reference in item 3 within the shaded text box to Map 20 on page 193.

Page 197: Relocate Map 21: Proposed Street Network and the associated caption near Policy 2 of Roadways and Complete Streets (pages 78-80) as Map 12. Renumber other maps as necessary. Update references to Map 21 on pages 47, 79, and 195 to reflect the relocation of the proposed street network map.

Page 199: Revise the colors/tones in Map 22: Building Heights to more clearly distinguish height differences.

Page 207: Add a caption to the image to read: “Townhouses and multifamily buildings designed to reflect single-family detached housing influences help provide a transition in intensity from high-rise multifamily and mixed-use development.”

Pages 209, 214, and 222: Correct the row shading in Tables 20, 21, and 22.

Page 231: Correct typo in “nodes” in the definition of plazas within the shaded text box.

Page 257: Correct the numbering at the bottom of the page where the three types of use categories that should be considered for the M-X-T Zone are listed. These should be numbered 1-3 rather than continuing the previous list as 9-11.

Pages 233 and 265: Revise item (II)(8) on each page to read: “Whenever the tables refer to an allowed use, that use is either permitted (P), [permitted but subject to certain general special exception standards (P*),] permitted by Special Exception (SE),….”

Pages 266-280: Shade every other row in the Tables of Uses for the Residential Zones to improve legibility.

Rear Cover: The hearings by the Planning Board and District Council are separate hearings; neither hearing will be a Joint Public Hearing.

Image Captions: Ensure consistency between image, map, and photo captions by adding periods at the end of all captions.

Maps: Correct typo to East West Hwy. (MD 410) on affected maps. Remove AMTRAK label from where it may appear in map legends.
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COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL
2015 Legislative Session

Resolution No. CR-7-2015

Proposed by Council Member Glaros

Introduced by Council Members Glaros, Franklin, Davis, Taveras and Harrison

Co-Sponsors

Date of Introduction March 17, 2015

RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION concerning

The College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Overlay Zone

For the purpose of approving, with revisions, as an Act of the County Council of Prince George’s County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council, the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment (TDOZMA), thereby setting forth and adopting detailed zoning proposals in Planning Areas 66 and 68 for the area generally bounded by the College Park Airport to the north; the Metrorail / MARC / CSX tracks to the west; the residential portion of the Town of Riverdale Park to the south; and the Northeast Branch Stream Valley Park to the east.

WHEREAS, upon approval by the District Council, this TDOZMA will amend portions of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map located in Planning Areas 66 and 68; and

WHEREAS, on June 18, 2013, the Prince George’s County Council, sitting as the District Council, adopted CR-57-2013, thereby initiating an amendment to the 1997 Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone and portions of the 1989 Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Master Plan and 1990 Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66, and 67; the 1994 Planning Area 68 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment; as well as certain County functional master plans, including the 1983 Functional Master Plan for Public School Sites; the 2005 Countywide Green Infrastructure Functional Master Plan; the 2008 Public Safety Facilities Master Plan; the 2009 Countywide Master Plan of Transportation; the 2010 Historic Sites and Districts Plan; and the 2010 Water
WHEREAS, as part of the plan’s collaborative planning and public participation process, the Planning Board staff conducted numerous meetings with community and agency stakeholders, to include four major community workshops, discussions with civic associations and business and property owners; municipal briefings with the mayor and municipal council for the City of College Park and Town of Riverdale Park, respectively; informational meetings with municipal, county, state, and regional agencies; targeted technical meetings with the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement and the Department of Health to address floodplain and stormwater management concerns and health impact assessments, respectively; meetings with the University of Maryland; a food truck event held at the M Square office and research park; and utilized social media and traditional forms of notification to maximize public participation and input concerning the plan; and

WHEREAS, on February 11, 2014, the District Council granted a six-month extension of the timeframe for preparing the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan and Proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment to provide additional time for staff to incorporate detailed transportation analysis, continue community outreach and education, and coordinate with residents and agencies to achieve consensus; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan is to develop a comprehensive plan that sets policies and strategies that build upon the land use policy guidance within the 2014 Plan Prince George’s 2035 General Plan for regional transit districts and the innovation corridor, more specifically: establishing a community-focused, realistic approach for implementation of a key County vision toward transit-oriented, mixed-use development that realize the countywide and municipal economic benefits of a major Metro station and two proposed Purple Line stations; recognizing the historical importance of the natural environment and the College Park Airport; employing best practices for planning and development to ensure the most comprehensive and sensitive approach to environmental stewardship, floodplain and stormwater management, future growth, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, transportation management strategies, and economic and community development; and incorporate the County’s first health impact assessment conducted for a comprehensive planning effort to create a healthier community; and
WHEREAS, the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan contains a comprehensive rezoning element, known as the Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment, intended to implement the land use recommendations of the transit district development plan for the foreseeable future; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board granted permission to release the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan and its associated Proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for public inspection on April 10, 2014; and

WHEREAS, on May 29, 2014, the Prince George’s County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan and Proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment; and

WHEREAS, on June 26, 2014, the Planning Board held a public work session on the Preliminary College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan to examine staff’s analysis of the testimony received in the public hearing record at the May 29, 2014, Planning Board public hearing, as well as exhibits received before the close of the Planning Board Public Hearing record of testimony on June 13, 2014, and to consider the staff’s recommendations thereon; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board voted to include one item of late testimony into the public hearing record, identified as Exhibit 31, and to continue its public work session until its July 10, 2014, meeting; and

WHEREAS, on July 17, 2014, the Planning Board voted to adopt Resolution PGC PB No. 14-61, thereby adopting the transit district development plan and endorsing the transit district overlay zoning map amendment with further amendments, extensions, deletions, and additions in response to the public hearing record; and

WHEREAS, on July 28, 2014, and pursuant to Section 27-213.04(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George’s County, being also Subtitle 27 of the Prince George’s County Code, the Planning Board transmitted the Adopted College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan and Endorsed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment to the District Council; and

WHEREAS, on September 16, 2014, the District Council conducted a duly advertised public hearing on the Adopted College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan.
and Endorsed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment; and

WHEREAS, on October 14, 2014, the District Council held a work session to consider the record of public hearing testimony, along with the Planning Board’s recommendations embodied in PGCPB No. 14-61 and, after discussion thereon, voted to direct staff to prepare a Resolution proposing certain amendments to the Adopted Transit District Development Plan and Endorsed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment and further directing that a second public hearing be held before the District Council to take public testimony on the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the District Council held a duly-advertised public hearing on eleven (11) proposed amendments to the Adopted Transit District Development Plan and Endorsed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment on January 13, 2015; and

WHEREAS, on February 24, 2015, the District Council held a work session to review the Planning Board’s recommendations on the public hearing testimony, voted to include three items of late testimony into the public hearing record, identified as Exhibits 44, 45, and 46, and directed Technical Staff to prepare a resolution of approval incorporating revisions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the County Council of Prince George’s County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council for that part of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George’s County, Maryland, that the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan and its associated Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment as adopted and endorsed on July 14, 2014, by PGCPB No. 14-61, be and the same is hereby approved with the following revisions:

A. REVISIONS TO THE ADOPTED TRANSIT DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

REVISION ONE:

Revise the plan language under section 2, “Existing Approvals and Addressing Phasing/Transitions” on page 35 to clarify the overall relationship of existing development approvals with the Approved TDDP. Remove the text box on page 36 of the Adopted TDDP.

REVISION TWO:

Add a new paragraph to the end of the discussion of the Riverside Covenants on page 35 to read: “Property owners are encouraged to pursue development opportunities and designs that implement the vision and goals of the TDDP. If the Riverside Covenants remain in place, the
Zoning Ordinance allows for flexibility for the Planning Board to apply different development standards through the amendment process.”

REVISION THREE:

Revise paragraph two under the subheading, “Effect of 1997 Parking Requirements” on page 65, as follows: “Over the medium-to-long term, as the Purple Line is constructed and the transit district transitions to more of a true transit-oriented area, the parking ratios originally established in 1997 are reasonable and appropriate as targets for new development....”

REVISION FOUR:

Add language to pages 92–95 of the adopted TDDP, as set forth in the paragraphs below, to reflect the ongoing conversations between staff, major property owners, DPIE, DPW&T, and DOE regarding the most appropriate measures to address identified floodplain, compensatory storage, and stormwater management concerns within the transit district, and the need for these conversations to continue as development and redevelopment occurs:

a.) Add a new paragraph at the end of the Water Quality and Stormwater Management background section on pages 92-93 to read: “It will be essential to continue the conversation of appropriate area-wide and site-specific water quantity, quality, and stormwater management approaches in order to achieve the overall vision and goals for the development of the transit district. Innovative collaboration between the private sector, affected municipalities, and public agencies, including the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement, Department of Public Works and Transportation, and Department of the Environment will be key to addressing the challenges posed by stormwater and floodplain management to achieve the TDDP vision. As one of the first actions of this collaborative process, the County’s 100-year floodplain study for the portions of the Anacostia River Watershed within and adjacent to the transit district should be updated to establish a current baseline of existing conditions to inform development proposals.”

b.) Retain the Planning Board’s revisions in the Adopted TDDP to generalize the discussion of the urban conservation park throughout the TDDP, and eliminate all specific references to the Litton Property as the preferred location for an urban conservation park. Revise the discussion of the proposed urban conservation park on page 95 to read: “Residents placed high priority on preserving open space throughout
the transit district. One suggestion called for creating a buffer zone near existing parks
to preserve open space. Others emphasized the desire for additional tree canopy
coverage and places for floodwaters to slow and reduce pressures downstream. [The
easternmost portion of the Litton Property is the best site within the transit district
identified to date that can serve multiple functions, including improved water quality,
control of water quantity, stormwater management, floodplain compensatory storage,
and additional trail connections and synergistic learning opportunities. While this
TDDP recognizes the University of Maryland has obtained subdivision approval for
development of the Litton Property at the time of this writing, this area contains two
types of hydric and poorly drained soils that make it an ideal location for the creation of
an urban conservation park that provides the much needed water quantity, water
quality, and stormwater management controls to support development and, potentially,
recreational opportunities for people working and living in the area.] The opportunity
exists for the development of an urban conservation park within the transit district, at a
designated location that will be so determined, in order to provide the much-needed
water quantity, water quality, and stormwater management controls to support
development and could serve as an area amenity providing recreational opportunities
for people working and living in the area; add value to the proposed neighborhoods and
the overall transit district; and contribute to marketing and branding to draw new
residents and businesses. Refer to the text box on the following page for additional
detail and the potential benefits of an urban conservation park.

REVISION FIVE:

Add a new Strategy 1.3 on page 96 to read: “Update the County’s 100-year floodplain study
for the portions of the Anacostia River Watershed within and immediately adjacent to the transit
district to provide a current baseline of existing and anticipated floodplain conditions.”

Renumber remaining Strategies accordingly.

REVISION SIX:

Add a new action step “ES5” to the implementation action table on page 147 to read:
“Update the county’s 100-year floodplain study for the portions of the Anacostia River
Watershed within and immediately adjacent to the transit district to provide a current baseline of
existing and anticipated floodplain conditions.” The potential parties involved would include
Prince George’s County and M-NCPPC, and the timeframe would be ongoing.

Re-number remaining action steps accordingly.

**REVISION SEVEN:**

Insert a new Map 23 to depict the relationship of the county’s Aviation Policy Areas to the transit district, and incorporate appropriate cross-references to this map where the TDDP text discusses the Aviation Policy Areas.

**B. REVISIONS TO THE ENDORSED TRANSIT DISTRICT OVERLAY ZONING MAP AMENDMENT**

**REVISION EIGHT:**

Delete the fourth bullet under the “Height” subheading on page 200 regarding building height transitions, since the existing language on pages 206 and 207 more explicitly incorporate the TDDP’s vision, intent, and development standards reflecting building form and massing approaches.

**REVISION NINE:**

Simplify the language and tables from pages 208–12 of the Adopted TDDP to ensure easy understanding of parking expectations and a policy that reflects best practices for transit oriented development while at the same time accommodating desired uses in the plan by:

a.) Revising the second bullet under the “Parking Requirements” heading on page 208 to read:

“The “Maximum Parking Ratios,” or the maximum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for non-residential, residential, and hotel land uses (regardless of neighborhood), are specified in Table 19 below. [These parking maximums are phased with a more generous allotment of parking available until 2025 (when the transit district should begin to achieve a self-sustaining market and development pattern) when maximum parking ratios are reduced.] Additional parking may only be permitted if it is provided within parking structures.”

b.) Revising the third bullet under the “Parking Requirements” heading on page 208 to read:

“The “Maximum Parking Ratios,” or the maximum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for each land use type….”
c.) Replacing Table 19 in the Adopted TDDP with the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ¼ mile of College Park/U of MD Metro Station</td>
<td>2.25 / 1,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ¼ mile of the M Square (River Road) Purple Line Station</td>
<td>3.00 / 1,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Transit District Area</td>
<td>3.00 / 1,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: GSF=gross square feet, DU=dwelling unit

1. Location/distance is measured from the center point of a rail transit station to the closest lot line of the development lot or parcel.

2. In addition to the hotel maximums specified above, up to 10 additional parking spaces may be provided for each 1,000 GSF of floor space dedicated to non-lodging uses (such as, but not limited to, ballrooms, conference and meeting rooms, and restaurants and lounges/bars) located within the associated hotel.

d.) Revising the last bullet on the right hand column on page 208 to read:

- “Development [is]may only be permitted to exceed the [m]Maximum [p]Parking [r]Ratios if the following criteria are met:

  ➢ “[Individual projects shall not provide more than 133 percent of the allowed maximum parking ratio.]”

  ➢ “Additional parking spaces may only be provided in the form of structured parking.”

  ➢ “The amount of additional structured parking spaces permitted beyond the Maximum Parking Ratios established above shall not exceed the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces in accordance with Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. Additional parking spaces above this threshold may only be approved by the District Council in accordance with Section 27-548.09.01(a)(1)(E) of the Zoning Ordinance, regardless of whether they are in the form of surface or structured parking.”

  ➢ “All parking spaces built in excess of the allowed [m]Maximum [p]Parking [r]Ratios shall be provided as shared and/or public parking and shall be offered at the same cost as to any other project occupants or tenants.”
“Applicants desiring to exceed the maximum parking ratios shall provide a comprehensive transportation demand management strategy/program including incentives for non-automobile travel, the proposed design of any parking structure to meet additional parking demand, implementation timing/phasing, and financial assurances.

“All parking spaces that are provided must be unbundled from the leasing and/or rental rates of associated development.”

“Development projects shall not exceed the maximum parking ratios once the total parking supply within the transit district equals or exceeds 11,039 spaces (equal to 133 percent of the year 2025 parking space maximum) or the “parking flexibility threshold.””

e.) Delete both Table 20: Transit Districtwide Parking Maximums and the bullet on page 209 that reads “The overall maximum amount of parking within the entire College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District shall not exceed the totals in Table 20 below. At no point shall the total number of surfaced parking spaces within the transit district exceed 7,500 parking spaces.” Renumber remaining tables within the TDDP and revise the Table of Contents accordingly.

f.) Revise parking discussions throughout the TDDP and TDOZMA, as may be appropriate and necessary, to reconcile the plan text with the above revisions.

**REVISION TEN:**

Revise the “Transportation Adequacy” section on page 210 as follows:

a.) Insert a bullet and revise the existing paragraph to read: “Within the College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District, the transportation facilities adequacy standard shall be Level-of-Service E for individual critical intersections calculated in accordance with procedures outlined in the guidelines maintained by the Transportation Planning Section of the Planning Department. The selection of critical intersections for any development or redevelopment project within the transit district shall be limited to any of the existing or planned intersections along Paint Branch Parkway and River Road excluding the intersections with US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) and MD 201 (Kenilworth Avenue). These routes are among the main commuter routes serving through traffic between various destinations within Prince George’s County and the greater Washington, D.C. region, and
development within the transit district is considered to have little impact on these facilities.]
b.) Add a new second bullet to read: “Until such time as a traffic signal at the intersection of River Road and Rivertech Court is installed or fully funded and permits have been issued by the county, each proposed development project with access on to River Road or Rivertech Court, and subject to Detailed Site Plan approval, shall submit a detailed analysis and a signal warrant study (using total projected traffic) at the time of their initial application for review by appropriate agencies to determine if a traffic signal, pedestrian crossing light, or other appropriate traffic safety measure is necessary to ensure pedestrians can safely and efficiently cross all legs of the intersection.”

REVISION ELEVEN:

Revise the zoning change table and map pertaining to TDOZMA Change Number 1 on pages 167–71 and 177 to retain the properties owned by Mr. Eric S. Francis, the Jarian family, the Metropolitan Washington Pigeon Racing Fanciers, Incorporated, and Mr. Norman F. Briggs, Jr., in the M-X-T (Mixed Use–Transportation Oriented) Zone, as these property owners have not provided their consent to reflect concurrence with the proposed rezoning of their property to any other zone required by Section 27-213.03 of the Zoning Ordinance. Accordingly, upon approval by the District Council, the following properties shall be removed from TDOZMA Change Number 1:

i. 5018 College Avenue, Lots 19-22 (Tax ID 21-2309367)
ii. 5012 College Avenue, Lots 25-29 (Tax ID 21-2309383)
iii. 5108 College Avenue, Lots 31-33 (Tax ID 21-2309268)
iv. 5100 College Avenue, Lots 36-40 (Tax ID 21-2309300)
v. 5110 College Avenue, Lots 28-30 (Tax ID 21-2309250)
vi. 5109 Litton Avenue, Lots 4-5 (Tax ID 21-2309235)
vii. 5011 Litton Avenue, Lots 8-18 (Tax ID 21-2309096)
viii. 5111 Litton Avenue, Lots 6-9 (Tax ID 21-2309243)
ix. Litton Avenue, Lots 1-3 (Tax ID 21-3098688)
x. Litton Avenue, Lots 34-35 (Tax ID 21-2309276)
xi. 7415 Corporal Frank Scott Drive, Lot 41 (Tax ID 21-2309284)
xii. Corporal Frank Scott Drive, Lots 42-44 (Tax ID 21-2309292)
xiii. 5112 College Avenue, Lots 26-27 (Tax ID 21-2367118)
xiv. 50th Avenue, Lots 1-2 (Tax ID 21-2296283)
xv. 51st Avenue, Lots 23-24 (Tax ID 21-2309375)
xvi. 5001 College Avenue, Lots 41-44 (Tax ID 21-2296259)

REVISION TWELVE:
Revise Map 18 (Proposed Zoning Changes) and Map 19 (Proposed TDOZMA Zoning) on pages 164 and 165, and Table 18 (Existing and Proposed Zoning Inventory in Acres) to reflect the TDOZMA changes adopted by the Planning Board and approved herein by the District Council.

REVISION THIRTEEN:
Add property information for Tax Account 3515913 to the zoning change table for TDOZMA Change Number 4.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Board staff is further authorized to make appropriate textual, graphical, and map revisions to correct identified errors, to reflect updated information and revisions, and to incorporate the zoning map changes reflected in this Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment is an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and to the official Zoning Map for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George’s County. The zoning changes approved by this Resolution shall be depicted on the official Zoning Map of the County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it is hereby the legislative intent of the District Council that the provisions of this Resolution are severable. Thus, if any provision, sentence, clause, section, zone, zoning map, or part thereof is declared illegal, invalid, unconstitutional, or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, then it is the further legislative intent of the District Council that any such illegality, invalidity, unconstitutionality, or unenforceability shall not affect or impair any of the remaining provisions, sentences, clauses, sections, zones, zoning maps, or parts hereof, or their application to other zones, persons, or circumstances, and this Resolution shall have been adopted as if such illegal, invalid, unconstitutional, or unenforceable provision, sentence, clause, section, zone, zoning map, or part had not been included herein.
Adopted this 17th day of March, 2015.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PART OF THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTHON REGIONAL DISTRICT IN PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND

BY:

[Signature]

Mel Franklin
Chairman

ATTEST:

[Signature]

Redis C. Floyd
Clerk of the Council
CERTIFICATE OF ADOPTION AND APPROVAL


The Prince George’s County Council, sitting as the District Council, approved this transit district development plan and its associated Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment by Resolution No. CR-7-2015, after a duly advertised public hearing held on September 16, 2014 and a second duly advertised public hearing on eleven proposed amendments held on January 13, 2015, on March 17, 2015.

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Elizabeth M. Hewlett  
Chairman

Casey Anderson  
Vice Chairman

Joseph Zimmerman  
Secretary-Treasurer
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

VIA: Fern Piret, Planning Director
Derick Berlage, Chief, Countywide Planning Division

FROM: CJ Lammers, Master Environmental Planner, Countywide Planning Division

SUBJECT: Resolution for signature on the Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition Accord

May 1, 2015

Attached for your consideration and approval is Full Commission Resolution Number 15-04 to allow The Maryland-National Park and Planning Commission to become a signatory to the Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition Accord.

This new coalition, called the Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition (Baltimore Wilderness or BW), seeks to build on the success of the Baltimore-Washington Partners' effort and expand the area of concern while retaining the model of sharing information with a limit on agency resource commitment.

The Accord states:

"This Accord in no way obligates or restricts the activity of any party hereto in any way. No Member shall obligate, or purport to obligate, any other Member with respect to any matter."

The BW Steering Committee (Attachment B) is requesting that The Maryland-National Park and Planning Commission become a signatory to the Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition Accord document provided in Attachment C. Baltimore Wilderness expects to remain an unincorporated voluntary association active in promoting green infrastructure for the mutual benefit of its members. Signing the Accord only obligates the Commission to provide readily available GIS datasets for use in mapping of existing resources and staff participation to the extent that staff is available.

One short-term outcome of BW is the development of a green infrastructure plan through a grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation's (NFWF) Hurricane Sandy Coastal Resiliency Grant Program. This grant is focused on a smaller geographic area than that covered by Baltimore Wilderness as shown in Attachment A, but will involve all of the identified jurisdictions in creating an important blueprint for regional coordination and advancement.
On April 23, 2015 the Montgomery County Planning Board was briefed on the Baltimore Wilderness project by Mark Sybmorski. On April 30, 2015, the Prince George's County Planning Board was briefed by CJ Lammers. The Prince George's County Planning Board voted to send this package to the Full Commission for your consideration.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Full Commission approve Resolution 15-04 and become a signatory to the Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition Accord.

Attachment A: Map of the BW Boundaries
Attachment B: BW Steering Committee
Attachment C: BW Accord document
Attachment D: Full Commission Resolution Number 15-04
Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition & Coastal Resilience Project
Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition

Steering Committee

January 2015

The Center for Chesapeake Communities (Gary Allen)
Parks and People Foundation (Jackie Carrera or Guy Hager)
SavATree Consulting Group (Michael Galvin)
Baltimore City (Kristin Baja)
The Maryland Department of Natural Resources (Christine Conn)
The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Genevieve LaRouche)
U.S. Forest Service (Morgan Grove)
The Chesapeake Conservancy (Joanna Ogburn)
US Department of the Interior (Lisa Pelstring)
Prince George’s County Planning Department, M-NCPPC (CJ Lammers – interim local government representative)
The Conservation Fund (Erik Meyers) ex-officio
The American Planning Association (David Rouse) ex-officio
Greater Baltimore Wilderness Accord

This Accord is made and entered into by and among the members of the Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition (hereafter referred to as the Baltimore Wilderness or BW.) The Accord creates a voluntary network of local, state and federal agencies and independent organizations that share and support common goals.

Vision
Baltimore Wilderness envisions a future where:
- Accessible interconnected and healthy ecosystems contribute to economic vitality, resilience and quality of life for all of the region’s residents and visitors;
- The region’s working lands, watersheds, open spaces and natural communities are intentionally protected, restored, enhanced, and managed for ecological health; and
- Healthy and prosperous communities appreciate and support natural ecosystems, creating an enduring culture of conservation and stewardship.

Mission
To improve the quality of life by identifying, restoring, enhancing and protecting an interconnected network of lands and waters supporting healthy ecosystems and communities to benefit the people and wildlife of central Maryland.

To achieve this mission, Baltimore Wilderness will focus on four programmatic pillars:
• Resilience – To improve the region’s capacity to achieve lasting economic vitality, BW will seek to mitigate impacts of climate change including sea level rise, flooding, stronger coastal storms, warmer temperatures, and drought through a protected regional green infrastructure network that includes forests, wetlands, parks, rain gardens and urban tree canopy. This network will absorb rainfall, store water, reduce flooding and provide additional community benefits, such as cleaner air, space for recreation, and relief from urban heat.

• Biodiversity - In this rapidly developing region wildlife habitat is continually fragmented or lost due to traditional infrastructure and development. Preserving valuable natural areas, such as forests, wetlands, vernal pools, and coastal environments provides access to food and shelter for wildlife, offers corridors for migration, and protects vulnerable, often at risk species.

• Equity – As access to nature is unequally available across the region, BW seeks to connect the region’s increasingly urbanized population with nature. Local and regional greenways, city parks, restored stream corridors, urban waterways and trees can reach even into heavily developed areas and provide connections with green and blue natural resources.

• Discovery and Engagement - In a world that is increasingly urbanized and dominated by technology, environmental and outdoor education for children and adults is even more important. BW must direct the attention of present and up-and-coming generations to the richness and value of the natural world so that we will collectively do better as its stewards.

Recitals
WHEREAS, the Greater Baltimore region’s natural resource lands are permeated by intense urban development making protection and restoration of contiguous blocks of green infrastructure critical for the region’s resilience to climate change, water and air quality and living resource services; and

WHEREAS, Federal, state and local agencies have a critical role in the protection, conservation, restoration and enhancement of unique and sensitive habitats and plant and animal communities; the maintenance and improvement of local soil, water and air quality; the reduction of greenhouse gases; and the provision of recreational and aesthetic amenities to the community; and
WHEREAS, we support the Chesapeake Bay Program and its signatory partners to meet the commitments of the New Chesapeake 2014 Watershed Agreement; and

WHEREAS, collaborative research and innovative technology improves natural resource management among participating organizations and the community;

NOW THEREFORE,
Each Member commits to the following:
• Fostering coordination of support for management and research to achieve stewardship objectives consistent with constraints of affected agencies or organizations;
• Improving communication among members and the public about shared goals and ideals for environmental stewardship;
• Meeting regularly to identify restoration, management or monitoring initiatives of mutual interest in targeted geographic areas;
• Maintaining and enhancing ecological, environmental and societal services provided by green infrastructure through management, restoration and conservation actions;
• Implementing joint management strategies for green infrastructure when feasible, given available financial and staff resources;
• Conducting outreach activities to improve awareness, and integrate public and private sensitivity to environmental issues; and
• Adopting sustainability criteria to guide our strategies, evaluate the progress of the Coalition, and communicate benefits to members and the public.

IN FURTHERANCE OF THESE SHARED VALUES AND COMMITMENTS, it is mutually agreed and understood by and among the parties hereto that,
This Accord reflects a voluntary commitment among the parties to work together to achieve the vision and mission articulated herein. This Accord in no way obligates or restricts the activity of any party hereto in any way. No Member shall obligate, or purport to obligate, any other Member with respect to any matter. Upon providing written notice of intent to withdraw to either Coalition Co-Chair at least sixty (60) days in advance of the effective date, any Member may withdraw from the Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition. Other voluntary policies and practices are described in the Policies and Procedures document adopted by the Steering Committee.
NOW, IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the following party has executed this Accord as of the date indicated.

__________________________________________________________________________  __________________________________________
Signature                                                              Date

__________________________________________________________________________
Print name/title

__________________________________________________________________________
Printed Name of Agency/Organization
M-NCPPC No. 15-04

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, in 2008 The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission signed a memorandum of understanding with the Baltimore-Washington Partners for Forest Stewardship (BWPFS or Baltimore-Washington Partners), a volunteer partnership of all levels of government created to share information among land managers in the Baltimore-Washington corridor; and

WHEREAS, in 2013 the BWPFS joined with other federal, state, local governments, and non-profit organizations to build on the success of the Baltimore-Washington Partners and expand the area of concern while retaining the model of sharing information with a limit on voluntary agency resource commitment; and

WHEREAS, this new organization is called the Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition; and

WHEREAS, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission recognizes that the Baltimore-Washington region contains a wealth of natural assets that provide a multitude of ecosystem services to people including improving air quality, water quality, and the livability of our communities, and that interconnected and healthy ecosystems contribute to the economic vitality, sustainability, and quality of life for County residents and workers; and

WHEREAS, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission recognizes the value and mutual benefits of aligning public and private partner resources to achieve a common vision that engages participation of affected individuals, governments, and organizations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission does hereby agree to become a signatory to the Greater Baltimore Wilderness Accord.

Adopted by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission this ___day of ___2015.

* * * * * *

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY.

M-NCPPC Legal Department

Date 4/24/15
Resolution of Adoption of the Approved Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment

Andrea Gilles, Senior Planner, Area 2 Division, Andrea.Gilles@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.495.4541
Nancy Sturgeon, Master Planner Supervisor, Master Plan Team, Area 2 Division, Nancy.Sturgeon@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.495.1308
Glenn Kreger, Chief, Area 2 Division, Glenn.Kreger@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.495.4653

Completed: 5/4/15

Recommendation

Approval of the Resolution of Adoption.

Summary

Attached for your review and approval is M-NCPPC Resolution Number 15-05 to adopt the Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment. The County Council, sitting as the District Council, approved the Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment by Resolution Number 18-104 on March 31, 2015. The Montgomery County Planning Board approved the adoption of the Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment by Resolution Number 15-45 on April 23, 2015.

Attachments:
1. Montgomery County Planning Board Draft Resolution MCPB 15-45 and M-NCPPC Resolution 15-05
2. Montgomery County Council Resolution Number 18-104, Approval of Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment
ATTACHMENT 1

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
6611 Kenilworth Avenue • Riverdale, Maryland 20737

M-NCPPC No. 15-05
MCPB No. 15-45

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, by virtue of the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, is authorized and empowered, from time to time, to make and adopt, amend, extend and add to the General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District within Montgomery and Prince George's Counties; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Montgomery County Code, Chapter 33A, held a duly advertised public hearing on Thursday, September 11, 2014, on the Public Hearing Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment, being also an amendment to the General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District Within Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as amended; and the Approved and Adopted Aspen Hill Master Plan, as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board, after said public hearing and due deliberation and consideration, on December 4, 2014, approved the Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment, recommended that it be approved by the District Council, and on December 5, 2014, forwarded it to the County Executive for recommendations and analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Executive reviewed and made recommendations on the Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment and forwarded those recommendations and an analysis to the District Council on March 23, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Council, sitting as the District Council for the portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District lying within Montgomery County, held a public hearing on February 3, 2015, wherein testimony was received concerning the Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment; and

WHEREAS, the District Council, on March 31, 2015 approved the Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment, subject to the modifications and revisions set forth in Resolution No. 18-104; and

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY

[Signature]
M-NCPPC LEGAL DEPARTMENT
WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board, on April 23, 2015, recommended that The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopt the Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment as approved by the District Council.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that in accordance with Section 21-103 of the Maryland Land Use Article, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission does hereby adopt said Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment, together with the General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District Within Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties, as amended, and the Approved and Adopted Aspen Hill Master Plan, as amended, and as approved by the District Council in the attached Resolution No. 18-104; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of said Amendment must be certified by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of each of Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties, as required by law.

******

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 15-45 adopted by the Montgomery County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 23, 2015, in Silver Spring, Maryland on motion of Commissioner Dreyfuss, seconded by Vice Chair Wells-Harley, with a vote of 5 to 0, and Chair Anderson, Vice Chair Wells-Harley, and Commissioners Dreyfuss, Presley, and Fani-González voting in favor of the motion.

Casey Anderson, Chair
Montgomery County Planning Board
ATTACHMENT 2

Resolution No.: 18-104
Introduced: March 31, 2015
Adopted: March 31, 2015

COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PORTION
OF THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL DISTRICT
WITHIN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: County Council

SUBJECT: Approval of December 2014 Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment

1. On December 5, 2014, the Montgomery County Planning Board transmitted to the County Executive and the County Council the December 2014 Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment.


3. On January 30, 2015, the Director of the Montgomery County Office of Management and Budget transmitted to the County Council the Fiscal Impact Statement for the December 2014 Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment.

4. On February 3, 2015, the County Council held a public hearing on the December 2014 Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment. The Minor Master Plan Amendment was referred to the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee for review and recommendation.

5. On March 2, 2015, the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee held a worksession to review the issues raised in connection with the December 2014 Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment.

6. On March 24, 2015, the County Council reviewed the Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment and the recommendations of the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee.
Action

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council for that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following resolution:

The Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment, dated December 2014, is approved with revisions. County Council revisions to the Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment are identified below. Deletions to the text of the Plan are indicated by [brackets], additions by **underscoring**. All page references are to the December 2014 Planning Board Draft Plan.

Page 13: Revise Proposed Zoning Map (Map 7) to reflect Council changes.

Page 14: Revise the second and third paragraphs and combine into one paragraph as follows:

The properties north of Aspen Hill Road may support mixed-use development as the market evolves in the future, particularly if the properties are assembled and redeveloped comprehensively. [To facilitate such development, the properties recommended for NR zoning within this Minor Amendment area may be appropriate for CRT Floating Zones as the area further evolves.] More intense redevelopment should be focused toward Connecticut Avenue to give maximum visibility to new uses and make it easier for pedestrians on Connecticut Avenue to access those uses. Pedestrian amenities, including wide sidewalks, signage improvements directing toward transit options, green planting strips between pedestrians and vehicular areas, and significant tree planting should be provided along all connections. [Redevelopment of the vacant, former Vitro/BAE office site, should have its primary access off of Connecticut Avenue and access to/from Aspen Hill Road should be limited to a right-in/right-out driveway to alleviate queuing pressures on Aspen Hill Road and intersection congestion during peak hours.] To minimize additional traffic flow impacts on Aspen Hill Road near its intersection with Connecticut Avenue, consider limiting access to and from the site from the existing full-movement Home Depot driveway from Connecticut Avenue. If it is determined that another driveway access is necessary, consider a right-in/right-out driveway on Aspen Hill Road, if possible for emergency vehicles only.

Page 14: Revise the first sentence in the fourth paragraph as follows:

Projects adjacent to single-family residential neighborhoods should use compatible building mass, height and setback, and façade articulation to create **appropriate** transitions to those neighborhoods.

Page 14: Revise the fifth paragraph as follows:

This Plan recognizes that there may be a phased redevelopment of the north side of Aspen Hill Road over a long period of time. It is likely that the former Vitro/BAE property will redevelop in the shorter term, followed by potential redevelopment of the remaining properties over time, as the market evolves to support a moderately dense mix of land uses. While this Plan recognizes
[the need to accommodate some] that near-term [ , single-use] development may be single-use, the long-range goal is to facilitate the opportunity for a comprehensive redevelopment of these sites should any of the properties change use or be consolidated. A Combination Retail Conditional Use is not appropriate for the Minor Amendment area because such a use would have a significant long-term impact on the area and alter the character of the surrounding low-density residential neighborhoods. This Plan envisions an area with great variety of vibrant and more compact uses. Therefore, a use that includes a department or retail store in combination with a pharmacy and full-line grocery is not appropriate for the MMPA area. Such a use would have a significant long-term impact on the retail character of the area and the variety of sizes and types of commercial uses and tenants.

Page 14: Revise the Recommendation heading and bullets as follows:

**Zoning Recommendation**

- Rezone the entire Minor Amendment area north [properties on the northwest corner] of Aspen Hill Road and west of Connecticut Avenue (Figure 1 above, No. [2] 1) from EOF-3.0, H-60, R-90, and CRT-0.75, C-0.75, R-0.25, H-45 to CRT-1.5, C-0.5, R-1.0, H-60.
- [Rezone the remaining properties on the north and northwest portion of the Minor Amendment Area (Figure 1 above, No. 1) from EOF-3.0, H-60 and R-90 to NR-0.5, H-60.]

Page 15: Revise the Recommendations heading as follows:

**Zoning Recommendations**

Page 16: Revise the Design Requirements heading and first paragraph under that heading as follows:

**Design [Requirements] Guidance**

[The properties recommended for NR zoning within this Plan area may be appropriate for CRT Floating Zones as the area further evolves.] To facilitate the [potential] transition of this area to [CRT zoning] a more pedestrian-friendly, accessible, and human-scale environment, any redevelopment within the Minor Amendment area [of the properties recommended for NR zoning must] should incorporate [certain mandatory] the following design elements. [Under no circumstances should such properties redevelop without incorporating all of the following requirements:]

Page 16: Revise Design Guidance #2, **Building Placement**, as follows:

2. **Building Placement**: All buildings must front on a street (public or private), the shared use drive between Vitro/BAE and Home Depot, or public open space, with a preference for concentrating new development along Connecticut Avenue to establish a street presence along this major thoroughfare and give maximum visibility to new uses. [All new buildings must comply with the following requirements:]

73
- [At least 50% of the front facade of any building fronting on Connecticut Avenue or Aspen Hill Road must be within 35 feet of the right-of-way on which the building fronts, except that building placement along Connecticut Avenue may exceed the 35 foot distance from the right-of-way to the minimum extent necessary to achieve plan objectives.]
- [At least 50% of the front facade of any other building should not typically be located more than 20 feet from the street or public open space on which the building fronts.]
- [On the north side of Aspen Hill Road, non-residential buildings may not be constructed within 100 feet of an adjacent lot improved with a detached house.]

Page 16: Add a new Number 3 and renumber the rest of the list on the page:

3. Transition to Residential Neighborhoods: Ensure appropriate transitions between non-residential development and adjacent residential neighborhoods to minimize the impact of new development on those neighborhoods. As required by the zoning ordinance, provide landscaping and new tree canopy in parking areas; taper building heights away from existing residential development; and retain (and expand where feasible) existing trees and greenery the entire length of the western edge of the Vitro property to buffer new development. On the north side of Aspen Hill Road, non-residential buildings may not be constructed within 100 feet of an adjacent lot improved with a detached house.

Page 17: Revise Figure 3: Design Criteria Diagram to illustrate the transition area along the entirety of the western edge of the Vitro/BAE property line on the north side of Aspen Hill Road and add footnote indicating that the length of the 100 foot setback for non-residential buildings depends on the location of adjacent detached homes.

Page 18: Revise the third paragraph, Transitions, as follows:

Transitions between commercially zoned properties and immediately adjacent single-family neighborhoods are defined in the Zoning Ordinance. [Compatibility requirements, including height compatibility, are described in section 4.1.8.B.] Specific guidance on transitions and compatibility are provided in the Land Use and Zoning Recommendations and Design Criteria sections of this Plan.

Page 19: Revise the first paragraph as follows:

The study area is part of a larger commercial cluster, which serves as a neighborhood center for the Aspen Hill area. The scope of this amendment was limited to a group of properties along the western edge of the cluster, so the combined potential of the larger Aspen Hill commercial area was not explored in full detail by this exercise. An update to the 1994 Aspen Hill Master Plan is programmed to begin in July 2015[,] and will address the larger commercial area. In addition to changing land use dynamics in the region, the inclusion in the County’s Master Plan [the approval of priority planning and design studies] of the Georgia Avenue North Bus Rapid Transit line, with a proposed station at Georgia Avenue and Connecticut Avenue[,] (see Transportation Section), has the potential to catalyze more compact development in this area.
Page 20: Delete the last sentence of the third paragraph as follows:

*Georgia Avenue (MD 97)* is a six-lane major highway traversing in a northwest-southeast direction approximately a quarter mile east of the properties subject to the Minor Amendment. Traffic signals are in place at the nearby intersections with Aspen Hill Road and Connecticut Avenue. The posted speed limit on Georgia Avenue is 45 MPH. The 2013 AADT on Georgia Avenue, as reported by SHA for the segment near Connecticut Avenue (MD 185), is approximately 43,900 vehicles per day. This represents a 3.8% decrease from 2011. Georgia Avenue is planned as a bus-rapid transit (BRT) corridor with a station to be located at the intersection with Connecticut Avenue. [SHA, Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), and Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) is currently considering various design and operations alternatives for this BRT line.]

Page 20: Revise the fifth paragraph as follows:

The Minor Amendment area is served by a number of bus routes provided by the County's Ride On and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's (WMATA) Metrobus services (see Map 8, following page). Along Connecticut Avenue there are a total of four bus routes, three of which are provided by Ride On (#26, #34, #41) and one route (#L8) by Metrobus. Route #26 also runs east-west along Aspen Hill Road. The bus stops along the segment of Georgia Avenue in the vicinity of the Minor Amendment area are served by a total of [five] four bus routes, one Ride-on (#53) and [four] three Metrobus ([#Y5,] #Y2, #Y7, #Y8[, #Y9]). Depending on time of day, these buses typically run every 20-30 minutes.

Page 21: Delete the last two sentences on the page (describing proposed Bus Rapid Transit on Georgia Avenue) as follows:

In November 2013, the County Council approved the *Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan*. The plan recommends 11 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridors throughout the County, including the segment of Georgia Avenue through the study area of this Minor Master Plan Amendment, to be developed in order to help ease congestion and improve travel times. According to the plans for this corridor (Corridor 1: Georgia Avenue North), a future BRT station is to be located at the intersection of Georgia Avenue and Connecticut Avenue. [The MTA, SHA, and MCDOT are in the process of evaluating four different transit and BRT design options that include dedicated lanes for transit vehicles and operational upgrades for traffic signals to give priority to transit vehicles. There is currently no funding source identified for construction of this BRT line, however, the current planning phase is funded.]

Page 22: Delete the first and second bullets under Transportation Recommendations and replace as follows:

- [Access to Aspen Hill Road from the Vitro/BAE site should be provided via a right-in/right-out driveway. This will prevent entering/exiting left-turning vehicles from worsening the existing back-ups on eastbound Aspen Hill Road from the nearby traffic]
signal at Connecticut Avenue. Additionally, on the northern side of Aspen Hill Road between the Vitro/BAE site driveway and Connecticut Avenue traffic signal there are already three other curb cuts (two for the Shell gas station, one for Dunkin Donuts) in the short span of approximately 400 feet. This driveway should serve as secondary access and be shifted as far west as possible at the time the property is redeveloped.

- [Primary access to the Vitro/BAE site should be provided via the existing full-movement Home Depot access driveway to Connecticut Avenue. A traffic signal should be installed at this intersection to improve both traffic flow and pedestrian safety.]
- To address potential traffic operations impacts on Aspen Hill Road, the primary access to and from the Vitro/BAE site should be via Connecticut Avenue, a major highway, and the majority—if not all—of the traffic should be directed there. To address potential traffic operations and pedestrian impacts on Connecticut Avenue, a traffic signal at this intersection should be considered. If a secondary access to and from the site from Aspen Hill Road is necessary, it should be designed to minimize the traffic there and its impact on residents living on or near that road. To further limit and control traffic impacts to the adjacent residential neighborhood, consideration should be given to only allowing access to/from the Vitro/BAE site at Aspen Hill Road, if possible for emergency vehicles only.

Page 22: Delete the fifth bullet under Transportation Recommendations and replace as follows:

- [The existing transition from four-lanes to two-lanes heading westbound on Aspen Hill Road should be shifted as far west as feasibly possible to provide more merging room for westbound vehicles and more stacking space for eastbound vehicles queuing from the traffic signal at Connecticut Avenue.]
- If warranted by a traffic study, consider shifting the westbound transition on Aspen Hill Road from four lanes to two lanes for a minimal distance to provide more merging room for westbound vehicles; this transition should extend no further than the western driveway of the existing church.

Page 23: Delete the first bullet and replace as follows:

- [The southbound free-right ramp from Georgia Avenue to Connecticut Avenue should ultimately be removed. Instead, southbound right turns should come to the traffic signal with all other traffic. Removal of the free-right ramp will slow traffic traveling southbound on Connecticut Avenue by the Vitro/BAE site.]
- Consider removing the southbound free-right ramp from Georgia Avenue to Connecticut Avenue, so that southbound right turns would come to the traffic signal with all other traffic. Removal of the free-right ramp would slow traffic traveling southbound on Connecticut Avenue by the Vitro/BAE site.

Page 24: Delete the last bullet on the page (under Reduce energy consumption by) as follows:

- [Integrating geothermal systems to reduce energy consumption and allowing and encouraging wind energy conversion systems and large district energy systems.]
COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The Minor Master Plan Amendment area (MMPA) is well served by nearby schools, parks, recreation areas, and libraries. Brookhaven Elementary School and Parkland Magnet Middle School are located within a mile of the MMPA area. The Aspen Hill Public Library, situated on Aspen Hill Road, is less than a half mile from the intersection of Connecticut Ave and Aspen Hill Road, and the Wheaton Woods Swimming Pool is a short walk to the west beyond the Library. According to Montgomery County Public Schools, the elementary and middle schools that serve the MMPA area are projected to be within capacity for the next six years. At the high school level, the area is served by the Downcounty High Schools Consortium - Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Northwood, and Wheaton. Blair, Einstein, and Northwood high schools are projected to exceed their capacities in the coming years. Given the smaller geographic scope of this Plan and the limited emphasis on new, near-term residential redevelopment, this MMPA would have limited to no impact on school capacity. As part of the overall update to the 1994 Aspen Hill Master Plan, school capacity and the need for any future capital programs will be evaluated in greater detail.

Several nearby parks serve this area of the Aspen Hill community, including English Manor Neighborhood Park, Parkland Local Park, Aquarius Local Park, Northgate Local Park, Strathmere Local Park, Aspen Hill Local Park, and Harmony Hills Neighborhood Park. The Matthew Henson State Park and Trail is within a mile of the MMPA, and Rock Creek Park and Trail is within approximately one and a half miles. The 2012 Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan does not identify needs for additional parkland in this area of the County; it only specifies 2 additional tennis courts. As properties redevelop within the boundaries of this MMPA, the new development will be required to provide public amenity space as well as meet the recreation guidelines to help offset the needs of any new residents.

As recommended in the Transportation section (page 23), this plan supports connections that serve as vital links to the regional network and Countywide trail corridors. This Plan affirms the recommendation in the 2005 Countwide Bikeways Functional Master Plan to install a shared-use path along the western side of Connecticut Avenue (reference code SP-27) to connect to the regional network, including the Matthew Henson Trail. This shared-use path should be constructed in conjunction with applicable redevelopment in the MMPA.

Page 25: Add the following language after the first sentence in the Implementation section:

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

The CRT zone incorporates a series of prescriptive form and placement standards as a means to accomplishing the intent of the zone. Flexibility is currently built into the Zoning Code by allowing a developer to choose to develop under the Optional Method of development. By doing so, development standards are established by the site plan approval process and are therefore instituted through Planning Board review. Even with this option, however, through ongoing outreach and training sessions on the new Zoning Code, concern continues regarding
certain development standards. In response, an alternative to the approval process under Standard Method Development should be considered to allow additional flexibility through the site plan approval process.

Page 25: Revise the Proposed Zoning table to reflect Council changes.

General

All illustrations and tables included in the Plan will be revised to reflect the District Council changes to the Planning Board Draft Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment (December 2014). The text and graphics will be revised as necessary to achieve and improve clarity and consistency, to update factual information, and to convey the actions of the District Council. Graphics and tables will be revised to be consistent with the text.

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council
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SUBJECT: FY2016 Operating Budget

RECOMMENDATION
The Board of Trustees ("Board") of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission ("Commission") Employees' Retirement System ("ERS") respectfully submits the FY2016 Operating Budget for approval. The budget totals $1,871,772 which is a 9.6% increase from FY2015 and provides for comprehensive services and communications in the administration of the Commission’s primary retirement program.

BACKGROUND
The Commission established the ERS effective July 1, 1972, in accordance with the Trust Agreement between the Commission and the ERS’ Board. The Board’s primary responsibility is to administer the ERS for the sole benefit of the members in order to pay the promised benefits.

Annually, the Board prepares and presents an operating budget setting forth projected expenditures for the operation of the ERS for the Commission’s review and approval. The Board also prepares certain projected expenses, including banking, investment consulting and investment manager fees for the Commission’s information. The Board monitors closely the fees and expenses from consultants and professional advisors to ensure comparability to other public funds of the ERS’ size and complexity.

Although there is no formal restriction or budget guideline imposed by parties outside the Board, the Board is sensitive to the limitations imposed on the Commission by the two counties. Historically, administrative expenses were equal to 1% of estimated covered payroll and the ERS consistently maintained its budget within this expense assumption. As the Commission payroll was reduced through
management restructuring, the amount available for budget consideration using the 1% expense assumption decreased as work program requirements increased making it difficult to effectively manage the ERS' work program. After considerable analysis, at its February 5, 2013 meeting, the Board approved an operating budget each year based exclusively on the ERS' fiscal work program requirements which is consistent with other local retirement systems.

ANALYSIS

The Personnel Committee examined each expenditure category and its funding. The FY2016 Operating Budget (Attachment 1) proposes overall spending at $1,871,772 based on the work program requirements reflected below. The FY2016 Operating Budget is an increase of 9.6% in spending from FY2015.

Personnel Services
Total Personnel Services are estimated to increase by 7.9% from FY2015. The ERS staff currently consists of eight career positions: the Administrator and seven full-time employees. The FY2016 Operating Budget includes the addition of one full-time employee for benefit administration. The FY2016 Operating Budget includes a placeholder for salary adjustments. Employee compensation usually follows suit with non-represented Commission employees. Pension costs are 18.46% for the employees in the defined benefit plan. Pension costs remain flat at 8% for the two employees in the ICMA 401(a) plan. Health insurance costs are projected to increase by 10%.

Supplies & Materials
In order to maintain Commission standards for hardware, Computer Supplies in the amount of $10,500 are anticipated for the replacement of outdated computer equipment.

Other Services & Charges
This category nets to an overall increase of 17.6% and includes professional services (actuarial, auditing, and legal); education and training; insurance (fiduciary, general liability and a fidelity bond); and miscellaneous services (printing, rent, copier and software maintenance fees).

Actuarial Services
Actuarial services are projected at $74,370 and include funding for the annual actuarial valuation, a 5-year experience study, an actuarial factor review, actuarial deficiency calculations for transfers, board and staff training, annual review of the investment and salary assumption, and additional work required as a result of GASB Statement No. 67, Financial Reporting for Pension Plans, and GASB 68, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions.

Auditing & Tax Consulting Services
Auditing & Tax Consulting Services are projected at $36,823 and include funding for the annual audit, tax advice related to the ERS' alternative investments, review of all K-1s, and assistance in navigating the filing and disclosure requirements for the ERS' international investments.

Legal Services
The Board continues to contract with outside pension law specialists, the Groom Law Group of Washington, D.C. Fees are projected at $145,000, a 41.5% increase from FY2015 and include issues related to new and existing alternative investment structures, complex plan member issues, and maintenance of the ERS' tax qualified status. The increase in funding for outside counsel affords the Administrator the flexibility to use outside counsel for urgent matters.
Computer Consulting
Computer Consulting is projected at $22,500 and includes a required Oracle upgrade and modifications to the interface between the ERS and the Commission. In FY2016, staff plans to issue a Request for Proposal for replacement of the existing pension software system which was developed in 2001. Implementation is not anticipated until FY2017; therefore, the FY2016 Operating Budget does not include proposed costs.

Education & Training
The Board continues its commitment to trustee and staff education and training in order to maintain the highest standards of fiduciary accountability. Trustees are required to complete eight hours of investment and fiduciary training each year and to attend at least one educational conference every other year that will better enable trustees to perform their fiduciary duties. Funding remains level at $31,500 for FY2016.

Rent
The ERS reimburses the Commission for rent which is set at $96,015, an 11.2% increase from FY2015. Rental rates remained artificially low in FY2013 and FY2014 with the Commission offsetting increases by utilizing a fund balance. For FY2015 and FY2016, the Commission lowered the fund balance and increased rental rates.

Chargebacks
Finance
In July 2005, ERS technology operations were integrated with the CAS-IT Department in an effort to establish cross training, back up and enhanced services for the ERS and CAS-IT. The ERS reimburses Finance through a chargeback for these services in an amount of $47,200. The Board continues to maintain Commission standards for hardware, software, security and access control provided funds are available.

Legal
The Commission’s General Counsel’s office provide legal services to the ERS in the areas of contract review and negotiation, litigation oversight, employee appeals and general plan advice. The ERS reimburses the General Counsel’s Office through a chargeback of $64,200 for these services.

Capital Outlay
The ERS maintains Commission standards for hardware; however, no Capital Outlay is anticipated for FY2016.

FY2016 Investment Services
Attachment 2 estimates fees for bank custodial services provided by The Northern Trust Company of Chicago, Illinois; investment consulting services provided by Wilshire Associates of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and investment management services provided by investment managers investing in domestic equities, international equities, fixed income, alternatives, real estate and high yield income. Investment manager fees fluctuate based on the market value of the portfolio. Estimated fees are based on the December 31, 2014 portfolio value of $779,074,000. The estimated fees assume a 7.4% return for 2014 and 2015 with fees estimated at 40 basis points.

Attachments
1. FY2016 Operating Budget
2. FY2016 Investment Services
## FY 2016 Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>Projected as of 8/30/15</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual as of 30-Jun-14</td>
<td>Actual as of 30-Jun-14</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual as of 31-Dec-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES-FULL TIME</td>
<td>622,157</td>
<td>740,519</td>
<td>793,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES-PART TIME</td>
<td>109,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SALARIES</strong></td>
<td>732,067</td>
<td>740,519</td>
<td>793,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td>243,745</td>
<td>259,734</td>
<td>316,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEB BENEFITS</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>27,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREE BENEFITS</td>
<td>11,690</td>
<td>7,117</td>
<td>6,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td>282,935</td>
<td>304,051</td>
<td>350,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCRUED LEAVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,149</td>
<td>10,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>1,016,102</td>
<td>1,051,719</td>
<td>1,154,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPLIES &amp; MATERIALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES &amp; FURNITURE</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>8,874</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SUPPLIES</td>
<td>3,464</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SUPPLIES &amp; MATERIALS</strong></td>
<td>7,430</td>
<td>11,637</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER SERVICES &amp; CHARGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial</td>
<td>64,610</td>
<td>39,440</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing &amp; Tax Consulting</td>
<td>22,210</td>
<td>29,269</td>
<td>34,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>112,237</td>
<td>49,530</td>
<td>102,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Consulting</td>
<td>32,750</td>
<td>14,675</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION AND TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERS</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>5,553</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSTEES</td>
<td>11,591</td>
<td>7,929</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING</strong></td>
<td>17,212</td>
<td>14,679</td>
<td>31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>6,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDUCIARY LIABILITY</td>
<td>30,860</td>
<td>31,971</td>
<td>34,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS/GENERAL LIABILITY</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDELITY BOND</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>1,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>33,555</td>
<td>35,253</td>
<td>37,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERSHIPS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>2,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Services</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING &amp; BINDING</td>
<td>6,817</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>77,370</td>
<td>78,560</td>
<td>86,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier</td>
<td>8,798</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIRS &amp; MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>28,079</td>
<td>23,765</td>
<td>26,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>5,944</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER SERVICES &amp; CHARGES</strong></td>
<td>419,799</td>
<td>300,765</td>
<td>423,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARGEBACKS-MACPCC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGEBACKS-FINANCE</td>
<td>47,200</td>
<td>47,200</td>
<td>47,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGEBACKS-LEGAL</td>
<td>84,200</td>
<td>64,200</td>
<td>64,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CHARGEBACKS</strong></td>
<td>111,400</td>
<td>111,400</td>
<td>111,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL OUTLAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,853,760</td>
<td>1,478,840</td>
<td>1,708,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FY 2016 Investment Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual FY 2013</th>
<th>Actual FY 2014</th>
<th>Estimated FY 2015</th>
<th>Estimated FY 2016</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Custodial Services</td>
<td>$ 307,646</td>
<td>$ 300,402</td>
<td>$ 309,414</td>
<td>$ 318,696</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Consulting Services</td>
<td>$ 189,400</td>
<td>$ 192,700</td>
<td>$ 196,700</td>
<td>$ 202,600</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Management Services</td>
<td>$ 2,398,202</td>
<td>$ 2,382,261</td>
<td>$ 3,429,596</td>
<td>$ 3,679,956</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 2,895,248</td>
<td>$ 2,875,363</td>
<td>$ 3,935,710</td>
<td>$ 4,201,252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Investment manager fees fluctuate based on the market value of the portfolio. The market value per Wilshire's report as of December 31, 2014 was $799,067,000. Estimated fees of 40 basis points are based on a 7.3% return assumption for 2015 and a 7.3% return for 2015 with possible return assumption rate change to 7.2% for 2016.

(2) Investment Consulting services include fees for the primary investment consultant, Wilshire Associates.
May 12, 2015

To: The Commission
Via: Patricia C. Barney, Executive Director

From: Anju Bennett, Corporate Policy and Management Operations Division Chief
Shelley Gaylord, DHRM Budget Manager

Re: Budget Transfer for the Department of Human Resources and Management, and Merit System Board

Requested Action
The Administration Funds for the Department of Human Resources and Management (DHRM), Merit System Board, and Central Administrative Services - Support Services (CAS SS) are anticipated to have some savings in personnel costs primarily from unanticipated salary lapse and benefits savings in FY15. We are requesting approval of a budget transfer for a portion of these savings to enable us to address critical agency-wide priorities (identified below) and allow us to stay on track with other planned priorities for FY16.

Proposed Use of Lapse/Savings

**DHRM**

After accounting for the 1% savings plan we expect DHRM to have $273,682 in salary lapse/savings. We are requesting to use $245,000 funds as follows:

1. **ERP Consulting Services**
   - $150,000
   - As we implement various modules of the ERP system, we are requesting use of funds to support project management and system needs. Proposals to use the funds will be presented to the ERP Steering Committee which consists of representatives from each of the Departments. Areas that are in need of additional resources include: ERP system integration with existing online platforms, training, communications, and technical consulting.
   - Automating the data integration between the new ERP system and Commission’s online recruitment system (NEOGOV)
   - Automate the Commission’s employee identification/security badge system with the ERP to ensure great efficiency, ensuring integrity of security access to Commission buildings.
   - Consulting support for implementing management self-service, and employee self-service, and automated employee benefit enrollment.
   - Support for system upgrades to Lawson Budgeting Planning module.
   - Integration between Enterprise Asset Management and the Human Capital Management

2. **External Consultant**
   - $75,000
   - The agency has extensive policy work that needs to be addressed. The current staffing levels are insufficient to address the current workload, which covers 200 policy areas including organizational functions, employment, procurement, financial systems, and risk/liability and safety regulations. In addition there are a large number of critical policies that require our immediate attention, such as ethics, ADA compliance, financial procedures, etc. Approval of this proposal will allow the agency to secure the services of a qualified consultant on a short term basis to help the agency address some of the extensive and critical policy work that needs to be completed.
3. **Archives**

   Corporate Records/Archives has several compliance and safety concerns that need to be addressed, including removal of chemical waste from non-working equipment, repair of storage and work areas, and improvement of ventilation system.

   **Merit System Board**

   This Office projects a small positive variance of approximately $9,203 in salaries due to amended work hours by the part-time merit employee. After accounting for the 1% savings plan, we expect the Merit System Board to have $7,547 in salary lapse/savings. We are requesting use of $5,000 to fund outside counsel. Outside counsel provides guidance to on technical matters that come before the Merit System Board.

We appreciate your consideration of our request.
MEMO

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK & PLANNING COMMISSION
Department of Finance, Office of Secretary-Treasurer

TO: Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
FROM: Joseph C. Zimmerman, CPA, Secretary-Treasurer

SUBJECT: Request to spend FY 2015 Personnel Services savings.

DATE: May 12, 2015

ACTION REQUESTED: Board approval to spend salary lapse

The Department of Finance expects to realize savings of approximately $450,000 in its Personnel Services budget due to delay in filling critical positions as a result of unusual turnover. Approval is requested to allocate savings in this budget category to fund needed ERP related software enhancements that include:

- Legacy system data archiving
- Acquisition of reporting tools (Spreadsheet Server)
- Consulting specific to increasing functionality
- Purchase of training vouchers- ERP Analyst
- Acquisition of software to further enhance delivery of ERP core services (A/P Invoice automation, ACH/eRemit)
- Acquisition of Kronos data management software

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal. I look forward to discussing this with you next week.
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Montgomery County Department of Parks
Montgomery County Department of Planning
Prince George’s County Department of Parks & Recreation
Prince George’s County Planning Department
Central Administrative Services
Practice 6-40
M-NCPPC Sustainability Standards

The Practice was revised on November 19, 2012 to establish "a broader understanding of sustainability standards that benefit the environment, our workplace, and the communities we serve."

The Practice directs the Commission, via the sustainability committee, to continue to create, plan and share sustainability programs, goals and projects.
Sustainability Goals and Objectives

There are six main goals that guide implementation of the policy:

- Utility and Energy Conservation
- Sustainable Acquisition and Use of Agency Supplies
- Recycling and Solid Waste Management
- Sustainable Infrastructure and Natural Areas
- Health and Wellness
- Employee Education & Training
Sustainability Goals and Objectives

Overall Priority Recommendation:

• Create and/or assign staff to serve in dedicated Sustainability Coordinator positions to manage the sustainability-related activities and reporting (one each in Montgomery and Prince George's County).
Utility and Energy Conservation

Currently the Commission is:

- Meeting the goals of reducing energy consumption, eliminating waste and improving efficiency.

- Exceeding the goal of obtaining 40% of electricity from renewable energy sources (currently at 50%).
Utility and Energy Conservation

Priority Recommendations:

- Continue to increase amount of energy acquired from renewable energy sources.

- Continue to implement a broad range of energy efficiency improvements.
Sustainable Acquisition and Use of Agency Supplies

The Commission is:

- Meeting goals with regard to reusing office supplies and furniture and in printing and copying

- Meets in part and is in the process of meeting goals with regard to procurement.
Sustainable Acquisition

Recommendations

- Work with Central Purchasing to assist with development of on-line surplus venues for equipment, furniture, etc.
- Embrace electronic documents for meetings.
- Develop standard lists of "Preferred Green Products" and identify "Green" vendors.
Recycling and Solid Waste Management

Commission wide operations meet many of the goals outlined in the practice:

- Is in the process of meeting the overall rate of 90% of recyclable materials.

- It meets goals in recycling, reusing, and reducing solid wastes (including paper, containers, oils, batteries, tires, scrap metal, vegetative waste, dredge spoils, etc.)
Recycling and Solid Waste Management

Recommendations:

- Expand efforts to expand/promote recycling at area parks

- Expand on efforts to reduce waste at events

- Explore food waste composting
Sustainable Infrastructure and Natural Areas

The Commission is:

In the process of meeting:
• Sustainable building – LEED silver or equal

Meets goals supporting:
• Sustainable site work – SITES or LEED,
• Natural resources management,
• Community Planning and Development
Sustainable Infrastructure and Natural Areas

- **Recommendations:**
  - Develop policy to incorporate LEED standards into operations and smaller projects.
  - Evaluate LEED and SITES pilot projects to provide guidance on future projects.
  - Expand funding for invasive management.
Health & Wellness

The Commission currently:

Meets the goals tied to:

- Supporting healthy communities,
- Raising awareness of workplace health, safety and wellness,
- Mitigating workplace hazards and
- Developing actions based on accident reviews.
Health & Wellness

Recommendations:

- Develop communication plan to share sustainability efforts with employees and public

- Develop MOU with Montgomery County Recreation Department and consider employee discounts at Commission facilities to promote/provide health & wellness programs at reduce fees.
Employee Education & Training

Recommendations:

• Develop educational resources to provide information, tips and reminders to staff regarding sustainability efforts on Insite, via UPDATE and broadcast emails.

• Expand training opportunities with a focus on LEED certifications for both design and operation of buildings, and “Building Wellness” training and certification program.

• Work with DHRM on the development of an essential job function focusing on Sustainability.
Questions?
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Biennial Sustainability Report
July 2014 – June 2016

The Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission
The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Biennial Sustainability Report

The members of the Agency-Wide Sustainability Committee have compiled the Biennial Sustainability report for the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission to share information on past and ongoing efforts to meet the goals of the Practice. This report addresses Practice No. 6-40, M-NCCPC Sustainability Standards last amended and approved November 19, 2012 in describing initiatives that have been implemented throughout the agency and recommends new or revised goals to ensure that the Commission stays at the forefront of sustainability practices.

The Committee commenced work in April 2013 to identify the steps required to develop departmental biennial plans and the Biennial Sustainability report for the Montgomery County Department of Parks, Montgomery County Department of Planning, Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation, Prince George’s County Planning Department and Central Administrative Services.

The Agency-Wide Sustainability Committee has coordinated efforts to communicate goals outlined in the plan to staff and the community. The Committee, through the efforts of a team of departmental work groups, has assessed the status of ongoing programs that meet the practice requirements, and has prepared a number of prioritized recommendations to be implemented in order to comply with the goals outlined in the practice over the next two years.

The Montgomery County Sustainability Coordinating Committee and the Prince George’s County Sustainability Committee serve as each respective County’s liaison to the Agency-Wide Sustainability Committee and works with the Central Administrative Services Coordinating Committee as the point of contact and clearinghouse for sustainability-related issues. The Coordinating Committees support and advance environmental performance, economic prosperity, and social equality through a variety of initiatives. The staff assigned to support the Coordinating Committees facilitates the development and implementation of practices, policies, procedures, and plans.

Each Sustainability coordinating committee received departmental support in selecting content experts. The sustainability plan implementation requirements and tasks benefited greatly from the knowledge, efforts, and dedication of these individuals who shared...
their expertise through their experience indirect management and work program responsibilities.

Each work group conducted an assessment of current management and operating practices. The assessment process accomplished the following:

1. Identified practices, policies, procedures, and implementation plans which met the proposed M-NCPPC Sustainability Standards.

2. Identified practices, policies, procedures, and implementation plans which need improvement to meet the proposed M-NCPPC Sustainability Standards.

3. Identified tasks and work plans to be completed during the Fiscal Years 2014-2016 to improve the practices, policies, procedures, and implementation plans to meet the proposed M-NCPPC Sustainability Standards.

4. Developed a report on the work group assigned area of responsibility for inclusion in the practices, policies, procedures, and implementation plans to be submitted in the Departmental Sustainability Work Plan Report presentation to the Executive Committee by May 2015 outlining initiatives for the upcoming year. As part of this process, Montgomery Parks and Planning presented their work plan to the Montgomery Planning Board on October 9, 2014.

5. Determined recommendations that should be performed or investigated to meet the M-NCPPC Sustainability Standards.

The content expert work group reports were delivered to the Sustainability Committee and were summarized based on the following:

- Identified overall policies and best management practices which should be implemented throughout M-NCPPC.
- Identified which of the recommendations were ongoing initiatives within M-NCPPC.
- Prioritized three highest rated recommendations to be implemented in the 2014-2016 timeframe.
- Included the remaining recommendations for investigation and implementation in future years.

In the following pages, we present efforts currently in place, sustainability recommendations for implementation together with new initiatives for the term July 2014 to June 2016.
Sustainability Report

July 2014 to June 2016

The following are accomplishments achieved and on-going activities that address sustainability goals as well as the recommended programs and projects proposed to be implemented over a two year period (2014-2016) to meet the requirements of the Practice No. 6-40, M-NCCPC Sustainability Standards.

Priority recommendations for July 2014- June 2016 for the agency as a whole:

- Create a Sustainability Coordinating Committee to implement the Sustainability Report (hereafter referred to as "Report").
- Create and/or assign staff to serve in dedicated Sustainability Coordinator positions to manage the sustainability-related activities and reporting (one each in Montgomery and Prince George’s County). The coordinator for both the Montgomery County Department of Planning and Department of Parks, to report to Facilities Management. The coordinator for Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation and the Planning Department to report to Natural and Historical Resources Division. Provide all necessary resources.

Duties to include:

- Manage and implement each County’s respective Plan.
- Establish education and training for current and new staff on the policies and practices that are developed to facilitate the implementation, tracking, and reporting of the Plan.
- Track and report the implementation of the Sustainability Standards. This should be included as part of the Performance Standards for Operations staff.
- Establish web-based resources to facilitate access to sustainability information for Commission staff and expand this information to share significant and innovative sustainability efforts and work practices within work programs.
- Use this platform to develop information on our sustainability efforts for community use and publicize reports on the sustainability program and results.
- Provide training to facility managers or designee(s) on how to access utility data available on ECAP, and how to investigate, and locate inefficiencies.
- Develop clear and measurable metrics that will measure progress in achieving goals outlined in Practice 6-40.
- Collect data; review, refine, and develop an accessible Annual Report.
- Identify measures to address areas of concern.
**Utility/Energy Conservation:** Conserve natural and fiscal resources by eliminating waste, improving efficiency, reducing the consumption of energy, and increasing the use of renewable sources of energy. Whenever feasible, new appliances and building materials should meet Energy Star or equivalent ratings for high efficiency and energy conservation. This should be in addition to considering other environmental attributes such as recyclability and applicable federal/state safety and building code requirements.

- Utility Measurement and Monitoring
- Conservation of Electricity and Natural Gas
- Management of Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) Systems
- Utilization of Technology Improvements
- Renewable Energy Resources

**Ongoing Activities that Support the Practice Item Goals:**

- Continued to incorporate indoor and outdoor lighting controls (programmable; occupancy or motion sensors and accessible remotely) to provide only the amount of light needed depending on occupancy and the amount of natural light available.
- Ongoing upgrade of thermostats to WIFI/remote controlled programmable thermostats to monitor HVAC systems to manage usage efficiently, improve response times and reduce staffing costs.
- The replacement/upgrade of lighting systems with LED or other energy efficient fixtures to reduce energy consumption and improve efficiency of maintenance operations by reducing inventories and lengthening bulb replacement cycles
- Implementation of a Comprehensive Energy Management program since 2003 as reported to the Montgomery County Council annually in the Resource Conservation Plan. The Energy Management program has continued to reduce consumption based on the implementation of projects in Fiscal Year 2013. The major change this past year has been in the cost of energy resources with an overall reduction of 18%. The Department of Energy grant projects were completed early in the year. The resulting consumption reductions from this and other projects have kept overall consumption at the same level as the previous year. Projects underway this year include additional lighting retrofit and heating and air conditioning equipment replacements.
- The Commission (including all operations in both counties) is part of the Montgomery County Clean Energy Buyers Group, a coalition of Montgomery County agencies and municipalities that purchase electricity supply generated from clean national wind energy. It currently purchases 50% of its electricity load via wind power. In June 2014 Montgomery County obtained pricing from two vendors and awarded a contract, for only one year, FY15 for 50% of load and a price of $0.00123 per kWh. It currently exceeds the minimum partner level requirements and meets leadership club requirements of the US EPA Green Power Partnership. The Commission has exceeded the original goal of purchasing 40% of its electricity is produced or supported through renewable energy sources by 2040.
http://www.epa.gov/greenpower/partners/partners/montgomery-countycleanenergybuyersgroup.htm

- Installation of geo-thermal heating and cooling systems in both new and renovated facilities (Vansville Community Center, Riversdale Mansion, Southern Regional Technology and Recreation Complex.)
- The planning and development of solar farms in both counties (RFP’s have been sent out and proposals are currently under review).

Recommended New Initiatives for July 2014 - June 2016:

1. Survey building envelope conditions and develop schedules for upgrades.
2. Incorporate heat exchange technology with exhaust air into applicable new or replacement equipment delivering fresh outside air to conditioned spaces.
3. Require that renewable resources are used in new construction; formal justification for not incorporating renewable resources is required.
4. Train facility managers and staff on the use of EnergyCap module in the EAM//SmartParks/ParkStat program to allow staff direct access to utility usage to develop better awareness of use and costs.
5. Develop a green technology demonstration facility that incorporates both energy saving and renewable energy features (Prince George’s).
6. Seek to generate or purchase higher percentages of renewable energy (strive to match Montgomery County Government’s goal of 100% renewable energy)

Recommended Initiatives for Future Investigation/Implementation:

- Renewable energy, such as solar, wind and geothermal, should be considered for new and replacement systems where life cycle cost savings are justified to further reduce the Commission’s carbon footprint and further promote clean power alternatives wherever practical.
- Insulate exposed piping and ventilation ducts in accordance with at least LEED Silver or equivalent standard.
- Each facility should provide an annual report of its implementation plan ensuring that energy resources are used effectively. These plans should be kept in a central database for review.
- Identify sites and systems that are high utility users in order to prioritize the implementation of energy efficiency improvements.
- Require vending machine providers to install energy savers on machines.
- Replace HVAC window and thru-the-wall units to comply with new EPA codes to reduce reliance on Freon as a cooling agent and to improve air ventilation and energy efficiency.
- Include induction lighting with other types of low energy equipment.
- Use of natural gas standby generators, where feasible, to create cleaner exhaust. Use dual fuel units when a diesel unit is required due to engine/generator size.
- Assessment of facilities (EFM reports) to establish equipment life cycle replacement programs for each facility to increase reliability and reduce maintenance costs. Also used to develop CIP and Major Maintenance priorities.
- Formalize facility maintenance inspections and repairs using Enterprise Asset Management (SmartParks/ParkStat) to insure equipment is operating at maximum efficiency.
- Install additional integrated energy management systems in commercial sized buildings to control all lighting, temperature, and equipment operation schedules to reduce energy use.
- Provide training and technical assistance (to all Facility Managers) to meet Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Volume Program for Operations and Maintenance, or LEED for Existing Buildings Operations and Maintenance criteria, for a minimum of Silver or equivalent rating for operations and maintenance. Expand this standard to major renovations on facilities.
- Replace HVAC equipment with modulating and/or include frequency drives to improve efficiency; highest efficiency rated equipment should be used.
- Evaluate replacement of external windows on Executive Office Building (Curtain Wall System) with double pane windows with energy efficient coatings.
- Conduct full building HVAC study of Executive Office Building to identify energy inefficiencies and ensure adequate heating and cooling. Study will measure the air quality and identify needed improvements to existing ventilation system. Investigate the development of renewable energy farms.
Fleet Management Conservation:

Conserve natural and fiscal resources by eliminating waste, improving efficiency, reducing the consumption of energy, and increasing the use of renewable sources of energy. Review vehicle efficiency standards, operating procedure, and best management practice. Evaluate greenhouse gas emission standards and compliance with local and state guidelines.

- Utility Measurement and Monitoring
- Conservation of Fuel
- Management of Vehicle and Maintenance Equipment
- Utilization of Technology Improvements
- Utilization of Alternative Energy Resources
- Use of Alternative Commuting Resources

Ongoing Activities that Support the Practice Item Goals:

- Reserved parking spaces for carpoolers and fuel efficient vehicles (hybrids and electric.) at maintenance/administrative facilities as well as public facilities.
- Current recycling efforts for batteries, waste oil, tires, antifreeze, scrap metal and contaminated fuel.
- Expanding fleet of electric vehicles. In addition to current Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations at staffed facilities in Montgomery County, new EV charging stations are being added over the next two years in both Prince George’s and Montgomery Counties (locations determined by operations/need).
- Continuing to ensure that all vehicles receive periodic maintenance consistent with manufacturer specifications and track through Gasboy Fuel System and the Faster Fleet Management program.
- Commission-wide support of telework and compressed work weeks through best practices established and training programs in use throughout the regions; update Administrative Practice 03-01 to reduce emissions, gas consumption, commuting time. Management to review schedules and encourage staff, where appropriate, to participate in telework and compressed work schedules.
- Implementation of 2010 assessment study recommendation for fleet management and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to meet proposed Montgomery County Guidelines. Expand use of resources such as Montgomery County Commuter Services to provide education opportunities, collaboration with WMATA and grow the SmartBenefits program to encourage use of public transit resources.
- Expanded teleconferencing/videoconferencing/live-streaming video capabilities to reduce travel.
- The sale of WMATA Senior SmarTrip Cards at Senior Activity Centers (Prince George’s) that allows staff and patrons 65 years or older to ride the Metrobus and Metrorail at discounted rates.
- Guidelines established in Formula 2040 (Prince George’s) directing increased connectivity of park facilities with schools, communities, businesses and transit centers.
- Plan Prince George’s 2035 Approved General Plan outlines policies, standards and projects that will enhance bicycle network connectivity and pedestrian safety and
access to transit including designing new transportation systems that accommodate all modes of transportation, enhance bike lanes and trail connections and encourage bike commuting to employment and transit centers.

- Installation of idle limiters (10 minutes) on all large diesel dump trucks.

**Recommended New Initiatives for July 2014-June 2016:**

1. Expand use of B5 bio-diesel to include the use of B20 bio-diesel during warm weather months.
2. Expand current fleet of hybrid and electric vehicles by 10 percent over the next two years.
3. Make right-sized vehicle assignments for staff to ensure the most efficient use of the agency’s fleet.
4. Set fleet MPG standards for passenger vehicles (to exclude maintenance and Park Police vehicles and other specialized vehicles) to promote fuel efficiency.
5. Encourage (where appropriate) the use of telework or compressed work weeks.

**Recommended Initiatives for Future Investigation/Implementation:**

- Install public pay-per-use electric vehicle charging stations within all regional and recreational parks. Units would be level 2 (full charge in 4 hours) and credit card operated.
- Reduce overall fuel consumption by 20% through route planning (telematics), idle limiters on all vehicles, just in time/place direct deliveries and purchase of more fuel efficient vehicles. Re-invest savings to replacement vehicles (all vehicles 10 years old or over 120K miles) for aging fleet.
- Investigate alternative service part selection, steel wheel weights instead of lead, synthetic oils and synthetic lubricants for example. Produce sustainable standardization guidelines.
- Expand the use of webinars and on-line training to reduce travel time to training locations as appropriate.
- Provide for creation of “hot desks” to allow localized telecommute space within existing Commission facilities.
- Expansion of current vanpool program to include two new vanpools: one that would travel from Prince George’s County to Parks’ Shady Grove location and a new Frederick area van that would travel to a location in Central Montgomery County. This is to include additional commuting van pools and van pool venues for Commission staff, especially for the relocation of the Montgomery Departments to Wheaton in 2019.
- Request assistance from DOT to develop a Wheaton Transportation District to assist in sustainable transportation opportunities.
- Reinforce guidelines on limiting the idling of all vehicles unless required (i.e. K-9 units.)
**Water Conservation and Management:**

Conserve natural and fiscal resources by eliminating waste, improving efficiency, reducing the consumption of water, and increasing the use of non-potable water resources.

- Utility Measurement and Monitoring

**Practice Item Goals:**

1. Install and properly maintain automatic and low flow faucets, where practical.
2. Whenever feasible, utilize low flow toilets, waterless urinals and other innovations to reduce water demands.
3. Investigate and where feasible, install an efficient infrastructure for use of rainwater or grey water at M-NCPPC facilities, including water amenities and landscape watering.
4. Upon learning of any abnormal water usage pattern, facility managers shall investigate, locate, and immediately repair any leaks and inefficiencies.
5. Strive to plant native trees and shrubs in landscaping.
6. Strive to reduce lawn areas to minimize the need for irrigation and plant areas with appropriate drought tolerant native species.

**Ongoing Activities that Support the Practice Item Goals:**

- Use of Energy CAP to monitor water usage.
- Use of low flow toilets and other innovations such as waterless urinals, whenever feasible, to reduce water demands.
- Use of timers/automatic shutoffs for showers in high volume facilities.
- Water consumption reduction programs in Fiscal Year 2013 were focused on irrigation water consumption and service location consolidations. Water and sewage costs were reduced by 9%. The staff is focused on reducing water use through a series of awareness programs, conservation indicatives, leak identification programs, and projects to reduce irrigation water consumption.

**Recommended New Initiatives for July 2014 - June 2016:**

1. Document existing water conservation standards, policies and implementation practices and develop a plan to conserve water.
2. Assess the potential for reusing grey water at Commission facilities.
3. Assess the potential to capture and reuse rainwater, including water amenities and landscape irrigation at Commission facilities.
Recommended Initiatives for Future Investigation/Implementation:

- Utilize a standard annual water conservation progress reporting form and incorporate results into annual sustainability report.
- Increase outreach and education efforts to decrease the use of Commission-owned fire hydrants by commercial water tank trucks, and establish an MOU with Fire Departments to ensure that Commission-owned fire hydrants will not be used to test equipment, for training or drill exercises, or to fill fire trucks except in cases of emergency.
- For new Commission facilities, fire hydrants should not be metered unless they need to be. If future hydrants on Commission property do need to be metered, then they should be metered separately so the Commission does not pay for sewage treatment as well as the cost of the water.
- Track unavoidable temporary water usage increases and compare with overall water consumption trends to help identify the water usage increases that may indicate leaks or water usage inefficiencies that may be corrected.
- Create a Commission-wide native species list that includes information for each species on drought-tolerance.
- Require use of soil moisture sensors, where feasible, in all existing and new automatic irrigation systems.
- Develop guidance to prioritize decisions in cases that involve competing conservation needs, where conserving one resource will result in the increased use of another resource.
- Identify new water conservation practices or technologies and develop policies and practices that govern their use.
- Establish a Bi-County Commission Work Group to evaluate the issues surrounding use of native plantings and reduction of lawn areas.
- Increase staffing and funding for additional supplies needed to establish and maintain landscaped areas.
- Provide additional resources for staff training on proper landscape planting care techniques.
Sustainable Acquisition and Use of Agency Supplies:

Develop procurement specifications that encourage the use of goods and services which support the agency's commitment to sustainability in areas including, but not limited to, resources conservation, protection of the environment, and workplace health and safety.

- Office Supplies and Furniture
- Printing and Copying
- Procurement

Ongoing Activities that Support the Practice Item Goals:

- Increase communication opportunities for Departments to use the existing Commission Surplus program and collaborate on potential opportunities for staff to bid or donate furniture, equipment and office supplies.
- Reuse or recycle warehoused furniture. Because storage facilities are limited, implement surplus shopping system. After reasonable time, recycle out to Commission sources or free-cycle or E-Bay items. We should not store; we should provide to charity or other function that will re-purpose the item. Requires update of system for listing/using surplus items as well as authority to use e-cycling opportunities authorized/available in the Commission.
- All disposal or external surplus/recycling of M-NCPPC property shall be coordinated with the Department of Finance, Purchasing Office, to ensure adherence to legal dispossession of assets, with a preference placed on repurposing outside M-NCPPC for the benefit of the community.
- Follow local or state ordinances and/or continue the voluntary practice of replacing plastic and Styrofoam plates, cups and cutlery used for meetings with paper (preferably recycled content) and/or bio-plastics.

Expand the use of the following Best Practices already in place - July 2014- June 2016:

- Manage Commission events that provide food and beverages to avoid waste.
- Support use of reusable, personal water bottles/cups/coffee mugs in the workplace.
- Capitalize on meeting and conferencing technology by using more phone and video conference calls (including webinars for training), even locally, to cut back on use of vehicles and travel times.
- Continue implementation of two-sided printing default on Commission printers and work area photocopy equipment.
- Continue use of post-consumer recycled paper in printers and as recommended by our common equipment manufacturers (HP and Xerox).
- Limit use of color copying/printing to reduce costs and resources. Raise awareness of color printing via standalone printers.
- Unless specific job demands or technical specifications of a printer require otherwise, purchase and use 100% post-consumer recycled paper, preferably with chlorine-free processing. Current paper purchasing is in accordance with this practice policy.

**Recommended New Initiatives for July 2014 - June 2016:**

1. Work with Central Purchasing to assist in implementing online surplus venues to coincide with better warehousing of equipment, furniture, and recycling opportunities.
2. Collaborate with green vendors to develop standard shopping cart lists of “Preferred Green Products” for sustainable, recyclable, and green certified supplies and materials.
3. Embrace electronic documents for meetings and use technology to display information at meetings and for review by attendees.
4. Create a zero/waste events policy that incorporates recycling instruction and guidance to facilitate compliance (i.e., the placement of a recycle bin alongside each trash container).

**Recommended Initiatives for Future Investigation/Implementation:**

- Provide standard format for documents scanned as Commission materials viewable on the web.
- Create a tag in Supply Chain Management (SCM) to identify sustainable “preferred” purchases so that analysis of preferred green purchases is possible and reportable.
- Ban the sale of plastic water bottles at Commission facilities and install water fountains/coolers with filters instead. Monitor legislative activities of Montgomery and Prince George’s County to piggyback or utilize opportunities for shared resources.
- Work toward elimination of stand-alone print equipment to enhance use of electronic document access and with existing equipment, continue the best practice of double-side documents with post-consumer and green certified paper products.
- Within the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software, the Fixed Asset Module may be tied to Enterprise Asset Management Module (EAM) which is still in its early stages and not yet live.
Recycling and Solid Waste Management:

Implement projects and programs to recycle, reuse, and reduce solid wastes used by M-NCPPC employees and patrons to meet or exceed the regulatory mandates established by government regulations. Recycling and disposal of materials shall comply with relevant Federal/State safety regulations.

A. Implement recycling and reuse programs to achieve an overall rate of 90% of recyclable materials mandated by state or local law (including mixed paper, commingled materials, yard trim materials, Christmas trees, and scrap metal).

B. Implement recycling and reuse programs to include other material to include but not be limited to oils, batteries, asphalt, tires, furniture, computers, electronics, construction debris, etc.

C. Implement programs to recycle and reuse plant, tree, and related vegetation materials to include composting within the natural resources of the agency.

D. Develop community-based information programs to encourage, demonstrate, and educate patrons on best practices to recycle, reuse, and reduce solid waste at M-NCPPC facilities/programs.

Ongoing Activities that Support the Practice Item Goals:

- Educating and training staff on proper recycling and recording methods highlighting the importance of this program. Schedule presentations by a Recycling Specialist from Montgomery County’s DSWS or Prince George’s County’s DOE at no cost to the Commission.

- Analyzing existing inventory of waste and recycle containers and scheduled collections on an annual basis in all Regional and Recreational Parks to determine if recycling containers exist for both MP and (CM) at all collection sites (Montgomery County only).

- Using email to distribute information, documents and newsletters to reduce paper use and waste, postage, envelopes, administrative staff time, etc.

- Outreach and on-site interpretive programs and demonstration projects on recycling, composting, rain gardens, rain barrels and conservation of natural resources at nature centers.

- Incorporation of conservation and natural resource education into youth programming and volunteer opportunities.

- Collection of recyclable materials (single stream) from all staffed facilities. Expansion of recycling collection efforts to high use park sites such as regional parks, sports complexes (Prince George’s)

- Composting of green waste using existing park facilities.

- In land use planning, Montgomery Departments’ efforts link sustainable environmental standards, and affordable, economic feasibility in public and private programs and plans that improve and incorporate bikeways, walkways and trains into existing and proposed development.

- Implementation of a Recycling and Solid Waste management program since 2003 as reported to the Montgomery Department of Environmental Protection annually. The Recycling and Solid Waste Management program reported for calendar year 2012, a recycling rate of 54.5%. The required rate is 50%. The report confirmed an
additional 17.4% for voluntary recycling programs bringing the total for required and voluntary to 71.9% for the year. The results were confirmed in a report from the Montgomery County Division of Solid Waste Services as of April 2013. The efforts of the recycling committee have proven beneficial in promoting recycling with the staff through training and awareness programs. A pilot test program is underway in the Wheaton Regional Park to improve recycling rates of park patrons especially at picnic pavilions.

**Recommended New Initiatives for July 2014 - June 2016:**

1. Expand on efforts to reduce waste at events including food waste composting.
2. Expand efforts to promote recycling in area parks.
3. Establish a unified approach to recycling disposed tires in our Parks.
4. Provide double-side print instructions for employees to update the default print setting on desktop computers and laptops and eliminate any setting for banner sheets.
5. Redevelop a convenient, user friendly reuse e-store for employees to recycle and reuse surplus office supplies, furniture, and materials before purchasing new supplies.

**Recommended Initiatives for Future Investigation/Implementation:**

- Develop an accurate method to record yard trim and brush recycling; consider purchasing a truck scale to weigh this material.
- Establish waste reduction and recycling program language in Division Chiefs, Assisting Division Chiefs, and Park Managers Performance Management Form.
- Determine which Single Stream Material Recovery Facility single rear-loading compactor trucks should take recyclable materials. Reinforce policy to take materials collected by non-rear loading compactor trucks to existing Waste Management recycle dumpsters in the various Maintenance Yards (Montgomery County).
- Analyze collection schedules for waste and recycling containers and what vehicles (either rear-loading compactor trucks or pick-up trucks) should be used to most efficiently empty containers.
- Purchase a recycling data collection module in the new EAM system.
- Establish new voluntary recycle programs, including wooden pallets, used cooking oil, internal food waste, and white wood/construction debris.
- Identify consumable items that can be purchased in bulk to reduce freight costs.
- Expand recycling operations into regional parks and high volume facilities.
- Develop pilot projects on the composting of food waste from rental sites and concession facilities and other facilities (picnic shelters.)
- Expand current metal recycling by adding separate bins for each type of metal (copper, aluminum, steel, etc.) to take advantage of values of different metals.
Locate new dumpsters and improve reporting. Reduce the current number of processors of 20 separate accounts to a more manageable number.

- Record auto shop recycling material quantities in pounds and not gallons. Ensure all mechanic shops be included in recycling data collection.
- Set up of indoor collection sites to have a consistent layout with waste and recycling containers (to include both mixed paper (MP) and comingled (CM) adjacent to each other in Montgomery County). Label containers on the lids and sides of the units. Place recycle posters above containers where feasible.
- Placement of outdoor collection dumpsters (trash, recycle CM+MP or single stream (dependent on County), scrap metal, and any voluntary recyclable material that warrants a collection dumpster, e.g. tires or white wood/construction debris) adjacent to one another in one location at M-NCPPC facilities.
Sustainable Infrastructure and Natural Areas:

The M-NCPPC will utilize the national and state standards for green practices in the design of facilities and in the management of affected natural resources. Natural areas will be managed to maintain healthy ecosystems and maximize biodiversity.

- Sustainable Building
- Sustainable Site Work
- Community Planning and Development

Practice Item Goals:

A. Sustainable Building – Whenever feasible:
   1. All new construction of M-NCPPC buildings will be at least LEED Silver eligible or equivalent standard.
   2. Major renovation of M-NCPPC buildings will meet at least LEED Silver eligibility or equivalent standard.
   3. Capital improvement plans will include implementation of at least LEED Silver eligibility or equivalent standard.
   4. When planning new office sites, consideration should be given to locations that offer access to public transportation resources such as metro rail, trains, buses, and carpools.

B. Sustainable Site Work – Where appropriate:
   1. Include, in Capital improvement plans, the implementation of the Sustainable Sites Initiative (SITES) or equivalent standards (such as LEED) in all construction and renovation.
   2. Plant native trees and shrubs around agency-owned buildings to provide wind and summer sun shelter.
   3. Utilize appropriate site layout, landscaping and material choices to reduce heat island effect and summer cooling costs.
   4. Use best practices including, but not limited to, current environmental site design standards to avoid, trap, and control erosion or surface runoff of detergents, fertilizers, pesticides, and soil into storm drains and surface waters.

C. Community Planning and Development - Where possible and practical, Community Planning and Development will:
   1. Plan and locate new development according to Smart Growth principles and in conjunction with Maryland Sustainability initiatives.
   2. Locate recreation facilities to afford access via public transit and trails networks.
   3. Co-locate community recreation centers and major recreation facilities with other public facilities.

Ongoing Activities that Support the Practice Item Goals:

- The construction of two new facilities (Vansville Community Center and Southern Region Technology and Recreation Complex) that meet LEED Silver requirements.
• The Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation’s Formula 2040: Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space establishes a framework that incorporates smart growth principles into the development of future park facilities and trails including increasing the connectivity of parks with schools, communities, businesses and transit centers.
http://www.pgparks.com/formula2040.htm

• The Prince George’s County Planning Plan Prince George’s 2035 Approved General Plan presents a blueprint for the long-term growth and development of Prince George’s County, Maryland. The plan’s growth goals include mixing land uses, green building design, walkable communities, directing development toward existing communities and transit centers, providing a range of housing choices, and a range of transportation choices.

• The 2012 Park, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan for Montgomery County encourages the use of Smart Growth principles to create parks that are walkable or accessible by transit.

• Montgomery Parks is currently working on a comprehensive amendment to the Countywide Park Trails Plan. The amendment proposes a new “Locps and Links” framework for park trails of countywide significance, which aims to provide a countywide park trail experience within 3 miles of the majority of county residents by 2030. Montgomery Parks is scheduled to present the staff draft plan amendment to the Montgomery County Planning Board in late spring or early summer 2015.
http://www.montgomeryparks.org/PPSD/ParkPlanning/Projects/cwptp_ammend/cwptp.amendment.shtml

• Montgomery County Bill 17-06, Buildings, Energy Efficiency and Environmental Design, adopted in November 2006, requires that County-built or funded (at least 30% of the cost) non-residential buildings achieve a LEED silver rating. This law applies to new buildings with at least 10,000 square feet gross floor area (GFA); renovations or reconstructions of existing buildings with at least 10,000 square feet gross floor area that alters more than 50% of the building’s GFA; and an addition that doubles the building’s footprint and adds at least 10,000 square feet of GFA. The law took effect to apply to all projects programmed or funded in FY09 or later. Refer to link below for adopted law.

• State of MD House Bill 637, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission – High Performance Buildings, MC/PG 101-13, adopted March 20, 2013. This law, which went into effect on October 1, 2013, requires that capital projects including construction or renovation of a building that is 7,500 square feet or greater be constructed to achieve a LEED Silver rating or comparable numeric rating from another nationally recognized, accepted and appropriate numeric sustainable
development rating system, guideline or standard approved by the State. 

- Standard Equipment Guidelines Manual, Central Maintenance Division, 1998. Outlines equipment standards for exterior doors and frames, electrical fixtures, lights and alarm hardware, heating and cooling plants and plumbing fixtures. It acknowledged the need for energy and water savings and referenced several organizations such as ASHRAE, API, and ANSI for guidance in these areas. 

- Montgomery County Code, Chapter 19, Erosion, Sediment Control and Stormwater Management Regulations (current through July 31, 2013). All projects with more than 5,000 square feet of disturbance incorporate erosion and sediment control measures. (Click on the link below and open Chapter 19):  
http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/Maryland/montgomery/appendix/appendixf *countylawsapplicabletomunicipa?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:m 
ontgomeryco_md_mc

- Maryland Department of the Environment, Maryland Stormwater Design Manual, May 2009. All projects are designed using environmental site design principles.  
http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/StormwaterManagementProgram/ 
MarylandStormwaterDesignManual/Pages/Programs/WaterPrograms/Sedimentand 
Stormwater/stormwater_design/index.aspx

- Maryland Department of the Environment, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Discharge Permits which govern work for the M-NCPFC, Montgomery County Department of Parks.  
http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/StormwaterManagementProgram/ 
http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Permits/WaterManagementPermits/Water 
DischargePermitApplications/Documents/GDP%20Stormwater/12_SW_CompleteFinal 
alPermit.pdf

- M-NCPFC, Montgomery County Department of Parks and Montgomery County Department of Recreation, Vision 2030 Strategic Plan, June 2011. This plan, which provides long-term planning guidance, includes several goals and objectives that address sustainable site and building work. Objective 5.2 is “provide for flexible spaces and green facility designs.” Goal 9 is “maintain quality park and recreation lands and facilities for attractiveness and long term sustainability” and includes information about maintenance standards and renovations to incorporate LEED and SITES principles. Goal 16 is “Be leaders in sustainable green practices.” This goal recommends incorporating sustainability in planning, design construction and operations and recommends creating a sustainability plan, new initiatives, and metrics for measuring success.  
http://www.montgomeryparks.org/about/vision/documents/vision2030 

- M-NCPFC Montgomery County Department of Parks, Planting Requirements for Land-Disturbing Activities and Related Mitigation on M-NCPFC Montgomery County
Parkland, April 2009 includes native plant lists recommended for park property. In addition, the Commission’s Pope Farm Nursery provides native plants to the park system.  
http://www.montgomeryparks.org/PPSD/Natural Resources Stewardship/Veg Management/documents/planting_reqs-on-disturbed-land_rev-april09-.pdf

- Draft Sections of M-NCPPC Park Design Guidelines, 2006-2007. Attachment A includes general sections from draft park design guidelines that address planting and sustainability. These guidelines need to be updated and were not officially adopted, but serve as internal reference documents for park design staff.

- Construction Waste Management Plans (Specification Section 103): Attachment B is a newly created specification section that has been used on recent major park capital improvements projects (Montgomery County).

- Maintenance and Operations Manuals: A newly created standard has been developed for recent major park site design projects to require submittal of system manuals to ensure that maintenance and operations recommendations and requirements for sustainable and non-traditional products are transferred to maintenance staff.

- Ongoing implementation plans in the Department of Parks Capital Improvement Program dedicated to pollution prevention and stream protection projects. These projects stabilize stream channels from active erosion, provide water quality treatment to filter runoff of pollutants before they enter streams, and they enhance forest resources by removing invasive plants and planting native trees. Refer to projects 078701 - Pollution Prevention and Repairs to Ponds & Lakes (page 51), and 818571 – Stream Protection (page 59) in the link below.  

- State of Maryland House Bill 475, Sustainable Communities Act of 2010, promotes equitable, affordable housing by expanding energy-efficient housing choices to increase mobility and lower the combined cost of housing and transportation. The law favors concentrated transit-oriented development, investment in older urban areas, and provides tax credits.  
http://mlis.state.md.us/2010rs/bills/hb/hb0475t.pdf

http://montgomeryplanning.org/development/zoning/

- Pedestrian Impact Statements for Capital Projects: Each new major project proposed in the Parks Capital Improvements Program is required to have a Pedestrian Impact Statement submitted with the project PDF form to the Montgomery County Office of Management and Budget. This form ensures that pedestrian connectivity and master plan recommendations have been considered as part of the project.
• Implementation of a Montgomery County Department of Parks, Phase II NPDES Permit for discharges from State and Federal Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) since 2009 as reported on an annual basis to the State of Maryland.

• Finalize review of draft guidelines for evaluating the adequacy of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Centers and Corridors consistent with CB-2-2012 and the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (Prince George’s County). http://www.pgplanning.org/Resources/Publications.htm


• Develop/update Trails Master Plans to systematically identify areas of current and potential need, set priorities for future projects in consultation with county residents. The recommendations of the Trails Master Plan should be incorporated into the determination of priorities for inclusion in the Capital Improvement Plan as well as priority level for project initiation.

• Draft guidelines for evaluating the adequacy of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Centers and Corridors consistent with CB-2-2012 and the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (Prince George’s County). http://www.pgplanning.org/Resources/Publications.htm
Recommended New Initiatives for July 2014 - June 2016:

1. Incorporate sustainability goals, practices and products (using LEED or equivalent standards and Sustainable SITES as guides) into:
   a. New facility plans and ongoing design projects
   b. Standard park construction specifications & details
   c. Park design guidelines

2. Evaluate SITES and LEED or equivalent standards pilot projects to document lessons learned, ideas and recommendations for future projects. Incorporate pre-design assessments in standard scopes of work to explore opportunities for sustainability and provide checklists for project and construction managers.

3. Develop policy to incorporate LEED or equivalent standards in construction and renovation for small building projects and obtain certification, including commissioning services, to verify and document that building systems perform according to standards required in LEED (or equivalent) particularly for existing facilities.

Recommended Initiatives for Future Investigation/Implementation:

- Establish methods to share information gathered for sustainable products, methods and practices related to site and building design and construction with others in the Commission.
- Revise Standard Equipment Handbook from the Facilities Management Division to incorporate sustainable equipment and practices.
- Monitor performance of sustainable practices over time and publish results.
- Create new level of effort Capital Improvements Program PDF to fund retrofits to existing facilities to incorporate sustainable practices (such as photovoltaic panels on buildings, reinvestment of energy savings realized by installation of LED lighting systems).
- Establish Department “Sustainability Specialists,” who can serve as references to other staff.
- Consider how the Parks Prescription Initiative components can be incorporated into the planning and design of parks.
- Ensure preventative maintenance work requests provide for specialty sustainable equipment and products.
- Develop planned Eco Districts to create sustainable cities and neighborhoods in Montgomery County.
- Compile reference lists of product vendors and price lists for commonly used site construction materials, site furnishings, product manufacturers and plant nurseries, which utilize sustainable operating practices.

- Adjust building specifications as necessary if the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services adopts the 2012 International Green Construction Code (IgCC). If this takes effect, it may override the Montgomery County green building law and could have the same or different thresholds.
Natural Resources and Habitat Preservation:

The M-NCPCC will utilize the national and state standards for green practices in the management of natural resources. Natural areas will be managed to maintain healthy ecosystems and maximize biodiversity.

- Natural Resources Management
- NPDES Permit Requirements
- Stormwater Management

Practice Item Goals:

1. Develop and implement a Natural Resources Management Plan for all parklands acquired for conservation purposes after 2012. This Plan provides general guidance to park management staff for the management of natural areas in parks.
2. Maintain, and expand as appropriate, the existing program for the inventory, assessment, and control of non-native and invasive (NNI) plants.
3. Maintain, and expand as appropriate, the existing program for the control of nuisance wildlife (e.g. white-tailed deer, Canada geese, etc.)
4. Utilize integrated pest management practices, where effective.
5. Maintain, and expand, as required by State regulations, storm water management systems, and the monitoring of water bodies and restoration of watersheds within the park system.

Ongoing Activities that Support the Practice Item Goals:

Goal 1
A Natural Resources Management Plan is in place and can be found at the following link. Natural Resources Management Plan (PDF)

Goal 2
A comprehensive program for inventorying, assessing, and controlling non-native invasive plants is in place in the Park Planning and Stewardship Division in Montgomery County. The following plans and practices guide the work.

- 2009 Comprehensive Vegetation Management Plan for M-NCPCC Parkland (pdf, 1.1MB)
- NNI Plant Management Plan (pdf, 205KB)
- Best Management Practices for Control of Non-Native Invasive (pdf, 254KB)

The Natural and Historical Resources Division’s Park Ranger program oversee the inventory, assessment and control of non-native and invasive plants in Prince George's County. Key areas throughout the county are managed in coordination with staff at nature centers and waterfront parks and the extensive use of volunteers.

Goal 3
A nuisance wildlife program is in place in the Park Planning and Stewardship Division to control white tailed deer and Canada geese. The Comprehensive Management Plan for White-tailed Deer in Montgomery County, MD (2004 update) (PDF) guides the work.
There is a Canada goose egg oiling program at several facilities to reduce nuisance goose population growth. This work is done under a special permit issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USF&W) through their Resident Goose Nest and Egg Registration Website.

The Natural and Historical Resources Division’s Park Ranger program oversees the inventory, assessment and management of resident geese through a variety of methods including egg adding, round ups of resident geese, managed hunts and the issuance of permits for hunting blinds in specific areas. They work in concert with Park Police on the development and implementation of plans for control of white tailed deer via managed hunts. They also manage the contract with the State of Maryland for cost sharing mosquito controls in areas of standing water (no aerial spraying).

**Goal 4**
The Commission is committed to protecting our environment and ensuring the safety of employees and users of our parks. To this end, the Commission will act responsibly by implementing a program for safe handling, storage, and application of pesticides. The Commission’s program will comply with all relevant regulations and incorporate State of Maryland and respective County’s initiatives for an Integrated Pest Management Program. The Commission has an Integrated Pest Management practice which can be accessed below.

M-NCPPC Administrative Procedures No. 02-01 Pesticide Safety & Integrated Pest Management (IPM), effective date July 25, 2002

**Goal 5**
Under State and Federal stormwater regulations, Montgomery Parks is required to have two National Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System (NPDES) Permits. The first is an industrial permit which covers our twelve maintenance yards. The second is our Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Permit (MS4) which covers all of our parkland. For the MS4 stormwater permit we are required to create best management practices to address each of the following six minimum control measures: Personnel Education and Outreach, Public Involvement and Participation, Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination, Construction Site Runoff Control, Post Construction Stormwater Management, and Pollution Prevention and Good Housekeeping. The Prince George’s County Department of the Environment and the Department of Public Works and Transportation has jurisdiction of these in Prince George’s County. Park, Planning and Development staff works with the County to ensure that all regulations are met.

The Montgomery County NPDES Annual Report summarizing this work for the Maryland Department of Environment can be accessed at the following link.
Recommended New Initiatives for July 2014 - June 2016:

1. Increase funding and staffing of the Non-Native Invasive (NNI) management program, with a career position dedicated to this program.

2. Provide staff training on IPM practices, methodologies and places they can access educational materials such as the Maryland Cooperative Extension, Home and Garden Information Center - Online. Use University of Maryland as a guide for cultural practices as well. Provide information to staff about trees available at Pope Farm nursery that are disease and pest resistant.

3. Initiate use by National Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System (NPDES) staff of mobile GIS to collect data and photographs on opportunities for restoration of degraded watersheds. Ensure that adequate mobile devices and ArcGIS licenses are available to allow for the collection of field data on water related natural resource issues. Create GIS layers, maps and forms for collecting field data. Train staff and deploy mobile mapping solution.

Recommended Initiatives for Future Investigation/Implementation:

- Utilize NPDES staff monitoring Stormwater Management (SWM) facilities to identify new locations where Canada geese are nesting and incorporate egg oiling into their regular monitoring and maintenance efforts. Create or add to any existing SWM facility monitoring data sheet space to gather information on goose nesting and loafing activity in and around the facility. Use this information to identify future egg oiling locations.

- Allocate additional staff to accelerate the time-table for writing and implementing Natural Resource Management Plans for the most important natural area parks.

- Assign a wildlife staff member to develop/expand a volunteer-based, park-focused natural resource monitoring program which makes use of internet and other technologies similar to and including established Citizen Science programs, such as Frog Watch, Audubon Christmas Bird Counts, and many others.

- Establish a crew dedicated to natural resource management work similar to the Horticulture Crew in the Horticulture, Forestry & Environmental Education (HFEE) Division, which focuses on horticulture related work. Work program would be shared with NNI management efforts. One area of focus for this crew would be planting native shrubs and herbaceous plants into areas of NNI removal.

- Implement an aggressive education program directed at promoting the importance and immediacy of the NNI problems to political leaders including each county’s respective Planning Board, County Council, County Executive, and County residents.
Health and Wellness:
Promote safety, health, and wellness through our workplace, programs, and services.

Practice Item Goals:
- Support healthy communities by integrating sustainability concepts and green practices with relevant program offerings, to further enhance patron and employee well-being.
- Raise awareness of workplace health, safety, and wellness issues through comprehensive training and education programs targeting illness and injury prevention.
- Mitigate workplace hazards through timely identification, investigation, and remedial action.
- Whenever reasonable, complete collaborative reviews of accidents and design new programs to encourage greater understanding of risks and actions to implementation.

Ongoing Activities that Support the Practice Item Goals:
- Extensive interpretive programs on a wide range of environmental education, sustainability and conservation topics are offered both on site and through outreach programs by nature centers, park rangers, and park naturalists.
- Extensive opportunities provided for communities and patrons to participate in activities that address sustainability goals (trash reduction, non-native invasive plant removal, stream clean-ups, water quality monitoring, riparian restoration, tree plantings, and interpretive art projects.)
- Conducting employee health risk assessments and using the results to develop related educational and benefit programs.
- Routine trainings on specialized subject matter, such as energy conservation and the use of fleet vehicles, how to recycle common materials, etc.
- Field inspections (risk managers) of safety practices and work conditions, similar to what is being done for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) compliance.
- The Commission provides residents with community garden locations in which participants grow fresh, healthy food for their families. (11 community gardens/600 gardeners in Montgomery), (4 community gardens/132 gardeners and 6 youth demonstration gardens in Prince George’s).
- Ongoing worksite wellness programs targeting physical activity, nutrition and worksite culture that reflect the priority given to employee health and wellness. These include programs such as the Passport to Wellness program, Employee Health & Fitness Week, and reoccurring health and wellness initiatives (Step to It), Lunch and Learn demonstrations, etc.
- Ongoing Work/Life initiatives that demonstrate a commitment to employees through an inclusive corporate culture, progressive and flexible work/life programs, cutting-edge employee benefits, and strong community involvement. Programs
include monthly articles in *Update* on health and wellness topics, health screenings, healthy eating presentations,
- Routine safety trainings by Risk Management and subject matter experts on specialized subject matters, such as the safe use of fleet vehicles, correct use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), blood borne pathogens, etc.
- Ongoing efforts by the Risk Management and Safety team to reduce workplace hazards through timely identification, investigation and remedial action. Actions include ongoing training and consultations for staff, updating Risk and Safety Manuals, research and recommendations on related legislation, reviewing and managing worker’ compensation claims.
- OSHA reporting for all of the Commission so all areas are aware of number of injuries, types and losses that are being reported.
- Use of “Passport to Wellness” program (Prince George’s) that provides employees with free access to Department of Parks and Recreation recreational facilities.
- Conducting self-assessment of all afterschool program sites (all community centers) using the Alliance for a Healthier Generation “Healthy Eating and Physical Activity Standards”. Develop goals/action plans to improve programs to meet recommended standards.

**Recommended New Initiatives for July 2014 - June 2016:**

1. Develop an MOU with the Montgomery County Recreation Department for health and wellness programs for employees, including reduced fees at Parks and County Recreation Department facilities modeled on Prince George’s County’s Passport to Wellness programs.
2. Develop a comprehensive Communication Plan to more fully engage the public and patrons on issues of sustainability concerning environmental awareness and conservation.
3. Develop a public Sustainability webpage(s) (on Commission websites) to highlight current and future actions as well as provide an online opportunity for communities to provide feedback regarding sustainability efforts.
4. Include sustainability information in permitted customer packets and informational and marketing brochures.
5. Develop a Sustainability symbol/icon to identify programming, information and initiatives that reflect our sustainability efforts and progress.
6. Enhance Social Media Outreach to capitalize on low-cost outreach opportunities using existing social media accounts (Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube) to share sustainability efforts, events and facts with employees and patrons.
Recommended Initiatives for Future Investigation/Implementation:

- Add green tips to the Info Share and Update online newsletter.
- Place sustainability messages in the program guides for consumption by the public.
- Compile information on the internal efforts of Departments to make the organization more sustainable and package that information for public and patron consumption.
- Identify location of kiosks throughout Commission facilities, implement pilot kiosks and develop standards for sustainability information standards on all for public use.
- In keeping with Formula 2040 (Prince George’s) goals on program development, work to incorporate health and fitness components into 75% of all program offerings (over 14,000 programs) to include component definitions, program standards, outcome and evaluation requirements.
- Develop an employee program to address tobacco use and cessation.
- Educate staff regarding discounts available at local gyms and fitness facilities (Montgomery County).
- Work to add class discounts to Passport to Wellness program (Prince George’s)
- Increase proportion of healthy snack options/drinks in all Commission vending machines.
- Provide outdoor areas at work locations to allow for meal breaks, meetings, and team-building activities in natural settings.
- Foster sustainability awareness through periodic “Eco Lunch and Learns” where individuals are encouraged to displace or present information on related topics.
- Host annual “Eco Fair” to provide individuals and teams to exhibit displays showing personal sustainability/ecology/recycling tips and efforts. Consider opportunity to include local green vendors to present information/display and sell environmentally friendly wares (similar to Trash to Treasures Expo at Watkins Nature Center).

NOTE: Training session instruction and videos should reflect the work being done by employees.
Employee Education, Training, and Engagement:

Sustainability Practice Item Goals:

A. Sustainability efforts will be fostered through agency-wide promotion and education of environmental awareness and conservation.
B. Employees should be encouraged to seek sustainability credentials appropriate to their work program.
C. Supervisors are responsible for reviewing work program requirements as they pertain to implementation of sustainability efforts. Applicable sustainability goals are to be incorporated into employee performance expectations.

Ongoing Activities that Support the Practice Item Goals:

- Identify sustainability topics for inclusion in the Nature Matters and Green Matters Lecture Series (Montgomery) and Speaker’s Series (Prince George’s)
- Expanded staff access to the ongoing development of resource content available on InSite
- Continued training of staff to be subject matter experts on sustainability (attendance at NC State Green School at Oglebay, continued professional development training, and continued C.E.U. training required to maintain professional certifications (LEED, trades, engineering, architecture, planning, etc.)
- Expand on success of Montgomery County Celebrating Sustainability and In-service training programs.

Recommended New Initiatives for July 2014 - June 2016:

1. Develop educational resources to provide information, regular e-mail reminders and tips on how staff can improve their sustainability efforts at their work stations and work sites both in Update as well as other departmental publications and newsletters. Determine sustainability training priorities by working across all departments and divisions to assess needs and provide staff with listing of external training opportunities. Increase the amount of sustainability programming made available in future In-Service Trainings.

2. In conjunction with supervisory-level staff, direct the Department of Human Resources Management to work with the Sustainability Committees to develop/modify an Essential Job Function to focus on Sustainability to include sustainability goals, standards and strategies for inclusion in performance evaluations.
Recommended Initiatives for Future Investigation/Implementation:

- Require staff to attend a minimum number of events/classes about sustainability (workshops, presentations etc.). Develop list of recommended/required trainings.
- Formalize sustainability check lists for the application of sustainability-specific features in each site plan; develop a menu of options with minimum requirements. All review staff must be trained in what, when and how to apply these standard requirements (for example, storm water management (ESD), energy efficiency, electric vehicle stations, native plants, non-native invasive species, green buildings, etc.).
- Formalize sustainability objectives for master and sector plan processes that apply the latest Federal, State and County bills and regulations in order to meet requirements and goals. Ensure staff is informed about current and changing regulations with regard to sustainability initiatives and how these may impact specific work programs.
- Develop methods to accurately transfer sustainability knowledge between divisions and departments.
- Promote opportunities for competition or challenges among work sections or between divisions and departments as methods to educate, engage and motivate staff on issues of sustainability. (Examples: Sustainability IQ Cup Challenge, Adopt a Hallway, monthly Sustainability Captains).
- Promote staff competencies by providing monetary incentives, compensatory time, or administrative leave for successful completion of sustainability credentials and continuing education.
- Develop a Commission-wide “Eco Fair” event focused on sustainability. Individual employees and teams are invited to compete for awards for displays showing personal and professional efforts regarding: sustainability / ecology / recycling / tips, etc.
**Sustainability Practices Matrix**

The following is a matrix chart of the Practice requirements to assist in the initial assessment of the current practices.

As current programs and practices are identified they will be added to this section of the work plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>Measurable Goal</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Regulatory Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Measurement and Monitoring</td>
<td>Facilities Management, Energy Committee and Consultant</td>
<td>Annual Resource Conservation Plan</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Use ECAP program to track utility use.</td>
<td>County requirement (MC only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Development, Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Resource Conservation Plan</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Use ECAP program to track utility use.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of Electricity and Natural Gas</td>
<td>Facilities Management, Energy Committee and Consultant</td>
<td>Annual Resource Conservation Plan</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Reduce electricity and gas use by 2% by 2015.</td>
<td>County requirement (MC only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Development, Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Resource Conservation Plan</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Use ECAP program to track utility use.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of Water</td>
<td>Facilities Management, Advisory Committee and Consultant</td>
<td>Annual Resource Conservation Plan</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Reduce water use by 2% by 2015.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Development, Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Resource Conservation Plan</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Use ECAP program to track utility use.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC Systems</td>
<td>Facilities Management, Energy Committee and Consultant</td>
<td>Annual Resource Conservation Plan</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Reduce electricity and gas use by 2% by 2015.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Development, Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Resource Conservation Plan</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Use ECAP program to track utility use.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Plan/Year</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Sustainability Impact</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fleet Management</strong></td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Development, Admin Services, Park Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>Annual Resource Conservation Plan</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Use ECAP program to track utility use.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Use of Alternative</td>
<td>Facilities Management, Management Services</td>
<td>2011 Plan Developed</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Measure fleet official mpg. Create procedure to balance mpg, space, utility needs for vehicles. Purchase higher mpg vehicles.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting Resources</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Development, Area Operations</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Measure fleet official mpg. Create procedure to balance mpg, space, utility needs for vehicles. Purchase higher mpg vehicles.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Supplies and</strong></td>
<td>Management Service</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Excess office furniture stored at Woodside Gym and Burnt Mills.</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture**</td>
<td>Area and Facility Operations</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Excess office furniture offered to other Departmental ops electronically</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing and Copying</strong></td>
<td>Management Service</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Parkside paper now meets requirements.</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Procurement</strong></td>
<td>Management Service</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Develop green procurement policy and ensure it is being utilized.</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing, Admin Services</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Develop green procurement policy and ensure it is being utilized.</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve 90% recycle rate of mandated materials</td>
<td>Facilities Management, Recycling Committee and Consultant</td>
<td>Annual County Department of Environmental Planning Report</td>
<td>53% current to meet County Goal 50%</td>
<td>Achieve 70% mandated recycling by 2015. Achieve 50% mandated recycling by 2020.</td>
<td>County requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area Ops, NHRD, Maintenance &amp; Development</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement recycling for oil, batteries, asphalt, tires, furniture, computers, electronics, construction debris</td>
<td>Facilities Management, Recycling Committee and Consultant</td>
<td>Annual County Department of Environmental Planning Report</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Implement tracking system for non-mandated recyclables.</td>
<td>County requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Development, Area Operations</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>HFEE, Facilities Management and Recycling Committee</td>
<td>Annual County Department of Environmental Planning Report</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Percent of yard/tree waste composted.</td>
<td>County requirement (MC only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Development, Area Operations</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based education to promote recycling</td>
<td>Facilities Management, Recycling Committee and Consultant</td>
<td>Part of Recycling Program</td>
<td>Pilot Testing</td>
<td>Develop signage and recycling outreach in parks</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Responsibility Area</td>
<td>Part of Recycling Program</td>
<td>Progress Status</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td>Required Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Building (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design-LEED)</td>
<td>NHRD, PAMD, Area Operations</td>
<td>PDD</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>All buildings are required to be certified to be LEED Silver.</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Site Work (SITES)</td>
<td>PDD, HFEE, Regions</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Set goal for % of park development projects certified through Sustainable Sites Initiative.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Planning &amp; Development, Maintenance &amp; Development</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td></td>
<td>All buildings are required to be certified to be LEED Silver.</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Planning &amp; Development, Maintenance &amp; Development, Area Ops</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Management</td>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Establish Natural Resource Management Plan</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management Plan in place.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Management (Non-Native Invasive Plant Management Program)</td>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Countywide Natural Resource Management Plan in place.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHRD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| Natural Resources Management (Deer Management Program) | PPS | Hold managed hunts and sharpshooting to reduce deer populations, manure runoff to waterways and to increase forest vegetation and improve stream buffers. | Montgomery Park deer management program harvested 1,042 deer from 23 park units. | TBD | TBD |
| Natural Resources Management (NPDES) | PPS, PDD, NP, SP, HFEE | Underway | Underway | Meet regulatory requirements to work for improved water quality in park watersheds. | State and Federal requirement |
| (Handled by PGC DOE and DPWT) | N/A | N/A | Meet regulatory requirements to work for improved water quality in park watersheds. | State and Federal requirement |
| Community Planning and Development | PPS, Planning Dept. | Underway | Underway | TBD | State and Federal requirement |
| Park Planning &amp; Development, Planning Dept. | Underway | Underway | Formula 2040, Plan 2035 | State and Federal requirement |
| Health and Wellness | Health and Wellness Committee, Management Services | TBD | TBD | TBD | Required to Meet Practice |
| SHWD Health and Wellness Section | TBD | TBD | Passport to Wellness | Required to Meet Practice |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Education and Training on Sustainability Goals (Sustainability Rollout)</th>
<th>Sustainability Coordinating Committee</th>
<th>Underway</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Hold three sustainability rollout meetings in August 2013</th>
<th>Required to Meet Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Coordinating Committee, HR</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Training program being developed</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Education and Training on Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>PPS/ HFEE</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Provide sustainability training to all employees each year.</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Coordinating Committee, HR</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>Training program being developed</td>
<td>Required to Meet Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use sustainable trail standards</td>
<td>Natural Surface Trails</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>In use in 2005.</td>
<td>Montgomery Parks has established sustainable trail standards modeled after International Mountain Bike Association and National Park Service guidelines.</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Trails Master Plan currently being developed</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committees & Work Groups:

M-NCPPC Agency-Wide Sustainability Committee: The Committee will meet to serve as Agency-wide point of contact and clearinghouse for all sustainability-related issues for the M-NCPPC. The Department Directors and Division Managers will designate one or more employees to act as the departmental Sustainability Coordinator(s) and serve as the representative(s) to the agency-wide Sustainability Committee. The committee tasks are:

- Share ideas for implementation of sustainability goals throughout the agency and on a departmental level.
- Promote sustainability awareness within M-NCPPC and the region.
- Assist in preparing the departmental Sustainability Plan that meets, at a minimum, the sustainability goals and objectives set forth in this Practice.
- Communicate goals outlined in the departmental Sustainability Plan to all operations/facilities and provide support for implementation of the Plan.

Montgomery County Committee Members:

- Ellen Bennett, Advancement Programs Manager, Brookside Gardens, HFEE Division, Montgomery County Parks
- Geoffrey Mason, Principal Natural Resources Specialist, Park Planning and Stewardship Division, Montgomery County Parks
- Christine McGrew, Acting Principal Administrative Specialist, Management, and Technology Services, Montgomery County Planning

Prince George’s County Committee Members:

- Anthony Nolan, Chief, Natural and Historical Resources Division, Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation
- Michael Zamore, Planner Coordinator, Community Planning Division, Prince George’s Planning Department

Central Administrative Services Committee Member:

- Lisa Dupree, Senior Management Analyst (Policy), Corporate Policy and Management Operations
**Sustainability Coordinating Committees:** The Coordinating Committee will meet to serve as each County’s liaison to the Agency-Wide Sustainability Committee and as the point of contact and clearinghouse for County sustainability-related issues. The Coordinating Committee will support and advance environmental performance, economic prosperity, and social equality through a variety of initiatives. The staff assigned to support the Coordinating Committee will facilitate the development and implementation of practices, policies, procedures, and plans.

The Coordinating Committee tasks include:

- Educating and motivating the workplace and the communities served about sustainability.
- Coordinate the compilation of the County [Departmental Sustainability Plan Assessment Report](#) for management review, comment, and approval of the documents to be presented to the Commission Executive Committee to outline initiatives for the upcoming year.
- Coordinate the compilation of the County [Biennial Sustainability Plan](#) and plans for the program accomplishments and recommendations to the Commission Executive Committee to outline initiatives for the upcoming two-year period. (The Biennial Sustainability Plan will be reviewed and presented every two years).
- Oversee the development of sustainability practices, policies, procedures, and plans.
- Development of or use of existing metrics to evaluate sustainability efforts.
- Measuring and reporting on sustainability efforts.
- Fostering collaboration between the County and external resources.
- Coordinating efforts to meet the policy goals of the [M-NCPPC Sustainability Standards](#) which went into effect November 19, 2012.

The bi-county offices (or Central Administrative Services) are located at 6611 Kenilworth Avenue, Riverdale Maryland. This building houses three departments (Department of Human Resources and Management, Department of Finance and the Legal Department). It also houses bi-county operations of the Office of Internal Audit, the Office of the Chief Information Office and the Merit System Board.

The Corporate Policy and Management Operations Division lead the development of the M-NCPPC Sustainability Policy with input from departments and adoption by the Commission

**Central Administrative Services Coordinating Committee Member:**

- Lisa Dupree, Senior Management Analyst (Policy), Corporate Policy and Management Operations

**Montgomery County Coordinating Committee Members:**

- Ellen Bennett, Advancement Programs Manager, Brookside Gardens, HFEE Division, Montgomery County Parks
- Geoffrey Mason, Principal Natural Resources Specialist, Park Planning and Stewardship Division, Montgomery County Parks
- Christine McGrew, Acting Principal Administrative Specialist, Management, and Technology Services, Montgomery County Planning
- John Nissel, Deputy Director of Operations, Montgomery County Parks
• Jim Poore, Chief, Facilities Management Division, Montgomery County Parks
• Arnold Ramsammy, Assistant Chief- Utilities, Facilities Management Division, Montgomery County Parks
• Richard Anderson, Principal, CQI Associates

Prince George’s County Coordinating Committee Members:

• Anthony Nolan, Chief, Special Programs Division
• Kyle Lowe, Acting Chief, Natural and Historical Resources Division
• Jon Seils, Assistant Division Chief, Maintenance and Development Division
• Nancy Steen, Acting Budget Manager, Administrative Services
• Joe Bearn, Fleet Manager, Maintenance and Development Division

Sustainability Work Groups: The work groups will be comprised of staff “content experts” who have direct management and program responsibilities for the designated sustainability plan implementation requirements and tasks. The workgroups will be responsible for development of the sustainability standards policies, procedures, and implementation plans for the designated areas.

Each workgroup will conduct an assessment of current management and operating practices. The assessment will:

1. Identify practices, policies, procedures, and implementation plans which meet the proposed M-NCPDC Sustainability Standards.

2. Identify practices, policies, procedures, and implementation plans which need improvement to meet the proposed M-NCPDC Sustainability Standards.

3. Identify tasks and work plans to be completed to improve the practices, policies, procedures, and implementation plans to meet the proposed M-NCPDC Sustainability Standards.

4. Develop a report on the workgroup assigned area of responsibility for inclusion in the practices, policies, procedures, and implementation plans to be submitted in the Departmental Sustainability Work Plan Report to be presented to the Executive Committee to outline initiatives for the upcoming year.

Department Directors and Division Managers:

Shall meet quarterly as part of the ongoing Quarterly Energy and Recycling Advisory Meeting to review the status of the sustainability, energy management, water conservation, recycling, and solid waste management programs.

Expand the scope of the advisory meetings to include the implementation of the M-NCPDC Sustainability Standards to include:
• Ensure compliance with this policy. Review, comment, and approve of the M-NCPPC Montgomery County Departmental Sustainability Plan Assessment that shall be presented to the Executive Committee to outline initiatives for the upcoming year.

• Following the first year of implementation of the Plan, Department Directors shall seek reports from the Coordinating Committee, Workgroups, employees and patrons on the status of achieving sustainability goals and objectives outlined in this Practice and in the Departmental Sustainability Plan.

• Review, comment, and approve of the Departmental Biennial Sustainability Plan that shall be presented to the Executive Committee to outline initiatives for the upcoming two-year period. The Sustainability Plan shall be reviewed and presented every two years.

Sustainability Central

Staff and User Involvement Communications

http://www.montgomeryplanningboard.org/sustainability/

Based on input from the participants at the training session a website portal was developed to foster communication with the staff.

The site is in development with the key data available as a resource for the staff

• Sustainability Practice 6-40
• Celebrating Sustainability PowerPoint
• Montgomery Departments Sustainability Coordinating Committee
  o Committee Contacts
  o Content Workgroup Teams
  o Work Group Descriptions

Sustainability Resources

• My Green Montgomery (Montgomery County)
• Your Guide to Green Living (Montgomery County)
• Policies for Shareable Cities
• World watch State of the World: Transforming Cultures
• World watch State of the World: Is Sustainability Still Possible?
• Guide to Going Local
• Guide to Sharing
### Employee Performance Evaluations Not Completed by Due Date

**By Department as of April 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>03/15</th>
<th>04/15</th>
<th>03/15</th>
<th>04/15</th>
<th>03/15</th>
<th>04/15</th>
<th>03/15</th>
<th>04/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman, Montgomery County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman, Prince George's County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of CIO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee/Chairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Human Resources &amp; Mgt.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Total by Days Late</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commission Wide Total:** 10 11

*Departments with ratings more than 60 days late have been contacted.*
May 6, 2015

TO: Commissioners

VIA: Patricia C. Barney, Executive Director

FROM: Joseph C. Zimmerman, Secretary/Treasurer

SUBJECT: MFD Purchasing Statistics—Third Quarter FY15

The Commission’s procurement policy (Practice 4-10, Purchasing) includes an anti-discrimination component which assures that fair and equitable vendor opportunities are made available to minority, female or disabled owned firms (MFDs). This program is administered jointly by the Office of the Executive Director and the Purchasing Division and includes a price preference program and an MFD subcontracting component based on the Commission procurement practices and the available MFD vendors in the marketplace. The price preference program has been suspended until a MFD study is conducted to provide evidence that the price preference is/is not needed. This report is provided for your information and may be found on the Commission’s intranet.

Some of the observations of this FY15 report include:

- Attachment A indicates that through the third quarter of FY15, the Commission procured approximately $92.9 million in goods, professional services, construction and miscellaneous services. Approximately 27.2% or $25.3 million was spent with minority, female and disabled (MFD) owned firms.

- Attachment B indicates that in the third quarter MFD utilization was 21.1%.

- Attachment C represents the MFD participation by type of procurement. The MFD participation for construction through the third quarter of FY15 was 39.3%. Attachment C also indicates that the largest consumers of goods and services in the Commission are the Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation and the Montgomery County Department of Parks. These programs significantly impact the Commission’s utilization of MFD firms. The MFD cumulative utilization numbers for these departments through the third quarter are 18.4% and 38.8%, respectively.

- Attachment D presents the FY15 activity for the Purchase Card program totaling approximately $9.0 million of which 2.2% was spent with minority, female and disabled (MFD) firms. The amount of procurement card activity represents approximately 9.7% of the Commission’s total procurement dollars. One reason for lower MFD participation on the purchase card is that the cards are used with national retail corporations when a
quick purchase for a maintenance job is needed. The purchase cards are also used for training registration in order to guarantee attendance.

- Attachment E portrays the historic MFD participation rates, and the total procurement from FY 1991 to third quarter FY15.

- Attachments F and G show the MFD participation in procurements at various bid levels to determine if MFD vendors are successful in obtaining opportunities in procurements that require informal bidding and formal bidding. Based on the department analysis, MFD vendors do appear to be participating, at an overall rate of 17.4% in informal (under $30,000) and 31.4% in the formal (over $30,000) procurements. In the newest delegation for transactions under $10k, MFD participation is 14.2%. MFD vendors are participating at an overall rate of 34.2% in transactions over $250,000.

- Attachment H presents the total amount of procurements and the number of vendors by location. Of the $92.9 million in total procurement, approximately $59.0 million was procured from Maryland vendors. Of the $25.3 million in procurement from MFD vendors, $20.2 million was procured from MFD vendors located in Maryland.

- Attachment I compares the utilization of MFD vendors by the Commission with the availability of MFD vendors. The results show under-utilization in the following categories: Asian, Native American and Females. The amount and percentage of procurement from MFD vendors is broken out by categories as defined by the Commission’s Anti-Discrimination Policy. The availability percentages are taken from the most recent State of Maryland disparity study dated July 5, 2013.

- Attachments J and K are prepared by the Department of Human Resources and Management and show the amount and number of waivers of the procurement policy by department and by reason for waiver. Total waivers were approximately 1.5% of total procurement.

For further information on the MFD report, please contact the Office of Executive Director at (301) 454-1740.

Attachments
### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Procurement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Waivers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Procurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>MFD $</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince George's County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners' Office</td>
<td>$ 150,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 38,182</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>1,420,309</td>
<td>24,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>418,327</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>49,385,347</td>
<td>717,084</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9,064,404</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,955,876</td>
<td>742,083</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9,520,913</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montgomery County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners' Office</td>
<td>42,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,440</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>1,217,103</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144,338</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>39,285,570</td>
<td>88,746</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,234,716</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40,545,559</td>
<td>136,746</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15,401,494</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Human Resources and Mgt.</td>
<td>513,552</td>
<td>267,080</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>146,531</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td>763,268</td>
<td>117,726</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>185,994</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Department</td>
<td>96,732</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27,187</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Board</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>14,159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Internal Auditor</td>
<td>16,698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,405,681</td>
<td>514,806</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>362,841</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$ 92,907,116</td>
<td>$ 1,393,635</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$ 25,285,248</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The "Waivers" columns report the amount and number of purchases approved to be exempt from the competitive procurement process, including sole source procurements.

Prepared by Finance Department
April 16, 2015
## CUMULATIVE BY QUARTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>September</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince George’s County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners’ Office</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montgomery County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners’ Office</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Human Resources and Mgt.</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Department</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Board</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Internal Auditor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ACTIVITY BY QUARTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Quarter</th>
<th>Second Quarter</th>
<th>Third Quarter</th>
<th>Fourth Quarter</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince George’s County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners’ Office</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montgomery County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners’ Office</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Human Resources and Mgt.</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Department</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Board</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Internal Auditor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

**MFD PROCUREMENT STATISTICS**

**BY MAJOR PROCUREMENT CATEGORY**

**FY 2015**

**FOR NINE MONTHS ENDED MARCH 31, 2015**

### ATTACHMENT C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>$26,173,069</td>
<td>$187,702</td>
<td>$10,416,074</td>
<td>$14,841,374</td>
<td>$317,428</td>
<td>$117,580</td>
<td>$8,114</td>
<td>$264,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFDS</td>
<td>$2,337,027</td>
<td>$23,085</td>
<td>$663,890</td>
<td>$1,350,172</td>
<td>$60,338</td>
<td>$64,514</td>
<td>$7,187</td>
<td>$168,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Miscellaneous Services: | | | | | | | | |
| Total $ | $10,532,832 | $678,039            | $2,477,345                     | $5,828,792                  | $794,167        | $263,097                    | $66,155         | $427,247          |
| MFDS    | $2,079,524  | $89,875             | $592,687                       | $1,277,659                  | $68,690         | $49,826                     | $0              | $887              |
| Percentage | 19.7%       | 13.3%               | 23.9%                          | 21.9%                      | 8.6%            | 18.9%                       | 0.0%            | 0.2%              |

| Professional Services: | | | | | | | | |
| Total $ | $5,395,209  | $286,389            | $2,325,458                     | $2,309,091                  | $303,854        | $99,171                     | $22,463         | $48,783           |
| MFDS    | $942,501    | $20,580             | $177,500                       | $411,499                    | $289,299        | $0                          | $20,000         | $14,623           |
| Percentage | 17.5%       | 10.3%               | 7.6%                           | 17.8%                      | 95.2%           | 0.0%                        | 89.0%           | 30.0%             |

| Construction: | | | | | | | | |
| Total $ | $50,580,771 | $66,973             | $24,066,693                    | $26,406,090                 | $4,860          | $33,714                     | $0              | $2,441            |
| MFDS    | $19,862,445 | $1,800              | $13,809,839                    | $6,025,174                  | $0              | $32,191                     | $0              | $2,441            |
| Percentage | 39.3%       | 2.7%                | 57.3%                          | 22.6%                      | 0.0%            | 95.5%                       | 0.0%            | 100.0%            |

| SUBTOTAL | | | | | | | | |
| Total $ | $92,881,881 | $1,217,103           | $39,285,570                    | $49,385,347                 | $1,420,309      | $513,552                    | $96,732         | $763,298          |
| MFDS    | $26,221,497 | $144,338             | $15,234,716                    | $9,064,404                  | $418,327        | $146,651                    | $27,187         | $185,994          |
| Percentage | 27.2%       | 11.2%                | 36.6%                          | 18.4%                      | 29.5%           | 26.5%                       | 28.1%           | 24.4%             |

| Pr. Geo. Commissioners' Office | | | | | | | | |
| Total $ | $150,220 | $38,182             | | | | | | |
| MFDS    | $38,182  | | | | | | |
| Percentage | 25.4%       | | | | | | |

| Mont. Commissioners' Office | | | | | | | | |
| Total $ | $42,886 | | | | | | |
| MFDS    | $22,440  | | | | | | |
| Percentage | 52.3%       | | | | | | |

| Merit Board | | | | | | | | |
| Total $ | $1,272 | | | | | | |
| MFDS    | $0      | | | | | | |
| Percentage | 0.0%       | | | | | | |

| Office of Chief Information Officer | | | | | | | | |
| Total $ | $14,159 | | | | | | |
| MFDS    | $206    | | | | | | |
| Percentage | 1.5%       | | | | | | |

| Office of Internal Auditor | | | | | | | | |
| Total $ | $16,698 | | | | | | |
| MFDS    | $2,923  | | | | | | |
| Percentage | 17.5%       | | | | | | |

| GRAND TOTAL $ | $92,907,116 | | | | | | |
| MFDS    | $25,295,248 | | | | | | |
| Percentage | 27.2%       | | | | | | |
### Attachment D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Procurement</th>
<th>Purchase Card Procurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total $</td>
<td>MFD %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince George's County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners' Office</td>
<td>$ 150,220</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>1,420,309</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>49,385,347</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50,955,876</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montgomery County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners' Office</td>
<td>42,886</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>1,217,103</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>39,285,570</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40,545,559</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Human Resources and Mgt.</td>
<td>513,552</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td>763,268</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Department</td>
<td>96,732</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Board</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>14,159</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Internal Auditor</td>
<td>16,698</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,405,681</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 92,907,116</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of Purchase Card Procurement to Total Procurement**: 9.7%

Prepared by Finance Department
April 16, 2015
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
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The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
MFD Procurement Statistics - Transactions Under /Over $250,000 and Total %
FY 2015 3Q

- Under $250K
- Over $250K
- Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percentage - MFD Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pr. Geo. Planning</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr. Geo Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont. Planning</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont. Parks</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHRM</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## TOTAL of ALL VENDORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Procurement</th>
<th>Number of Vendors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>$15,297,182</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County</td>
<td>18,120,642</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>33,417,824</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland - other locations</td>
<td>25,444,944</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Maryland</td>
<td>58,862,768</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1,722,247</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>12,918,731</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Locations</td>
<td>19,403,370</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,907,116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL of Non-MFD Vendors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Procurement</th>
<th>Number of Vendors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>$8,709,575</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County</td>
<td>6,624,552</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>15,334,127</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland - other locations</td>
<td>23,313,701</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Maryland</td>
<td>38,647,828</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>757,701</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>9,627,579</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Locations</td>
<td>18,588,760</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$67,621,868</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL of MFD Vendors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Procurement</th>
<th>Number of Vendors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>$6,587,607</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County</td>
<td>11,496,090</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>18,083,697</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland - other locations</td>
<td>2,131,243</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Maryland</td>
<td>20,214,940</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>964,546</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3,291,152</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Locations</td>
<td>814,610</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,285,248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The following shows the amounts and percentages of procurement by the location of the department. The bi-county departments' activity is divided equally between the two Counties.

### Total Procurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County</td>
<td>$51,658,716</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>41,248,400</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,907,116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MFD Procurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County</td>
<td>$9,702,334</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>15,582,914</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,285,248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Total Amount of Procurement $ 92,907,116

Amount, Percentage of Procurement by Category, and Percentage of Availability by Category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Owned Firms</th>
<th>Procurement</th>
<th>Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>$11,083,044</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3,848,439</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3,948,431</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>173,614</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Minority Owned Firms</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,053,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Owned Firms</td>
<td>6,199,664</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Owned Firms</td>
<td>32,056</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Minority, Female, and Disabled Owned Firms</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,285,248</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) Availability percentages are taken from State of Maryland study titled "Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Disparity Study: Volume 1," dated July 5, 2013, table 2.23 on page 84.
(2) n/a = not available
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REASONS FOR WAIVERS
CUMULATIVE DOLLAR AMOUNT & NUMBER OF WAIVERS
FY 2015
FOR NINE MONTHS ENDED MARCH 31, 2015

Attachment J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$634,504</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$643,095</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Source: 4-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Source: 4-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Source: 4-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$56,036</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$1,393,635</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERCENTAGE OF WAIVERS BY REASON**

Waiver Reason Definitions:

**Emergency:**
Sudden and unforeseeable circumstance have arisen which actually or imminently threaten the continuance of an essential operation of the Commission or which threaten public health, welfare or safety such that there is not enough time to conduct the competitive bidding.

**Required by Law or Grant:**
Public law or the terms of a donation/grant require that the above noted vendor be chosen.

**Amendment:**
A contract is already in place and it is appropriate for the above noted vendor to provide additional services and/or goods not within the original scope of the contract because the interested service and/or goods are uniquely compatible with the Commission's existing systems and patently superior in quality and/or capability than what can be gained through an open bidding process.

**Sole Source 4:**
It has been determined that:

#1: The vendor's knowledge and experience with the Commission's existing equipment and/or systems offer a greater advantage in quality and/or cost to the Commission than the cost savings possible through competitive bidding, or

#2: The interested services or goods need to remain confidential to protect the Commission's security, court proceedings and/or contractual commitments, or

#3: The services or goods have no comparable and the above noted vendor is the only distributor for the interested manufacturer or there is otherwise only one source available for the sought after services or goods, e.g. software maintenance, copyrighted materials, or otherwise legally protected goods or services.
# The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

## Total Waivers, MFD Waivers, and Sole Source Waivers by Department

**Processed FY 2015**

**For the nine months ended March 31, 2015**

---

### Attachment K

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Waivers</th>
<th>MFD Waivers</th>
<th>% of MFD</th>
<th>Sole Source 4-1 Waivers</th>
<th>Sole Source 4-2 Waivers</th>
<th>Sole Source 4-3 Waivers</th>
<th>% Sole Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince George's County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners' Office</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>24,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>717,084</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66,604</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>742,083</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66,604</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montgomery County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners' Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>88,746</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136,746</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Human Resources and Mgt.</td>
<td>267,080</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td>117,726</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Department</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>514,806</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,393,635</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$ 78,604</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose of Summary of Waiver Report:

1. To monitor the amount, number, reasons for waivers in order to ensure the Commission is encouraging and maintaining good community, public, vendor, and interdepartmental relations;
   - To ensure fair and equitable treatment of all persons who deal in purchasing matters; to promote economy in Commission purchasing; and to ensure that minority owned firms receive a fair share of Commission awards (source: Practice 4-10); and

2. To comply with the Prince George's Planning Board directive of January 29, 1991 to report waiver activity to the Department Heads and the Planning Boards on a quarterly basis.

### Sole Source:

- **4:**
  - It has been determined that:
    - 4-1: The vendor's knowledge and experience with the Commission's existing equipment and/or systems offer a greater advantage in quality and/or cost to the Commission than the cost savings possible through competitive bidding, or
    - 4-2: The interested services or goods need to remain confidential to protect the Commission's security, court proceedings and/or contractual commitments, or
    - 4-3: The services or goods have no comparable and the above noted vendor is the only distributor for the interested manufacturer or there is otherwise only one source available for the sought after services or goods, e.g. software maintenance, copyrighted materials, or otherwise legally protected goods or services.

Prepared by Department of Human Resources and Management
April 1, 2015
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
FROM: Adrian R. Gardner
       General Counsel
RE: Litigation Report for the Month of April, 2015

May 6, 2015

Please find the attached litigation report we have prepared for your meeting scheduled on Wednesday, May 20, 2015. As always, please do not hesitate to call me in advance if you would like me to provide a substantive briefing on any of the cases reported.
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### April 2015 Composition of Pending Litigation

(Sorted By Subject Matter and Forum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Matter Category</th>
<th>State Trial Court</th>
<th>Federal Trial Court</th>
<th>Maryland COSA</th>
<th>Maryland Court of Appeals</th>
<th>Federal Appeals Court</th>
<th>U.S. Supreme Court</th>
<th>Subject Matter Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Appeal: Land Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Appeal: Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Dispute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tort Claims</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Dispute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Dispute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Dispute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Compensation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Forum Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![OVERVIEW OF PENDING LITIGATION](image)

OVERVIEW OF PENDING LITIGATION

- **TORT CLAIMS** 30%
- **Workers Comp** 19%
- **LAND USE** 20%
- **EMPLOYMENT** 10%
- **OTHER** 21%

By Major Case Categories
# April 2015 Litigation Activity Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count for Month</th>
<th>Count for Fiscal Year 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pending Last Month</td>
<td>New Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Appeal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use (AALU)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Appeal:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (AAO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Disputes (LD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tort Claims (T)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Disputes (ED)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Disputes (CD)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Disputes (PD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Enforcement (CE)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Compensation (WC)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Collection (D)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy (B)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (M)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# INDEX OF YTD NEW CASES

(7/1/2014 TO 6/30/15)

## A. New Trial Court Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glessner v. Commission</td>
<td>PGParks</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones v. Commission</td>
<td>PGParks</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins v. Commission</td>
<td>PGParks</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Entertainment v. Commission</td>
<td>PGParks</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission v. Paniagua</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission v. Pirtle</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County v. Darnell</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson v. Commission (D.Ct)</td>
<td>MCParks</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuckman-Barbee v. Commission</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson v. Commission (C.Ct)</td>
<td>MCParks</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick v. Commission</td>
<td>PGPR</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick v. Gather</td>
<td>PGPR</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsetti-Barczy v. Commission</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Jackson v. Commission</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Jackson v. Commission</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard v. Commission</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong v. Commission</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnette v. Commission</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill v. Commission</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Croom Civic Assoc. v. Commission</td>
<td>PGPB</td>
<td>AALU</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jang v. Commission</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell v. Commission</td>
<td>PGPR</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell v. Commission</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Myers Construction Corp v. Commission</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## B. New Appellate Court Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Hills Citizens Assoc. v. Commission</td>
<td>MCPPB</td>
<td>AALU</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaviani v. Montgomery County Planning Board</td>
<td>MCPB</td>
<td>AALU</td>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Myer Construction Corp. v. Commission</td>
<td>MCParks</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX OF YTD RESOLVED CASES
(7/1/2014 TO 6/30/15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Trial Court Cases Resolved</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission v. Sweeney</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission v. Ferman</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission v. Rivera</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundi v. Soresi</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaviani v. Montgomery County Planning Board</td>
<td>MCPB</td>
<td>AALU</td>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler v. Commission</td>
<td>PGPR</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson v. Commission (D. Ct.)</td>
<td>MCParks</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell v. Commission</td>
<td>PGPR</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litrenta v. Commission</td>
<td>PGPR</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall v. Commission</td>
<td>PGPB</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix v. Commission</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County, Md. vs Darnell</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Tort</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munoz-Saucedo v. Commission</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munoz-Saucedo v. Commission</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Myer Construction Corp. v. Commission</td>
<td>MCParks</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivera v. Commission</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Appellate Court Cases Resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slover et al. v. Montgomery County Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Hills Citizens Assoc. v. Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arking, et al v. MCPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Myers Construction Corp v. Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernado Rene Flores v. Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClure v. Montgomery County Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahady v. Montgomery County Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Hills Citizens Assoc v. Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disposition of FY15 Closed Cases Sorted By Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL CAUSE OF ACTION IN DISPUTE</th>
<th>DISPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees Retirement System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Human Resources and Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Department of Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaviani v. Montgomery County Planning Board</td>
<td>Petition for judicial review of Montgomery County Planning Board's enforcement order in MCPB No. 13-118, regarding Citation number EPD000007.</td>
<td>Order of Court affirming Planning Board Decision on 08/25/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slover et al. v. Montgomery County Planning Board</td>
<td>Petition for Judicial review of the Planning Board decision to approve two-lot subdivision located at 9490 River Road in Potomac filed by project opponents.</td>
<td>Order of Court of Special Appeals affirming Judgment on 06/20/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Department of Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beatty v. Montgomery County, et al.</strong></td>
<td>Claimant is suing for tort arising from slip and fall.</td>
<td>Order by Court of Special Appeals affirming Judgment on 06/4/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission v. Fermin</strong></td>
<td>WCC awarded 15% permanent partial disability under &quot;other cases&quot; and Commission appealed. 383591-V</td>
<td>Case Settled and Dismissed on 04/11/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission v. Kernan, et al</strong></td>
<td>Claim for breach of rental contract, seeking possession of property</td>
<td>Case dismissed on 11/03/14, tenant vacated property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Myer Construction Corp v. Commission</strong></td>
<td>Third party defendant noted appeal from Court's ruling in Commission's favor that URS owed the Commission duty to defend litigation.</td>
<td>Court of Special Appeals dismissed appeal on 09/25/14 with leave to file notice of appeal from a final judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Myer Construction Corp. v. Commission</strong></td>
<td>Plaintiff filed complaint for alleged delays and damages associated with the erection of a steel girder pedestrian bridge in Montgomery County. Commission filed third party complaint for alleged breach of contract seeking contribution and indemnity, and defense from URS Corporation</td>
<td>Fort Myer's case dismissed without prejudice on 03/31/14 and Court granted Motion for Sanctions and awarded Commission's Attorney's Fees and Costs against Fort Myer Construction in the amount of $376,597.68 on 04/28/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jackson v. Commission</strong></td>
<td>Defense of tort claim for claimed slip and fall alleged broken sidewalk at Jessup Blair Park in Silver Spring, Maryland.</td>
<td>Jury trial prayed; case forwarded to Circuit Court on 11/06/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munoz-Saucedo v. Commission</strong></td>
<td>WCC found claimant sustained 5% permanent partial disability under &quot;other cases&quot; and claimant appealed. (388096-V)</td>
<td>Case dismissed by Court on 02/03/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munoz-Saucedo v. Commission</strong></td>
<td>WCC found claimant sustained 5% permanent partial disability to first (index) finger on left hand and claimant appealed.</td>
<td>Case dismissed by Court on 02/03/15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Montgomery County Park Police |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montgomery County Planning Board</th>
<th>Petition for writ of certiorari seeking review of Court of Special Appeals order affirming Planning Board re-subdivision approval.</th>
<th>Petition for Writ of Certiorari denied on 04/21/14.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McClure v. Montgomery County Planning Board</td>
<td>Appeal filed from the Circuit Court ruling in the case of 21611 Ripplemead Drive; rejecting property owner's claim that lot not covered by conservation easement.</td>
<td>Judgment of the Circuit Court for Montgomery County affirmed on 12/02/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahady v. Montgomery County Planning Board</td>
<td>Appeal filed in the Circuit Court ruling in the case of 21611 Ripplemead Drive wherein Court rejected property owner's claim that his lot is not covered by a valid conservation easement</td>
<td>Judgment of the Circuit Court for Montgomery County affirmed on 02/09/15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation</th>
<th>Defense of claims seeking damages for injuries sustained at the Sports &amp; Learning Complex.</th>
<th>Case settled and dismissed on 10/02/14.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bundi v. Soresi</td>
<td>Commission is appealing the WCC's decision regarding permanency award</td>
<td>Case dismissed on 06/25/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission v. Sweeney</td>
<td>Defense of claim for property damage to a motor vehicle involving a vehicle allegedly operated by Commission employee</td>
<td>Complaint dismissed under Rule 3-506 on 11/25/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litrenta v. Commission</td>
<td>Defense of tort claim for personal injuries allegedly sustained when the plaintiff was the passenger on a Commission golf cart and fell out while his acquaintance was driving. The driver is also named as a defendant.</td>
<td>Case settled and dismissed on 10/08/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s County v. Darnell</td>
<td>Defense of claim for personal injury and property damages to motor vehicle involving a vehicle operated by Commission employee.</td>
<td>Judgment entered in favor of Commission employee on 01/14/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reijerson v. Commission</td>
<td>WCC found claimant sustained 10% permanent partial disability under “other cases” and claimant appealed</td>
<td>Case remanded to WCC on 09/25/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White v. Commission</td>
<td>WCC ordered certain surgery not causally related to accident injury and claimant appealed</td>
<td>Case remanded to WCC on 09/24/14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prince George’s County Planning Department

### Prince George’s County Planning Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Canavan, et al v. Commission</td>
<td>Petition for writ of certiorari seeking review of Court of Special Appeals order affirming Prince George’s County Circuit Court decision on 02/19/13 to uphold the Planning Board’s approval of Saddle Creek’s preliminary Plan of Subdivision.</td>
<td>Petition for Writ of Certiorari denied on 07/21/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Court/Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince George's Park Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler v. Commission</td>
<td>Defense of claim seeking damages for injuries sustained in an accident with a vehicle driven by a Park Police officer</td>
<td>Case settled and dismissed on 08/22/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivera v. Commission</td>
<td>Claimant/employee is appealing the WCC's decision regarding permanency award.</td>
<td>Consent Order to remand to Workers Compensation; case dismissed on 03/26/15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISTRICT COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND

Quick v. Commission
Case No. 0502-0023986-2014 (Tort)

Lead Counsel: Harvin
Other Counsel: 


Status: Pending Trial

Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/06/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/14</td>
<td>Service via certified mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25/14</td>
<td>Notice of Intention to Defend filed by Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/15</td>
<td>Court to reschedule case for trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>Amended Complaint filed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quick v. Gathers
No. 0502-0026963-2014 (Tort)

Lead Counsel: Harvin
Other Counsel: 


Status: Pending Trial

Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/10/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/14</td>
<td>Service via Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/15</td>
<td>Court to reschedule case for trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jang v. Commission, et al
Case No. 060100054592015 (Tort)

Lead Counsel: Aleman
Other Counsel:
Abstract: Defense of claim for personal injury and property damages to motor vehicle involving a vehicle allegedly operated by Commission employee.
Status: Pending trial.
Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/03/15</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Trial date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jones v. Kellogg, et al
Case No. 06010017422014 (Tort)

Lead Counsel: Harvin
Other Counsel:
Abstract: Defense of claim for personal injury and property damages to motor vehicle involving a vehicle allegedly operated by Commission employee.
Status: Pending trial.
Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/14/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/14</td>
<td>Notice of Intention to Defend filed by Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/15</td>
<td>Notice of Dismissal under Rule 3-506 (b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIRCUIT COURT FOR CHARLES COUNTY, MARYLAND

Burnette v. Commission  
08-C-15-000434 AA (WC)  
(W050308)

Lead Counsel: Chagrin  
Other Counsel:  

Abstract: Claimant/employee is appealing the WCC’s decision regarding permanent partial disability benefits.  

Status: Petition filed.  

Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/24/15</td>
<td>Petition filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/17/15</td>
<td>Joint Motion to Transfer Venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/15</td>
<td>Order granting Motion to Transfer to Circuit Court for Prince George’s County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIRCUIT COURT FOR HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND

Corsetti-Barczy v. Commission
13-C-15-102403 (WC)

Lead Counsel: Chagrin
Other Counsel:

Abstract: Claimant/employee is appealing the WCC’s permanency award.

Status: Petition filed.

Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/11/15</td>
<td>Petition filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/03/15</td>
<td>Settlement Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIRCUIT COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND

Anderson v. Commission
Case No. CAL14-07980 (T)

Lead Counsel: Harvin
Other Counsel: Dickerson

Abstract: Defense of claim seeking damages for injuries to a minor sustained in an altercation while attending Rollingcrest/Chillum Community Center Park.

Status: In discovery.

Docket:
- 04/07/14 Complaint filed
- 05/30/14 Motion to Dismiss filed by Commission
- 08/06/14 Motion to Dismiss denied.
- 01/27/15 Pretrial conference
- 07/21/15 Trial

Armstrong v. Commission
Case No. CAL14-22103 (ED)

Lead Counsel: Aleman
Other Counsel: Dickerson

Abstract: Defense of claim seeking damages for alleged workplace discrimination and termination.

Status: In discovery.

Docket:
- 08/08/14 Complaint filed
- 02/25/15 Service on Commission
- 07/10/15 Status Hearing

Commission v. 6509 Rhode Island Realty Corp.
Case No. CAL 13-20939 (PD)

Lead Counsel: Mills
Other Counsel: Johnson, Borden

Abstract: Condemnation initiated by the Commission.

Status: Complaint filed.

Docket:
- 07/19/13 Complaint for condemnation filed
- 10/06/14 Summons reissued for service on Defendant
**Commission v. Fleming**  
CAL 14-15514 (Tort)

**Lead Counsel:** Aleman  
**Other Counsel:** Dickerson

**Abstract:** Commission filed a lawsuit seeking subrogation recovery for amount due for personal injuries sustained by Commission employee.

**Status:** In discovery.

**Docket:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/20/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/14</td>
<td>Defendant served via certified mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/29/14</td>
<td>Defendant filed answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/14</td>
<td>Court accepts Defendant’s letter as answer to complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/15</td>
<td>Pretrial conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/05/15</td>
<td>Trial Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Commission, et al v. The Town of Forest Heights**  
CAL 15-04255 (M)

**Lead Counsel:** Borden  
**Other Counsel:** Mills

**Abstract:** Commission filed lawsuit to stop the unlawful attempt by the Town of Forest Heights, Maryland to expand its geographical boundaries by annexing properties without the required consent of any affected property owner or popular vote.

**Status:** Complaint filed.

**Docket:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/03/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Commission v. MARCOPOLO GF Co.**  
Case No. CAL 13-20940 (PD)

**Lead Counsel:** Mills  
**Other Counsel:** Johnson, Borden

**Abstract:** Condemnation initiated by the Commission.

**Status:** Pending settlement.

**Docket:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/19/13</td>
<td>Complaint for condemnation filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/16/14</td>
<td>Motion for Order of Default filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/29/14</td>
<td>Order of Default entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/23/14</td>
<td>Order of Default granted against MARCOPOLO GF Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/14</td>
<td>Ex Parte Hearing on Damages, settlement reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/14</td>
<td>Continued 60 days pending settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/15</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Friends of Croom Civic Association, et al. v. Commission**  
Case No. CAL-14-32333 (AALU)

Lead Counsel: Mills  
Other Counsel:  

Abstract: Defense against Administrative Appeal of decision by the Planning Board to approve Preliminary Plan 4-11004 in Stephen's Crossing at Brandywine. 

Status: Pending Oral Argument  
Docket:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/26/14</td>
<td>Petition for Judicial Review filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/14</td>
<td>Commission filed Response to Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/14</td>
<td>Commission filed Certificate of Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/14</td>
<td>Commission filed Notice of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/14</td>
<td>Brandywine T/B Southern Regional Coalition filed a Response to Petition for Judicial Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/15</td>
<td>Route 301/Industrial/CPI Limited Partnership filed a Response to Petition for Judicial Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/29/15</td>
<td>Oral Argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Glessner v. Surratt House**  
CAL 14-17158 (T)

Lead Counsel: Harvin  
Other Counsel: Dickerson  

Abstract: Defense of tort claim against a Commission employee and facility based on the alleged slander of authenticity regarding a photograph the plaintiff purports to be of Abraham Lincoln. 

Status: Complaint filed-never served.  
Docket:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/02/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed; no summons issued for service on Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/14</td>
<td>Motion to Enter Judgment filed by Plaintiff, despite lack of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed; Court orders Request for Waiver of fees granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/15</td>
<td>Status hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hawkins v. Commission

**CAL14-17950 (T)**

**Lead Counsel:** Harvin  
**Other Counsel:** Dickerson

**Abstract:** Defense of tort claim for claimed near drowning while taking swimming lessons at Prince George's Sports and Learning Center in Landover, Maryland.

**Status:** In discovery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/30/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/05/14</td>
<td>Answer filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/14</td>
<td>Plaintiff's counsel files Motion to Strike Appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/15</td>
<td>Court grants Motion to Strike Appearance of Plaintiff's Counsel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/15</td>
<td>Pre-trial Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/15</td>
<td>Motion for Sanctions filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/05/15</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hill v. Commission

**CAL15-04057 (ED)**

**Lead Counsel:** Dickerson

**Abstract:** Employee is seeking judicial review of the Merit Board’s dismissal of her appeal.

**Status:** Petition filed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/18/15</td>
<td>Petition for Judicial Review filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/15</td>
<td>Oral Argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Jones v. Commission

**CAL14-17154 (T)**

**Lead Counsel:** Aleman  
**Other Counsel:** Dickerson

**Abstract:** Defense of claim for trip and fall on alleged broken concrete and loose gravel at Tucker Road Community Center.

**Status:** In discovery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/15/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/22/14</td>
<td>Answer filed by Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/20/15</td>
<td>Pretrial conference scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>ADR Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/15</td>
<td>Trial Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Kelly v. Commission**
CAL 14-13688 (T)

Lead Counsel: Harvin  
Other Counsel:  
Abstract: Defense of claim for injuries sustained in alleged slip and fall at Newton White Mansion.  
Status: In discovery.  
Docket:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/12/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed; transferred from District Court, jury trial prayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/14</td>
<td>Answer filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/14</td>
<td>Pre-trial conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/15</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moore v. Perry, et al**
CAL14-22308(Tort)

Lead Counsel: Harvin  
Other Counsel:  
Abstract: Defense of claim for personal injury involving vehicle allegedly operated by Commission employee.  
Status: In discovery.  
Docket:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/18/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/24/15</td>
<td>Pretrial conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/21/15</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Newell v. Commission**
Case No. CAL15-05386 (Tort)

Lead Counsel: Harvin  
Other Counsel:  
Abstract: Defense of claim for trip and fall on alleged wire hanging from the light display at Watkins Regional Park.  
Status: Pending trial.  
Docket:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/11/15</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicholson v. Commission
CAL14-36539 (ED)

Lead Counsel: Chagrin
Other Counsel:

Abstract: Claimant/employee is appealing the DLLR's decision regarding unemployment insurance benefits.

Status: Pending Oral Argument.

Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/22/14</td>
<td>Petition for Judicial Review filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/15</td>
<td>Response to Petition filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/15</td>
<td>Oral Argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pollard v. Commission
CAL15-00392 (WC-B629257)

Lead Counsel: Chagrin
Other Counsel:

Abstract: Claimant/employee is appealing the WCC's decision denying the left hip surgery as causally related to his workers' compensation claim.

Status: Pending Trial.

Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/13</td>
<td>Petition filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/15</td>
<td>Motions Hearing; Motion to Dismiss denied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/15</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Savoy, D. v. Commission
Case No. CAL14-09608 (WC)

Lead Counsel: Chagrin
Other Counsel:

Abstract: WCC found claimant sustained 9% permanent partial disability under "other cases" and claimant appealed.

Status: Pending Trial

Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/29/14</td>
<td>Petition for Judicial Review filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/14</td>
<td>Response to Petition filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/04/14</td>
<td>Pretrial statement and Expert Designation filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/09/14</td>
<td>Pre-trial conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/15</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Savoy, G. v. Commission**  
Case No. CAL14-09719 (WC)

**Lead Counsel:** Chagrin  
**Other Counsel:**

**Abstract:** WCC found claimant sustained 2% permanent partial disability of right hand and claimant appealed.

**Status:** Pending Trial

**Docket:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/02/14</td>
<td>Petition for Judicial Review filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14/14</td>
<td>Response to Petition filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>Expert Witness and Pretrial statement filed by Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/14</td>
<td>Pretrial Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/15</td>
<td>Jury Trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuckman-Barbee Construction Co., Inc. v. Commission**  
Case No. CAL14-28635 (CD)

**Lead Counsel:** Dickerson  
**Other Counsel:** Chagrin

**Abstract:** Alleged breach of contract involving Southern Regional Technology and Recreation Complex in Fort Washington, Maryland.

**Status:** Case settled

**Docket:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/14</td>
<td>Service on Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/14</td>
<td>Motion to Dismiss or in the alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment filed by Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/14</td>
<td>Plaintiff’s Opposition to Commission’s Motion to Dismiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/15</td>
<td>Commission’s Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss or in alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/15</td>
<td>Hearing on Motion to Dismiss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td>Disposition Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/15</td>
<td>Notice of Voluntary Dismissal filed in accordance with Settlement Agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIRCUIT COURT FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

**Bell, et al v. Commission**  
Case No. 401282-V (LD)

Lead Counsel: Aleman  
Other Counsel: Dickerson

Abstract: Plaintiffs filed complaint for Declaratory Judgment to declare invalid a Conservation Easement Agreement

Status: Complaint filed.

Docket:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/23/15</td>
<td>Complaint filed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commission v. Johnson**  
Case No. 366677-V (CE)

Lead Counsel: Aleman  
Other Counsel: Dickerson

Abstract: Commission requesting finding of contempt in case in which the Court already granted the Commission's Petition for Judicial enforcement of Administrative Decision by the Planning Board Concerning Forest Conservation Easement violation.

Status: Further collection action and attempts to seek compliance by foreclosing bank.

Docket:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/22/13</td>
<td>Petition for Issuance of Show Cause Order Filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/16/14</td>
<td>Contempt Hearing held and Judicial Order issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/14</td>
<td>Order-Defendant must respond to Plaintiff's Interrogatories by 2/17/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commission v. Pirtle**  
Case No. 394157-V (CE)

Lead Counsel: Aleman  
Other Counsel: Dickerson

Abstract: Commission filed Petition for Judicial enforcement of Administrative Decision by the Planning Board Concerning Forest Conservation Easement violation.

Status: Pending Motions hearing.

Docket:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/12/14</td>
<td>Petition filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/14</td>
<td>Affidavit of Service on Defendant filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/14</td>
<td>Motion to Dismiss or in the alternative for Summary Judgment filed by Defendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td>Commission’s Opposition to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss filed; and Commission’s Motion to Dismiss Counterclaim filed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fort Myer Construction Corporation v. Commission
Case No. 399804V (CD)

Lead Counsel: MarcusBonsib, LLC (Bruce L. Marcus)
Other Counsel: Dickerson

Abstract: Plaintiff filed complaint for alleged delays and damages associated with the erection of a steel girder pedestrian bridge in Montgomery County.

Status: Complaint filed.
Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/23/15</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/15</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/15</td>
<td>Pre-trial hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>Motion for Appropriate Relief filed by Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/22/16</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Howard Entertainment, Inc. v. Commission
Case No. 393333-V (CD)
(Originally filed in District Court under Case #0602-0009462-2014)

Lead Counsel: Harvin
Other Counsel: Dickerson

Abstract: Plaintiff filed complaint for breach of contract of payment for services for Southern Area Operations Festival of Nations

Status: Case settled in principle.
Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/06/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed in District Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/14/14</td>
<td>Commission filed Intent to Defend and Request for Jury Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td>Bill of Complaint transferred to Circuit: Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/15</td>
<td>Case stayed for 30 days pending settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Jackson v. Commission**  
Case No. 397287-V (Tort)

**Lead Counsel:** Chagrin  
**Other Counsel:**

**Abstract:** Defense of tort claim for claimed slip and fall alleged broken sidewalk at Jessup Blair Park in Silver Spring, Maryland.

**Status:** Complaint filed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/06/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/15</td>
<td>Defendant files Motion to Dismiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/16/15</td>
<td>Hearing on Motion to Dismiss or in the Alternative for Summary Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/15</td>
<td>Status/Pre-trial conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L. Jackson v. Commission**  
Case No. 401201-V (WC)

**Lead Counsel:** Chagrin  
**Other Counsel:**

**Abstract:** Claimant/employee is appealing the WCC’s decision regarding low back exclusion from claim arising from 5/27/14 accidental injury.

**Status:** Pending trial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/18/15</td>
<td>Petition filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Pretrial hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L. Jackson v. Commission**  
Case No. 401202-V (WC)

**Lead Counsel:** Chagrin  
**Other Counsel:**

**Abstract:** Claimant/employee is appealing the WCC’s decision regarding low back not causally related to the accidental injury and denial of medical treatment and other benefits.

**Status:** Pending trial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/18/15</td>
<td>Petition filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Pretrial hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARYLAND COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS

Fort Myer Construction Corporation v. Commission
Commission v. URS Corporation (Third Party claim by Commission)
2015 Term, No. 16 (CD)

Lead Counsel: Marcus Bonsib, LLC (Bruce L. Marcus)
Other Counsel: Dickerson

Abstract: Fort Myer Construction Corporation appeals award of sanctions against it. Commission notes cross appeal, as does URS Corporation.

Status: Appeal filed.
Docket:
03/09/15 Notice of Appeal filed by Plaintiff.
03/19/15 Notice of Appeal filed by Commission
03/20/15 Notice of Appeal filed by URS Corporation

Kaviani v. Montgomery County Planning Board
September Term 2014, No. 01554 (AALU)

Lead Counsel: Dumais
Other Counsel: Lieb

Abstract: Appeal filed from the Circuit Court rule in the case of Montgomery County Planning Board's enforcement order in MCPB No. 13-118, regarding Citation number EPD000007.

Status: Awaiting oral argument.
Docket:
09/23/14 Notice of Appeal
06/2015 Oral Argument

Smith v. Montgomery County Planning Board
September Term 2013, No. 00774 (AALU)

Lead Counsel: Lieb
Other Counsel:

Abstract: Commission appealed Circuit Court ruling for forest conservation violations at 21627 Ripplemead Drive.

Status: Awaiting decision.
Docket:
06/21/13 Notice of Appeal filed
03/07/14 Commission's Brief filed
05/15/14 Reply Brief filed
06/11/14 Oral Argument held.
MARYLAND COURT OF APPEALS

Rounds v. Commission
September Term 2014, No. 00019 (PD)

Lead Counsel: Gardner
Other Counsel: Dickerson

Abstract: Defense of claim for violations of the Maryland Constitution and declaratory relief concerning alleged Farm Road easement.

Status: Judgment affirmed in most aspects with remand and Motion for Reconsideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/01/13</td>
<td>Petition for Writ of Certiorari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/13</td>
<td>Answer in Opposition to Petition for Writ of Certiorari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/13</td>
<td>Cert Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/14</td>
<td>Order re-scheduling case to November, 2014 session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/14</td>
<td>Oral Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/15</td>
<td>Opinion from Court of Appeals affirming most aspects and remanding for a limited purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/24/15</td>
<td>Defendant Brown files Motion for Reconsideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/16/15</td>
<td>Plaintiff Appellant responds agreeing to dismiss claim against Defendant Brown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/15</td>
<td>Mandate from Court of Appeals affirming in part and reversing in part; remanding to Court of Special Appeals directing that they remand case to Montgomery County for further proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/15</td>
<td>Order from Court of Special Appeals remanding case to Circuit Court for Montgomery County for further proceedings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# U.S. District Court of Maryland

**American Humanist Association, et al v. Commission**

Case #8:14-cv550-DKC (M)

**Lead Counsel:** Dickerson  
**Other Counsel:** Gardner, Harvin

**Abstract:** Defense of claim alleging violation of establishment clause of Constitution.

**Status:** Dispositive Motions.

**Docket:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/25/14</td>
<td>Complaint filed in U. S. District Court for the District of MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/14</td>
<td>Answer filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/14</td>
<td>Motion for Leave to submit Amicus filed by interested Marylanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/14</td>
<td>Motion to Intervene filed by American Legion entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/14</td>
<td>Court grants Motion of Eleven Marylanders for Leave to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appear Jointly as Amicus Curiae in Support of Defendants and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grants Motion to Intervene by The American Legion, The American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Legion Department of Maryland and The American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legion Colmar Manor Post 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/15</td>
<td>Parties are in process of filing cross-motions for Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judgment pursuant to Scheduling Order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hartford Casualty Insurance Company v. Commission**

Case No. 8:13-cv-01765 (CD)

**Lead Counsel:** Ober, Kaler, Grimes & Shriver (Michael A. Schollaert)  
**Other Counsel:** Dickerson, Chagrin

**Abstract:** Plaintiff bonding company filed complaint seeking alleged damages associated with surety work after taking over Fort Washington Forest Park and the North Forestville Projects in Prince George's County.

**Status:** Pending mediation.

**Docket:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/18/13</td>
<td>Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/27/14</td>
<td>Plaintiff filed Consent Motion to Stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/28/14</td>
<td>Court stays case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/25/14</td>
<td>Joint Status Report filed,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/26/14</td>
<td>Court extends stay through 01/23/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/15</td>
<td>Court extends stay for 120 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/15</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case No. 8:14-cv-03955 (LD)
(Originally filed under Case No. 397601V-Mont. Cty)

Lead Counsel: Gardner/Dickerson
Other Counsel: Harvin

Abstract: Plaintiff filed complaint for alleged delays and damages associated with the construction of a residential development in Clarksburg, Maryland.

Status: Awaiting decision on pending motions.

Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/18/14</td>
<td>Notice of Removal and Complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/15</td>
<td>Commission files Motion to Dismiss or in the Alternative for Summary Judgment and Supporting Memorandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/15</td>
<td>Plaintiffs file Motion to Remand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/15</td>
<td>Defendant Montgomery County's Opposition to Motion to Remand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/15</td>
<td>Commission's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/15</td>
<td>Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant M-NCPPC's Motion to Dismiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/23/15</td>
<td>Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Motion to Remand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/23/15</td>
<td>Commission's Reply to Opposition to Motion to Dismiss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Streeter v. Commission
Case No. 12-cv-0976 RWT(ED)

Lead Counsel: Harvin
Other Counsel: 

Abstract: Defense of claim alleging discrimination and retaliatory termination.

Status: Case Closed.

Docket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/17/12</td>
<td>Complaint filed in Circuit Court for Prince George's County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/03/12</td>
<td>Case removed to U.S. District Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/12</td>
<td>Commission's Preliminary Motion to Dismiss filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/13</td>
<td>Motion granted with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/14</td>
<td>Commission's Motion to Dismiss Complaint w/prejudice filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/31/15</td>
<td>Order Granted Motion to Dismiss Complaint with Prejudice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>