

**ST. MARY'S COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' MEETING
TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1996**

Present: Commissioner Barbara R. Thompson, President
Commissioner D. Christian Brugman
Commissioner Paul W. Chesser
Commissioner Frances P. Eagan
Commissioner Lawrence D. Jarboe
Dan Ichniowski, Interim County Administrator
John J. Kachmar, Jr., County Administrator
Judith A. Spalding, Recorder

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:05 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Commissioner Chesser moved, seconded by Commissioner Eagan to meet in Executive Session to discuss a matter of Personnel (County Attorney's evaluation), as provided for in Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1. Motion carried.

Personnel

Present: Commissioner Barbara R. Thompson, President
Commissioner D. Christian Brugman
Commissioner Paul W. Chesser
Commissioner Frances P. Eagan
Commissioner Lawrence D. Jarboe
George Foster, Personnel Officer (from 12:20 - 12:40 p.m.)

Authority: Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1

Time Held: 12:10 p.m. - 1:05 p.m.

Action Taken: The Commissioners discuss the evaluation of the County Attorney and agreed to continue discussion at next week's meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Eagan moved, seconded by Commissioner Chesser, to approve the minutes of Tuesday, June 10 (as presented) and June 11, 1996 (as corrected). Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF BILLS

Commissioner Eagan moved, seconded by Commissioner Jarboe, to authorize Commissioner President Thompson to sign the Check Register. Motion carried.

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

The Commissioners agreed to accept the agenda as amended (to delete the Personnel item regarding the County Attorney later in the meeting).

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR ITEMS

Present: Dan Ichniowski, Interim County Administrator

1) **Information Release - New County Administrator**

Mr. Ichniowski distributed an Information Release announcing that Mr. John J. Kachmar began his duties as County Administrator on Monday, June 17.

2) **Correspondence**

The County Administrator presented the following correspondence for the Commissioners' review and consideration:

- a) To Department of Health and Mental Hygiene regarding funding for Marcey House.

Commissioner Brugman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chesser, to approve and sign the letter as presented. Motion carried.

- b) To Private Industry Council authorizing County Administrator to sign the JTPA grant documents.

Commissioner Chesser moved, seconded by Commissioner Brugman, to approve and sign the letter as presented. Motion carried.

- c) To President, Charles County Community College regarding telecommuting center.

Commissioner Jarboe moved, seconded by Commissioner Eagan, to approve and sign the letter as presented.

- d) To Board of Education approving inclusion of "Literacy Works" Grant Award (\$11,067) into the Fiscal Year 1996 Budget.

Commissioner Chesser moved, seconded by Commissioner Eagan, to approve and sign the letter as presented. Motion carried.

2) **Boards, Committees, Commissions**

Mr. Ichniowski presented the following relative to Boards, Committees, Commissions:

a. **Letters of Appreciation - Annual Reports**

To Chairs of Boards (Planning Commission and Board of Appeals) expressing appreciation for presentation of annual report.

Commissioner Chesser moved, seconded by Commissioner Eagan, to sign and forward the letters as presented. Motion carried.

b. **Letter of Appointment**

Commissioner Jarboe moved, seconded by Commissioner Chesser, and motion carried, to reappoint Fred Wallace to the Board for the Community College at St. Mary's.

3) **Budget Amendment No. 96-53
Department of Recreation and Parks**

Mr. Ichniowski presented the referenced Budget Amendment recommended for approval by the Director of Finance with the following justification: To provide funding for architectural/engineering services for the modular building at Hollywood Elementary School for the Keep Program.

Commissioner Brugman moved, seconded by Commissioner Eagan, to approve and authorize Commissioner Thompson to sign the Budget Amendment as presented. Motion carried.

4) **Walden/Sierra
Community Grant Program Application**

On behalf of the Walden/Sierra Mr. Ichniowski presented the referenced Community Grant Program entitled: Education a tool for Prevention in the amount of \$10,000; local contribution is in the amount of \$2500 (in-kind).

Commissioner Jarboe moved, seconded by Commissioner Eagan, to approve and authorize Commissioner Thompson to sign the Grant Application as presented. Motion carried.

5) **Presentation of Fiscal Year 1997 Budget Document**

Also Present: Steve Welkos, Director of Finance

Mr. Welkos appeared before the Commissioners to present the completed Fiscal Year 1997 Budget Document. He reviewed the Reader's Guide, Demographics, Overview of the General Fund and Capital Improvements.

COURTHOUSE RENOVATION PROJECT

Present: Judge John Hansen Briscoe
Judge Marvin Kaminetz

Judges Briscoe and Kaminetz appeared before the Commissioners to express their, as well as the administrative officer of the court's, concerns relative to the courthouse renovation project, particularly concerns regarding disruptions and distractions during court. Judge Briscoe pointed out that there is "zero" tolerance in court for any type of noise, and with the project scheduled to take 18 months, they believed it necessary to bring this concern to the Board. He further indicated concerns about the need for a secured area to protect witnesses.

During the discussion Judge Briscoe invited the Commissioners to look at the project and to request the Department of Public Works, the architect, and the contractor to determine the disruptions that will be involved. He further advised that the Administrative Officer of the Courts has experts who are familiar with this type of project and who have overseen work being done.

The Commissioners expressed willingness to have the Department of Public Works work with the administrative court in identifying problem areas and developing solutions.

ROUTE 301 CORRIDOR STUDY

Present: Jon Grimm, Director, Planning and Zoning
John Sine
Ed Thomas
Heidi Van Luven

The referenced individuals appeared before the Commissioners to discuss the 301 Transportation Study and the recommendations, particularly as they relate to St. Mary's County. As background Mr. Grimm noted that the Governor had appointed a 75-member citizen task force to make recommendations to address transportation and related land use and environmental issues in the U.S. 301 corridor. The Task Force established goals to be accomplished and developed preliminary recommendations which will be presented at three workshops/ public hearings. Mr. Grimm stated that county representatives on the Task Force provided input, as reflected in the County's Comprehensive Plan, as it relates to the corridor.

Goals of preliminary recommendations included: enhanced mobility; improved community quality of life; protection of the environment; efficiency optimization; and promotion of economic development. Other recommendation topics included corridor wide recommendations; US 301 from MD 5/US 301 split at TB to US 50; MD 5 from I-495 to TB; and US 301 in Waldorf Area; LaPlata Area; South of LaPlata; and Land Use/Transportation Relationships in Other Areas; Implementation Recommendations; and Guidelines to Achieve Land Use Characteristics Supportive of Transportation Recommendations.

With regard to St. Mary's County Ms. VanLuven noted that the County should enhance its efforts to concentrate development within the currently designated development areas to protect the capacity of MD 5 and MD 235 and encourage use of express bus service for long-distance commuting.

A copy of the Preliminary Recommendations is on file in the Commissioners' Office.

WELFARE REFORM

Present: Roberta Loker, Department of Social Services

Ms. Loker appeared before the Commissioners to explain the changes in the welfare program throughout the State of Maryland and locally in St. Mary's County. St. Mary's County has instituted a New Directions Units, which is charged with diverting or limiting participation in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The basic premise of one of the new programs, "Family Investment Program" is that everyone should work and any job is a good job. In addition the AFDC program name has been changed to "Temporary Cash Assistance," which emphasizes that it is a temporary program. Ms. Loker pointed out that the new welfare reform allows each county to design its own program within certain guidelines. Other new programs include Full Family Sanction and a provision that if a child is born ten months or after application for assistance, funds will be terminated.

Since the inception of the program on February 12, there has been a decrease in the number of AFDC participants.

In closing Ms. Loker advised the Commissioners that Secretary of the Department of Human Resources Collins will be meet with the Commissioners on Monday, June 24 at the Carter Building.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' TIME

Efficiency Task Force

Commissioner Jarboe stated that the Efficiency Task Force has completed its task and inquired whether it should be disbanded. The Task Force will be presenting its final report on July 16 and the Commissioners indicated it could be disbanded at that time.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

Commissioner Eagan moved, seconded by Commissioner Jarboe, to meet in Executive Sessions to discuss matters of Personnel (Office of Community Services and Department of Recreation and Parks), as provided in Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1. Motion carried.

Commissioner Eagan moved, seconded by Commissioner Chesser, to meet in Executive Session to discuss a matter of Personnel (consideration of appointments to Boards, Committees, Commissions). Motion carried three to two with Commissioners Brugman and Jarboe voting against.

Personnel (Office of Community Services)

Present: Commissioner Barbara R. Thompson, President
Commissioner D. Christian Brugman
Commissioner Paul W. Chesser
Commissioner Frances P. Eagan
Commissioner Lawrence D. Jarboe
John J. Kachmar, Jr., County Administrator
Cynthia Brown, Director, Office of Community Services

Authority: Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1
Time Held: 3:50 p.m. - 4:25 p.m.

Action Taken: The Commissioners discussed a personnel matter with the Director, Office of Community Services.

Personnel (Department of Recreation and Parks)

Present: Commissioner Barbara R. Thompson, President
Commissioner D. Christian Brugman
Commissioner Paul W. Chesser
Commissioner Lawrence D. Jarboe
John J. Kachmar, Jr., County Administrator
Phil Rollins, Director, Recreation and Parks
George Foster, Personnel Officer
Judith A. Spalding, Recorder

Authority: Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1
Time Held: 4:30 p.m. - 5:25 p.m.

Action Taken: Mr. Rollins presented a proposal for the Commissioners' consideration and the Commissioners gave direction to staff.

Personnel (Consideration of Appointments to Boards, Committees, Commissions)

Present: Commissioner Barbara R. Thompson, President
Commissioner D. Christian Brugman
Commissioner Paul W. Chesser
Commissioner Frances P. Eagan
Commissioner Lawrence D. Jarboe
John J. Kachmar, Jr., County Administrator
Judith A. Spalding, Recorder

Authority: Article 24, Section 4-210(a)1
Time Held: 5:25 p.m. - 6:10 p.m.

Action Taken: The Commissioners reviewed the current status sheet, made nominations, and directed staff to contact the individuals and to prepare the appropriate letters of appointment.

7:00 P. M.

**MINUTES OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' WORK SESSION
LEXINGTON PARK-TULAGI MASTER PLAN * FRANK KNOX TRAINING CENTER**

All County Commissioners were present, as were County Administrator John Kachmar; Sue Wilkinson, Administrative officer ; County Attorney Doug Durkin. Planning Commission members present were Chairman Frank Taylor and Joe Anderson. Former Planning Commission member John Dixon was in attendance and several members of the Lexington Park Planning Task Force were also present. DPZ staff present were Jon Grimm, Director; Jeffrey Jackman, Senior Planner; and Peggy Childs, Recording Secretary.

A list of attendees is on file in DPZ.

Commissioner Thompson opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m., stating it is primarily intended to be a Commissioners' work session and facilitated discussion on the Draft Plan for the revitalization of Lexington Park, following the March 5th public hearing and public comment period.

Mr. Grimm summarized the February 6, 1996 Draft, which is comprised of the following components:

- VISION
- GOALS & OBJECTIVES
- MASTER PLAN
 - The "Wedge"
 - The Town Center
 - Commercial Corridors
- IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The Plan, as developed by the Commissioner-appointed Task Force in conjunction with ERM, Inc., Consultants, was reviewed by the Planning Commission, which recommended that the body of the Plan; i.e., Vision, Goals & Objectives, and Master Plan, be adopted as a Policy Statement, with Implementation Strategies attached as Appendices and procedures for implementation to be developed following adoption of the Plan.

The Mission Statement adopted by the Task Force was to prepare a comprehensive revitalization plan for the Tulagi Place core area and an overall development plan for the Lexington Park Development District, offering solutions for identified problems and seizing opportunities to upgrade and enhance the quality of life by providing for aesthetically pleasing, sustainable growth and development, specifying changes in infrastructure and facilities to achieve those goals.

The "Vision" focuses on a mix of land uses; i.e., residential, commercial, civic, and institutional, with recreational amenities, greenways, pedestrian access and improved streetscapes throughout the Town Center and transportation improvements throughout the "Wedge" area. The "Wedge" extends from the NAS North Gate, down Pegg Road to Great Mills High School, east to Hermanville Road and the NAS South Gate, returning to the North Gate via Route 235. The intent is to make Lexington Park a "people place," pedestrian friendly, with the Tulagi core as the central focus. However, the Plan is also intended to be applicable to the balance of the Lexington Park District.

Paramount to the focus of the process was the protection of the Naval Air Station and preserving and enhancing its future mission, as the county's major employer and the principal reason for Lexington Park's existence. Necessarily following from that is attention to the AICUZ (Air Installation Compatible Use Zone), not only for its protection and for public safety, but also as a vehicle to allow open space in the downtown area. The schematics prepared by the consultants are not intended to reflect specific land use requirements, but to illustrate how a mix

of uses could be accommodated. As it exists, the Zoning Ordinance does not provide the flexibility required for the redevelopment and would have to be amended if the Plan is adopted.

Commissioner Jarboe asked how the Plan would be funded? Mr. Grimm replied that a host of funding sources are listed in the appendices which *do not* include the County general fund property tax. Approximately \$8.5M to \$9M of funding is proposed over a 5-20 year time frame. The objective would be for private investment, private-public partnerships packaged through grant or loan-funding programs, setting up a revolving loan fund as part of the proceeds from the sale of the Skipjack building, and low-interest loans to business owners for redevelopment or new development. County funding *would* be required for improvements to public facilities such as the Lexington Park Library.

Commissioner Brugman also had concerns about funding, aesthetics, and architectural terms such as "visually attractive." He said he would prefer to bring people into compliance voluntarily, through incentives rather than government mandates; he was also concerned about devaluing properties and infringing on property rights and said he would like to see the AICUZ remain as it is.

Commissioner Thompson supported the Plan as a direction, or focus, with a menu of implementation strategies the Commissioners can choose from to get the County where we want to be, using incentive techniques and continued citizen input through the Task Force and through the public hearing process.

Commissioner Chesser stated he is very much enthused about the Plan. It needs some fine-tuning, but it is a first step, and he considers it good planning.

As the commissioner representative for the Lexington Park area and someone who lives and works there, Commissioner Eagan voiced the most concerns. She said as long as we consider the plan a guideline, where we can pick and choose what we want to move forward, it is good; it will benefit Lexington Park and the County in general and provide eligibility for grants and federal funding. Her concerns were with any change to the AICUZ, from the standpoint of protecting the Navy Base as well as protecting property rights, and how the plan will be implemented. She said she was *very* concerned with the statement in the plan that the 0.17 FAR is more than 50% below the allowable intensity and well below the usual yield for office and retail sites, because that affects what people can do with their property.

Also of concern to Mrs. Eagan was that many people in Lexington Park didn't know about the plan and that the cost of architectural designs forced on business owners could be passed on to the lessees and force them out of business. Mr. Grimm responded that one of the products of the contract with the consultant will be a brochure about Lexington Park identifying the need for revitalization, the redevelopment authority, some of the funding sources, and contacts within the community who would assist business owners or residents. The brochure will also provide a marketing tool, raising consciousness and educating the community about the opportunities the Plan will afford.

Planning Commission member Joe Anderson stated that he and the Commission agree with providing incentives and said the Plan is coming at an important time, while we are the process of reviewing our Comprehensive Plan. It is critical to establish the Vision now because, in the next 20 years, over **40%** of the growth in Maryland will occur in Southern Maryland and the number of households is projected to increase **70%** by the year 2020. Adopting the Vision will improve not only Lexington Park but the quality of life in the county and the region; in 20 years it will be too late.

Commissioner Eagan had further concerns with the goal/objective to provide large areas of green/open space in Lexington Park, including how that will be implemented and how it will affect existing businesses. Commissioner Thompson responded that the provisions of the Forest Conservation Act allow some creativity in that we can create "sending areas" for trees to minimize restrictions on business site; i.e., in commercial areas where there is no room for plantings, trees

can be planted in other areas. Mr. Grimm added that there is nothing in this plan that will change *anything* the day it is adopted; the Commissioners will simply be directing the task force or development authority to develop implementation strategies, and the appendices are the starting point for developing those mechanisms.

Task Force member Rachelle Millison stated what the Task Force bought into was the Vision, and she thinks the details of the implementation are almost too much for lay people to digest. The Task Force expressed *tremendous* concerns about architectural review and signage and she thinks she sees the same thing happening here because, other than maybe Jon Grimm, because it is his background, she doesn't know that there is anyone in this room who has studied urban planning and knows the implications of what we're discussing here. Commissioner Thompson replied, however, that it is incumbent for people to stay involved as we work through this because it has to be a community effort, through professional planners, with input from the citizens and the Planning Commission. It won't succeed otherwise, and we have to continue to reassure ourselves that we will do this the best way we can.

Mr. Grimm emphasized that the Plan will be a policy, or road map, an expression of where the community will go and how it will get there, with the Commissioners adopting whatever implementation methods they approve of. He said he sees an ongoing role for the Task Force, and suggested setting up a separate work session to discuss implementation strategies, if the Commissioners would like to do that.

Commissioner Jarboe commented that he has talked to people in other areas of the County and they don't want to subsidize Lexington Park. He said there should be a body of citizens pushing for this plan and he doesn't see that. He suggested Lexington Park incorporate, form a Town Council or a taxing district and do this themselves. Commissioners Thompson and Eagan strongly disagreed, Commissioner Thompson reminding that that is what the Task Force is - Lexington Park citizens, and there are a lot of people in this room with *vital* interests in Lexington Park. Commissioner Eagan pointed out we have *jobs* in Lexington Park and hundreds of people coming in here, and the Commissioners *have* to do *something*.

Robert Gabrelcik, Sr., a long-time businessman in Lexington Park, stated he and other businessmen there invest very heavily every year at tax time, and if Commissioner Jarboe ever saw Mr. Millison's tax bill, it would "knock him off his feet." That is money that is not being spent in Lexington Park but is going to other areas of the County. The Governor has pledged a *tremendous* amount of money to support this Plan, or he has said we will get \$34M back in taxes. Mr. Gabrelcik said he is not asking for his tax money back, but the people in Lexington Park should be getting roads, infrastructure, lighting, police protection, and everything else they need in return for their tax dollars.

Commissioner Eagan still had concerns that there may be people who may not be able to do what they had planned to do with their property; i.e., their investment. She said she understands that these are goals and objectives and that the implementation strategies will be discussed; she is just concerned that if we don't worry today about how we will get there, it could happen that we will already be there and not realize it.

Mr. Grimm responded that that was one of the specific concerns staff asked the consultant to focus on and he is concerned that that becomes close to a fatal flaw in the way the Commissioners review the Plan. There is no hidden "bag of tricks" and it was *never at all intended* that the Commissioners adopt terms like "visually attractive" and for staff to tell them how to do it. Many of the words on these papers are from the citizens themselves who participated in the process. There was some discussion at the Planning Commission level about taking out the implementation techniques altogether, and if the Commissioners want to do that it won't cause the Plan to fail; however, staff did not want the implementation strategies to be a mystery, because they are very technical and complex. We spent 2 years developing the 1990 comprehensive zoning and it will probably take anywhere from 6 months to 2 years to fully implement this Plan. It is the Commissioners' decision whether we use a carrot or a stick, whether it's funding or programs, and the Commissioners hold the decisions about the resources, so it's not like this is going to magically transform anything the day after it's adopted.

Dennis Nicholson, of the Housing Authority, advised that the State is looking for the County to adopt this as a general concept. It will take two years for implementation and there is two years' worth of grant funding we are looking at, and a Vision or a Concept would help tremendously.

Following this discussion, it was the consensus of the five Commissioners to accept the Plan in Concept, including the Vision, Goals & Objectives, with the understanding that there be further discussion regarding the AICUZ and implementation strategies.

The Commissioners deferred discussion on the recommendations for The Wedge, The Town Center, and the Commercial Corridors to a subsequent work session so they could discuss AICUZ. Mr. Grimm distributed Table 2.9 of the Zoning Ordinance, which shows the maximum FAR (Floor Area Ratio) density/intensity under the Ordinance for each zoning district. The FAR for non-residential uses ranges from .25 to .5; however the AICUZ Overlay Zones (APZ-1 & 2) are intended to be more restrictive. The FAR of a project is derived by dividing the building *site* area into the proposed *building* area. The consultant has proposed and staff supports using the FAR technique as a means of defining acceptable levels of intensity. Page 3 gives examples for FAR calculations with sample configurations shown on page 2. Example A.2 is the calculation for the Eagan-McAllister warehouse, located primarily in the APZ-2 and approved in 1994. Coincidentally, the FAR ratio is .172; however the Eagan-McAllister building was intentionally used to illustrate the FAR in response to questions raised by Mr. McAllister during the public hearing.

The intention was to develop an AICUZ proposal no more restrictive than the current process, but which would define for a landowner, before he got too far into the review process, whether his project would be acceptable or not. The proposed .17 was arrived at by running a series of examples with various existing sites, redevelopment opportunities for Lexington Manor, and paper sketches proposed by Mr. Chamberlin, and finding, by the iterative process, that .17 to .20 was the "break-even" point. As evidenced by Captain Standridge's letter of November 22, 1995, the Navy did a much more exhaustive analysis, looking at different use types, and has recommended that there be different FAR intensities based upon the type of use. The Navy would prefer to see and suggests a higher level of intensity for warehouse-type uses than for offices or assembly-type uses because of the number of people associated with them. The letter also provides a range of intensities that would be acceptable to the Navy, using a variety of techniques.

Task Force member Don Megby stated he thought Captain Standridge's letter provided a .5 for office uses, and that boils down into dollars - tax dollars as well as development dollars, and that's where we get into the AICUZ property devaluation issue. (A copy of CAPT. Standridge's letter with the attendant tables is attached to these minutes.)

Mr. Grimm said the .17 FAR is an average figure and could be higher; in fact, the Captain has suggested that for certain uses it should be higher and for other uses it should be lower. Commissioner Eagan pointed out that the Ordinance Table of Uses allows a .50 FAR in General Commercial; the proposed .17 FAR is more than 50% below the allowable intensity and well below the usual yield for office and retail sites. Mr. Grimm responded that what that refers to is how the AICUZ Overlay impacts the Commercial zoning district. Under the current regulations you could not achieve a FAR of .5 in the AICUZ Overlay area, even though the base zoning permits it, because of the Overlay restrictions on intensity.

The section that staff is trying to address with this recommendation is a footnote to a table in the Zoning Ordinance somewhere within the AICUZ section, which lists permissible uses, including office uses. The footnote says that "low intensity office uses only are permitted," and what we are trying to define is what a low intensity office use is.

The example referenced by Mrs. Eagan illustrates that .17 is a low intensity office use and it is intended to be. The .17 simply defines it, so that anyone whose property is within the AICUZ doesn't need to go through a 6-month process to determine what will be approvable; they can make an economic decision based upon a readily available and reasonably understandable technique. You can argue that .17 is too low, and the Captain has suggested that in his letter. The analysis conducted by the Navy would have cost the County an additional \$50,000 had it been done by a consultant; however, the Navy used an urban model applicable to San Diego or Norfolk and, under our Ordinance, the APZ-2 is intended to be low-intensity office.

Mr. Megby noted the discrepancy between the FAR for the Frank Knox Training Center on the Navy side of the street, which is .7, and the County requirement for property located right across the street. Mr. Grimm replied that CAPT. Standridge has stated that the FAR for varying uses can either be more or less than .17, based upon the concentration of people.

Commissioner Thompson stated it sounds like what the Navy did was further refine the consultant's idea, and we should take a look at that and see if it enables a clearer determination of what could be done based on the number of people present in a facility. Maybe our next step is to review that, or ask the Planning Commission to review it in some fashion so we can get a better feel for where we might be going with this whole question of AICUZ.

Mr. Grimm responded, because the Plan is policy and sets a direction, if the Commissioners are comfortable with using a technique like Floor Area Ratio but not setting what that ratio would be, that would give the Planning Commission some direction to provide more specificity and a clearer ability to determine a property's development potential.

The Commissioners agreed to accept the Draft Plan in Concept, including its Vision, Goals and Objectives. As accepted by the Commissioners, the intent of the Plan is to maintain the AICUZ as presently adopted, but to further quantify its application to streamline the determination of what property owners can do with their property within the AICUZ.

Mr. Grimm asked that the Commissioners review the documents he has provided, including Table 2.9, a letter from Mr. Chamberlin/Club Properties dated 2/20/96, and Mr. Blaha's letter of 3/14/96, and staff will provide a further response regarding CAPT. Standridge's position on AICUZ.

A second work session has been scheduled for Thursday, July 18th, at 7:00 p.m. in the Lexington Park Library meeting room to:

- (1) Discuss goals/objectives and implementation strategies for the three geographic areas; i.e., The "Wedge," the Town Center, and Commercial Corridors; and**
- (2) Allow continuing dialogue regarding various other components of the document.**

ADJOURNMENT

The work session was concluded at 9:26 p.m.

**Minutes Approved by Board of
County Commissioners on 6/25/96**

J. A. [Signature]
Recording Secretary