Montgomery County Maryland

For Immediate Release: Monday, February 25, 2019

Deadline for Applications Is Wednesday, April 24, at 5 p.m.

ROCKVILLE, Md., February 25, 2019 — The Montgomery County Council is seeking applicants to fill two vacancies on the Montgomery County Planning Board. The second terms of Chair Casey Anderson (Democrat), and Norman Dreyfuss (Republican) expire on June 14, 2019. Mr. Anderson is eligible to reapply as Chair (per Section 15-102 of Land Use Article of Maryland Code) and has indicated his intent to do so. Mr. Dreyfuss is not eligible to reapply.

Applications must be received no later than 5 p.m. on Wednesday, April 24, 2019.

No more than three members of the Planning Board may be from the same political party, and each member must be a resident and registered voter of Montgomery County when appointed. Members serve four-year terms and are limited to two full terms, except when applying for a 3rd term as Chair. The positions can be filled by a Democrat, a Republican, a voter who declines to affiliate with a party or a member of another party officially recognized by the Montgomery County Board of Elections. Current Boardmembers are Casey Anderson (Dem), Chair; Norman Dreyfuss (Rep); Natali Fani-Gonzalez (Dem); Gerald Cichy (Rep); and Tina Patterson (Unaffiliated). Annual compensation for Boardmembers is currently $30,000, and the Chair currently earns $207,262. The Council expects to set the salary for the Chair prior to the appointment.

The Planning Board serves as the Council’s principal adviser on land use planning and community planning. Planning Boardmembers also serve as commissioners of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The Planning Board’s responsibilities with regard to planning include preparation and amendment of the County General Plan; preparation and amendment of master plans and functional plans; formulation of subdivision regulations; preparation of or recommendations on text amendments to the County Zoning Code; implementation of the subdivision process by reviewing and approving all preliminary plans, site plans and other plans for development; advice on the planning implications of capital facilities and programs of the County government, Montgomery College, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and Montgomery County Public Schools; commenting, under its mandatory referral authority, on plans for public facilities of local, state and federal agencies; and approval of the work program and the annual operating budget for the Planning Department and the Commission’s bi-county offices.

The Planning Board sits as the Park Commission and approves the annual Parks Department operating budget and Capital Improvements Program (CIP); land acquisition contracts and major development contracts for parks; development plans for individual park facilities; policies for park operations; and park user fees.
The Planning Board meets all day, including into the evening, every Thursday and will schedule other meetings, as needed. The entire Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission meets the third Wednesday of every month. On average, a Planning Boardmember may spend two full days a week in scheduled and informal meetings. Additionally, substantial time is required for preparatory work and other activities related to Planning Board responsibilities.

Applicants should submit a letter of interest and resume (no more than 4 pages) listing professional and civic experience to: county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov or by mail to Council President Nancy Navarro, Stella B. Werner Council Office Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, Rockville, Maryland 20850.

Letters of application must be received no later than 5 p.m. on Wednesday, April 24. It is the Council’s policy not to consider applications received after the deadline. After the closing date, Councilmembers will review the letters of application and select applicants for interviews to be held soon thereafter.

Letters of application and resumes are made public as part of the appointment process and are available for public review. The interviews are conducted in public and will be televised. A financial disclosure statement of assets, debts, income and family property interests will be required to be filed by each applicant. Only the ultimate appointee will be required to make the financial disclosure statement available to the public.
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skatzman
President, "JustUs"-conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents
website: www.justus.group
email: admin@justus.group
Great spirits have always encountered violent opposition from mediocre minds. The mediocre mind is incapable of understanding the man who refuses to bow blindly to conventional prejudices and chooses instead to express his opinions courageously and honestly.

(Albert Einstein)
From: Tom Conger <taconger41@gmail.com>
Date: March 2, 2019 10:40:07 AM EST
To: JustUs admin <admin@justus.group>
Subject: The Need for an Inclusive Public Hearing

In the current issue of PLANNING (magazine of the American Planning Association) is an article titled, "Tips for Inclusive Public Meetings."

The article offers 6 tips, one of which is "Meet People Where They Are."

In the article, it points out that asking groups to come to city hall or other government buildings can be inconvenient, and, in some cases, intimidating for them. The article further states that, in order to gain more effective citizen participation, the Planning Board should set up gatherings in places directly related to the groups they are targeting.

In the case of Leisure World and the public hearing on the administration building, the Planning Board should be targeting the citizens of our 55 and over community, not having the hearing in the MNCPPC building in downtown Silver Spring.

The Silver Spring location is undesirable for a number of reasons: it is not convenient for the elderly residents of our community, the room where the hearing will be held is small, cramped, and not equipped to handle a large group of citizens, and the "psychological atmosphere" is indeed intimidating. The lawyers for LWCC will love the atmosphere of the setting, whereas your average Leisure World resident will not.

So, why not have the hearing in Leisure World? In Clubhouse One, the Ballroom can easily accommodate hundreds of residents.

Planning Board members, if you truly desire an INCLUSIVE PUBLIC HEARING, change the location of the gathering and have it where the most people will be able to participate--here in Leisure World.

Tom Conger.
Mutual 18
sikatzman
President, "JustUs"- conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents
website: www.justus.group
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Great spirits have always encountered violent opposition from mediocre minds. The mediocre mind is incapable of understanding the man who refuses to bow blindly to conventional prejudices and chooses instead to express his opinions courageously and honestly.

(Albert Einstein)

town meeting organization (TMO)
website: www.townmeetingorganization.com
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to vigorously express my objection to the proposed new administration building here at Leisure World.

I moved into my LW co-op apartment in December 2018. Prior to moving in, I had no idea of the degree to which LW residents distrust LW governance/management. Around this time last year, I attended a presentation by the LW General Manager on the proposed new admin building. He exhibited a diagram on the modifications of the original plan and spoke of the cost. At no time during that meeting did the General Manager request a show of hands from residents who favored or opposed the plan. I subsequently learned that a petition with signatures of over 2,000 residents, objecting to the new building, has been provided to the Planning Commission. I also became aware that the Parks and Planning Commission, in November 2017, directed LW administration to gain consensus from LW residents before going forward. I have never received a written survey from LW admin requesting my thoughts, concerns, approval or disapproval of the plan. So I’ll say it here: I am not in favor of the construction of a new administration building and I ask that you not approve the LW request to proceed. Our funds can be better spent maintaining the existing structures, enhancing safety, improving amenities and overhauling our system of governance to allow residents the right to elect our governing representatives.

Many living here are dissatisfied, especially with our spiraling co-op/condo fees, but they are reluctant to complain because they fear retaliation. Too often, when residents present their problems and concerns to governance, we are bullied, minimized and dismissed by the governing boards. The determination of LW governance to proceed with this proposal, which utilizes our funds without our consent, is a form of financial exploitation. Stop this egregious assault! SAY NO TO THE REQUEST FOR A NEW LW ADMINISTRATION BUILDING!

L.D. Cruz
Butler, Patrick

From: Feldmann <jjf3353@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 2:17 PM
To: Butler, Patrick; admin@justus.group; 'Janice McLean'
Cc: Mills, Matthew; Sanders, Carrie
Subject: RE: Next Hearing Date

Thank you very much Mr. Butler. I appreciate the quick response.

John

From: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 2:15 PM
To: Feldmann <jjf3353@comcast.net>; admin@justus.group; Janice McLean <janicewmclean@gmail.com>
Cc: Mills, Matthew <matthew.mills@mnccpc.org>; Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: Next Hearing Date

Hello All,

The Leisure World Site Plan hearing is tentatively scheduled for March 21, 2019. I will know by the morning of Monday, March 11 if the item will be officially scheduled that day.

Thank you,

Patrick

From: Feldmann <jjf3353@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 12:21 PM
To: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: admin@justus.group
Subject: Next Hearing Date

Mr. Butler,

I left a voice message for you and am following up with an email. We’re attempting to set up a town hall meeting for LW residents and would like to know when you will know for sure the date for the next hearing. We need the information by 3pm, as that is the deadline to submit articles for our newspaper. Thank you.

John

3019243353
Butler, Patrick

From: JustUs admin <admin@justus.group>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 10:09 AM
To: mont.co.planningboard@justus.group; Montgomery County Council; justus organization; tmo@townmeetingorganization.com; LW Green; LW Dogs; vaughn stewart; Marc Elrich; Anderson, Casey
Subject: Fwd: Admin building

From: Douglas Alexander <dougalex1@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Mar 5, 2019 at 10:03 AM
Subject: Admin building
To: <admin@justus.group>

The L. W. admin building is a Frank Lloyd style building which should not be torn down. The county has a department which is intent on preserving mid century modern buildings. The building should be renovated and preserved with the stonework and skylight and courtyard. The new building would be very out of place.

Susan Alexander

slkatzman
President,
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents

admin@justus.group

Albert Einstein – “We cannot solve our problems with the same level of thinking that created them.”
Hello Mr. Longpants,

Here is the response to your question to Carrie and me yesterday. Any further questions regarding how the items are scheduled and the agendas are set should be directed to Joyce Garcia.

Thank you,

Patrick Butler, AICP  
Regulatory Supervisor | Area 2 Division  
Montgomery County Planning Department  
8787 Georgia Avenue | Silver Spring, MD 20910  
301-495-4561  
Patrick.Butler@montgomeryplanning.org

Good Evening Everyone,

We are required to post agendas 10 days before the hearing date. The continued hearing on Leisure World is currently scheduled before the Planning Board on March 28, and the agenda will be posted no later than March 18. There is no requirement to post an agenda sooner than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

The Chair sets the agenda for Planning Board meetings with input from directors, chiefs, and staff.

Please let me know if you have additional questions.

Thank you.

Joyce Pettigrew Garcia
Appendix AA

Special Assistant to the Montgomery County Planning Board
The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Phone: 301-495-4631
Email: joyce.garcia@mncppc-mc.org

From: admin@justus.group <admin@justus.group>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 5:35 PM
To: Garcia, Joyce <joyce.garcia@mncppc-mc.org>
Cc: john feldmann <jjif1234@gmail.com>
Subject: LW Hearing

Joyce: you are requested to provide an answer to the question -

From: "admin@justus.group" <admin@justus.group>
Date: March 7, 2019 2:44:28 PM EST
To: patrick butler <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>, carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org, john feldmann <jjif1234@gmail.com>, Janice McLean <janicewmclean@gmail.com>, tom conger <taconger41@gmail.com>
Subject: LW Hearing

Patrick:

are you saying that the staff recommendation for a hearing date does not have to be identified on the March 14, 2019 (or any other meeting agenda) in order for the Planning Board commissioner to discuss/agree/approve a future hearing date as an agenda item? -

in other words, hearing dates are set by the staff, and not the commissioners?

slk

From: "Feldmann" <jjif3353@comcast.net>
Date: March 7, 2019 2:27:30 PM EST
To: "Butler, Patrick" <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: "Sanders, Carrie" <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>, <admin@justus.group>
Subject: RE: LW Hearing

Thank you again Mr. Butler.

John

From: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 2:18 PM
Appendix AA

To: Feldmann <jif3353@comcast.net>
Cc: Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>; admin@justus.group
Subject: RE: LW Hearing

Hello Mr. Feldmann.

The staff report and agenda item have to be posted ten days in advance. If the Planning Board date is March 28, the staff report and agenda item need to be posted by COB on March 18.

Thank you,

Patrick

From: Feldmann <jif3353@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:51 PM
To: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>; admin@justus.group
Subject: RE: LW Hearing

Mr. Butler,

Sorry to come back again, but if the 28th is the date for the next hearing, then I think it would have to be on the 14th's agenda. Do you have a deadline for being able to have it included on the published March 14 agenda?

John

From: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:31 PM
To: Feldmann <jif3353@comcast.net>
Cc: Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>; admin@justus.group
Subject: RE: LW Hearing

Hello Mr. Feldmann.

Yes, you are correct. We are now trying for March 28 as the tentative Planning Board date.

Thank you,

Patrick Butler, AICP
Regulatory Supervisor | Area 2 Division
Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Avenue | Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-495-4561
Patrick.Butler@montgomeryplanning.org
From: Feldmann <jlf3353@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:22 PM
To: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>; admin@justus.group
Subject: LW Hearing

Mr. Butler,

We’ve checked the website for the LW project, and it wasn’t listed for the meeting on March 14. It is our understanding that the meeting notice must be posted 10 days in advance of the meeting. If we are correct, then it appears that the earliest date for the meeting would have to be March 28.

I am asking about this as we have written a newspaper article about the March 21st meeting, and if that date has changed, we need to recall the article before it goes to press. We also don’t want to print handouts etc., with the incorrect date. Would you please get back to us this afternoon and let us know if the 21st is no longer the date for the meeting? I will give you a call to see if you are in your office. Thank you very much.

John
slkatzman

President, "JustUs"-conscience of the community

"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents

website: www.justus.group
email: admin@justus.group

town meeting organization (TMO)

website: www.townmeetingorganization.com
AN OPEN LETTER TO THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Please consider the following

You are Physicians having the specialty practice - “Planning.”

That’s right! Just think about that, metaphor, for a moment...

You shoulder an awesome responsibility. In a way, you make “life and death” decisions regarding the "structural well being" of Communities.

As such, you are also bound to follow the Doctor’s primary principle - “First, do no harm.”

Many residents in the Leisure World Community are counting on you to keep that principle in mind. Why? Because within the next few weeks, you will be asked to make a decision... you will be asked to approve the termination a 54 year old building.”

It is known that “making house calls,” is rare in this “day and age.” Still, make an exception. Come see “The Patient” for yourself before deciding. You will cast a vote. Please make it an “informed” vote.

Those who will be making the request to you, regarding demolition, have not consulted the Family of the patient. They will say they have...But...they HAVE NOT! Over 2,000 “family members,” who have signed a petition attest to this fact...

What’s wrong with the patient? Nothing that a “renovation” cannot cure.
Through the years the Administration building has been "stuffed with things" it did not need...

1. a bank when there are 6 banks just across the street.
2. a post office when there is one just across the street.
3. several offices occupied by a Realtor. The same one that has a large office just across the street.

Those who profess to represent the Leisure World “family” self proclaim their authority. They say it is bestowed upon them by Bylaws written in the 1980s. That matter is currently under MC Circuit Court challenge. That is not your concern...

Here is what should be...

Leisure World representatives came before you 16 months ago (November 30, 2017). They presented a Plan and made a request. Others from the LW Community stated the request being made was unwarranted. They presented evidence demonstrating the Community was not even surveyed about destroying the current Administration building. The 8,000 residents were denied a voice in the matter. No resident concurrence or consensus was ever sought. This should not be permitted when the expenditure of millions of dollars hang in the balance.

Your instructions to those seeking to destroy, & then rebuild, were clear & simple in 2017. The words of record were...“Go back to the LW Community and seek Consensus." That was not done. The Leisure World General Manager affirms it was not done. He has repeatedly explained why he did not attempt to do this. The reason is... because, he says, no one ( the Leisure Board?? ) instructed him to do that.

Now, however, you are expected to “Ok” the death of the very building that has been neglected by that very same LW General Manager. Tens of thousands of dollars are currently being spent to eradicate mold because of a lack of preventative maintenance. With that underway, and once completed, you are expected to approve the destruction of the very building where the “Mold” has been eradicated?

Does this make sense to you?

Leisure World has a building that can be modernized. It can easily accommodate existing staff and even more if needed. All that is required is “the will” to do it and an “assist” from you, who have a responsibility to...“First, do no harm.”

A picture of the Patient requesting you to care...
slkatzman
President, "JustUs"-conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents
website: www.justus.group
email: admin@justus.group

town meeting organization (TMO)
website: www.townmeetingorganization.com
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed
The most dangerous phrase in the language is "we've always done it this way."

silkatzman
President, "JustUs"-conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents
Great spirits have always encountered violent opposition from mediocre minds. The mediocre mind is incapable of understanding the man who refuses to bow blindly to conventional prejudices and chooses instead to express his opinions courageously and honestly.

(Albert Einstein)

Town meeting organization (TMO)
website: www.townmeetingorganization.com
Butler, Patrick

From: Garcia, Joyce
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 5:08 PM
To: admin@justus.group
Cc: vaughn stewart; Sanders, Carrie; Butler, Patrick; john feldmann; tom conger; Janice McLean; MCP-Chair
Subject: RE: LW Hearing

Slk,

1. Yes, the scheduled date is Thursday, March 28, 2019. We do not have a confirmed time, but you may consult the agenda when it is posted on March 18. I understand that your requested time for this item is 1:30 p.m., and we will try to honor your request as the Planning Board schedule will allow.

2. Yes, correct, March 27, 9 a.m. is the Planning Board deadline for receiving comments for the March 28 meeting. Note that correspondence received after the March 14 deadline will not be included in the online link. Please see my previous email for more specific information on correspondence.

Have a great evening.

Joyce Pettigrew Garcia
Special Assistant to the Montgomery County Planning Board
The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Phone: 301-495-4631
Email: joyce.garcia@mncppc-mc.org

From: admin@justus.group <admin@justus.group>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 3:48 PM
To: Garcia, Joyce <joyce.garcia@mncppc-mc.org>
Cc: vaughn stewart <vaughnstewart3@gmail.com>; Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>; Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>; john feldmann <jjjlf1234@gmail.com>; tom conger <taconger41@gmail.com>; Janice McLean <janicewmclean@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: LW Hearing

Joyce:

1. Is the hearing scheduled for Thurs. March 28, 2019?
   if so - what time?
2. are you saying that the 24 hour prior to hearing deadline (for correspondence) is 9:00 am - Weds. March 27, 2019?

slk

On Mar 11, 2019, at 3:36 PM, Garcia, Joyce wrote:

Good Afternoon Everyone,

Thank you for your patience. Responses to your questions regarding the confirmed Planning Board hearing date of March 28, 2019 are as follows:

1. The staff report, which is an Addendum to the original report from the November 30, 2017 Planning Board hearing, will be posted no later than close of business, 5 p.m., on Monday, March 18, and there is a chance it may be posted as early as close of business on Friday, March 15. Due to the fact that we’ve received such a significant amount of correspondence, posted with the staff report will be a link to view the correspondence received following the November 30, 2017 hearing.

2. The deadline for correspondence to be included in the link and posted online with the staff report is close of business on Thursday, March 14. Although correspondence received after this deadline will not be included in the online link, you may continue to send correspondence until the Planning Board deadline to receive comments of **24 hours before the hearing date, which is 9 a.m. on Wednesday, March 27**. Planning Board members will receive correspondence that we receive by the 9 a.m. March 27th deadline, emailed to mcp-chair@mnccpc-md.org.

Take care!

*Joyce Pettigrew Garcia*

Special Assistant to the Montgomery County Planning Board

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

8787 Georgia Avenue

Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Phone: 301-495-4631

Email: joyce.garcia@mnccpc-md.org

---

From: admin@justus.group <admin@justus.group>
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 5:14 PM
To: Garcia, Joyce <joyce.garcia@mnccpc-md.org>
1. When will ALL of the emails/letters/correspondence submitted since Nov. 30, 2017 be posted?

2. What is the "deadline" for current correspondence to be posted?

Good Morning Everyone,

As I mentioned, the Chair sets the Planning Board agenda. Future agendas are not set by discussion at Board meetings.

Joyce Pettigrew Garcia
Special Assistant to the Montgomery County Planning Board
The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Phone: 301-495-4631
Email: joyce.garcia@mncppc.mc.org
Appendix AA

From: admin@justus.group <admin@justus.group>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:22 PM
To: Garcia, Joyce <joyce.garcia@mncppc-mc.org>
Cc: john feldmann <jjj1234@gmail.com>; Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>; Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>; Janice McLean <janicewmclean@gmail.com>; tom conger <taconger41@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: LW Hearing

Joyce:

Thank you for your speedy reply.

The March 14, 2019 agenda has no mention of any discussion by the Commissioners at which time they discuss and/or decide a hearing date -- so, you are saying the date is not subject to a prior agenda item being posted for Commission & public discussion?

slk

From: "Garcia, Joyce" <joyce.garcia@mncppc-mc.org>
Date: March 7, 2019 6:10:09 PM EST
To: "admin@justus.group" <admin@justus.group>
Cc: john feldmann <jjj1234@gmail.com>, "Butler, Patrick" <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: LW Hearing

Good Evening Everyone,

We are required to post agendas 10 days before the hearing date. The continued hearing on Leisure World is currently scheduled before the Planning Board on March 28, and the agenda will be posted no later than March 18. There is no requirement to post an agenda sooner than 10 days prior to the hearing date.

The Chair sets the agenda for Planning Board meetings with input from directors, chiefs, and staff.

Please let me know if you have additional questions.

Thank you.

Joyce Pettigrew Garcia
Special Assistant to the Montgomery County Planning Board
The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Phone: 301-495-4631
Email: joyce.garcia@mncppc-mc.org
Joyce: you are requested to provide an answer to the question -

Patrick:

are you saying that the staff recommendation for a hearing date does not have to be identified on the March 14, 2019 (or any other meeting agenda) in order for the Planning Board commissioner to discuss/agree/approve a future hearing date as an agenda item?

in other words, hearing dates are set by the staff, and not the commissioners?

slk

Thank you again Mr. Butler.

John

Hello Mr. Feldmann.

The staff report and agenda item have to be posted ten days in advance. If the Planning Board date is March 28, the staff report and agenda item need to be posted by COB on March 18.
Thank you,

Patrick

---

From: Feldmann <jif3353@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:51 PM
To: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>; admin@justus.group
Subject: RE: LW Hearing

Mr. Butler,

Sorry to come back again, but if the 28th is the date for the next hearing, then I think it would have to be on the 14th's agenda. Do you have a deadline for being able to have it included on the published March 14 agenda?

John

---

From: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:31 PM
To: Feldmann <jif3353@comcast.net>
Cc: Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>; admin@justus.group
Subject: RE: LW Hearing

Hello Mr. Feldmann.

Yes, you are correct. We are now trying for March 28 as the tentative Planning Board date.

Thank you,

Patrick Butler, AICP
Regulatory Supervisor | Area 2 Division
Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Avenue | Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-495-4561
Patrick.Butler@montgomeryplanning.org

---

From: Feldmann <jif3353@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 1:22 PM
To: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>; admin@justus.group
Subject: LW Hearing
Mr. Butler,

We've checked the website for the LW project, and it wasn't listed for the meeting on March 14. It is our understanding that the meeting notice must be posted 10 days in advance of the meeting. If we are correct, then it appears that the earliest date for the meeting would have to be March 28.

I am asking about this as we have written a newspaper article about the March 21st meeting, and if that date has changed, we need to recall the article before it goes to press. We also don't want to print handouts etc., with the incorrect date. Would you please get back to us this afternoon and let us know if the 21st is no longer the date for the meeting? I will give you a call to see if you are in your office. Thank you very much.

John
slkatzman
President, "JustUs" - conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents
website: www.justus.group
eemail: admin@justus.group
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Great spirits have always encountered violent opposition from mediocre minds. The mediocre mind is incapable of understanding the man who refuses to bow blindly to conventional prejudices and chooses instead to express his opinions courageously and honestly.

(Albert Einstein)

town meeting organization (TMO)
website: www.townmeetingorganization.com
My name is Tom Conger and I am a Leisure World member/unit owner. I am a retired professional city planner, who worked directly for Montgomery County Executive Jim Gleason as the Planner in the Office of Program Coordination. I also served on the Metropolitan Dade County Florida Zoning Appeals Board for 8 years and was Coconino County Arizona’s Zoning Hearing Examiner for 5 years.

When I was a planner, I sought to follow the advice of world-renowned city planner Ian McHarg, whose book, "Design With Nature," described how we can live in harmony with the natural world, not against it. His "Plan for the Valleys" in northern Baltimore County, stressed that development should not occur in areas where runoff from storms would impact your buildings in a negative way. In other words, place your buildings on the portion of the site where water runs AWAY from the buildings, not toward them. Which brings me to the site in question, the Leisure World Board of Directors' proposal to tear down the current administration building, put up a parking lot, and build a new building downhill from the current structure.

Basically, the Board of Directors has proposed to put the new building in a ditch at the bottom of the hill, to which most of the runoff from the site will flow. And, by the way, Leisure World received over 60 inches of precipitation in 2018, 50% higher than our yearly average of 40 inches. Many climatologists say that we can expect to see more of these wetter than average years, including storms of much greater magnitude than in the past.

Leisure World does not have a good track record when it comes to soil and drainage issues. I have personally noticed this in my own Mutual, Mutual #18. My neighborhood consists of a few detached residences, but primarily semi-detached structures, many of which were constructed on berms of soil that were compacted, then built upon. As to my residence, and my two neighbors whose residences are attached to mine, it depends upon which portion of the berm you are on. Luckily, on my portion of the berm, water runs away from my house. Not so lucky for my neighbor on the other end!

When Leisure World constructed the buildings in Mutual 14, there were numerous soil issues. I am now quoting from the C. Bill Courtright document entitled: "The First Ten Years of a Five Year Plan 1966-1976 --pg. 33 - Chapter
"Construction Problems" #: "Test bores in the Mutual 14 area proved that the soil there was not suitable for the type of buildings planned and it became necessary to replace much of it."

Mutual Thirteen was to be the first to be constructed north of the Clubhouse. When it came time to clear this area, the Corporation undertook a major clearing operation and in the process leveled all of the land required for its construction plans for the next five years. This included almost all of the area north of the Clubhouse and much of the land in the eastern end of the Rossmoor tract. Test bores in the Mutual Fourteen area proved that the soil there was not suitable for the type of buildings planned and it became necessary to replace much of it. In this process, the top soil was piled in a large mound in the center of the cleared section which some wag called Mount Rossmoor. The unsuitable soil was moved away and soil from the eastern section of the Rossmoor project was hauled in to replace it. For several months a fleet of huge earth movers rumbled back and forth rearranging the landscape. The route they covered followed the eastern portion of the future North Leisure World Boulevard, some of which had been paved with asphalt to facilitate construction vehicles in Mutual Thirteen. Under the continual pounding of the earth-movers, the pavement disintegrated and the roadway became a ribbon of powdery dust and an impassable quagmire in rainy weather. The site of Mutual Fourteen was thus raised by as much as ten feet, possibly more. Fill-dirt was tamped down with huge machines and left to settle for a period of time before construction was to begin. As it turned out, the settling period was much longer than anticipated.

It should be noted that Leisure World's proposed construction site for the new building is immediately adjacent to Mutual 14 and consists of the same type of soil. And then there's the soil issue of the recently added fitness center room which was built onto Clubhouse Two. It was discovered after construction had begun that the soil was sinking and costly adjustments had to be made.

In addition to the absolute location of the site, we should also be assessing what impact there will be in regard to the site's relative location. Most importantly in this regard is what will the proposal's impact be vis-a-vis the "view shed." If the Board's proposal is carried out, the view that one has of our community as he or she enters Leisure World off Georgia Avenue will be hideously altered. Instead of viewing the existing admin building with its beautifully landscaped grounds (shrubs and mature trees), one will be looking at "a sea of asphalt" (quote from former Leisure World employee/Project Manager, Architect- Nicole Gerke). Also, 60 MATURE TREES will be destroyed.

Part of the intent of good site plan implementation is to ensure that the design is environmentally sound and aesthetically responsive to the needs of the community. As to placing a new building down in a ditch, this defies logic. Why would you deliberately put the structure in the most environmentally precarious part of the site? The best location, drainage-wise, is to have the building where it is currently located. This is not rocket science, and it has less to do with the best utilization of the site and more to do with the wants of the general manager of Leisure World.

You see, it comes down to his not wanting to be inconvenienced. His desire is to proceed as follows: Step 1: Build the new building down in the ditch, Step 2: When the new building is finished, have the general manager and staff immediately move into it and commence tearing down the current building.

As a retired city planner, I am of the opinion that we should be looking at the best utilization of the site and not be worrying about whether the general manager will be inconvenienced. Let's stop allowing the tail to wag the dog around here and start promoting good, sound community planning.

Planning Board Commissioners-- Honor what 2,200 Leisure World resident petitioners have requested in asking for a referendum on the building.
VOTE "NO"/ on Leisure World's site plan application.

Tom Conger

Mutual 18

skatzman
President, "JustUs"-conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents
website: www.justus.group
email: admin@justus.group

town meeting organization (TMO)
website: www.townmeetingorganization.com
From: linfrk1@comcast.net
Date: March 13, 2019 5:29:51 PM EDT
To: mont.co.planningboard@justus.group, admin@justus.group
Cc: Montgomery County Council <county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov>, vaughn stewart <vaughnstewart3@gmail.com>, Marc Elrich <marc.elrich@montgomerycountymd.gov>, justus organization <justus@justus.group>, tmo@townmeetingorganization.com, LW Green <lwgreen@justus.group>, lwdogs@justus.group
Subject: Re: Leisure World Site Plan 820170120--- From: Tom Conger - To: Montgomery County Planning Board

To: Montgomery Planning Board

To All,

My husband and I both disapprove of building a new building. The Board does not consider what the community as a whole feels about this issue. We have been very deliberate in expressing our concerns and have tried on numerous occasions to convey those concerns. I am a thirteen year resident of Leisure World Mutual 6A with only 7 units. We have had our own issues with soil erosion, drainage issues and foundation problems, so it concerns us that the idea of trying to force this new building on us is totally not warranted given the fact that we have all these problems.

We don't need a new building of this magnitude, we have a building that requires some long needed care, which has the space that would be a fantastic office for the staff. I ask you to take into consideration how we are being used.

Linda Barnes-Pretlow
slkatzman
President, "JustUs"-conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents
website: www.justus.group
email: admin@justus.group

Great spirits have always encountered violent opposition from mediocre minds. The mediocre mind is incapable of understanding the man who refuses to bow blindly to conventional prejudices and chooses instead to express his opinions courageously and honestly.

(Albert Einstein)

Town meeting organization (TMO)
website: www.townmeetingorganization.com
To: Montgomery County Planning Board

From: Tom Conger

My name is Tom Conger and I am a Leisure World member/unit owner. I am a retired professional city planner, who worked directly for Montgomery County Executive Jim Gleason as the Planner in the Office of Program Coordination. I also served on the Metropolitan Dade County Florida Zoning Appeals Board for 8 years and was Coconino County Arizona's Zoning Hearing Examiner for 5 years.

When I was a planner, I sought to follow the advice of world-renowned city planner Ian McHarg, whose book, "Design With Nature," described how we can live in harmony with the natural world, not against it. His "Plan for the Valleys" in northern Baltimore County, stressed that development should not occur in areas where runoff from storms would impact your buildings in a negative way. In other words, place your buildings on the portion of the site where water runs AWAY from the buildings, not toward them. Which brings me to the site in question, the Leisure World Board of Directors' proposal to tear down the current administration building, put up a parking lot, and build a new building downhill from the current structure.

Basically, the Board of Directors has proposed to put the new building in a ditch at the bottom of the hill, to which most of the runoff from the site will flow. And, by the way, Leisure World received over 60 inches of precipitation in 2018,
50% higher than our yearly average of 40 inches. Many climatologists say that we can expect to see more of these wetter than average years, including storms of much greater magnitude than in the past.

Leisure World does not have a good track record when it comes to soil and drainage issues. I have personally noticed this in my own Mutual, Mutual #18. My neighborhood consists of a few detached residences, but primarily semi-detached structures, many of which were constructed on berms of soil that were compacted, then built upon. As to my residence, and my two neighbors whose residences are attached to mine, it depends upon which portion of the berm you are on. Luckily, on my portion of the berm, water runs away from my house. Not so lucky for my neighbor on the other end!

When Leisure World constructed the buildings in Mutual 14, there were numerous soil issues. I am now quoting from the C. Bill Courtright document entitled: "The First Ten Years of a Five Year Plan 1966-1976 --pg. 33 - Chapter 8 "Construction Problems" : "Test bores in the Mutual 14 area proved that the soil there was not suitable for the type of buildings planned and it became necessary to replace much of it."

It should be noted that Leisure World's proposed construction site for the new building is immediately adjacent to Mutual 14 and consists of the same type of soil. And then there's the soil issue of the recently added fitness center room which was built onto Clubhouse Two. It was discovered after construction had begun that the soil was sinking and costly adjustments had to be made.

In addition to the absolute location of the site, we should also be assessing what impact there will be in regard to the site's relative location. Most importantly in this regard is what will the proposal's impact be vis-a-vis the "view shed." If the Board's proposal is carried out, the view that one has of our community as he or she enters Leisure World off Georgia Avenue will be hideously altered. Instead of viewing the existing admin building with its beautifully landscaped grounds (shrubs and mature trees), one will be looking at "a sea of asphalt" (quote from former Leisure World employee/Project Manager, Architect- Nicole Gerke). Also, 60 MATURE TREES will be destroyed.

Part of the intent of good site plan implementation is to ensure that the design is environmentally sound and aesthetically responsive to the needs of the community. As to placing a new building down in a ditch, this defies logic. Why would you deliberately put the structure in the most environmentally precarious part of the site? The best location, drainage-wise, is to have the building where it is currently located. This is not rocket science, and it has less to
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do with the best utilization of the site and more to do with the wants of the general manager of Leisure World. You see, it comes down to his not wanting to be inconvenienced. His desire is to proceed as follows: Step 1: Build the new building down in the ditch, Step 2: When the new building is finished, have the general manager and staff immediately move into it and commence tearing down the current building.

As a retired city planner, I am of the opinion that we should be looking at the best utilization of the site and not be worrying about whether the general manager will be inconvenienced. Let's stop allowing the tail to wag the dog around here and start promoting good, sound community planning.

Planning Board Commissioners-- Honor what 2,200 Leisure World resident petitioners have requested in asking for a referendum on the building.

VOTE "NO"/ on Leisure World's site plan application.

Tom Conger

Mutual 18

slkatzman
President, "JustUs"-conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents

website: www.justus.group
e-mail: admin@justus.group

town meeting organization (TMO)
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Butler, Patrick

From: Butler, Patrick  
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2019 4:26 PM  
To: Butler, Patrick  
Subject: FW: re: Leisure World Site Plan 820170120--- From: Tom Conger - To: Montgomery County Planning Board  
Attachments: great spirits.jpg; pg.33.jpg  
Importance: High

--------------------- Original Message ---------------------
From: mcp-crm-tracker@mnccpc-mc.org; 
Received: Wed Mar 13 2019 11:48:21 GMT-0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)  
To: mcp-chair@mnccpc-mc.org; MCP-Chair@mnccpc-mc.org; MCP-Chair #; ;  
Subject: re: Leisure World Site Plan 820170120--- From: Tom Conger - To: Montgomery County Planning Board

From: admin@justus.group <admin@justus.group>  
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 10:24 AM  
To: mont.co.planningboard@justus.group  
Cc: Montgomery County Council <county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov>; vaughn stewart <vaughnstewart3@gmail.com>; Marc Elrich <marc.elrich@montgomerycountymd.gov>; justus organization <justus@justus.group>; tmo@townmeetingorganization.com; LW Green <lwgreen@justus.group>; lwdogs@justus.group  
Subject: re: Leisure World Site Plan 820170120--- From: Tom Conger - To: Montgomery County Planning Board  
Importance: High

This is correspondence for publication on the Park & Planning online link

To: Montgomery County Planning Board  
From: Tom Conger

My name is Tom Conger and I am a Leisure World member/unit owner. I am a retired professional city planner, who worked directly for Montgomery County Executive Jim Gleason as the Planner in the Office of Program Coordination. I also served on the Metropolitan Dade County Florida Zoning Appeals Board for 8 years and was Coconino County Arizona’s Zoning Hearing Examiner for 5 years.

When I was a planner, I sought to follow the advice of world-renowned city planner Ian McHarg, whose book, "Design With Nature," described how we can live in harmony with the natural world, not against it. His "Plan for the Valleys" in northern Baltimore County, stressed that development should not occur in areas where runoff from storms would impact your buildings in a negative way. In other words, place your buildings on the portion of the site where water
runs AWAY from the buildings, not toward them. Which brings me to the site in question, the Leisure World Board of Directors' proposal to tear down the current administration building, put up a parking lot, and build a new building downhill from the current structure.

Basically, the Board of Directors has proposed to put the new building in a ditch at the bottom of the hill, to which most of the runoff from the site will flow. And, by the way, Leisure World received over 60 inches of precipitation in 2018, 50% higher than our yearly average of 40 inches. Many climatologists say that we can expect to see more of these wetter than average years, including storms of much greater magnitude than in the past.

Leisure World does not have a good track record when it comes to soil and drainage issues. I have personally noticed this in my own Mutual, Mutual #18. My neighborhood consists of a few detached residences, but primarily semi-detached structures, many of which were constructed on berms of soil that were compacted, then built upon. As to my residence, and my two neighbors whose residences are attached to mine, it depends upon which portion of the berm you are on. Luckily, on my portion of the berm, water runs away from my house. Not so lucky for my neighbor on the other end!

When Leisure World constructed the buildings in Mutual 14, there were numerous soil issues. I am now quoting from the C. Bill Courtright document entitled: "The First Ten Years of a Five Year Plan 1966-1976 — pg. 33 - Chapter 8 "Construction Problems" *: "Test bores in the Mutual 14 area proved that the soil there was not suitable for the type of buildings planned and it became necessary to replace much of it."

It should be noted that Leisure World's proposed construction site for the new building is immediately adjacent to Mutual 14 and consists of the same type of soil. And then there's the soil issue of the recently added fitness center room which was built onto Clubhouse Two. It was discovered after construction had begun that the soil was sinking and costly adjustments had to be made.

In addition to the absolute location of the site, we should also be assessing what impact there will be in regard to the site's relative location. Most importantly in this regard is what will the proposal's impact be vis-a-vis the "view shed." If the Board's proposal is carried out, the view that one has of our community as he or she enters Leisure World off Georgia Avenue will be hideously altered. Instead of viewing the existing admin building with its beautifully landscaped
grounds (shrubs and mature trees), one will be looking at "a sea of asphalt" (quote from former Leisure World employee/Project Manager, Architect- Nicole Gerke). Also, 60 MATURE TREES will be destroyed.

Part of the intent of good site plan implementation is to ensure that the design is environmentally sound and aesthetically responsive to the needs of the community. As to placing a new building down in a ditch, this defies logic. Why would you deliberately put the structure in the most environmentally precarious part of the site? The best location, drainage-wise, is to have the building where it is currently located. This is not rocket science, and it has less to do with the best utilization of the site and more to do with the wants of the general manager of Leisure World. You see, it comes down to his not wanting to be inconvenienced. His desire is to proceed as follows: Step 1: Build the new building down in the ditch, Step 2: When the new building is finished, have the general manager and staff immediately move into it and commence tearing down the current building.

As a retired city planner, I am of the opinion that we should be looking at the best utilization of the site and not be worrying about whether the general manager will be inconvenienced. Let's stop allowing the tail to wag the dog around here and start promoting good, sound community planning.

Planning Board Commissioners-- Honor what 2,200 Leisure World resident petitioners have requested in asking for a referendum on the building.

VOTE "NO"/ on Leisure World's site plan application.

Tom Conger
Mutual 18

slkatzman
President, "JustUs"-conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents

website: www.justus.group
email: admin@justus.group
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---

**Butler, Patrick**

**From:** Butler, Patrick  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 14, 2019 5:23 PM  
**To:** Butler, Patrick  
**Subject:** FW: Admin building CRM:0123006  
**Importance:** High

---

*Original Message*

---

**From:** mcp-crm-tracker@mncppc-mc.org;  
**Received:** Tue Mar 05 2019 10:16:28 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time)  
**To:** mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org; MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org; MCP-Chair #; ;  
**Subject:** FW: Admin building

---

**From:** JustUs admin <admin@justus.group>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 5, 2019 10:09 AM  
**To:** mont.co.planningboard@justus.group; Montgomery County Council <county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov>; justus organization <justus@justus.group>; tmo@townmeetingorganization.com; LW Green <lwgreen@justus.group>; LW Dogs <lwdogs@justus.group>; vaughn stewart <vaughnstewart3@gmail.com>; Marc Erlich <marc.elrich@montgomerycountymd.gov>; Anderson, Casey <Casey.Anderson@mncppc-mc.org>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Admin building  
**Importance:** High

---

**From:** Douglas Alexander <dougalex1@gmail.com>  
**Date:** Tue, Mar 5, 2019 at 10:03 AM  
**Subject:** Admin building  
**To:** <admin@justus.group>

The L. W. admin building is a Frank Lloyd style building which should not be torn down. The county has a department which is intent on preserving mid century modern buildings. The building should be renovated and preserved with the stonework and skylight and courtyard. The new building would be very out of place.

Susan Alexander
slkatzman
President,
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents

admin@justus.group

Albert Einstein – “We cannot solve our problems with the same level of thinking that created them.”
Butler, Patrick

From: admin@justus.group
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2019 7:38 PM
To: mont.co.planningboard@justus.group; justus organization;
tmo@townmeetingorganization.com; LW Green; lwdogs@justus.group
Cc: Montgomery County Council; Marc Elrich; vaughn stewart
Subject: Delegate Stewart Admin Building Testimony
Attachments: Delegate Stewart LW Admin Building Testimony.pdf

From: Vaughn Stewart <delegatesstewart@gmail.com>
Date: March 14, 2019 4:34:34 PM EDT
To: mcp-chair@mnccpc-mc.org
Cc: admin@justus.group
Subject: Delegate Stewart Admin Building Testimony

Please see attached: Delegate Vaughn Stewart’s written testimony regarding the proposed administrative building.

Thanks,

Sophia Heimbrock
Chief of Staff
Del. Vaughn Stewart, District 19
(410) 841-3528

slkatzman
President, “JustUs”- conscience of the community
“JustUs” advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents
website: www.justus.group
email: admin@justus.group
Great minds have always encountered violent opposition from mediocre minds. The mediocre mind is incapable of understanding the man who refuses to bow blindly to conventional prejudices and chooses instead to express his opinions courageously and honestly.

(Albert Einstein)

town meeting organization (TMO)
website: www.townmeetingorganization.com
Chairman Anderson,

I am writing with regard to the proposed administration building in the Leisure World community. I have had the privilege of speaking with dozens of Leisure World residents about this issue. It has become clear to me that the residents hold a wide variety of views on the import of the proposed administration building.

To the extent that the Planning Board wants to see a consensus among Leisure World residents before moving forward, I recommend that the Board accept further public input and continue deliberations on this issue. A consensus among residents does not yet exist.

For a proposed project of this magnitude, it is essential that the decision making process remain fair and democratic.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Vaughn Stewart
Maryland State Delegate, District 19
AN OPEN LETTER TO THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Please consider the following

You are Physicians having the specialty practice - "Planning."

That’s right! Just think about that, metaphor, for a moment...

You shoulder an awesome responsibility. In a way, you make “life and death” decisions regarding the "structural well being" of Communities.

As such, you are also bound to follow the Doctor’s primary principle - “First, do no harm.”

Many residents in the Leisure World Community are counting on you to keep that principle in mind. Why? Because within the next few weeks, you will be asked to make a decision... you will be asked to approve the termination a 54 year old building.”

It is known that “making house calls,” is rare in this “day and age.” Still, make an exception. Come see “The Patient” for yourself before deciding. You will cast a vote. Please make it an “informed” vote.

Those who will be making the request to you, regarding demolition, have not consulted the Family of the patient.
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They will say they have...But...they HAVE NOT! Over 2,000 "family members," who have signed a petition attest to this fact...

What's wrong with the patient? Nothing that a "renovation” cannot cure.

Through the years the Administration building has been "stuffed with things" it did not need...

1. a bank when there are 6 banks just across the street.
2. a post office when there is one just across the street.
3. several offices occupied by a Realtor. The same one that has a large office just across the street.

Those who profess to represent the Leisure World "family" self proclaim their authority. They say it is bestowed upon them by Bylaws written in the 1980s. That matter is currently under MC Circuit Court challenge. That is not your concern...

Here is what should be...

Leisure World representatives came before you 16 months ago (November 30, 2017). They presented a Plan and made a request. Others from the LW Community stated the request being made was unwarranted. They presented evidence demonstrating the Community was not even surveyed about destroying the current Administration building. The 8,000 residents were denied a voice in the matter. No resident concurrence or consensus was ever sought. This should not be permitted when the expenditure of millions of dollars hang in the balance.

Your instructions to those seeking to destroy, & then rebuild, were clear & simple in 2017. The words of record were..."Go back to the LW Community and seek Consensus." That was not done. The Leisure World General Manager affirms it was not done. He has repeatedly explained why he did not attempt to do this. The reason is... because, he says, no one ( the Leisure Board?? ) instructed him to do that.

Now, however, you are expected to “OK” the death of the very building that has been neglected by that very same LW General Manager. Tens of thousands of dollars are currently being spent to eradicate mold because of a lack of preventative maintenance. With that underway, and once completed, you are expected to approve the destruction of the very building where the “Mold” has been eradicated?

Does this make sense to you?

Leisure World has a building that can be modernized. It can easily accommodate existing staff and even more if needed. All that is required is “the will” to do it and an “assist” from you, who have a responsibility to...“First, do no harm.”

A picture of the Patient requesting you to care...

Bob Ardike
From: Norman Dreyfuss
Received: Sun Mar 03 2019 17:03:24 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
To: mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org; MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org; MCP-Chair #; ;
Subject: FW: LEISURE WORLD - BUILD IT AND THEY WILL COME?...from Bob Ardike

THE LEISURE WORLD GOLF COURSE DOES NOT HAVE TO REMAIN A REVENUE "PARASITE."

Dome Over the Leisure World Golf Course.

Plans have been developed to encase the entire 94 acres of the LW Golf Course within a Dome. It is believed, this would be a "First." Something found nowhere else in the world.

Build it...An Indoor 18 hole Golf Course... and they will come.

Just imagine the Revenue. A limited use facility becomes self sustaining.
Final costs for the project remain to be determined. A preliminary estimate to construct the Dome, provided by the Chair of the LW Budget & Finance Advisory Committee, pegs the cost at around 2 billion dollars. The Chair of the BFAC plans to meet with several tellers, who work in the financial institution located in the Administration building, to narrow the figure. Right now, there are hopes to amortize the construction loan over a period of 415 years.

At the moment, however, the Chair of the BFAC is sequestered with the General Manager. They are pondering whether it is absolutely necessary to submit the preliminary plan to the (MCPB) Montgomery County Planning Commission? There is also some worry. The general feeling of Leisure World management is that the Commissioners, on the MC Planning Board, are incapable of “seeing the big picture.”

Lastly! There is a strong indication that a “senior level” Leisure World employee submitted a letter of resignation over being told of this project. She was told that IF it were decided the “Dome proposal had to be submitted to the Planning Board, she would be the one who would do and defend it.

Not all of what she said can be printed (mature audiences advised). This much can be, “You expect me to defend this to the Montgomery County Planning Board? I don’t need this. I’m out of here!”

* Below is a sample “resignation letter.” Any resemblance between this sample letter and the one that may have been submitted as a result of the above is purely coincidental...

Leisure Management needs a replacement who will be versed enough to go before the (MCPB) Planning Board to present the proposal. A substitute has yet to be chosen.

A “competition,” among the remaining LW employees will determine who will be assigned the task. The “loser” will be given the dubious honor. The General Manager has decided that...a “Round-robin” tournament of “Rock-Paper-Scissors” will establish who gets the job...OMG!

A loan of the size needed is not “chicken feed.” “Good faith” money must be deposited. Keep tuned to this “email station.” You will be amazed where that money is going to come from...

Bob Ardike
MEMORANDUM
Leisure World of Maryland Corporation
3701 Rossmoor Blvd.
Silver Spring, MD 20906

TO: LWCC Board of Directors
FROM: Kevin Flannery
DATE: January 18, 2019
SUBJECT: Nicole Gerke resignation

I would like to advise you that I have received a letter of resignation from Nicole Gerke, the Physical Properties Department’s director of community services, effective February 8.

Nicole and I have met with Ron Pancotti and Tom Snyder and are preparing a strategy regarding areas of responsibility leading up to February 8. I will keep leadership informed of our progress recruiting her replacement.

In her letter Nicole said that “working at LWM has been a positive experience and one for which I am grateful.... I have enjoyed working at Leisure World.”

I greatly appreciate all the contributions Nicole has made to the community and the management organization in the five years she has spent here and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.
From: admin@justus.group
Sent: Saturday, March 2, 2019 11:20:23 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Anderson, Casey
Cc: Cichy, Gerald; Fani-Gonzalez, Natalia; Patterson, Tina; Sanders, Carrie; Butler, Patrick; vaughn stewart; justus organization; tmo@townmeetingorganization.com; LW Green; lwdogs@justus.group; Marc Elrich
Subject: A message to the Montgomery County Planning Board: The Need for an Inclusive Public Hearing

In the current issue of PLANNING (magazine of the American Planning Association) is an article titled, "Tips for Inclusive Public Meetings."

The article offers 6 tips, one of which is "Meet People Where They Are."

In the article, it points out that asking groups to come to city hall or other government buildings can be inconvenient, and, in some cases, intimidating for them. The article further states that, in order to gain more effective citizen participation, the Planning Board should set up gatherings in places directly related to the groups they are targeting.

In the case of Leisure World and the public hearing on the administration building, the Planning Board should be targeting the citizens of our 55 and over community, not having the hearing in the MNCPPC building in downtown Silver Spring.

The Silver Spring location is undesirable for a number of reasons: it is not convenient for the elderly residents of our community, the room where the hearing will be held is small, cramped, and not equipped to handle a large group of
citizens, and the "psychological atmosphere" is indeed intimidating. The lawyers for LWCC will love the atmosphere of the setting, whereas your average Leisure World resident will not.

So, why not have the hearing in Leisure World? In Clubhouse One, the Ballroom can easily accommodate hundreds of residents.

Planning Board members, if you truly desire an INCLUSIVE PUBLIC HEARING, change the location of the gathering and have it where the most people will be able to participate--here in Leisure World.

Tom Conger.
Mutual 18
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Butler, Patrick

From: Butler, Patrick
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2019 5:29 PM
To: Butler, Patrick
Subject: FW: LEISURE WORLD - THE MAGNIFICENT SEVEN? ...from Bob Ardike CRM:0123009

-------------- Original Message ---------------
From: Norman Dreyfuss;
Received: Sat Mar 02 2019 12:53:47 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
To: mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org; MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org; MCP-Chair #; ;
Subject: FW: LEISURE WORLD - THE MAGNIFICENT SEVEN? ...from Bob Ardike

From: Marybeth Ardike
Sent: Saturday, March 2, 2019 12:53:34 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: LW Board of Directors; Leisure World News; aclwm@lwmnc.com
Cc: admin JustUs; Montgomery County Council; Fani-Gonzalez, Natali; Cichy, Gerald; Patterson, Tina; Anderson, Casey; Marc Elrich; ben kramer; vaughn stewart; bonniecullison; ben shneider; CCOC@montgomerycountymd.gov; Dreyfuss, Norman
Subject: LEISURE WORLD - THE MAGNIFICENT SEVEN? ...from Bob Ardike

A previous email showed the names of residents on the LWCC, Leisure World Board of Directors, in 2013. Now "fast forward" to the year...

2019

Nine (9) who were on the Board in 2013 have remained on the Board. Twenty-five (25), current, members were not on the Board in 2013

Seven (7) of the Nine (9) who were on Board in 2013 deserve “Special Recognition.”

They are Leisure World’s Magnificent Seven (remember the 1960 movie with Yul Brenner?)

It is also they who have PACKED the Leisure World Executive Committee for 6 years (look at the names shown. They just keep “recycling”). What’s more, these same individuals ensured they were added as members to significant Leisure World Advisory Committees.
Now! One might be inclined to ask, “How were they able to be placed on “significant LW Advisory Committees?” Here is how...

Prospective members to an Advisory Committee make known the desire to join a given Committee. The name(s) is then forwarded by the respective Mutual Presidents to the residing Chairperson of the LWCC. The residing Chairperson has the final say in deciding who is named.

So, and here is the “kicker.” If you are the President of a Mutual, and you want to be on a “certain” Advisory Committee, is there any doubt about you being named? It really is plain and simple as that!

Here are the Names to Remember

Leisure World Community Corporation
Executive Committee
2013
Members Present: Barbara Cronin, Chair; Vice Chair; David Frager,
Executive Secretary; Henry Jordan,

Leisure World Community Corporation
Executive Committee
2014
Members Present: Barbara Cronin, Chair; Vice Chair; David Frager,
Executive Secretary; Henry Jordan, Paul Eisenhaur, Phil Marks,
Linda Wacha

Leisure World Community Corporation
Executive Committee
2015
Members Present: David Frager, Chair; Executive Secretary; Henry Jordan,
Barbara Cronin, Paul Eisenhaur, Phil Marks,
Linda Wacha

Leisure World Community Corporation
Executive Committee
2016
Members Present: David Frager, Chair; Executive Secretary; Henry Jordan,
Barbara Cronin, Paul Eisenhaur, Phil Marks,
Linda Wacha

Leisure World Community Corporation
Executive Committee
2017
Members Present: David Frager, Chair; Executive Secretary; Henry Jordan,
Barbara Cronin, Paul Eisenhaur, Phil Marks,
Linda Wacha

Leisure World Community Corporation
Executive Committee
2018
Members Present: Paul Eisenhaur, Chair; Executive Secretary; Henry Jordan, Phil Marks,
Linda Wacha
And last, but not least, let us acknowledge the role of a former Leisure World Chairperson, Marion Altman. Her reign extended from 2008-2011. She is the Chairperson "credited" for requesting the first legal opinion in 2009, "sparking" everything which followed.

Consider this...you might think of her as Leisure World's “Yul Brenner,” if you think of who played “the leading role” in the Leisure World saga, resulting in the 2018 Class Action Lawsuit challenging LW’s manner of Governance...

In summary...

Had these individuals not been willing to compromise their personal reputations, by doing what they saw as necessary, LW would not be in its present state. For it is they, who have controlled the Narrative and set the Agenda for the Community, for the past Six Years.

More about the sophisticated approach these individuals embarked upon, to ensure LW’s Governance would be challenged in the County Court system, will be forthcoming.

Bob Ardiike
The Leisure World Community Corporation (LWCC) Board of Directors is comprised of 34 Directors. They represent 29 separate and distinct entities called Mutuals.

The major addressees of this email are the 2019 Leisure World Community Corporation (LWCC) Board of Directors.

LOOK carefully at what is shown below. You will see the names of LWCC Board members for the year 2013. Do you see your name?

Likely you do not see your Name. Here is why...

Only Nine of you...9... were LWCC members back in 2013...
SO...

That means you have not had the opportunity to carefully examine and discuss...

1. The letter dated March 9, 2009, wherein counsel for LWCC conceded Leisure World is subject to the 1987 Maryland HOA Act.

OR

2. *The complete 2012 report from the LWCC mandated Special Committee which was established to Review Leisure World Governing Documents. Richard P. Thornell, an Attorney and Professor of Law Emeritus, served on that Committee. He and the other members, of "The Special Committee," found that the selection process for the Leisure World Governing Board did not comply with the HOA Act of 1987 and that Leisure World homeowners are denied their right to an election. The Special Committee made recommendations to remedy this. Those recommendations were ignored by the Board at the behest of the LWCC Chairperson at the time.

*Professor Thornell, who was on that “Special Committee” in 2012, is the “lead” Plaintiff in the class action lawsuit currently in the Montgomery County Circuit Court

Here is the “News” I take no joy in breaking to you. Even if you see the documents referenced above; even if you agree with what you read; you can do nothing to change "what is"...

Here is why...

The “Narrative,” assuming you understand the usage of that term, is totally controlled by 5 of the 7 people who made up the Executive Committee in the year 2013( go back to see the names) plus the previous Chairperson, who reigned from 2008 - 2011 and the present Chairperson of the Board.

Just reflect on this, if only for a moment...

Those who control the Narrative also control the Agenda...and those 7 people remain in control of the Narrative

More about this tomorrow...
Seven 7 is an Unlucky Number... for the 8,000 Residents of Leisure World
**Executive Committee – 2013:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Barbara Cronin</th>
<th>M 17A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair</td>
<td>David Frager</td>
<td>M 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>Henry Jordan</td>
<td>M 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Phil Marks</td>
<td>M20B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Lawrence Traynham</td>
<td>M 20A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Neil Ross</td>
<td>M 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Linda Wacha</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Mutual</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>2nd Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
<td>224.5</td>
<td>Charles Smith</td>
<td>Jim Engle*</td>
<td>Marita Buscher*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
<td>224.5</td>
<td>Jim Perretta</td>
<td>James Olsen*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
<td>224.5</td>
<td>Linda Wacha</td>
<td>Jim McAlister*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
<td>224.5</td>
<td>Mary Louise Furgurson</td>
<td>Eleanor Friedenberg*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Marion Herrington</td>
<td>Shannon Braddock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6A</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Margaret Bacon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6B</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Susan Eisenhour</td>
<td>Carolyn Martese</td>
<td>Eileen Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6C</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Richard Fine</td>
<td>Alvin Temin</td>
<td>Bud Tardiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Arthur Rounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nadine Roberts</td>
<td>Anneliese Guerin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Lennox French</td>
<td>Betty Kontaxis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Paul Eisenhaury</td>
<td>Michael Showalter</td>
<td>Dora Pugliese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Yvette Rich</td>
<td>Jack Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Marian Altman</td>
<td>Clarise Pruitt-Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Billie Saunders</td>
<td>Antonio Marotta</td>
<td>Paul Bessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>John Radcliffe</td>
<td>Linda O'Neill</td>
<td>Richard Bambach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Richard Carlson</td>
<td>Virginia Pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>James Turner</td>
<td>Joan Allston</td>
<td>Corwin Bambach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 17A</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Barbara Cronin</td>
<td>Sheila Szymanski</td>
<td>Susan Curow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 17B</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Frances Deakins</td>
<td>Beverly Stevens</td>
<td>Ray Kurlander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Joel Swetlow</td>
<td>Alan Stokely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 19A</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Elayne Klein</td>
<td>Pat Dunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 19B</td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Lawrence Damsky</td>
<td>Virginia Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 20A</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Lawrence Traynham</td>
<td>Susan Krause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 20A</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Sara Kain</td>
<td>Ken Zajic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 20B</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Philip Marks</td>
<td>Philip Klubes</td>
<td>Paul Spiegel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 20B</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Al Lukas</td>
<td>Jane Hughes</td>
<td>Barbara Kaze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Rosalind Kipping</td>
<td>Arthur Kaufman</td>
<td>Marilyn Kaze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Jane Morgan</td>
<td>Carole Portis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Henry Jordan</td>
<td>Sid Sussan</td>
<td>Marvin Franklin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Roy Dickstein</td>
<td>Bill Heyman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Barry Lubin</td>
<td>Judy Friedman</td>
<td>Ruth Friedman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>David Frager</td>
<td>Gene Byron</td>
<td>Sid Gritz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All MM alternates may serve in place of any of the four MM directors.
From: admin@justus.group
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2019 8:39 AM
To: mont.co.planningboard@justus.group; Garcia, Joyce
Cc: Montgomery County Council; vaughn stewart; justus organization; LW Green; tmo@townmeetingorganization.com; lwdogs@justus.group
Subject: Leisure World Site Plan 820170120---LW Administration Building site plan

This is correspondence for publication on the Park & Planning online link

From: Valerie Williams <val2stamp@gmail.com>
Date: March 15, 2019 1:41:39 AM EDT
To: Just US Legal Committee <admin@justus.group>
Subject: Re: LW Administration Building site plan ---Park & Planning

To: Mont. Co. Park & Planning Board Commissioners.
From: Valerie V. Williams - Mutual 22

I have been an unit owner/resident of Leisure World (LW) since January 2014. Why do we need a new Administrative Building (Admin) here in LW? How often does the average resident even use that building? OK, so when the current building was constructed, as a sales office, including a Bank, a Post Office and a Real Estate Office was very convenient for future owners and the residents. That made sense because, fifty years ago, there wasn't a Leisure World Plaza (LWP) outside the main gate. Now, there is no reason for these businesses to be taking up space in the Admin Building.

When Bank of America decided not to renew their lease, that area would have doubled the existing space for the admin staff. At that time, we had to pay thousands of dollars for mold remediation for that area of the building. We should also remove the Post Office. There are two Post Offices a short distance from LW, one in LWP and another on Connecticut Ave. We should also remove the Real Estate Office; there are several in LWP, as well as several Banks located in LWP. Leisure World provides shuttle buses that go the LWP 4 days a week. If this commercial space was designated for the Admin Staff, that should be sufficient space. Another option would be to redesign the Atrium that now exists in the Admin building lobby. There is no further expansion within LW, therefore, there should not be a need for additional employees.

A. R. Meyers + Associates Architects, Inc. AIA, submitted to the LW Board a report dated 08/08/12, "Leisure World of Maryland Administrative Building - Space Needs Assessment and Preliminary Systems Review". In this report, the board was given several options. This report recommended that an engineering study be done for the Admin building. An engineering study was never done.
Appendix AA

According to the LWCC Board of Directors (BOD) Meeting records, a few of the reasons for a new building were as follows: 1. They didn't want to spend $100K for an engineering study. 2. They didn't want the staff to have to deal with working in temporary trailers - not convenient for them. (Considering the conditions, they are now working in, they might actually like working in a trailer.) To me and many LW resident/owners these are not valid reasons to spend millions of dollars on a new building.

I was not able to attend the 30 Nov 17 Montgomery County Parks and Planning Commission (MCPPC) meeting, however, I did listen to the broadcast. LWCC has not done what the board recommended. There is no consensus! All they did was to make changes to their site plan. They then presented these changes during the Mutual Board Meetings in the Feb/March 2018 time frame. They did not discuss the changes, they presented these changes.

They still don't get it, "We the people" don't want the expense of a new admin building. The effect on the environment, the landfill and the destruction of dozens of trees is too high a price to pay for a new building that is not needed or necessary. The idea of replacing mature trees with 5-6' shade trees is surely a joke. Who is the shade for? The squirrels?

"If you cut down a tree, is what you are putting in its place worth the sacrifice? Does it matter in the long run, or is it only about short-term ego?" This was taken from a book I recently read by Nora Roberts novel "Heart of the Sea". This statement really hit home for me.

All the buildings in LW are aging, including the Mutual Buildings. I live in Mutual 22, "The Pines". It is a 4-story condo with 94 units, which was built in 1981. We had an engineering study done for our building in 2017. Our building needs 1.5 million dollars' worth of repairs; and that is only repairs for the outside of the building.

Every owner when buying in LW pays a 2% Resale Fee at closing. I and several other residents, were under the impression that the 2% Resale Fee was divided between the Trust Properties and the Mutual in which we were buying. This is not the case, although it makes sense to do it that way. This should be changed and made retroactive to at least 2010. Many Mutuals are having major problems with their buildings. That 1% fee is needed by the mutuals, not squandered on a new admin building that is not necessary. Did you know that the LW BOD had been talking about increasing the fee from 2% to 3%? Oh,
and maybe 1% might go to the mutual! It’s time for the General Manager and the LW BOD to listen to the residents/owners. There are a lot of residents who live here now, that were not here in 2010, when that decision was made. It might have made sense back in 2010 to build a new admin building, it doesn’t make sense now.

We should be following Montgomery County’s example of “Revitalizing Buildings” not tearing them down and putting up a parking lot! The building design is of historical value and should be saved.

slkatzman
President, “JustUs”-conscience of the community
“JustUs” advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents
website: www.justus.group
email: admin@justus.group

town meeting organization (TMO)
website: www.townmeetingorganization.com
I am an owner in Leisure World (LW) of Maryland, Fairways North, Mutual 17b. I have lived in Leisure World for 9 years and during many of those years have expressed my disappointment in the proposal for the LW Administration Bldg and Clubhouse 1 project.

I am retired after being employed by Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, Hughes, BAE, L3 with critical thinking skills. I have used these skills in my career in management supporting several government agencies (DOD, Intel) as a consultant. In my opinion this proposal is a huge waste of time, money, and not necessary. There are recommendations that would provide the access to Clubhouse 1 and the Administration Building as it stands. In the last few years more residents have been vocal with their disapproval of the proposal and have encountered new rules against protesting, collecting signatures, and in general obtaining community consensus. There is at least one fourth of the population, documented, that are against the proposal.

When the Leisure World of Maryland Community Corporation Board voted on the project several years ago, the President of my mutual, Mrs. Francis Deakins, Fairways North, voted against the building. She did this based on a survey that she conducted in our Mutual. In the last few years I have spoken to most of the residents of my mutual and can confirm that the majority are totally against the proposal for the new building. I’ve also spoken to many residents from the other 29 mutuals and hear the frustration and general
feeling that there is nothing that can be done at this time to stop the project.

The premise of the new building is to provide more parking at the entrance to Clubhouse 1 for residents that have difficulty walking from the Administration parking lot to the Clubhouse since there is an incline. This parking space will provide access to a limited amount of residents. Members of the Security & Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) were invited to design the parking area that will be created in this plan. There were two other committees that provided their input to the parking area. Please keep in mind that these committee members have no experience or expertise in planning traffic flow, parking lots, or storm drainage awareness. The members are all volunteers that give their opinion; no real expertise in what might be problems for space, storm drainage, traffic flow, Handicapped Accessibility (ADA), etc.

Recently, a member of the STAC asked the Security Director and Assistant General Manager about the Planning Boards request to confirm that there was a professional Traffic Study performed. The Planning Board has not requested a Traffic Study. As a member of the STAC I had recently requested the most recent LW Traffic Study and was provided the electronic version from 2003. The STAC has requested a new traffic study since it has been more than 15 years and there has been more development in Leisure World that has impacted traffic flow, safety, and high risk areas within the community.

Another major reason for proposing a new building is that there is a need for more space for the employees of Leisure World of Maryland Corporation. Many residents have come forth with numerous ideas for remodeling the building which would provide
more than ample space. There are many areas of wasted space in the building that would accommodate the employees.

Of major concern were the problems that the building has with mold, mildew, and asbestos. Unfortunately, the mold and mildew are as a result of poor property management from the General Manager, Assistant Manager, and Physical Properties department that were not capable of identifying the building drainage from the roof to the ground. The asbestos problem will need to be remediated regardless of the possibility of a new building or remodeling.

When this proposal began several years ago, many residents requested an Engineering Study which was dismissed by the General Manager. Unfortunately, the LWCC Board of Directors followed his recommendation. This is the same General Manager that has neglected the current building with its problems for more than 30 years.

Thanks for your attention.

Joyce Temple       cell #240-204-2597
Butler, Patrick

This is correspondence for publication on the Park & Planning online link

From: Joyce Temple <jtemple17b822@gmail.com>
Date: March 16, 2019 11:38:56 AM EDT
To: patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org
Subject: Plan 820170120 Leisure World Administration Bldg and Clubhouse 1- Hearing March 28

I am an owner in Leisure World (LW) of Maryland, Fairways North, Mutual 17b. I have lived in Leisure World for 9 years and during many of those years have expressed my disappointment in the proposal for the LW Administration Bldg and Clubhouse 1 project.

I am retired after being employed by Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, Hughes, BAE, L3 with critical thinking skills. I have used these skills in my career in management supporting several government agencies (DOD, Intel) as a consultant. In my opinion this proposal is a huge waste of time, money, and not necessary. There are recommendations that would provide the access to Clubhouse 1 and the Administration Building as it stands. In the last few years more residents have been vocal with their disapproval of the proposal and have encountered new rules against protesting, collecting signatures, and in general obtaining community consensus. There is at least one fourth of the population, documented, that are against the proposal.

When the Leisure World of Maryland Community Corporation Board voted on the project several years ago, the President of my mutual,
Mrs. Francis Deakins, Fairways North, voted against the building. She did this based on a survey that she conducted in our Mutual. In the last few years I have spoken to most of the residents of my mutual and can confirm that the majority are totally against the proposal for the new building. I've also spoken to many residents from the other 29 mutuals and hear the frustration and general feeling that there is nothing that can be done at this time to stop the project.

The premise of the new building is to provide more parking at the entrance to Clubhouse 1 for residents that have difficulty walking from the Administration parking lot to the Clubhouse since there is an incline. This parking space will provide access to a limited amount of residents. Members of the Security & Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) were invited to design the parking area that will be created in this plan. There were two other committees that provided their input to the parking area. Please keep in mind that these committee members have no experience or expertise in planning traffic flow, parking lots, or storm drainage awareness. The members are all volunteers that give their opinion; no real expertise in what might be problems for space, storm drainage, traffic flow, Handicapped Accessibility (ADA), etc.

Recently, a member of the STAC asked the Security Director and Assistant General Manager about the Planning Boards request to confirm that there was a professional Traffic Study performed. The Planning Board has not requested a Traffic Study. As a member of the STAC I had recently requested the most recent LW Traffic Study and was provided the electronic version from 2003. The STAC has requested a new traffic study since it has been more than 15 years and there has been more development in
Leisure World that has impacted traffic flow, safety, and high risk areas within the community.

Another major reason for proposing a new building is that there is a need for more space for the employees of Leisure World of Maryland Corporation. Many residents have come forth with numerous ideas for remodeling the building which would provide more than ample space. There are many areas of wasted space in the building that would accommodate the employees.

Of major concern were the problems that the building has with mold, mildew, and asbestos. Unfortunately, the mold and mildew are as a result of poor property management from the General Manager, Assistant Manager, and Physical Properties department that were not capable of identifying the building drainage from the roof to the ground. The asbestos problem will need to be remediated regardless of the possibility of a new building or remodeling.

When this proposal began several years ago, many residents requested an Engineering Study which was dismissed by the General Manager. Unfortunately, the LWCC Board of Directors followed his recommendation. This is the same General Manager that has neglected the current building with its problems for more than 30 years.

Thanks for your attention.

Joyce Temple    cell #240-204-2597
Mr. Butler, I am a owner in Leisure World; all they do it find more ways to spend money where SOMEONE is getting a kickback. BUT they can't wash the windows. It is ridiculous. Ann Ingram
Butler, Patrick

From: admin@justus.group
Sent: Sunday, March 17, 2019 5:05 PM
To: justus organization; tmo@townmeetingorganization.com; LW Green
Cc: mont.co.planningboard@justus.group; vaughn stewart; Montgomery County Council
Subject: 3-17-19 portable classrooms - Argyle Middle School

this is what was recommended in the A.R. Meyers report -Option 1 - renovate - Option 2 - renovate and expand -- using portable offices to be located in the Admin Bldg parking lot to house the employees -

LW employee - General Manager Kevin Flannery didn't think it good enough for him -

(it's certainly good enough for Montgomery County public school students and their teachers!)
skatzman
President, "JustUs"-conscience of the community
"JustUs" advocates to enhance the quality of life for all Leisure World residents

website: www.justus.group
email: admin@justus.group

town meeting organization (TMO)
website: www.townmeetingorganization.com