



Meeting Summary  
April 13, 2022

**Attendance**

Panel Members: Robert Gorman, Chair  
Dan Lovette  
Fred Marino  
Larry Quarrick  
Vivian Stone

DPZ Staff: Anthony Cataldo, Nicholas Haines and Melissa Maloney

1. **Call to Order** – DAP Chair Robert Gorman opened the meeting at 7:03 p.m.
2. **Review of Plan No. 22-09 Chick-Fil-A, 6395 Ten Oaks Road**  
Applicants and Presenters:  
Architect/Designer: Jade Mendoza, Kat Alvarez (Esencia)

**Background**

The Chick-Fil-A restaurant is placed on the eastern side of Lot D and is approximately 3.32 acres in size, zoned Business General (B-2). The Chick-Fil-A restaurant occupies the eastern corner of the property at the intersection of Ten Oaks Road and Clarksville Pike. The existing restaurant has a two-car stacking drive thru and associated parking area. There is also an existing brick retaining wall that wraps around the drive thru along the property boundary with associated landscaping along the Clarksville Pike road frontage.

The restaurant proposes to install a canopy over the existing side by side drive thru lanes to facilitate face to face ordering during peak hours. The 945 square foot canopy will be 46 feet by 20 feet in size and will stand 9.5 feet tall. The canopy will overhang 15 feet beyond the existing setback lines on site as well. This will necessitate the canopy to go through the variance process to approve the encroachment. No other alterations are proposed to the property.

**Applicant Presentation**

The applicant is seeking a setback variance for an existing Chick-Fil-A located at 6395 Ten Oaks Rd to build a 46'x 20' canopy to cover an existing 2 lane drive thru that will overhang 15' beyond the existing setback lines. The canopy will allow 2-6 employees to work outside under cover to take orders and payments during peak hours to speed up traffic. The metal canopy will be outfitted with lights, fans and heaters and will match the existing awnings for the Chick-Fil-A building. Chick-Fil-A can accommodate any special zoning requests regarding the design of the canopy or 6 columns. There will be 2' of striping areas that the employees can stand on.

**Staff Presentation.**

DPZ advised this is an existing structure and wall that will not be disturbed, and all work will happen within those boundaries. The property is subject to the Clarksville Pike Manual. If the panel has any recommendations for architecture, lighting or landscaping, they would be welcome. DPZ advised that

the applicant is seeking a setback variance for the canopy. DPZ actions tonight do not supersede the hearings examiner review of the project.

## **DAP Questions and Comments**

### **Site Design**

DAP inquired if the canopy was protruding into the right of way or the set back.

The applicant advised it is only protruding into the set back, but the canopy is matching the existing deck.

DAP asked if the existing light pole next to the wall will be relocated.

The applicant advised that the light pole will remain, and it exists outside the proposed canopy. The applicant also mentioned that there will be additional lighting provided inside of the canopy.

### **Landscape**

DAP inquired if there was vegetation or landscape adjacent to the edge of the canopy.

The applicant advised that the existing vegetation will not be disturbed. There is currently a brick wall with Arborvitae planted alongside it.

DAP suggested to add more landscaping to the 4 Arborvitae along the wall on Route 108 to create a real screen as it appears very stark.

### **Architecture**

DAP inquired if this canopy is the same as the other Chick-Fil-A stores.

The applicant advised that this is a prototype

DAP commented that the design seems straightforward and the materials and aesthetic of the steel canopy match the existing building style and design.

## **DAP Motions for Recommendations**

1. DAP Member Larry Quarrick made the following motion:

That the applicant considers enhancing the evergreen buffer along the wall to provide more screening.

DAP Chair Robert Gorman seconded.

Vote: 5-0

### **3. Review of Plan No. 22-11 Annapolis Junction Residential Building and Hotel, 10140 Junction Drive**

Applicants and Presenters:

Owner/Developer: St Johns Properties

Engineers: Mark Johnston, Carl Gutshick (GLW)

Builder: Neil Greenberg (Somerset Construction)

Architects: Faik Tugberk, Chong Cho (Architects Collaborative Inc.)

### **Background**

The roughly 2.29-acre site is comprised of remaining Parcels D & F, zoned TOD, which is in the southeast quadrant of Dorsey Run Road and Henkels Lane. The TOD (Transit Oriented Development) zone allows for the development of multi-use centers, office, and high-density residential development that are located and designed for safe and convenient pedestrian access by commuters using the MARC Trains and other public transit links. The two parcels are the last remaining undeveloped pieces of the Annapolis Junction project. The Annapolis Junction development was last reviewed by the DAP

in 2013 for the main residential, office, hotel, and retail buildings with their associated garages. Parcels D & F were initially slated to have a retail building on parcel D and a 6-story hotel on Parcel F. In April 2021 council bill (CB7-2021) was approved which would allow for a building within 750' of a MARC station to exceed 100' and up to 180' under certain circumstances. The applicants have submitted the revised proposal to take advantage of the newly established guidelines.

This project proposal revises the two buildings on Parcels D & F in the original plan. The new layout will construct two towers connected by a shared lobby and first floor restaurants. The two towers will consist of a 16-floor residential building (295 units) and a 11-story hotel (108 guest rooms). A new 5 story parking garage will also be constructed adjacent to the existing garage to provide additional parking. The existing parking structure to the south will also be revised to include parking on a partial third story.

### **Applicant Presentation**

This site currently contains a 416-unit apartment & midrise wrap configuration building, 101,000 square foot office space that is 88% leased and a 5400-retail site with 3 restaurants. There is also a 700-space intermodal parking garage that serves the Savage Marc train, 2 regional bus lanes and is a pickup point for Ft. Meade and NSA. Two approved components that are not built yet include a 14,000 square foot retail building and a 150-room hotel. The applicant was granted 180' building height to create a signature building in order to increase residential density. The site plan revision includes a single building with 2 towers and a shared podium lobby and 2 restaurants on either end. The first tower will include 108 hotel rooms and the second tower is 133' and will have 295 residential apartments. The site is located at the southeastern end of Howard County and borders the railroad tracks and sits down from Rt 32.

This site will be built as a modular (beehive) structure to expedite building. The 16-story residential building on the left will have 12' wide modules. A 1-bedroom apartment is 2 modules (24' wide) and a 2-bedroom apartment will have 3 modules (36' wide). The 11-story hotel on the right will have 14' wide modules. The modules will be fully built offsite and then erected with a crane.

A parking lot addition will be added to the existing parking garage in the bottom left of the site to accommodate more parking. The infrastructure at this site is all in place except for some sewer that needs to be rerouted and reconfiguration of the drive lanes.

The building will be visible from all sides and the 2 towers are designed to play off each other. The second floor of the hotel will have common amenities including a fitness room, community room, indoor/outdoor pool and an outdoor deck. The restaurant below will have an outdoor eating space. There is a lot of industrial activity in the area around the site. The 2 volumes of the building will be set at an angle to provide different views and relationships between the 2 structures. Each side of the building has slightly different articulation. The arrival elevation is transparent and welcoming and there will be a large canopy at the drop off. Interest was added to every façade except for the 2 facades facing each other. The end facades will have signage, especially since the hotel needs recognition.

### **Staff Presentation.**

DAP reviewed the plan for Annapolis Junction in 2013. This 2.9-acre site is a combined site of E & F parcels which is zoned TOD and is within the Rt 1 corridor. The site has direct access to the Marc Station which is adjacent to the existing garage structure. In April 2021 CB7 bill allowed the increased height of the building for the proposed hotel and residential structure with restaurants on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor. The applicants will also be adding a new 5 story parking garage. DPZ would like DAP to evaluate and make recommendations on the orientation, layout and configuration of the site plan and new structure to ensure the new building fits within the design context of the Annapolis Junction project. DPZ would

like recommendations on the design as it interfaces with the nearby Marc station as well as the road layout, architecture, landscaping and surrounding amenities.

## **DAP Questions and Comments**

### **Site Design**

The applicant advised that the streetscape including street lights and street trees has not changed since the original SDP.

DAP asked about the distance between southern face of the building adjacent to the parking structure and asked if the lower units would be getting any sunlight.

The applicant responded that the parking garage is tiered to not encumber the lower units. The new garage addition is on the hotel edge where the rooms begin higher in elevation. It was also noted that the garage was constructed high enough to provide some measure of buffer and noise reduction from the adjacent rail line.

### **Overall**

DAP commented that this is an interesting site with so many different building types and it is a very urban building in the middle of suburbia. The other residential and office buildings are very suburban, but the new building is very attractive.

### **Parking**

Regarding orientation, DAP questioned the proximity of the building to the parking garage and if the lower units will have enough daylight as they seem very close together.

The applicant responded that there is 60' between the structures. Also, the applicant bumped up the first floor of the building so those units would not be hampered by the parking garage and the parking garage in that area is not as tall as the addition. There is also a skybridge connecting the parking garage to the second level. The parking garage acts as a good buffer with the industrial rail line and they are below the decibel requirement.

DAP inquired if elevators will be included in the parking garage.

The applicant advised that they have elevators in the garage now but are adding a new one by the skybridge

DAP commented that they liked the pedestrian walkway from the garage to the building.

### **Amenity Space**

DAP inquired what amenities the residents will have living in this very dense space and commented it would be nice to have rooftop space.

The applicant advised they will have an open terrace at the penthouse that wraps around the party room. Also, there will be an outdoor deck that wraps around the indoor/outdoor pool area on the second floor of the hotel. These amenity spaces will be shared by the apartment and the hotel residents. The apartment residents can order room service from both restaurants.

The applicant advised that the site will have a semi enclosed skybridge and half will include a dog run with artificial turf with drainage underlayment.

### **Stormwater Management**

DAP inquired if the applicant will have full control over the sediment basin.

The applicant advised they have full control. The sediment basin is owned by MDOT, but the applicant has included in the covenants that they will cover the costs of all maintenance and

betterment of the site. They will maintain around the parking garage, but not within the parking garage.

DAP inquired if there was a small bio retention pond in the rear of the parking garage and what was it supposed to represent.

The applicant advised that is correct and it is a micro bio retention that will treat the new parking condition. Additional impervious material was not added, but the grades have been rearranged. The whole parking garage will be treated by the micro bio retention pond behind the garage.

### **Waterline**

DAP commented that the location of the water line may become a large maintenance issue and the applicant may want to consider pushing this out further from the building.

### **Landscape**

DAP commented that a landscape plan was not included and the streetscape with street trees and plantings is extremely important in dense areas to give some relief to the ground plane.

The applicant commented that it is a very tight site and that they recessed the building as much as possible. Trees would obstruct the building, but greenery could be incorporated on the arrival side. The green lawn areas will have a lot of vegetation included. The applicant intends to complete and compliment the streetscape.

DAP advised that when submitting the final submissions that landscape plans are provided to DPZ so DAP can review it. It will add a lot to the project to provide shade and relief. DAP commented that the landscaping looks stark. DAP advised it would be beneficial to add pops of color and street trees even if they are columnar in nature.

The applicant advised that they are maintaining the street trees along Junction Drive and the same number of trees on the SDP plan will be included. Along the residential building there will be 3 street trees with tree pits. There is not much room in the rest of the streetscape since 8' wide sidewalks need to be included. This is an urban façade with not a lot of opportunities for landscape. The applicant advised to add lushness they will incorporate large scale pots along the building. Large planters will also be used to section off the outside seating area for the restaurant. Any green areas on the plan can include trees or other vegetation, especially at the island at drop off. This project is subject to the TOD landscape requirements and there is quite a bit of landscaping around the residential and office buildings and around the garage. The area to the west of the hotel will be a stormwater management amenity with a fountain and lighting as well as a walking path, 3 overlooks with gazebos that have already been built.

DAP commented that there are many components at this site including office building, hotel, residential, retail and parking and people staying there will want the area to feel like a neighborhood and be able to walk. Streets trees and street lighting will make the area feel more like a neighborhood. DAP encourages the applicants to create a pedestrian environment at the ground level.

DAP commented that greenery could be added to the rooftops for residents to garden since you are so limited on landscape space.

### **Architecture**

DAP commented that they like the new hotel and residential building and it will be noticeable from the Marc train and advised that they like the composition and feel of the building.

DAP inquired if the building material used will be EIFS and wanted to confirm the materials for the darker parts of the façade.

The applicant advised that the larger structure is covered with EIFS, but also has pre-cast panels made of masonry and glass, especially at the ground level. The darker parts on the façade are aluminum windows.

DAP commented that the base does not seem proportionate to the scale of the building and feels “squatty” at the base with the mass above it and it is important to keep the human scale for the neighborhood.

The applicant responded that the towers are cantilevered over the base. The base is pushed in to accommodate the sidewalk.

#### **DAP Motions for Recommendations**

No motions were made.

#### **4. Review of Plan No. 22-10 Elkridge Crossing II, 3200 Washington Blvd**

Applicants and Presenters:

Engineers: Paul Cavanaugh (Fisher, Collins & Carter)

Developers: Barry Mehta, Chetan Mehta (Elkridge Developers)

Architect: Amit Barman

Landscape Designer: Kelly Mayo (The Enchanted Gardener)

#### **Background.**

The 12.74-acre site is zoned CAC-CLI and located on multiple parcels along Washington Blvd. The CAC (Corridor Activity Center) zone accommodates pedestrian oriented, urban activity centers with a mix of uses. CAC encourages multi-story buildings along the Route 1 frontage, with ground floor retail and parking to the side and rear. The Elkridge Crossing development received sketch plan approval in 2004 and phase I was completed in 2014. It included 214 units with a mix of apartments and townhomes on approximately 13.76 acres. Development of Elkridge Crossing II, approved in December 2018 has progressed through two sections since the last DAP review with 71 townhome units being completed in Sections I and II along the northern portion of the property. The revised Elkridge Crossing II plan now proposes a mixed-use development of 188 townhomes and two commercial buildings. Additional townhouse units are proposed to replace available parking at the northern section of the site, the main open space focal area is proposed to be reduced to provide additional townhouse units, and a portion Bharat Way is being eliminated and additional units are infilling the previous sticks of townhomes.

#### **Applicant Presentation**

The first sketch of this plan was approved in December 2018 to restart this project and included 158 townhomes and 48 apartments in the 2 front buildings for a total of 206 units. This is in addition to the 220 units that are in the existing community already. The applicant was granted and still has the full allocation of 206 units. The applicant planned child care in 1 building and retail in the other building at the street level and 3 floors of 24 apartments in each building. The concept of 2 matching structures and the hardscape related to Rt 1 remains unchanged.

The applicant advised that having a childcare center below regular apartments would be an issue for the children’s safety. The applicant explored the option of 55+ age restricted apartments but found that CAC zoning does not allow age restricted apartments even with a conditional use. The applicant found that an assisted living facility is allowed and there is a need for more assisted living facilities in the

county. The applicant proposes to replace the apartments to an assisted living facility with a medical adult daycare center in the 2 front end buildings. The applicant would like the DAP's permission to give up the 48 apartments from the frontage buildings and replace them with 30 townhomes and return the 18 excess allocations to the county. The applicant would like approval to reduce the total density from 206 total mixed units to 188 16'x40' townhouses that are a mixture of front and rear loading. The townhomes will have a 2-car tandem garage and an 18' driveway for a 3<sup>rd</sup> parking space and additional parking has been provided on site. It was noted that the county only requires 2 spaces per unit and .5 spaces/unit for visitor parking.

Elkridge Elementary and Elkridge Landing Middle schools will connect to the community via a stair/walkway from Daniel John Lane. The applicant proposes before and after care school care as well as full day daycare that would be convenient to the families in the community.

The main floor of the retail building will include a coffee shop, hair salon, laundry, medical offices and home improvement contractor, etc. The applicant specified that more amenity and open space than required has been added which includes far more than the previous sketch plan. The townhomes will have exterior material options such as brick or stone veneer or vinyl siding with bump out windows and have optional decks or rooftop patios.

The applicant suggested the road network is a well-organized street pattern that provides circulation throughout the community. The 35 units (section 1) on Calvin Ct and 35 units on the corner of Mugat Way have already been built. Section 2 includes the 2 sticks of units on Emily Jane Lane and opposite the model units on Mugat Way.

The required parking for the residential units is 470 spaces and the applicant is providing 620 spaces which is more than 30% excess parking. The utilities are designed in accordance with the county design manual and the applicant will provide public water and sewer connections that will safely convey the storm water runoff and manage it onsite and at the connections to Rt 1. The stormwater management is designed in accordance with the county and state requirements which includes retrofitting existing facilities and is included as part of the amenity space. The amenity stormwater management is evenly distributed throughout the property and will provide the point source treatment with small scale practices including dry wells, planter boxes and opportunities for pervious pavers. The amenity space is a required 2.64 acres, but the applicant is proposing 3.64 acres distributed throughout the community.

Landscape Designer, Kelly Mayo, presented the landscape plans for the open space sections 1-5 in detail. The primary goal of the applicant is to create quiet enjoyment spaces with accessibility and light activity spaces with trees, native plants and pollinator friendly options. The applicant will also provide community garden space, benches, walkways, gazebos, fire pits, covered barbeque areas and outdoor fitness spots with permanent equipment. Other amenities being considered include a community pavilion and deck, pickle ball court, bocce ball court, putting green, sand volleyball court, tot lot, bench swings and a tiered grassy plaza. The applicant plans to remove invasive species as needed. The 2 commercial buildings at the front of the community will have an upscale downtown feel. The building on the right will have street level parking, 2 levels of child daycare and an adult day care facility at the top level. The street level parking will be screened from Rt 1. The ground floor of the building on the left will house restaurants with outdoor seating, laundry, hair salon, medical offices, etc. with 2 levels of assisted living on top. A connector bridge is proposed to join the 2 sides of the building together and will create a gateway into the community. A 2' tall sign and logo will be on top of the gateway with the community name, Elkridge Crossing. A similar sign will adorn a freestanding feature wall at the central pavilion.

## **Staff Presentation**

This is a new revised design for the ElkrIDGE Crossing II development. The panel last saw this project in December 2018. The first 2 sections of development have been completed in accordance with the approved sketch (S-19-005) which include the northern most units along Mahant Way and the first few sticks of townhomes along Bharat Way up to section 3. DPZ noticed that submitted plans began diverging from the original approved sketch. DPZ thought it prudent to pause the project review at this time and have the panel review the new layout and proposed product. DPZ is still reviewing the plans concurrently. This is still a mixed-use development with 2 commercial buildings along Rt 1. It will be the same townhome designs with NVR architecture that was previously reviewed by the panel. The uses of the commercial buildings have changed, and the overall layout has changed and there are many differences between the current approved plan and this proposal. These include the configuration and location of the open space amenity areas, the pedestrian and vehicular circulation, the number and organization of townhouse units, and overall feel of the project. DPZ would like the panel to make recommendations and evaluate the new orientation layout and site design. DPZ asks the Panel to make recommendations on landscaping, hardscaping, furnishings, the interface with Rt 1, parking, amenity spaces, stormwater management, grading and the overall layout. Any revisions or enhancements to adjust the design would be greatly appreciated. Some necessary elements such as retaining walls are currently constructed and may affect the recommendation.

## **DAP Questions and Comments**

The DAP previously reviewed this project at the December 5, 2018 meeting and made the following meeting recommendations.

1. The applicant should consider differentiating alleys and streets in an appropriate manner.
2. Development fronting Route 1 should meet the intent of the guidelines and create an urban frontage along Washington Boulevard.

## **Site Design**

### **Overall**

DAP commented that there seems to be less open space than more. The central main space is being squeezed in on both sides with more townhomes. DAP also commented that the central park is now off center from the roadway and is no longer a focal point at the end of Doctor Patel Drive. There are a lot of dead-end streets and no street trees that were in the other scheme. There will not be any green areas in the design. The design is very different from what they were going to build before. This design is a major step back from where the applicant was in a significant way.

DAP suggested it would be better to take some of the townhouses and turn them into a smaller footprint apartment building to free up some of the streetscape and open space since it is just too crowded. The original sketch plan had a green space focal point when you entered the community and now there is just leftover green space. The previous plan had a much better design organizing elements that included landscaping. The applicant is squeezing in as many units as possible and not paying attention to any details.

DAP states the applicant should have included the previous renderings to view side by side and color coded what was changed and the style should match.

DAP commented that the original design had an order to the whole complex. When entering the community visitors would come in through the main drive that centers on a focal point and green space. Now the green space is not on center anymore and there is no focal point as you drive into the community and that makes it clear the applicant is trying to fit more units in there. The focal point could

have had a sculpture element or something that shows you are in the heart of the community and would serve as the focal point of Elkridge Crossing Way.

The applicant advised that the 2 buildings in the front had 2-4 floors of apartments with 24 units in each building.

### **Number of Units**

The previous plan had 158 townhouses + 48 apartments for a total of 206 units. The new plan has 188 townhouses which is an addition of 30 townhouses.

DAP advised it is not a one for one comparison with apartments and townhouses and the new design is a completely different plan style. The townhouse layout and design takes up much more space and requires more parking.

### **Parking**

DAP advised that having guest parking in the driveways will be insufficient and the streets will be filled with cars and trash/recycling receptacles.

The applicant advised that the 48 apartments that were planned for the 2 buildings required 2.5 parking spaces for each apartment for a total of 120 parking spaces. By eliminating the eliminated the apartments and changing to assisted living. For 50 assisted living beds, 25 parking spaces are required. The area that was a huge parking lot above the 2 frontage buildings allowed the applicant to add more units to have a more consistent community of same priced, same style type of townhouses instead of a mix of apartments and townhouses. The community was not very happy with the apartments and felt they would lower the value of the townhouse units. The townhouses are selling at \$500,000 price range and the apartments would be much lower. The density has not been increased but reduced.

DAP responded that these changes made the plan worse and the applicant is justifying it because of the change in use of the front buildings.

### **Open Space**

DAP commented that some of the areas that are suggested as open space are just left-over spaces that could not accommodate more units. DAP commented that the previous plan was better and noted that DPZ will need to address this.

The applicant advised there is 1 acre more of open space.

DPZ staff advised that the amenity space calculations presented have not been verified to be accurate yet.

DAP advised there is a difference between buffer and usable open space. The open space around the perimeter is buffer zone and has walls and no pathways and is not usable amenity space.

DAP commented that they appreciate all the amenities that were discussed and were driven by community input. DAP questioned if those amenities would really be built if there is not a formal design. DAP inquired who would maintain the amenities such as the community garden. This project should have been looked at from the beginning and created a central park for both sides of the community and not have amenities tucked behind people's townhouses. All the amenities are disjointed, and it is not a complete recreational package that should all be in a park and not scattered throughout the community.

The applicant responded to there will be a circuit of walkways and it will be accessible. The applicant loves the idea of a central park but understands that this is a high-density community and they are making the best possible use of the space. The applicant is not sure how to address the differences between a buffer zone and useable space. The community will be very walkable.

DAP commented that there are no street trees shown, and the green space is not a green necklace around the community, and it is very disjointed. Green space should have all been designed at the heart of the community and not left-over space. DAP explained that the landscape elements should be shown on the plans to illustrate the design and style to the panel.

The applicant advised that many street trees have been ordered for this community and are proposed to be planted.

DAP advised that unless we reject the plan that the panel has 1 opportunity to ensure the plans are meeting the guidelines for landscape and architecture and they are not seeing that on the plan. There needs to be an organized structure for designing the tree lined streets. DAP advised that the panel needs to see a defined landscape plan with schedules, species, numbers, and sizes.

The applicant advised that the county has very elaborate landscaping requirements and they will be meeting all the requirements.

### **Assisted Living Facility**

DAP questioned whether you will find an operator for a 48 unit assisted living facility.

The applicant advised he is a certified assisted living manager and currently own and run an assisted living home for April Bloom.

### **Landscape**

DAP would like to see a professional landscape plan for the streetscape and open spaces with plant schedules that they normally receive with submissions to see the types, sizes and species of what is proposed.

### **Architecture**

DAP advised they would appreciate seeing plans and elevations of the units. DAP inquired if the units are narrower than the previous design.

The applicant advised they are the same units that have been there all along and section 1 is built. The units are 16' wide by 40' deep units with 18' driveways in front of them. The Ryan townhomes are very popular units. The applicant advised that the wider units are previously built and are 2 over 2 which is part of Elkridge Crossing I. Elkridge Crossing II is the piece to the left that wraps around and connects.

DAP commented that they need to see the architecture and only saw a rough sketch of the gateway and nothing of the individual housing units.

### **DAP Motions for Recommendations**

DAP Chair Robert Gorman made the following motion:

That the applicant addresses the following items, describe how the current proposal is better from a design perspective, and return to the DAP for a second review.

1. A more rational road plan.
2. Allow more additional guest parking on the street.

3. A more rational open space plan with an attempt to connect them.
4. Include street trees.
5. Have fewer townhouse units.

DAP Member Fred Marino seconded.  
Vote: 5-0

**5. Other Business and Informational Items**

- a. The next DAP meeting will be April 27, 2022.
- b. The May 11, 2022 DAP meeting is tentatively scheduled.

**6. Call to Adjourn**

DAP Chair Robert Gorman adjourned the meeting at 9:30 PM