I enjoyed the two presentations at the Civic Center last night, although I preferred the second one (senior housing). One of the things I liked about that plan was the provision of two meeting rooms accessible to the outside. Silver Spring already has a meeting room crisis [the new library is not helping] and it’s most important to the community that there be meeting rooms that can be reserved by groups of all kinds. The Quakers in Philadelphia guaranteed themselves a place in heaven when they included free meeting rooms of all sizes when they renovated their old Meeting House.

Walter E.

Dear Sirs,
I vastly prefer the Gudelsky-Centronia proposal after attending the October 4 meeting! The Victoria Housing building looks like a huge fortress. It reminds me of the horrible former Wheaton library.

Regards,
Beverly M.

Good morning,

I was unable to attend last night's meeting, but I'm very interested in the two proposals that you've posted online for the old Silver Spring library site.

I have to say that I'm disappointed in both proposals. The site is next door to a 12-story apartment building, only a few blocks from the Silver Spring metro, near fantastic amenities in downtown Silver Spring, and on a major road. To build only a 4-story building with 92 units, or even worse to limit the redevelopment to a single-use low-rise child care center, is a waste. To put 92 surface parking spaces on a site with 92 units of mostly affordable senior housing that is well-served by bus lines and a few blocks from the Metro is also a waste. My understanding is that car ownership rates among low-income seniors are relatively low, and the site is just down the street from a large public garage for any childcare staff who choose to drive.

Given the apartment building next door, the height of the townhouses across the street that are built into the hill, and the height of other nearby buildings (the apartments at Cedar & Ellsworth, the apartments on the NW corner of Colesville & Spring) the site could easily accommodate a 6-8 story building without impact to the character of the neighborhood. This would provide dozens of additional units of desperately needed housing over the current proposals, or additional space for community amenities or offices. Given the location and the type of housing planned, no additional parking beyond the 92 already proposed spaces should be needed.

If an expanded plan is infeasible, then I would much rather see the Spring House plan than one that provides no additional housing at all. I also strongly support the child care use that's in both proposals. I have two young children and am well aware of the need for additional options in the area, especially if they can provide affordable child care for those who are unable to spend nearly double their mortgage on daycare the way I do.

For what it's worth, I live in the single family neighborhood just down the street. I imagine that comments from those of my neighbors who dislike any change or additional development will be plentiful, but please know that they do not speak for the entire neighborhood. Some of us chose to live
Sincerely,
Catherine V.

My wife and I attended last night’s presentation of the two proposals by both teams and would like to offer the following observations:

1. The proposals are have very different goals and is hard to compare them in the same plane.
2. The Children’s Day Care center proposal appears to have the best approach to the site. It is the least disruptive of the overall environment and has the strongest purpose/concept basis. It’s main weakness is the insufficient response to the elderly housing component/requirement. That might be solved by negotiating a higher level of units than the proposed 15.
3. The housing block proposal looks far weaker in many respects. This building is bulky and does not fit well in the site. The presentation cleverly avoided showing the looming apartment building next door, and the overwhelming site coverage that will greatly disrupt the existing environment. It also misses an opportunity to express the strong potential of an Architectural Statement that does not try to cow-tow to the surrounding housing stock. The building “front” looks at a 12 story mediocrity. What a sad view for the apartment dwellers. Furthermore, how can this outfit function well with so little parking and so many site circulation problems that its many distinct functions bring up? We also think that the undefined daycare space size and location appears to be another problem. And why does it show a courtyard in the north side where the sun exposure is nonexistent?

We greatly appreciate the opportunity to express our thoughts. We hope that the Day Care solution gets serious and positive consideration. Missing that, we hope that the Housing proposal gets a strong critical review.

Tad G.

Hello,

My name is Marciela D. and I’m a resident of the Seven Oaks-Evanswood neighborhood. I want to thank you for putting together an excellent forum yesterday on the old Silver spring library project. Both teams had good presentations and ideas. I wanted to provide some input as a younger (32) homeowner in the area and why I think the first proposal is a better fit for the neighborhood and for the Silver Spring community as a whole.

1st proposal (Martha Gudelesky Center)
· This proposal was excellent and well thought out. It seemed that the community would be able to use much of the space of the center both indoors and outdoors making it not just a building in our community but a real community member.
· Affordable **early childcare** is a critical need! As a young woman who will not get any paid maternity leave from my job, finding **infant care** is essential and very difficult in our area. This is even
more critical for low-income working families. I was heartened to see this center would incorporate infant care and have 125-150 slots for that.

- The commitment to repurposing the old building and sustainable materials for the new portion is environmentally friendly and cost-effective
- The lack of need for external funding or large zoning changes means this project could happen quickly and minimize current community disruption.
- The lack of senior housing on site was not ideal but the commitment to fund affordable housing in a block in the more immediate downtown community might be better for seniors with quicker access to restaurants, pharmacies, and transit.

**2nd proposal (Victory Housing)**

- It was great that this group would provide a high level of affordable senior housing on site. One thing that was unclear was what would happen if seniors did need to transition to assisted living eventually - would they be kicked out of this building at that time? Would there be resources to help them?
- It was disappointing to see the limited places that the community would get to interact with this formerly public space. The group referred to a “terrace" outside and one amenity room, but that really means quite a lot of loss of currently public use land for the community.
- The lack of early childcare/infant care is disappointing. Families need care for infants often starting as young as 6 weeks, and this childcare facility will not address that need for young families. MoCo wants young families to move to and remain in the county, but without adequate infant care in metro accessible areas, it’s easier and more cost-effective to move further out.
- The lack of details on space for the children was concerning and made me feel the childcare portion was not well-thought out. The proposer described children using Ellsworth Urban Park as a play area which really isn’t ideal. It seemed that perhaps the group would "figure out details later" but that could greatly affect the quality of the child care.
- The number of parking spaces seems inadequate if each resident will be given a parking space (staff for the childcare center, community members using the dog park and Ellsworth urban park, parking for childcare pickup/dropoff etc.)
- The need for zoning changes will likely make this project progress slower and creates some additional risk

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts and I hope you continue engaging with the residents of the nearby community as well as the larger Silver Spring community throughout this process.

Marcieela D.

Greetings,

I just want to say I was impressed with both presentations the other night. Although both proposals have attractive aspects, the first one, the Martha B. Gudelsky child development center, is the one I would love to see built. The Millenials, our largest generation of Americans, are starting their families and will continue to have children for the next 15 years. Millenials also love urban environments like downtown Silver Spring, with its transit options and proximity to restaurants and entertainment. I think providing a quality child development center for children ages 0-5 is a fantastic idea to attract this generation and encourage them to call Silver Spring home. They will find the area an attractive place to live and work. Having a child development center with outdoor green space is the perfect addition to
downtown and is a fabulous way to honor the former library site. In addition, Montgomery County won’t need to lend any money to make the center a reality.

I strongly hope that you choose to award the contract for the Martha Gudelsky child development center. This center would be a huge asset to our neighborhood.

Thank you,
Denise P.

Hello,

I live in the Chelsea Heights community and have a strong opinion about the 2 proposals for the old library site.

I am opposed to the Victoria Housing proposal. The building will be much too high and will eat up too much green space with its parking lot. It will ruin the view from numerous residences in my community. The beauty of the park will also be diminished as it will be dwarfed by this huge building. The building will simply be too large for this area to maintain a "neighborhood" feel. As a homeowner, I also worry that 72 subsidized housing units will have a negative impact on property values.

The MBGDCD project on the other hand will provide a much more neighborhood-friendly space, use only their own funding sources, and maintain the integrity of the original building.

If I have a say, I vote for MBGDCD!

Thank you,
Karen W.

Hello,

I am a Silver Spring resident and appreciated hearing about the two proposals for the former Silver Spring library site.

I’d like to express my concern regarding the Spring House by Victory Housing. I live across the street in the new Chelsea Heights Townhomes and a few things spring to mind about this proposal:

1) The proposal, while ambitious and thoughtful, appears to try to do too much in an extremely small space. It’s like fitting the furniture from a three bedroom home into a studio apartment. I believe the construction of such a space (which includes demolition of the current library) will not only take a much, much longer time than the other proposal, but will create a lot of air pollution due to the tearing down of the building. I can see the library from my home (I’m literally right across the street) and am extremely concerned about this.

2) The addition of all of the new residents poses several concerns:
A) There are exclusively one-way streets on Ellsworth which will make traffic difficult not only during rush hour (with the dropping off and picking up of children) but pretty much all the time. I'm not sure those small one-way streets can accommodate all of that additional traffic.

B) The new residences will need to be hooked up to the water/sewer system. When I moved in across the street, I was told I'd have to pay over $1,000 a year for the next 20 years to cover the cost. Since these apartments are all affordable housing, will the costs be taken on by Montgomery County (and passed to the taxpayers)? Also, with all of the additional homes plugged into the water/sewer system, I would think that would create additional wear and tear on the system, potentially resulting in problems and extra costs for those already in the neighborhood.

C) The proposed childcare center is not creating any outdoor space for the children and they will all be using the park nearby. This seems like the city/taxpayers are subsidizing the daycare center. Additionally, I found it troubling that the builders implied they would seek to expand their space into the nearby dog park for parking of other needed space. The current residents enjoy utilizing the space as it is.

D) Visitors to the residents of the homes will need to park on the street and there is already extremely limited street parking in that area.

E) While the homes are set to be, primarily, for low-income elderly persons, who is to say that children and grandchildren - entire families - will move into these apartments? Will there be reviews to ensure only a certain number of people per apartment? Or could one person move in, and then many other family members move in to join them? If there are 92 units, that could translate into hundreds of additional people in that small area.

3) This proposal appears that it will have a much higher cost on Montgomery County taxpayers than the day-care center. Additionally, not all Montgomery County taxpayers contribute equally - the people who live in the 4-5-year-old new housing development near the Forest Glen Metro (where there was a mansion that was torn down and turned into about 10-12 homes) pay significantly less taxes than I do, because they have not been reassessed yet - and there homes are much bigger and likely worth the same or more as my home.)

The only drawback of the Martha Guldesky childcare center is the increased traffic during rush hour - but it will probably be about the same as the Communikids daycare. I believe the Martha Guldesky center will be of great value to the neighborhood and others, and will be an asset to the immediate and further-out neighborhood. Spring House appears to be too ambitious and will cause great harm to those living near by.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Kind Regards,

Lillian W.
I attended the October 4, 2017 DGS-sponsored Re-Use of Former Silver Spring Library 'Proposals Comparison Event' at Silver Spring Civic Building. Here are my Comments:

1. Two proposals presented were: Spring House/Victory Housing Proposal to build a new Senior's apartment house plus a ground-level child care/education center; Proposal by the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center, Inc. for an Early Child Care/Development Center to be operated by CentroNia on this site, and affordable Senior rental housing elsewhere in downtown Silver Spring. These were the top two Proposals submitted in response to a Department of General Services RFP for an appropriate Re-development Design/Build/Operate project on Site of the Former Silver Spring Public Library between Colesville Road and Ellsworth Ave., Silver Spring, MD.

Both proposals aimed to fulfill the requirements of the DGS Request for Proposals:
1) provide 15 units of affordable Senior Housing in downtown Silver Spring area:
2) construct an Early Child-Care facility on-site with a qualified Child Care Provider organization to operate it. These two 'land re-use' proposals were intended to make the best possible use of the former Silver Spring Library site, including preservation of the Library's Mid-Century architectural characteristics and existing Green space at this valuable Site - stipulated at No Capital Cost to Montgomery County Government.

2. One of these Proposals - the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center, Inc. & CentroNia was thoroughly prepared, presenting a clearly thought-out design that demonstrated preservation of Green Space and the Library's architectural features. It offers a financially sound (private foundation) source of funding "at no capital cost to Montgomery County Government". This proposal is to create a highly qualified child care/development facility re-utilizing the former Library building, and subsidize rentals for 15 affordable Senior apartment units elsewhere in 'downtown' Silver Spring.

The Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center, Inc. & CentroNia proposal is the better of the two. It is the only proposal that meets and exceeds the key requirements in the DGS RFP. The Gudelsky proposal for this Site provides a garden space and an on-site early-childhood outdoor playground. It offers affordable care services to the largest number of young children (120-150). It promises a very generous financial support commitment by the Martha B. Gudelsky Foundation for design/construction of an innovative, site-suitable Child Care Center. It also offers public use of parts of the child care facility on Week-Ends and after-hours on week-days. Funding is to be guaranteed for all construction, to subsidize the child care operations, and for 15 affordable Senior Apartments elsewhere in Silver Spring CBD. Together, this makes the Gudelsky proposal a superlative offer. I strongly recommend that Montgomery County Government select the ' Gudelsky/CentroNia' proposal.

The Spring House/Victory House proposal meets minimal requirements of the RFP, but does not compare qualitatively or operationally to the Gudelsky proposal. The Spring House proposal is for a single large Senior housing apartment building with 94 small and mid-sized apartments including 15 affordable rental apartments. The new Senior apartment building is substantial, but a small ground floor child care facility serving up to 80 children is less adequate. The Spring House pre-school Child Care Provider is focused on teaching foreign languages rather than on early childhood development; it does not compare in breadth or depth to CentroNia, a recognized Metro-area early Child-care/Child Development provider for ages 0 - 5 young/pre-school child care; it is designed to serve nearly twice as many children as the Spring House proposal. The Gudelsky/CentroNia Child Care/Child Development
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The proposal would provide quality early child care that far outshines that of the Spring House/Victory House proposal.

Remarkably, the Gudelsky proposal fully funds ALL site preparation and building capital costs for this project without recourse to grants or loans from Montgomery County or the State of Maryland, and subsidizes early child care operations to make them more affordable. This gives the Gudelsky proposal a strong financial advantage. A less valuable, but adequate component is Gudelsky’s offer to fully subsidize 15 Senior rental apartments in Silver Spring. The Spring House proposal depends heavily on anticipated receipt of County and State government grants and loans, along with yet to be arranged ‘for-profit’ private capital investment. It appears to lack required financial cost details for the project’s capital costs and operating costs, and does not specify how affordability of Child Care and Senior Housing costs will actually be met.

Timing and Environment: near-term availability of an operating facility favors the Gudelsky proposal. Its Architectural design, permitting, construction time-line is scheduled for completion of an early child-care/development center on the former Library site within a two-year period, including the renovation and preservation of the existing Mid-Century style former Silver Spring Library/grounds. This proposal includes a minimum of surface parking area for a very limited number of vehicles with controlled vehicular access from Ellsworth Ave., a County street. Construction is designed to use ‘Green’ building techniques and materials. In contrast, the Spring House proposal appears to take up to four years to complete construction and includes some questionable contingencies that may require even more time to reach final completion and operational status, with less usable space for early child care.

Spring House proposes a much larger building footprint than the Gudelsky proposal. This requires razing the former Silver Spring Library entirely to construct a new apartment building twice as high as the Gudelsky building, with no clear commitment to using ‘Green’ construction methods. The Spring House proposal has large amounts of paved parking space and a two-way paved private street accessible from Colesville Road, a very congested urban-area State Highway - creating a difficult entrance/exit. The Spring House proposal would result in much less green-space/outdoor child-care facilities than the Gudelsky proposal; far too much Spring House ground-level square footage is for motorized vehicles, resulting in more traffic congestion and pollution.

4. I am a long-time Silver Spring resident (graduate of Montgomery Blair High School) and a Senior citizen not seeking affordable housing or early child care. I am also a Behavioral Science researcher (retired) specialized in understanding needs of families with small children. My adult son and his family own and occupy a home adjacent to the former Silver Spring Library (on Noyes Drive in Woodside Park).

I judge the Gudelsky proposal as best-suited to the scale and expectations of the surrounding residential neighborhoods. I view the Gudelsky proposal as the best available, most innovative and affordable facility/program for early child care at the former Silver Spring Library site. Pre-school child care is an seriously under-served need identified by Montgomery County Government, and the highest priority issue for Montgomery Moving Forward - in which I participate. I also advocate more, especially more affordable, Senior rental housing in the Silver Spring CBD. It is not essential that such Senior Housing be sited on the grounds of the former Silver Spring Library.

I strongly recommend DGS select the Martha B. Gudelsky, Inc./CentroNia proposal for the formerly Silver Spring Library site. Montgomery County government should initiate final negotiations to contract with Gudelsky/CentroNia representatives for this facility including a legally enforceable written commitment from Gudelsky/CentroNia to fulfill ‘No Capital Costs to the County’ in the RFP, including:
subsidies for affordable Senior housing and for income-qualified families of pre-school children selected to attend. I understand that this full-funding commitment will be from the Gudelsky Foundation.

Joel T.

Thank you for organizing the informative meeting on the two finalists for the old SS library use the other night. The most important question for me on redevelopment of these taxpayer owned parcels is, will the Mr. Leggett opt to sell the land to the developer or will it lease the land? And what is the process for each of these choices?

I urge the County Executive to retain ownership of our land. Right now, priorities may be senior affordable housing and day care. But 20 years from now, the priority might actually be parks and green natural space, community gardens, a school, or a health clinic. Also, if the County (and taxpayers) maintain control of the land, we are in a stronger position to shape the development and uses, especially with regards to open space, traffic circulation, pedestrian safety, parking and transit access options, and accessible services for different income levels. Could you outline the decision making process on the old SS library reuse, or direct the community to where the processes are spelled out? It seems a bit of a black box. Understanding the process will help guide community discussion and decision making.

Jean C.

As a 23-year resident of the SOECA neighborhood in Woodside, I greatly prefer the Gudelsky Child Development Center proposal for this area. Our area is residential in nature, and it is crucial to honor the mostly single-family home residential character of our community. This proposal is a better fit with the neighborhood, provides more desperately-needed green space, keeps and refurbishes the existing low-rise buildings, and still meets key service needs by providing early-development child care. The Victory Housing proposal is too large, creates another monolithic building in an area that already has way too many high-rise apartment and condo buildings, and totally fails to fit into the residential profile of our historic neighborhood.

Thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

Joseph G.

I live just two blocks from the former Silver Spring Library and have reviewed both proposals you are considering for redevelopment of that site. While both have strengths and weaknesses I support the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center & CentroNia proposal. This proposal makes the best use of the existing building, respects the character of the surrounding neighborhood, provides a vital and much-needed service in the DTSS area, and meets the County’s goal of providing new affordable living spaces for senior citizens.

The County should negotiate to increase the number of affordable apartments made available to senior citizens under this proposal. The child care center proposes to use Ellsworth Urban Park as its playground. This is a huge benefit to the center as it will not have to purchase land and equipment for a
private playground. The County should receive significant consideration for this benefit. In addition, the County should seek assurances that the center’s use of this park will not interfere with use by neighborhood children and other visitors to the park. It would be good to know what improvements/enhancements/changes will need to be made to the park to make it suitable as a playground for a child care center.

As plans for the child care center are developed in more detail, attention should be paid to the amount of parking proposed on the site as neighborhood streets already accommodate the cars of residents, users of Ellsworth Urban Park and Dog Park, and visitors to downtown Silver Spring.

Thank you,
Kristen C.

---

Dear DGS, County Executive Leggett, and David Dise;

Thank you for sharing with the public and soliciting our thoughts and feedback on proposals for reuse of the public land at the Silver Spring Library site.

I support 100% 
#1, which trumps all points > that the library land, both parcels, MUST remain owned by the Public> into perpetuity.

-- that the land management and the historic building and the building us use be transferred to the Parks Department, (and Rec Dept to manage programs)
-- that the Master Plan and PROS plans, as promissory notes to the public, dictate that land disposition should remain public, and the sale of this land to another owner violates the pubic trust.
-- that the residents of downtown , with exploding population, need public land larger pocket parks and green spaces, and we should not sell public land to build more cement.
and, I strongly disagree that the library lands (2 parcels) be disposed of. This public land should NEVER be sold to a private entity.

With that said, secondarily, what I like about the Guldesky proposal: 
-- the building visually and conceptually as presented > in size and scale is good. There is a good balance of building mass and limited expansion of the built footprint. 
--It keeps the historic library> excellent!
--it maintains the current building footprint, and maximizes /keeps the sorely needed outdoor open and green space> environmentally very good.
--I like that the Guldesky's are from Silver Spring, my daughter is the 4th generation of my family to live in the neighborhood. My grandfather also designed Silver Spring churches, schools, and community spaces, and public housing. His was a voice of reasonable development when Silver Spring was THE first Suburb. These kinds of family legacies are good things and keep a part of the old with the new. However I don't agree that the Guldesky's take ownership of this public land. I like that they have a good sense of why this library site means so much to the community, long time residents and newcomers,who live here, and am excited their Foundation's proposal reflects this same community vision.

The proposed building Use:
-- childcare is ok, although what the community wants and needs and lacks and has asked for for 5+ years, is a teen center in the library building, with indoor and outdoor spaces (as the 5-year old teen charrette so carefully dictated) Of course the community agreed some child care and senior care could co-habitat, with different hours or rooms set aside for the different ages, and/or overlapping such as seniors reading to small children during the day, and teens having a place to play ping pong or volleyball, or watch movies or do art, or hang out and talk indoors after school or evenings or weekends, or a teen teaching a senior how to use social media! :).

**What I don't like about the Gudelsky proposal:**

-- **Car TRAFFIC** and ingress/egress

150 children - is A LOT, and would generate traffic for a small school, and would generate traffic inside the neighborhood from 7-10 am and 3-7 pm. **Unless it is contained to Colesville Road, and Cedar Street.** The site visitors MUST not have access on Ellsworth Drive from Dale. Otherwise, the County and developer need to allocate thousands of dollars to mitigate safety on Ellsworth Drive. The street will need lighting, sidewalks the entire length of Ellsworth (Cedar to Dale) and on both sides of the street. The road will need car lanes and bike lanes, and safety and noise mitigation. This street needs to remain a safe, walkable, quiet street. The street is the MAIN pedestrian pathway for hundreds of people that live in downtown silver Spring and the surrounding 1 mile radius! There are walkers, strollers, bikers, of all ages. More cars won't mix well. Ellsworth is now our entire neighborhoods MAIN Street. Downtown residents, Chelsea Heights residents, bike riders, bike commuters, families all use it as THE pedestrian access route.

-- Retaining the SOECA Neighborhood Traffic Protection Plan. In addition to funding extensive mitigation on Ellsworth, The SOECA neighborhood has strict existing Traffic Restrictions and must be maintained as the legal promises for the last 20+ years.

-- I could not find any track records for the Gudelsky Foundation running a day care center, its seems this might be their first shot at such an endeavor. This is worrisome. Is this a long term 20-30 year proposal? or a test run for a few years.

**I do not like the Victory Housing proposal**

-- The footprint is way to large, it envelopes the entire acreage (or almost all of it) and leaves little to NO green or open space,

-- It adds more cars and even more parking spaces

-- the design is boring, milk-toast and generic, and is disrespectful and does not integrate the historic library design.

Frankly, Senior Housing and the Victory Housing proposal belongs should be placed and integrated into the new Gudelsky White Oak project development. This land is wide open has hundreds of thousands of acres, it will be on a transit line, and would be much more suitable, have more 'air and outdoor space, and access to shops.

Kathleen S.

If you must choose between the two finalists presented at the Oct 4th presentation, please choose the **Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center & Centronia.** I am a father of two and live on Mayfair Place, a block from the cite where this is planned. The current park is already overcrowded due to the significant increase in population density in the immediate neighborhood without any increase in available park space. This space presents a golden opportunity to increase the size of the current park on adjacent property already owned by the county for the enjoyment of all as detailed to the master plan. We should stick with the master plan, but the Martha B Gudelsky Child Development Center &
Centronia appears to a reasonable compromise if you take some of that parking lot, which is never fully utilized, and incorporate it into the current park.

Sincerely,
Robert S.

---

More Children, More Grass, NOT more apartments.

SS is already fast approaching over-supply for the market.... and rents will become lower to reflect that oversupply.

SS has long paved over with waaay too much concrete, left far to little grass, and a resulting a dearth of decent playgrounds. For heavens sake, go with the children's center, keep the footprint, keep the "low rise" as it meets the neighborhood, and allow a dedicated, controlled playground for the children... NOT forcing them to play in the DOG PARK!

LuAnn M.

---

Yo soy parte de la familia de Centronia, madre de dos niños prescolares y quiero solicitar se tenga en cuenta la prioridad para que centroNia, pueda obtener la biblioteca de silver spring y así ofrecer más servicios a las familias de montgomery county. Agradeciendo su atención

Jovita H.

---

Hi,

I would like to express my support for the proposal to do a childcare center in the location of the former Silver Spring Library on Colesville Road. I think keeping most of the current structure in place and using the surrounding areas as green spaces for the children makes most sense in a downtown area that's much too quickly becoming too crowded.

Thank you
Chantal R.

---

I am a teacher at CentroNia Learning Center, and a resident of Silver Spring MD. and on behalf of our diverse community I am confident that the department of General Services, take into consideration the great need in our community for child care quality for Infants, toddlers and preschoolers. CentroNia will be able to extend these services if this proposal is granted to our community.

Sincerely
Ligia B.
Soy un padre de familia que tengo a mi hijo en centronia, y en lo personal me siento sumamente satisfecho con lo que ellos estan haciendo por mi hijo, me encantaria que ese proyecto siga creciendo por el bienestar de muchos niños como el mio. Por su atencion muchas gracias..
Gabriel G.

Thank you for the recent public meeting related to the old Silver Spring library. I applaud the county for creating the stakeholder process that was used as input into the RFP development and for allowing the community to weigh in on the finalists. Regardless of the final selection, it will be important that the land remains to be owned by the county, to ensure that the proposed design is not swapped out at a later date for a design in which the community is not involved. The county should not transfer ownership of the land to the finalist, as this site has been and should continue to remain a community-focused asset.

Of the two proposals, I am strongly in support of the Gudelsky/Centronia proposal, which was the only one of the two that met all of the RFP objectives (i.e., increase senior housing in the Silver Spring area, contribute to the need for child care services in Montgomery County, no cost to the county, incorporate green space with the neighboring park). By far the Gudelsky/Centronia proposal was the much stronger proposal as it was visionary, beautifully designed, historically consistent with the old library, aligned well with the neighboring park, has no financial impact on the community/state and it will be a facility that Silver Spring can be proud of for generations to come. Instead of trying to cram an average housing concept and average child care center into a small, unsuitable space for both, they made the right decision to focus on the most appropriate design for the location. It is an extremely rare opportunity to have an available site right next to a public park. To propose yet another housing complex in Silver Spring, when there are housing units being developed throughout the downtown area, would be an injustice for the overall community. Gudelsky/Centronia’s decision to increase affordable senior housing in the area, but at more suitable locations in the downtown area, shows vision for the community. The proposed design, which is a beautiful architecture that revitalizes the old Silver Spring library, is a nod towards preserving history and creating a facility that is consistent with the neighboring setting. Beyond the beautiful design, there is an award winning child development center proposed with Centronia, which is known widely for their excellent child care services. Not only does the design preserve green space, but it expands publicly available space for the community in their courtyard area. And to reiterate, this proposal will have no financial impact on the community as it is completely funded.

On the other hand, the Victory Housing proposal only met half of the objectives of the RFP, as there will be an unknown cost to the county/state and they did not incorporate green space that blends with the neighboring park. There were also many issues present with the Victory Housing proposal. The graphics/images were completely deceiving as there were no street names included to provide context, there were missing graphic details surrounding the facility, the park was completely misrepresented and inaccurately portrayed, and likely the proposed design won’t fit in the space if they put in a road that has both parking and sufficient space for 2 lanes of driving between Colesville and Ellsworth. Also, it seemed the child care center was an afterthought to the design as the presenters did not even consider where kids would be playing outdoors and during the presentation they stumbled and said they would use the neighboring park, which would raise a very high security risk for the kids. Beyond the design and child care facility problems, they also had a very difficult-to-understand scale of affordability for units, which likely no one would be monitoring, nor enforcing, allowing them to push more units into high-priced market rate units. Finally, they were very vague when it came to the cost of the proposed design and they said they will require financial support from the county/state, which does not meet the
RFP objectives. As their design/proposal shows, the old Silver Spring Library space/land is not conducive to both a quality child care center and affordable, high quality housing on the same location, as it is a very small space, not designed for such a concept. Overall the proposal is very deceptive and would not be something that this community would be proud of, as it’s just another uninteresting housing unit with a sub-par child care center with no vision.

By leaps and bounds I favor the Gudelsky/Centronia proposal as it meets all objectives of the RFP, namely increasing affordable senior housing, contributing to child care services, incorporating green space with the neighboring park, at no cost to the county and in the end is a beautiful design that this community can take pride in. Clearly there are other more suitable locations (e.g. 2 Bonifant parking garages next to the transit center in downtown Silver Spring recently considered for an arena), that would be a prime location in the heart of services and public transportation, for a large affordable senior housing design. But this location is perfect for a moderately sized, beautiful child development center that revitalizes the old library building, integrates well with the neighboring Ellsworth Park, preserves much needed green space and will provide a high quality child development service for the community.

Regards,
Steve P.

After attending the presentation of the 2 proposals in the SS Civic Center on Oct. 4, and just reviewing the proposals again online at the DGS/OPD website, I feel the Spring House proposal better meets the needs of the county as well as the requirements spelled out in the RFP.

Admittedly, the Gudelsky proposal would create an outstanding childcare center that would serve more children than the Spring House proposal would. However, the Gudelsky proposal to buy or lease only 15 existing residences elsewhere in Silver Spring and make them affordable doesn't begin to address the need for more senior housing in MoCo.

In contrast to Gudelsky offering only 15 residences at or below 60% of AMI, the Spring House proposal would offer 72 affordable units, with 5 units at or below 30% of AMI; 5 units at or below 40% of AMI; 17 units at or below 50% of AMI and 45 units at or below 60% of AMI. That's an enormous difference. And Spring House would accomplish this in a 4 story building that is attractive, would blend in with the surrounding neighborhoods and also would offer high quality childcare serving 80 to 100 children. The developer and owner of Spring House, Victory Housing, has a proven record with 15 properties in MoCo offering more than 2,000 senior-focused units. The Communikids childcare program it would provide would offer language immersion, which is vitally important for MoCo to be able to assimilate its growing number of residents from different cultures with different languages. Also, having senior housing located within easy walking distance of downtown Silver Spring would lessen, if not eliminate, the need for most of its residents to own a car. Senior residents of Spring House would be able to easily access and enjoy the benefits of downtown Silver Spring, including shopping, library, culture at AFI and the civic center, restaurants, and transit with bus stops nearby and a Metro station a short walk away too. Spring House would be the epitome of transit-oriented development which we need more of in MoCo.

In summary, the Spring House proposal would better address the need for more affordable senior housing in MoCo, and its location next to downtown Silver Spring is ideal. The childcare program Spring House would offer also sounds great. It’s clear to me that Spring House also better meets the requirements spelled out in the RFP.
In closing, it's worth noting that my wife and I live in Woodside Park, which is the neighborhood across Colesville Road from the old SS Library. We think it would be wonderful to have affordable senior housing built so close to us, and would enjoy seeing and interacting with more senior citizens in downtown Silver Spring. The businesses in downtown SS would love it too.

I encourage the County Executive to select the Spring House proposal. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter with me more. I also would be happy to be quoted publicly stating that Spring House would be a wonderful addition to Silver Spring.

Sincerely,
Brian D.

Good afternoon,

My name is Ines O. The reason for this letter is because I want to let you know that CentroNia has been part of my life for 8 years now and I still have a couple more years to go. CentroNia has helped out my family and hundreds of other families and are still helping out families throughout the whole year. I think CentroNia will benefit the community because CentroNia always offers programs for the adults in the families such as workshops, job fairs, health fairs, and many different types of subjects that a family might want some help and guidance with. CentroNia has made a huge difference in my children's life as well. CentroNia always made sure that my children were either on the level of his age or advanced. If my child was lacking on any subject they would always make sure to have some one on one time with him to get to the level they needed to be in. In general, CentroNia has always been there to help out my family and my children in any way possible as well as I know they have been there helping other families in the community. I believe opening another CentroNia in our area would be great for the children and the community. CentroNia always makes sure to have father-male involvement with their children and offer many activities throughout the year. If you have any questions feel free to give me a call to 301-283-8906 or contact me via email at isoquendo09@gmail.com Thank you very much !

Sincerely,
Ines O.

Dear DGS,

The rendering for the Victory House proposal does not appear to meet conditional use minimum requirements, specifically in terms of setback, minimum required open space, and minimum square feet per child required for day care. We need to understand better if the minimum requirements are overlapping each other, or how the two conditional uses will be carved out separately and evaluated by a Hearing Examiner.

I also don’t believe SHA will allow such a robust access from Colesville Rd where there is no signal to facilitate either vehicular traffic or pedestrians walking with children.

My question is, how could this project be one of the finalists when what would be allowed by a Hearing Examiner may be quite different from the Victory House proposal and rendering, and may affect their business model and borrowing capacity?
Jean C.

Buenos días, yo soy una madre primeriza y mi voto es por Centronia, que necesitamos ese espacio para nuestros pequeños niños que son nuestro futuro, en mi caso Centronia me ha ayudado a ser una mejor madre para mi hija también me siento muy contenta...

Aurora T.

I attended the presentations and studied the proposals for the 2 groups vying for the former SS Library site. I understand that County Executive Leggett will ultimately choose one of the proposals, so petitioning him with my choice, appears to be my only recourse at this time.

I believe the Gudelsky Child Development Center & CentroNia (G&C) for this site is clearly the best and most exciting proposal. To quote from their overview, their vision is to create a “state of the art early childcare and education center that respects and builds on the history, green space, and residential character of the site.”

The Gudelsky/CentroNia plan retains and “recycles” our Heritage 1957 Rhees Burket Prairie School style architecture of the former SS Library building, which meets several Criteria for Historic Preservation. It is a landmark building for the greater Silver Spring community.

Victory (V) tears down and landfills this important structure. Adaptive reuse, in this case for an excellent purpose, child development, is also environmentally sound. The greenest building is one that already exists. Almost all of the embodied energy of material production and constructing a building is lost when it is destroyed.

The G&C plan retains all the existing green space on the site and has the potential to save all the existing trees surrounding the heritage library building; only constructing a new 2 story addition at the rear, on a portion of the surface parking lot, thus respecting the residential character of the neighborhood. According to Victory’s complete program submissions, an aerial view of the Library site on page 68 shows Victory’s building superimposed on the property, and very little green space is retained. In fact, under V’s proposal, pavement and impervious surfaces significantly increase and trees and green space dramatically decrease.

This aerial photo and rendering shows Victory’s Spring House built right up against and overshadowing the County’s new Dog Park which precludes saving any of the trees on the north side of the library property.

G&C has the opportunity to incorporate these trees within their extensive designated child playground area. Since the G&C plan saves the former library, all of the mature trees surrounding the structure can be spared.

Gudelsky has the entire existing building of 2 levels and a new light-filled 2-story addition, all devoted to their CentroNia Child Development Center, and will serve up to 70 or more, additional children than Victory’s KinderKids.
KinderKids dedicated space shown on Victory’s Spring House lower level floor plan diagram seems constrained for up to 100 children served. And is this space really 6,000 square feet as mentioned? Their Child Center seems like an afterthought as does their suggested playground, wedged between the dog park and their proposed retaining wall. If this is not feasible KinderKids proposes to use Ellsworth public park for their children’s playground.

The Gudelsky proposal provides subsidies for 15 off-site affordable senior residences in the CBD core nearer to transportation and other amenities in one of the existing or new apartment buildings that will ultimately add another 7,000 residences in Downtown SS. (Incidentally out of this significant number, I suspect there is the opportunity to create many more subsidized senior residences in more advantageous locations for the elderly.) As pointed out, the 15 units satisfies the County’s requirements for a hypothetical on-site 50-unit resident mid-rise with 30 percent affordable senior residents.

The Gudelsky proposal has the opportunity to offer subsidized senior units much sooner since it is possible some of the offsite apartments are already available. Otherwise, according to permitting and construction time lines from the proposers, G&C will take less than 2 years to complete their CentroNia project, but V could take up to 3 years to finish their proposed 4-5 story building. This would be after the contract is signed, permitting is satisfied, zoning approval is granted, and after the used-books store returns home to Wheaton to their space in the new Wheaton Library in 2019-2020.

Parking issues: Gudelsky will provide 80 spaces which seem more than adequate for their CentroNia staff, some visiting parent spaces, and Ellsworth Park playground and dog park patrons. Victory states it is providing 92 spaces, but this is not apparent from the aerial view. Their retaining wall on the northeast side of their building jutting out from the KinderKids room removes 8 spaces, and because of shadows on its rendering, the number of parallel parking spaces on their proposed 3-lane access road, which seems problematic in itself, on the south side, are obscured. Even if true, this number of parking spaces seems inadequate for their projected 92 senior residences, KinderKids staff, Ellsworth Park and dog park visitors.

Other major benefits of the Gudelsky proposal include importantly, as the County requires, that “Mo Co will bear no costs of capital.” CentroNia also creates approximately 50 new full and part-time jobs. Community activists in the immediate neighborhood have encouraged me to recommend that the land be leased, not sold, so it can be returned to the County, and remain in the public domain, and under public control. This is what Gudelsky states in an email they desire.

George F.

Gudelsky Foundation Proposal is an elegantly designed light-filled vision incorporating leading architect, civic leader, S.S. resident Rhees Evans Burket’s Frank Lloyd Wright-inspired Library. This Proposal respects and is sensitive to the integrity of our Library, its intact green rolling land, and the neighborhoods! Davis Carter Scott’s design resonates with the “organic modernism” theme of “bringing the outside inside.” Its heart and soul is the multi-cultural Child Development Center to be operated by CentroNia, child care experts, and includes community space. Affordable Senior apartments will be provided advantageously in the CBD. Gudelsky Foundation fully funds capital developmental costs for the whole endeavor! Their responsive Proposal allows a treasured public structure and its land to continue to serve the Public.

The Silver Spring Historical Society applauds and supports the Gudelsky Proposal!
Marcie Stickle, SSHS Advocacy Chair, 301-585-3817, 8515 Greenwood, S.S. 20912
Burket's Silver Spring Library, Wright-Inspired: Adaptive Reuse, Stand Alone, Sensitive Incorporation Into New Development to Protect, Preserve, Honor It

Contributed By: Marcia L Stickle Email The Author: marcipro@aol.com

Adaptive Reuse! Silver Spring Historical Society enthusiastically supports adaptively reusing our former 1957 Silver Spring Library designed by leading Metro D.C. area architect, Mo Co Civic Leader, and Silver Spring resident Rhees Evans Burket, along with its environmental setting and its parking lots of 2.35 acres to continue to serve the community.

Just as it integrates itself into the hilly landscape, it's a perfect fit to serve the community! In “harmony with nature,” this "Parkitecture" building and its setting are Burket's legacy gift to Silver Spring and Montgomery County.

One excellent vision for adaptive reuse is as a Children's Center; with immediate access to the adjacent Ellsworth Urban Park and Playground! Kids' Gardens can spring up in the green and treed lawns surrounding Burket's Library. What a hands-on healthy green learning tool for the kids!

Adaptively reusing unique existing community structures preserves OUR Silver Spring’s tapestry, unique architecture, our history, our stories, our singular Time Line! Burket notes his S.S. Public Library as a “principal work” in the AIA Directory 1962. The Silver Spring Library was the linchpin of the new County Public Library system established in 1951:

"The formal merger of the S.S. Library and other participating libraries into the County library system took place on July 1, 1951. Takoma Park, Rockville, and Bethesda elected not to join the system initially, although Rockville and Bethesda joined later. The S.S. Library with its two branches and large reference collection, was the linchpin of the new County system.

"A New Library on Colesville Road. The County began planning for a new S.S. Library. Rhees Burket, a local architect, was hired to design the new building. . . . County Library Board unanimously approved the site on Jan. 21, 1954" [Oshel, Bob & Friends of the S.S. Library, "The S.S. Library, 1931-2001: Enriching Lives for 70 Years," P. 8].

Rhees Burket (1899-1963), Silver Spring resident, was a noted architect in the greater D.C. area for his homes, commercial and public buildings, including myriad schools. His Stratford School, Arlington, Va., is on the National Register of Historic Properties, and recently achieved local designation: https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/.../HALRB STRATFORD...

Rhees Burket was a Civic Leader: Montgomery County Civic Federation President, 1946-1948, and MCCF Washington Star Cup Recipient, 1947, “for performing most outstanding public service on behalf of Montgomery County.”*

Inspired by Frank Lloyd Wright's "organic modernism," "in harmony with nature," his 1957 S.S. Library of stone and glass and brick, integrated into the hilly landscape, was the largest County library at the time.
This public building is Burket’s legacy to Silver Spring and Montgomery County.

Burket’s Mid-Century Modern structure, “‘an architect’s dream,’ was the phrase used to describe the new S.S. Library when it was given its final inspection last Th. Morning by the County Manager, the County Council, and several members of the County Library Board,” The Maryland News, 12/28/1956.

Built on a 200-footwide strip running from Colesville to Ellsworth Drive, on land given by the Hecht Co., “the Building was designed to fit into the naturally landscaped lot which adds to its attractiveness. The few trees that had to be moved to make way for the building were saved and replanted. The many dogwood, blue spruce and beech were undisturbed,” The Maryland News, 2/28/1956.

“Rhees Burket, the Architect, went all out on this building. And from the looks of things he had a fairly free hand in design and equipment. . . . . if the sign wasn’t out front we doubt if you would guess it to be a library. It looks more like a new home built by some Texas oil or ranch man . . . . we would suggest you stop by this beautiful building and take advantage of the books and the atmosphere. You will thoroughly enjoy it,” Silver Spring Record, 1/26/1957.


Frank Lloyd Wright’s “organic modernism,” “in harmony with nature,” is expressed in Burket’s structure with its low horizontal lines, low-pitched hip roofs and projecting eaves to create an integrated-into-the-landscape quality. A massive fieldstone chimney rises at the axis of intersecting roof planes. Library has a cross-shaped open floor plan.

Walls of native uncoursed stoneyhurst stone, a polychrome mica schist, quarried at Seven Locks and River Roads, Montgomery County, appear to undulate in juxtaposition with glass and aluminum framed window walls, awning windows, continuous bands of clerestory windows and red brick walls.

Stone chimney and several stone walls carry through into the interior spaces of the singular structure.

An elegant, very long and wide, approx. 70’ X 20’, flat-roofed entrance canopy doubles as a carport for auto pick up and drop off point welcoming patrons arriving via the access road. Three large canopy roof openings allow light and moisture into the raised planter beds below.

This building is unique; there is no other community structure of this style in all of S.S.’s CBD, or adjacent.

Looking forward to working together to achieve and celebrate the adaptive reuse of Silver Spring’s unique former Library, “in harmony with nature,” and its continuing service to the community: Rhees Burket’s legacy gift to Silver Spring and Montgomery County! Interior and exterior Photos are available.

Jerry M., Marcie S. & George F.

I’m writing to ask that in considering building plans for the old Silver Spring Library site that you try to retain the original building. Silver Spring is trying to make mid-century Modernism the hallmark of downtown Silver Spring.
I grew up in Silver Spring when it was the only library around so I spent many a day in there. The old 1950s Bookmobile was my other source of so much joy. They would let me sit there on the stool reading for as long as I wanted. I believe for many, many of the old Silver Springers this is a valuable piece of the past. I hope we can keep this piece of the past into our future.

Thank you so much,
Joan S.

As a former resident of Silver Spring [1949 - 1980] I strongly urge the adoption of the Gudelsky development plan. What we have learned here in St. Petersburg, FL (where I now live) is that, if you fail to preserve a reasonable spectrum of your history, you will surely lose the capability for a community identity. Without community identity, there grows a void in the collective concern of its citizens and that void leads to the growing improbability of garnering collective support for any community projects. We, here in St. Petersburg have honored our past and successfully integrated it into our growth plans. The result is we have a growing, vibrant community, while those around us who have failed to follow this path have faltered and are, only now, beginning to imitate our vision. I would hope Silver Spring, in light of the Silver Theatre restoration project, would do the same. Good Luck....

Dale M.

I grew up in Silver Spring in the 1960s and learned many valuable lessons at the Colesville Road library.

In the spirit of the building having been a public resource all these years, it would be a travesty and a civic insult to allow some developer to raze the building and build ticky-tacky overpriced apartments.

Maintain this building as a public resource and historic architecture. To do otherwise would be unforgiveable and a slur against the people.

Ray G.

Dear Sir / Madam,

as a resident of Silver Spring for all my 51 years and having lived in Downtown Silver Spring - at Cole Spring Plaza, I support the Gudelsky project which retains and includes the adaptive use of 1957 Silver Spring Public Library. This structure is a gem and should not be torn down.

Thank you,
Arden R.

In responding to presentations by the two finalists that submitted proposals for the site of the former Silver Spring Library, I am representing Montgomery Preservation Inc (MPI), the countywide nonprofit preservation advocacy organization.

MPI believes the Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal is by far the better of the two. It incorporates the existing library building, an icon of Montgomery Modern architecture designed by Rhees Burket, a noted architect.
architect with a lifetime of civic and professional leadership. It is a flagship structure, constructed early in the then-new Montgomery County Library System when other towns operated facilities out of smaller makeshift buildings. Adaptive reuse of this building will commemorate this history as well as provide ongoing community benefit for the residents of Silver Spring and Montgomery County.

The library is a long-time iconic community structure that, with its green space, is compatible with the physical and residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. Unlike the Victory Housing proposal, the Gudelsky/CentroNia plan retains the site’s green space and topography and incorporates it with the neighboring park. As density increases in parts of the County like Silver Spring, it’s important to retain green space that has historically been an amenity in existing communities and neighborhoods (hopefully even to provide more). Victory, MPI has noted, would preserve very little of the library site’s green space.

The Gudelsky plan to subsidize a grouping of senior affordable units in new or existing apartment buildings in the Silver Spring CBD is a creative approach and one that could be adopted for other planned apartment construction in the county, helping to address the critical need for more affordable housing. The Gudelsky plan meets the RFP objective of increasing affordable senior units, and it would locate those units in a convenient downtown area.

In providing senior affordable housing offsite, the Gudelsky plan offers the advantage of showcasing a state-of-the art child development facility operated by a nationally recognized provider of early childhood care and education. With a strong visible presence on Colesville Road, this child development venue would be a source of pride for the County and Silver Spring, preferable to resembling an adjunct to a housing component as does Victory’s child care center.

Moreover, it seems impractical to combine both housing and child care on this relatively small site, particularly since this would allow for very little green space. This was apparent to MPI in its review of the Victory proposal. There is considerable potential for intergenerational programs in the child development center whether or not senior housing is present on the site. Gudelsky/CentroNia is projecting partnerships with senior groups, as well as enrichment activities for all ages, in its child development center.

To summarize, MPI supports preservation and adaptive reuse of the former Silver Spring Library as an excellent representative of Silver Spring and the County - architecture, parkland, community use, neighborhood support, and a historic example of mid-20th century vision and growth. The Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal undeniably corresponds with each of these qualities.

Mary R.

I’m writing in support of the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center & Centronia proposal for redevelopment of the former Silver Spring Library site. Any redevelopment should not allow sale of the land. The county should retain the property. The Gudelsky proposal is consistent with the environment, ensures high-quality child care, and respects and expands green space.

Mary G.
Silver Spring’s communities have the potential to benefit from redevelopment of the Silver Spring Library site, which is outside the Central Business District in a residential area, from the Gudelsky Child Care proposal, in three ways: preservation (and reuse) of a locally significant building designed by a notable Maryland architect; preservation and use of a significant amount of open and green space that comprises the site; and establishment of a childcare facility that serves East County families including those who work in local hotels, restaurants and service jobs.

My first preference, turned down by the County Executive, would have turned the entire site over to the Parks Division of MNC-PPC for a full-scale, master-planned urban park with passive and active recreation and multi-generational community uses to serve thousands of apartment-dwelling families, seniors, youth, and employees in the close-in areas. Absent that opportunity, the proposal for the Gudelsky Childcare Facility comes closest to meeting what I believe are important community needs and cultural values.

Spring Street is the official termination point of the CBD in Silver Spring; while several apartment buildings from the 1960’s exist north of Spring Street, I believe it would be an adverse precedent to build a multi-story, multiple use structure proposed by Victory Housing at the former library site. There are multiple sites in the CBD that would be appropriate (parking garages and other County-owned property) to evaluate for redevelopment: these would provide a substantial number of affordable and senior housing units within easy walking distance to the Transit Center, Metro, banks and everyday shopping, to the Transit Center and to amenities. It is very puzzling that with 8500 housing units in the “pipeline” for development in Silver Spring, that the County is unable to meet demand for affordable housing or for senior housing. It is my hope that an incoming County Administration in 2019 will proactively address the creation of affordable family-sized housing units (2 and 3 bedroom apartments) and senior housing in the Central Business District close to transit and multiple amenities.

Preservation of the Building

The Gudelsky Childcare Center proposal, as outlined in the October 4 public presentation, would preserve the Rhees Burket-designed midcentury modern library of 1957 (façade, shell and selected interior features). Burket was a notable local architect and resident of Montgomery County, with a strong sense of civic pride, a follower of Frank Lloyd Wright with the philosophy of “harmony in nature,” in his use of natural materials. This structure is likely National Register eligible. It utilizes local natural materials, for example stone that was quarried at Seven Locks Road. An additional 10,000 square feet added at the back (two story space) is highly compatible with the existing building and the neighborhood (about 5 feet higher ridgeline than the current roofline) and far more acceptable for the Chelsea Court viewshed. The interior will be adapted for child care uses and some additional event uses for local groups.

Preserving the existing building honors the existing setback from Colesville Road as green space.

Preserving buildings is also an important component of sustainability and green building design: the reuse of an existing building means preserving the structure’s embodied energy (original materials and labor). An additional note: Redevelopment of this site should use LEED building standards for the interior, especially in ensuring a healthy environment for infants and children (VOC-free paints, floor coverings, furniture, natural lighting, etc) would strengthen this proposal.

Green Space
The proposal indicates the Center will preserve 30% green space on the 2.3 acre site, and more may be required through masterplan/zoning. Additionally, it will create secure, outdoor play space appropriate for children to learn and have recreation.

Childcare Population
The Gudelsky proposal underscores that the County Executive named improvement in childcare facilities for the County as a #1 priority. The Gudelsky proposal indicates that CentroNia will care for 125-150 children from ages 0 to 5, whose families are in Silver Spring or workers in the downtown seeking affordable care for their children. This is a more substantial number than the 80-100 proposed by Victory.

Economic Aspects
All of the capital costs of redeveloping the site and building will be undertaken by the Gudelsky Family Foundation. County Executive Leggett made clear in initiating the RFP process for reuse of the former Library site that the County has no funds to do capital development or operate a recreation center/childcare or multigenerational center at this location (per David Dise/Greg Ossont, at multiple stakeholder meetings in 2016). The Center proposes to create up to 50 full-time and part-time permanent positions for the Silver Spring community

Ownership of the Site
Ownership of the land and the Library building should be retained by Montgomery County under a lease agreement for a stated period, for example, 25 years (for a dollar-a-year payment), while retaining the County ownership of the site. This site should not be monetized. If the Gudelsky Foundation fails to develop the site, fails in any required obligation of the lease or general agreement with the County, or ceases to operate, the lease would be nullified and the entire site would revert to the County for transfer to MNC-PPC Parks Division. (The Victory Housing Project on Route 29 is a 75-year ground lease between the County and the Victory Housing/Archdiocese, for $2,000 a month. The County required full prepayment of $1.8 million for the ground lease.)

The Victory Housing Proposal
As a longtime Colesville Road resident (single family home across from the Library site), and resident of Woodside Park, I am troubled by the potential for any further development beyond the CBD (Spring Street) of multi-story, multi-unit housing along the Colesville Road corridor, from Sligo Creek Parkway to the CBD. The Victory Housing proposal, if actualized, would set a negative precedent (or the potential for multiple exceptions) for similar development at other sites on Colesville Road from Noyes Drive to Sligo Creek Parkway (church parking lots, churches, vacant sites) along the perimeter of low-scale, low-density communities that include Woodside Park, Seven Oaks, and Woodside Forest.

Here’s a short list of weaknesses and issues that concern me about the Victory proposal: The Victory proposal appears not to meet, according to the renderings, the “special use” provisions (of R60) for the North and West masterplan: minimum of 50% green space on the site; setback from Colesville Road: minimum of 50-foot setback from the roadway that must be maintained as green space. (See site diagram on page 71 of Victory Housing proposal); side and rear setback of 25 feet. It appears the side setback on the park side does not meet the requirement. See overhead diagram view on p. 70 of the Victory proposal. The development seems to exceed the required setbacks.

Traffic Protection
It appears that the proposal does not meet the restricted traffic protection for Seven Oaks/Evanswood area (related to the Chelsea Housing project). Parking may not be sufficient for the combined use as housing and childcare center.

**Ingress/Egress of the Victory Housing proposal**
The Victory Housing proposal shows three lanes of one-way inbound vehicle use (two moving vehicle lanes, 1 parking lane) from Colesville Road to the side main entrance into Victory Housing. With combined childcare and housing uses, this is very intense use; and unlikely to be approved by the State Highway Administration to allow (left turn in) during a.m. rush hour. That is 4 inbound lanes, one of which is dedicated to turn turns at Spring Street; or left turn southbound during p.m. rush hour with 4 lanes outbound (ingress would be across four lanes of outbound traffic during evening rush). It does not resolve the potential overuse of Ellsworth Drive, with two way traffic spilling onto Cedar Street. That street now has two bicycle lanes and reductions in vehicle lanes that would cause significant traffic congestion from delivery trucks, service vehicles, taxis, and automobiles.

**Combined Housing and Childcare Uses**
The proposed use (92 units) and childcare center is overly intensive, contradictory, and may not meet required standards. For example: The requirement of (X) square feet per child in a childcare facility: it is unclear that this proposal meets the standard. There is no secure, enclosed outdoor play area for children demonstrated in the renderings. It appears that Victory wants to use Ellsworth Park as the main recreational/educational outdoor space for children and seniors. The rendering (page 71 of the proposal) shows a green-space area that is actually the developed dog park for Ellsworth Park.

**Lack of Elevation from Colesville Road**
The proposal does not show an elevation that visualizes the appearance of the property from Colesville Road, which is a highly visible location. The siting of the “front door” and welcome area is actually on the side facing the Colesville Towers apartment building.

**Financing**
The Victory Housing proposal expects that Montgomery County Housing Authority must provide subordinate financing to achieve this project (along with state support).

Roberta F.

---

I am a staff at Centronia for the past 8 years, both my grandchildren graduated from Centronia and they are excelling in Elementary School, that is because at Centronia we prepare children for school readiness, I feel very proud to belong to this organization, we are growing Year by year and it is very sad to turn away the parents because we do not have enough space.

If Centronia is given the building it will be great blessing to the community where they could get their children ready for Kindergarten, I would humbly request that the building be given to Centronia where children can be prepared to become better citizens.

Thank you
Margaret B.
I am supporting the opening of Centronia early childhood center. As a resident of Montgomery county, I firmly believe this center will give best education specially for children who come from low income family.

Thanks
Momina D.

Escribo este correo para apoyar la labor que CentroNia hace con nuestras familias. Soy madre de dos hijos, CentroNia recibio a mi hija en el 2009 y no solo a ella abrio las puertas tambien para mi. En el 2010 me dieron la oportunidad de integrarme al equipo, como apoyo a las maestras, luego fui asistente del maestro y actualmente soy la lider de salon. En el 2016 mi segundo hijo increso al establecimiento. Yo conoci la organizacion como madre y la labor que ellos realizan que encanto, uno se siente como en familia todo el tiempo ellos apoyan a los ninos y sus familias en las todas las areas de desarrollo, y en todas las necesidades. Proveyendo buenos habitos, comidas saludables y un ambiente agradable. Estoy muy orgullosa de que mis hijos hayan tenido la oportunidad de crecer y aprender en CentroNia. Y mucho mas ahora que tambien puedo aportar parte de mi para ayudar con la mision.

Atentamente,
Rosmery E.

Dear Ronnie –

I am writing on behalf of Preservation Maryland in support of the Gudelsky plan for the reuse of the former Silver Spring Library as it is the only plan that retains the intact structure and surrounding greenspace.

The architect of the Library, Rhees Evans Burket, has begun to be recognized for his work in Virginia and his Stratford School in Arlington was recently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. From what I understand, the Library is a rare remaining and excellent example of his work in Maryland.

Reuse is not without its challenges, and with our support for the Gudelsky plan, we would also like to offer any preservation guidance that may be needed during the course of the selection process or beyond.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond, and please contact me with any questions.

Very best,
Meagan B.

Hello,

I recently found out that CentroNia is one of two finalists for the redevelopment of the former Silver Spring library on Colesville Road.
I'm writing to express my enthusiastic support of the new bilingual education center. As a parent of a 3 year old with another on the way, I've been thus far disappointed by the lack of bilingual education options in the area. Of the ones I've found, they're all extremely unaffordable, even for a family with 2 professional jobs. It's as though only the wealthy are afforded the opportunity to provide their children with a second language and quality care.

With a new CentroNia facility, many more families would be able to provide their children with this sought-after bilingual education. I can't see any better investment than that of cultivating global citizens and seeing our community thrive.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards,
Natali F.

Dear Executive Leggett,

I am writing to support the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center and Centronia proposal for the site of the former Silver Spring library, an excellent plan that provides numerous benefits for Montgomery County and Silver Spring. It provides outstanding childcare for low income families, affordable housing, preserves an important architectural resource, and saves green space without imposing any costs on the county. This proposal has something that will please numerous groups; the high-quality childcare for low income families will please those concerned with the achievement gap in our schools, the affordable housing for seniors will please those concerned with housing, the small footprint and preservation of park space will please the local residents and the preservation of an important historic structure will please the preservation community. The Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center and Centronia proposal is the best project for this space.

The Gudelsky Proposal will provide excellent, subsidized childcare with most of the spots reserved for lower income families where the need is greatest. This unique location will allow working parents to drop off and pick up their children on the way to or from transit. The rigorous standards proposed by this group means more children will enter school prepared to learn rather than behind wealthier students. In contrast, the other proposal has poorly thought ideas for child care that lack a serious academic component and would either require subsidies from the county for low income children or would be entirely market rate care for wealthier families. They couldn’t even say where the children would play outside except to suggest that perhaps they would use public park, thus removing it from public use during most of the day.

The preservation of Rhees Burket’s Wright-inspired building is an important part of the Gudelsky Proposal. The loss of important historic structures is a problem throughout the county and this plan would allow the renovation and reuse of the iconic old library without imposing any costs on the county. With the increasing interest in mid-century modern architecture, this building could also function as a draw for tourist from sites such as the Building Museum, especially since it could be reached by the Red Line which is just outside the Building Museum. Attracting tourist dollars should be a priority for the county and this plan would develop a new site with the potential to bring people from DC out to Silver Spring.
The Gudelsky Proposal proposes putting affordable senior housing nearby, distributed with market rate units thus avoiding developing an easily stigmatized, low income building. Intergenerational programs in the child development center would be an important component of this proposal.

The Gudelsky Proposal most closely responds to the Master Plan for the area and the SOECA Petition which has almost 900 signatures. It would preserve green space and generate less traffic than the other proposal, leading to greater acceptance by the surrounding neighborhoods. Unlike the other proposal, they have included explicit plans for community use of the building, which would help to alleviate the difficulty in finding space for community groups to meet near downtown Silver Spring.

Moreover, the county could have all of these benefits without bonds or subsidies.

Thus, the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center and Centronia proposal for adaptive reuse of the former Silver Spring Library meets so many criteria and would provide so many benefits for the county, its children, senior citizens and nearby residents that it is undeniably the best choice for this space.

Sincerely,

Valarie B.

---

**Advantage of Gudelsky/CentroNia Proposal**

**Financing:** Gudelsky proposal requires no money to be invested by the County (or any public funding). Victory Housing would require investment funds from county and other public funding.

**Buy vs. Lease:** Gudelsky will lease the parcel. Victory’s intent not clear.

**Preservation/history:** Gudelsky would preserve former library building, providing physical continuity with the history of the Silver Spring library and the Silver Spring community. Former library building is compatible with the residential area. Stunning Prairie School style architecture meets several historic designation standards.

**Scale of projects:** Adjacent neighborhoods noted in an online petition (892 signatures in support) to preserve the historic Silver Spring Library and retain the site’s open green space – goals that the Gudelsky proposal comes closest to accommodating. The Gudelsky plan is far more compatible with the residential neighborhoods than Victory in several ways: minimizing impact on the property, preserving the former library, and retaining green space.

**Affordable senior housing:** Gudelsky plans to provide a group of 15 affordable senior housing offsite in a building in the downtown Silver Spring area. Residents would have benefit of living in downtown Silver Spring. Plan meets the RFP objective for more housing, and unlike Victory, **Gudelsky would provide housing at no cost to the County** or other public entities.

**Providing housing offsite:** To put both housing and child care facility on this site would involve destruction of a valuable community amenity: the historic former library with its park-like setting, which can be enjoyed by nearby homeowners and apartment dwellers. Silver Spring needs more, not less, green space in neighborhoods near the CBD. Affordable housing is needed also, but the County should look for options that are not destructive to communities.

**Size of site/green space:** Not really large enough to effectively accommodate both housing and child care. Gudelsky would leave ample green space for community use and a designated outdoor area for child care recreation. Victory’s building would overwhelm the site and leave very little green space, and Victory would rely on adjacent park for children’s outdoor recreation.
Child development: Gudelsky partner CentroNia is an award-winning child development provider, offering multilingual early childhood education to mixed-income families. The proposal would dedicate the space to this use while maintaining the character of the site. Would serve more children than Victory and include 0 to 5 years old (youngest at Victory would be 3 years).

Multigenerational/community use: Gudelsky/CentroNia plans multigenerational programs and will offer space for community activities.

Mary R.

To Mr. David Dise, Mr. Greg Ossont, and County Executive Mr. Ike Leggett,

Thank you for holding a meeting to have the two finalists present their case to the public and also for requesting public comments on the proposals. This is public land being discussed, and public input is crucial. The best solution is still to follow the Master Plan and transfer the land to Parks. More parks and open space are needed in Silver Spring more than any area of the county. The balance of these comments, however, are on the proposals:

The two proposals were distinctly different in how they approached a solution, and the better solution is the one proposed by the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center & Centronia (“Gudelsky”).

Using the criteria from the RFP:

20% Overall quality: The Gudelsky proposal and presentation were much more detailed. The views better showed the design and a floor plan. Dedicated outdoor child play space was included. The overall design better considered interior space allocations for child care and community spaces. The design keeps public land for public use and is more consistent with the master plan. The Victory Housing (“Victory”) proposal had several open questions, including how much green space would remain, the view from Colesville, dedicated outdoor play space, and proximity of the building to the dog park. The view from the “front” of the building did not include Colesville Towers. Better proposal: Gudelsky

30% Meeting County objectives: There were four aspects to this: Increase senior housing, provide child care, ability to perform at no cost to the County, and green space that blends with adjacent park. The Victory proposal would provide more units of affordable housing. The Gudelsky proposal would provide for more children, with more space per child, perform at no cost to the County, retains all green space, and blends in well with limited addition of height. The Victory proposal appears to significantly reduce open and green space with a much larger footprint, and have a much higher profile than the Gudelsky proposal. It would also require funding assistance and a waiver of property taxes (which is a cost to the County). Better proposal: Gudelsky

30% Expertise and financial capacity: Though both seem to show significant expertise and financial capacity, the Gudelsky proposal is less expensive (requiring less financial resources) and the Gudelsky Foundation appears to have more financial resources, require less leveraging, and be less dependent on funding, tax waivers, and loan guarantees from the County. Better proposal: Gudelsky

10% Financial benefit to County: The Gudelsky proposal states that all costs will be covered by grants and private funding. The Victory proposal assumes DHCA loans and a waiver of property taxes. This assumes that the land remains the property of the County, as presented in the past. Better proposal: Gudelsky
10% Experience partnering with public agencies: No significant difference was presented or seen in proposals, both seem to show significant experience. The best solution for the criteria is the Gudelsky proposal considering all aspects of the RFP, not just focusing on a single component. Also consider that the Gudelsky proposal is lower risk in factors not included in the proposal, including having a higher chance of receiving approval for rezoning or a special exception, and that the Gudelsky proposal is a closer-though not perfect-matched to the Master Plan.

Between the two proposals, please select the Gudelsky proposal and lease the property to them.

Thank you,
Michael B.

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing regarding the 1957 Silver Spring Public Library, designed by Rhees Burket and located at 8901 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, MD.

This is a historic building in downtown Silver Spring and I'm writing to support the reuse of the building as the future home of the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center.

The Gudelsky Child Development Center plans to retain the library with its sensitively designed rear addition and respects the library's organic design (a tenet of architecture developed by Frank Lloyd Wright).

Downtown Silver Spring does not need another modern high-rise. Reuse of historic buildings and architecture is a rare part of downtown anymore and it would be a great shame not to support the reuse of the old library space.

I have fond memories of using the old public library when I first moved to the suburb and I believe other people could benefit from use of the space through the mission of education and child development.

Thank you,
Ameena M.

To the selectors of the best proposal and County Executive Mr. Leggett,

Please objectively look at the feedback being received. The Gudelsky/Centronia proposal has seen far more support from local residents. This proposal is most in line with the petition to transfer to Parks, supported by almost 1000 signatures. This proposal is more in line with the Master Plan and zoning. This proposal is more detailed and thought out. This proposal is less of a financial burden to county taxpayers.

The primary support of the Victory Housing proposal is encouraged by a lobbying group that is funded by developers and is communicating incorrect information to their constituents, most of which do not live in or near the CBD or North and West Silver Spring areas, which are the most affected by the improvements. This proposal does currently include more affordable units, but it also shows that some
Dear Ms. Warner -

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed redevelopment of the former Silver Spring library. Please see the comments below, on behalf of the Woodside Park Civic Association.

In responding to presentations by the two finalists that submitted proposals for the site of the former Silver Spring Library, I am representing the Woodside Park Civic Association (WPCA). Woodside Park consists of more than 600 homes in a neighborhood that borders both Colesville Road and Georgia Avenue, and is walking distance to Downtown Silver Spring. Given that our neighborhood is directly across the street from the former Silver Spring Library, we are keenly interested in how that land will be used in both the near-term and long-term.

While WPCA does not officially endorse either of the proposals, we strongly believe that the county should prioritize two key principles when deciding on which proposal to adopt:

1. Montgomery County should maintain ownership of the land; and
2. Maximize the retention of green space on the property.

WPCA supports the county leasing the land to the eventual occupant, rather than selling the land. County ownership of the land provides the county with leverage for future generations of Montgomery County leadership to determine the best use of the land in the decades to come. Given that the land is so close to both the central business district and borders residential neighborhoods, the county is best situated to represent the needs of all parties, rather than an entity that purchases the land.

The library, with its green space, is compatible with the physical and residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. WPCA supports the maximization of green space in and near downtown Silver Spring. As density increases in parts of the county like Silver Spring, it’s important to retain green space that has historically been an amenity in existing communities and neighborhoods.

We ask that county leaders take these concerns into consideration as decisions are made. Given our neighborhood’s proximity to the site under discussion, we urge the county to think not only of any near-term benefit of one proposal or another, but seriously consider long-term ramifications of any decision that is made – both for the land in question and for the communities surrounding the land.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Dan D.

To Whom It May Concern:

I’m writing regarding the 1957 Silver Spring Public Library, designed by Rhees Burket and located at 8901 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, MD.
This is a historic building in downtown Silver Spring and I'm writing to support the reuse of the building as the future home of the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center (inspired by the direction from the Silver Spring Historical Society).

Why am I in support of the Gudelsky Child Development Center? The Child Development Center plans to retain the library design (which includes a tenet of architecture developed by Frank Lloyd Wright).

Downtown Silver Spring does not need another large residential structure--there are plenty of high-rise apartment buildings transforming and ridding Silver Spring of local business spaces as it is.

It is disheartening to see many features of what makes Silver Spring unique be torn down and developed into costly apartments, ruining the skyline. People need community spaces and local businesses in downtown Silver Spring, not just high cost apartments! There has been much turn-over in the almost six years I've been a Silver Spring resident.

Hence, the reuse of historic buildings and architecture is a rare part of downtown anymore and it would be a great shame not to support the reuse of the old library space. With the opportunity for a Child Development Center to become part of that specific downtown location, is an investment in the suburb as well as a historic Mid-Century structure. Historic preservation of architecture is a way to add to not only Montgomery County’s cultural heritage, but also that of the state of Maryland.

I have fond memories of using the old public library when I first moved to the suburb and I believe other people could benefit from use of the space through the mission of education and child development.

Thank you,
Ameena M.

I am writing as a sociologist who has done work in how societies remember, that is the sociology of memory, and also from knowledge I have gained as a member of the Silver Spring Library Advisory Committee to express my support for the Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal for the renewal of the old Silver Spring Library site. One of my concerns is that in making the decision about how to redevelop this site, the County take into account the extraordinary work we have done so far in preserving the history of the library in Montgomery County, beginning with the rehabilitation of Jesup Blair House in South Silver Spring. This history is important as a record of activism and engagement by ordinary citizens to develop in Montgomery County that most American of institutions, the public library. Jesup Blair House served as the Silver Spring library from 1933 to 1957 when the library moved to the Colesville Road site now under your consideration. That “new” Silver Spring Library was designed by Rhees Burket and moved the County library system into a position of national prominence with its design and with the dedication of a building of that caliber as a public library. Of the two proposals before you, the Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal the one that preserves the inherent structure of the Rhees Burket design and also the greenspace that has been an amenity for County residents in that area since 1957; but also importantly, the Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal preserves the continuity of the history of the public library in Montgomery County. The preservation of historic record from Jesup Blair to the Colesville Road site to the new public library, only a few blocks away, offers the quiet testimony of architecture to the depth of our commitment to democratic values represented in the ongoing education offered by the library. In a County that prides itself on and publicizes itself as one of the best-educated counties in the nation, that record is an important proof.
I urge you to choose the Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal and to reject the unintentional but nevertheless definite destruction the Victory proposal would bring to this record and to that site.

Jill B.

---

Isiah Leggett, County Executive
Montgomery County
Rockville, MD 20850

Subject: For former Silver Spring Library property: First, I support the Master Plan, then I support Gudelsky project as rendered and presented to community

Dear Mr. Leggett,

First of all, I want to reiterate that my preference is that you follow the North and West Silver Spring Master Plan and transfer ownership of the old Silver Spring Library property to the Parks Department. As we discussed in our meeting last year, there is a severe shortage of parks and open space serving the growing SS CBD multifamily buildings, and opportunities like this are rare and usually very expensive (see Bethesda Woodmont Triangle). Nonprofits and a broad representation of the surrounding community worked hard to create a vision for a youth center and expanded park space. Silver Spring is exploding, and there is almost nowhere within walking distance to kick a ball or shoot a hoop.

Second, if you are not going to comply with the master plan, I strongly support leasing this taxpayer owned property to the selected developer. DGS agrees, leasing the property gives the county the most leverage over its use. If you want to use this property to meet priority needs, leasing the property is really the only way to guarantee your objectives will be met and taxpayer owned land will be used to support policy priorities and a greater good.

Third, if you decide to reuse this valuable taxpayer owned property to meet a high priority social need other than park and youth center, I support the Gudelsky CentroNia child care center proposal as rendered on the DGS website and as presented to the larger community a few months ago. Closing the achievement gap and improving the quality of our schools is the county’s number one priority. Experts agree, early childhood education, especially for low income children, is a predictor of academic success. The early childhood education/daycare center, as presented by the Gudelsky Foundation representative, makes good use of the location, the land, and the warm, adaptable historic building. The children will have a safe and controlled place to play outdoors, the property can be configured to accommodate the approximately 50 staff and their vehicles, as well as dropoff and pickup for what I hear now is 200 children. The Silver Spring CBD workforce will have a beautiful and safe facility for their children. The Gudelsky proposal all purports to make its facility available to community and youth groups, which was the original goal in county and community conversations on reuse of the old Silver Spring Library and property.

That said, I hope the Gudelsky’s will increase the offsite affordable senior housing. I don’t think it has to be in SS CBD. The Gudelsky’s are benefiting from many county-provided tax advantages and below market real estate on their almost 300 acre Viva White Oak site. Viva White Oak promises to be a dynamic, diverse mixed use community with shopping, a hospital, parks, and access to a bus rapid
transit that can whisk residents to the Silver Spring Metro in 15 minutes. I don’t think the senior housing needs to be in the Silver Spring CBD when there are other live/work/play areas under development.

Although Victory Housing has proven to be a good partner for the County, I don’t believe their proposal meets the minimum requirements for child care as a conditional use described in the zoning code. The Victory Housing plan for child care intends to use the public playground for the facilities outdoor play area. I object to the privatization of the park space, if an entire day care depends on a small playground for its required outdoor recess. In spite of your observations, the Ellsworth Urban Park is very popular with families. Plus, there are many more young families moving to nearby SS CBD. The Victory Housing proposal doesn’t appear to comply with minimum open space and setback requirements. Also, it relies on access via Colesville Rd and a new three-lane driveway for access. I don’t think SHA will approve that access. Bottom line is, I see a lengthy and expensive deliberation before a hearing examiner for the two very intense combined uses proposed by Victory Housing on the constrained old SS Library site, as well as uncertain funding given the Republic Congress’ proposed tax bill.

I am certain that future administrations will follow DHCA’s proposed housing plan and rebuild SS CBD parking garages (whose utility will quickly diminish with new transportation technologies and disrupters) with affordable housing on top.

Sincerely,
Jean C.

To Whomever,

I am writing on behalf of the Silver Spring Library LAC; we would like to encourage you to choose the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center, Inc. & Centronia proposal for the old Silver Spring Library site.

The Silver Spring Central Business District is a walkable, appealing urban space that serves a diverse community and keeping it that way requires an inclusive, far-seeing vision. Too often urban renewal ends up scrubbing away the past.

The Gudelsky project would give us a chance to both honor the past and provide for the future at the same time.

This proposal maintains most of the green space around the old library building in an area with precious little green space. The project would serve many more children in a spacious, state-of-the-art facility in an area with precious few daycare opportunities.

The Gudelsky proposal preserves the library building and in the evenings and on weekends will offer community groups meeting space which is another commodity that there is not enough of in the downtown business district.

Lastly the Gudelsky Foundation can build their project without the use of County funds, another resource in short supply these days.

Thank you for your attention.
To The Office of Planning & Development:

As a homeowner in the North Hills of Sligo Creek Park about 1/2 mile from the Old Library site, I wish to offer my support for the Gudelsky - Centro Nia proposal providing a Child Care Center and underwriting Senior Low-Income housing at an alternative location.

Most impressive was that Gudelsky carefully and thoroughly established the need for the facility they proposed and clearly laid out how their proposal would meet this need.

The Gudelsky proposal also addressed projected costs and how they would be met.

I also liked the architectural scale of the Gudelsky proposal, which more appropriately mediates the transition from Downtown Silver Spring to the residential community.

While the proposal’s solution to the Senior Housing issue is somewhat limited, I was impressed by the creative commitment they have made to addressing this need. I agree that the Old Silver Spring Library site is not adequate to addressing the two distinct needs set out in the RFP. The Gudelsky proposal addresses the Child Care need very thoroughly, and provides an innovative approach to contributing the need for Senior Housing.

I appreciate having this opportunity to voice my opinion. Whichever proposal is selected, I look forward to having a valuable new asset in my neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Morey E.

Dear County Executive Leggett:

The Seven Oaks-Evanswood Citizens’ Association (SOECA) thanks you for the opportunity to review and comment on the finalists’ proposals and presentations for the former Silver Spring Library site. The site is a parcel of publicly-owned land that has an enviable amount of open/green space given its proximity to the Silver Spring CBD in the North and West Silver Spring Master Plan area. On the land there are mature shade trees and natural grass, which are in short supply in and around the CBD. The Library is adjacent to Ellsworth Park; its present configuration of a low rise building with a large lawn allows it to blend nicely into our neighborhood.

At SOECA’s November 8, 2017 meeting we were fortunate to have Greg Ossont from the Department of General Services update us on the current status of your deliberations about redevelopment of the site and to have our questions answered by him and by Jay Green from the Department of Housing and Community Affairs. SOECA residents appreciate the effort made by the County to keep us informed by having County staff make presentations to us and by creating a website where we can view the two proposals under consideration, see comments from citizens from around the area, and review some of the rules and regulations that will govern the redevelopment process.
The approved feedback of Seven Oaks-Evanswood Citizens Association, representing over 850 homes adjacent to the Silver Spring CBD, is as follows:

SOECA first supports that the land be transferred to Montgomery Parks, as specified in the Master Plan and PROS plan, both of which were reviewed and approved by the County. Neither of the final proposals is consistent with these plans.

Assuming that the site will not be transferred to Parks but one of the two proposals is accepted, we considered and discussed both proposals in the meeting and expressed a clear preference for the County to offer a long-term ground lease to the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center and CentroNia for a childcare facility on the site, while retaining County ownership of the land. Other reasons we support the Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal are:

- Retaining ownership of the land by the County is extremely important to us. Since the Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal does less environmental damage to the site it preserves options and flexibility for the County in the future.
- The Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal preserves the existing building with a small and unassuming addition on the back. The Silver Spring Historical Society has contacted you about the importance of the existing building; like the Historical Society, we want the existing building preserved and we request that the footprint of the building to be increased only marginally, resulting in a building that remains an architecturally appropriate transition to a neighborhood of single family homes. In contrast, the Victory Housing proposal is for a large building whose walls appear to extend beyond the setback limits.
- There are very limited opportunities to preserve open and green space in and near DTSS. Please choose the Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal so you do not miss this chance to continue the advantages of open space for both our neighborhood and the nearby CBD, including informal sport and recreation, preservation of the natural environment, and storm water management.
- Maintaining the existing building has the added advantage of preserving as many of the existing trees as possible.
- We expect the County to legally abide by and protect its citizens living within the Seven Oaks Residential Parking Permit Zone adjacent to Silver Spring’s CBD by insisting that whatever development occurs on the former Library site be required to comply with the existing Neighborhood Traffic Protection Plan.
- We are supportive of the Gudelsky/CentroNia proposal’s innovative financing plan. Requiring no public funds for their project, including offsite affordable housing, leaves the County’s own affordable housing budget free to be used for additional affordable housing in our area. This is a win-win for the County and its taxpayers.
- Many young families are moving into the homes within a mile or so of the site. They have chosen to live within walking distance of the services they need and want. Toward that end, we encourage you to keep crosswalks, preferably with additional pedestrian-friendly improvements, in place across Colesville Road and elsewhere so that families that want to use the childcare center can do so without having to rely on a car.
- As a civic association operating on a limited budget we are always looking for low-cost meeting space for our membership meetings, social gatherings, and other opportunities to meet and learn from each other. The Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center and CentroNia proposal provides a superior approach (as compared to the Victory Housing proposal) to providing this much-needed resource to this community.
Former Silver Spring Library Presentations  
Comments Received by the Montgomery County Department of General Services

To summarize, for the reasons outlined above, we strongly urge the County to retain ownership of the land and to select the Martha B. Gudelsky and CentroNia proposal.

Michael B.

Gudelsky Foundation Proposal is an elegantly designed light-filled vision incorporating leading architect, civic leader, Silver Spring resident Rhees Evans Burket’s Frank Lloyd Wright-inspired Library. This Proposal respects and is sensitive to the integrity of our Library, its intact green rolling land, and the neighborhoods! Davis Carter Scott’s design resonates with the “organic modernism” theme of "bringing the outside inside."

Its heart and soul is the multi-cultural, multi-lingual, multi-income Child Development Center to be operated by CentroNia, child care and education experts, and includes community space. Inter-generational activities are also planned. Affordable Senior apartments will be provided advantageously in the Silver Spring CBD. Gudelsky Foundation fully funds capital costs for the whole endeavor! There is absolutely no cost to the County or the taxpayer.

Their responsive Proposal allows a treasured public structure and its land to continue to serve the Public. The architect notes his S.S. community library as a Principal Work.

Adaptively reusing existing community structures preserves S.S.’s vibrant tapestry, unique architecture, our history, our stories, our singular Time Line.

Spirit of Public Service is embodied also through the stories of 2 families and 2 women: the Burkets, the Gudelskys, CentroNia Founder Beatriz “B.B” Otero, and President & CEO Myrna Peralto, a recipient of YWCA’s 2017 Woman of Achievement Award. Architect Burket served as Mo Co Civic Federation President, and VP, receiving the MCCF Star Cup for his exemplary contributions to Mo Co. Gudelskys’ public service spirit is described also in Part 3: “Service and Contributions.”

Silver Spring Historical Society joins with Preservation Maryland, Montgomery Preservation Inc, other community members and entities,* to applaud and support the Gudelsky Proposal!

Marcie Stickle, SSHS Advocacy Chair, 301-585-3817, 8515 Greenwood, S.S. 20912  
http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DGS/Resources/Files/OPD/SSLibrary/MarthaBGudelskyChildDevelopmentCenterCentronia.pdf  
Historical/Architectural/Adaptive Reuse/Biographical Info:  
http://www.preservationdirectory.com/PreservationBlogs/ArticleDetail.aspx?id=4979&catid=1  
Original Rendering of our "Parkitecture" Library & Land

*Gudelsky Proposal most closely responds to the Neighborhoods’ Petition with its 892 signatures; Petition Update, 10/21/17:  
"Of the two proposals, the first proposal--from the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center & Centronia--is more compatible with the goals of this petition. The space would be used by the community and local families, be more compatible with the residential area that it is located in, retain the historic library building, and not be a large impact to the property."

Burket's Silver Spring Library, Wright-Inspired: Adaptive Reuse, Stand Alone, Sensitive Incorporation Into New Development to Protect, Preserve, Honor It

Contributed By: Marcia L Stickle Email The Author: marcipro@aol.com

Adaptive Reuse! Silver Spring Historical Society enthusiastically supports adaptively reusing our former 1957 Silver Spring Library designed by leading Metro D.C. area architect, Mo Co Civic Leader, and Silver Spring resident Rhees Evans Burket, along with its environmental setting and its parking lots of 2.35 acres to continue to serve the community.

Just as it integrates itself into the hilly landscape, it's a perfect fit to serve the community! In “harmony with nature,” this "Parkitecture" building and its setting are Burket's legacy gift to Silver Spring and Montgomery County.

One excellent vision for adaptive reuse is as a Children's Center; with immediate access to the adjacent Ellsworth Urban Park and Playground! Kids' Gardens can spring up in the green and treed lawns surrounding Burket's Library. What a hands-on healthy green learning tool for the kids!

Adaptively reusing unique existing community structures preserves OUR Silver Spring’s tapestry, unique architecture, our history, our stories, our singular Time Line! Burket notes his S.S. Public Library as a “principal work” in the AIA Directory 1962. The Silver Spring Library was the linchpin of the new County Public Library system established in 1951:

"The formal merger of the S.S. Library and other participating libraries into the County library system took place on July 1, 1951. Takoma Park, Rockville, and Bethesda elected not to join the system initially, although Rockville and Bethesda joined later. The S.S. Library with its two branches and large reference collection, was the linchpin of the new County system.

"A New Library on Colesville Road. The County began planning for a new S.S. Library. Rhees Burket, a local architect, was hired to design the new building. . . . County Library Board unanimously approved the site on Jan. 21, 1954" [Oshel, Bob & Friends of the S.S. Library, "The S.S. Library, 1931-2001: Enriching Lives for 70 Years," P. 8].

Rhees Burket (1899-1963), Silver Spring resident, was a noted architect in the greater D.C. area for his homes, commercial and public buildings, including myriad schools. His Stratford School, Arlington, Va., is on the National Register of Historic Properties, and recently achieved local designation: https://www.apsva.us/post/local-historic-district-designation-for-stratford-school/
Inspired by Frank Lloyd Wright’s "organic modernism," "in harmony with nature," his 1957 S.S. Library of stone and glass and brick, integrated into the hilly landscape, was the largest County library at the time. This public building is Burket’s legacy to Silver Spring and Montgomery County.

Burket’s Mid-Century Modern structure, “‘an architect’s dream,’ was the phrase used to describe the new S.S. Library when it was given its final inspection last Th. Morning by the County Manager, the County Council, and several members of the County Library Board,” The Maryland News, 12/28/1956.

Built on a 200-footwide strip running from Colesville to Ellsworth Drive, on land given by the Hecht Co., “the Building was designed to fit into the naturally landscaped lot which adds to its attractiveness. The few trees that had to be moved to make way for the building were saved and replanted. The many dogwood, blue spruce and beech were undisturbed,” The Maryland News, 2/28/1956.

“Rhees Burket, the Architect, went all out on this building. And from the looks of things he had a fairly free hand in design and equipment. . . . . if the sign wasn’t out front we doubt if you would guess it to be a library. It looks more like a new home built by some Texas oil or ranch man . . . . we would suggest you stop by this beautiful building and take advantage of the books and the atmosphere. You will thoroughly enjoy it,” Silver Spring Record, 1/26/1957.


Frank Lloyd Wright’s “organic modernism,” “in harmony with nature,” is expressed in Burket’s structure with its low horizontal lines, low-pitched hip roofs and projecting eaves to create an integrated-into-the-landscape quality.

A massive fieldstone chimney rises at the axis of intersecting roof planes. Library has a cross-shaped open floor plan.

Walls of native uncoursed stoneyhurst stone, a polychrome mica schist, quarried at Seven Locks and River Roads, Montgomery County, appear to undulate in juxtaposition with glass and aluminum framed window walls, awning windows, continuous bands of clerestory windows and red brick walls.

Stone chimney and several stone walls carry through into the interior spaces of the singular structure.

An elegant, very long and wide, approx. 70’ X 20’, flat-roofed entrance canopy doubles as a carport for auto pick up and drop off point welcoming patrons arriving via the access road. Three large canopy roof openings allow light and moisture into the raised planter beds below.

This building is unique; there is no other community structure of this style in all of S.S.’s CBD, or adjacent.

Looking forward to working together to achieve and celebrate the adaptive reuse of Silver Spring’s unique former Library, “in harmony with nature,” and its continuing service to the community: Rhees Burket’s legacy gift to Silver Spring and Montgomery County! Interior and exterior Photos are available.
Part 3: Continuity of the Spirit of Public Service & Contributions Embodied in 2 Women & 2 Families:

http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DGS/Resources/Files/OPD/SSLibrary/MarthaBGudelskyChildDevelopmentCenterCentronia.pdf

Architect Burket was a S.S. & Mo Co Civic Leader, commencing in the 1930s, including as Mo Co Civic Federation President and Vice Pres, recipient of the MCCF Washington Star Cup for his exemplary work on behalf of the County; actively engaged with the Allied Civic Association Groups; President of the Linden Civic Association; President, Woodside School Parent Teachers Association; and myriad civic roles before during and after WWII. His legacy library is a living tribute to him and to OUR unique S.S. history. Burket's family also acted in the public interest:

Architect Burket's wife played a leading role in moving the burgeoning S.S. Library from the East S.S. Elementary School in 1934 to Jesup Blair Community House in Jesup Blair Park. In 1942, she played a leading role along with her colleagues in bringing to fruition a wing designed by leading architect Howard Wright Cutler and his daughter Katherine Cutler, first woman architect licensed in the state of Md., and S.S. residents on Dale Drive! Mrs. Burket was a Trustee on the Montgomery County Library Board.

Burket's Grandfather William Jones Rhees co-founded, at the age of 22 with 2 youthful colleagues of 21 years of age, the YMCA in D.C., one of the original 6 national chapters. Rhees served as YMCA Secretary, Librarian, and President over the years. Jones served many distinguished roles at the Smithsonian Institution, including as Keeper of the Archives, and was a prolific writer. At the age of 29, his 2-Volume Manual of Public Libraries, Institutions, and Societies in the United States and British Provinces of North America (1859), was published, recommending guidelines for the construction of library buildings, classification of volumes, and local organizations and exchanges. The list of libraries included in the volume was often reprinted.

Gudelsky Foundation Philanthropic Acts, Gudelsky Family Contributions
Gudelsky Family is an inspiring immigrant story.
Gudelsky Foundation has performed many philanthropic acts since its inception in the 1960s.
Gudelsky Family has made major contributions to Mo Co; Howard County; & Va., over the years.
Founders Isadore & Homer Gudelsky's and their Family's contributions include, but are not limited to:

Montgomery Modern: Modern Architecture In Montgomery County, ... https://books.google.com/books?isbn=1329867483 Clare Lise Kelly - 2016 - History 1905–1963) Arriving in Silver Spring about 1930, Isadore Gudelsky was one of the ... One of Gudelsky's early projects was Montgomery Arms Apartments (1941) [Colesville & Fenton] Designed by leading architect George Thomas Santmyers. Search "Gudelsky," Note 4 Items!
Gudelskys built Art Deco Mo Arms Apts. to serve the New Deal workers coming to town! assembled the land to provide for the Flower Theatre & Shopping Center! donated funding for the AFI Silver Theatre Restoration. donated funding for the Round House Theatre, Silver Spring. built Montgomery [Medical] Center, Fenton Street, which includes an underground theatre & plaza! provided land to create Columbia, Md., Howard County. co-developer of Wheaton Plaza. co-developer of Tysons Corner, Va. major patrons of University of Maryland Medical Center; medical building in Homer Gudelsky's name benefactor to WETA for educational programming, including "Mr. Rogers" benefactor to Montgomery College to establish the Homer S. Gudelsky Institute for Technical Education (GITE), a public-private joint venture providing state-of-the-art technical education and training benefactor to help establish The Gudelsky Environmental Education Center, Howard County; Holly Gudelsky Stone, environmental educator, the key lead donated land in Worcester County, West Ocean City, to Parks & Recreation Dept. to establish Homer Gudelsky Park http://worcesterrecandparks.org/parks-and-facilities/homer-gudelsky-park

Marcie S.

I am a resident of Woodside Park and attended the presentation for the two proposals for the Old Silver Spring Library.

If the property is not going to be returned to the Parks Department as per the Master Plan then I strongly favor the Gudelsky Proposal. This proposal requires no money from the county, it preserves the beautiful architecture of the library and maintains the surrounding green space. Over 892 local residents and neighbors signed a petition supporting the preservation of the library building and maintaining the green space at that location. There is a huge need for affordable childcare in the county and a large child care center would be very attractive to the many young couples and families moving into the downtown Silver Spring area as well as those employed in DTSS. The Victory Housing Proposal presentation left out a lot of information. The view of the building from the Colesville Road side was not available. They downplayed the significant impact the property would have on local traffic because of the residents as well as those dropping and picking up from daycare. Victory Housing is affiliated with the Archdiocese of Washington and one attendee asked if that meant that residents from outside the county/from within the Archdiocese would be able to live there. The answer was yes. The County should be funding housing for residents outside of Montgomery County. The building would be built to the setbacks on all four sides leaving no green space for the residents or for the child care center housed within. The presenters said that the architecture was similar to the library but really it was an uninteresting building that looked like it could be in any office park.

The county just reported a budget shortfall so financially the Gudelsky Proposal makes the most sense - for both the county and for Downtown Silver Spring.
The county just spent $8.5 million dollars to purchase .4 acres in downtown Bethesda in theory to show residents the county is committed to creating community space - I think Silver Spring deserves the same consideration and we should maintain the green space and our old Silver Spring Library.

Kathleen B.

Dear Ms. Warner – Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the two proposals for the redevelopment of the former Silver Spring Library Site.

Preservation Maryland has reviewed the proposals and is supportive of the proposal by the Martha B. Gudelsky Child Development Center & CentroNia.

The intact structure and parklike setting are retained and sensitively enhanced in the Gudelsky proposal whereas the scale of the Spring House proposal by Victory Housing destroys the Maryland-architect designed building and encroaches on the surrounding greenspace rare in downtown Silver Spring.

The architect of the Library, Rhees Evans Burket, has begun to be recognized for his work in Virginia and his Stratford School in Arlington was recently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. From what I understand, the Library is a remaining and excellent example of his work.

We appreciate that the Gudelsky proposal retains approximately 30% of the green space of the property and takes care to increase the useable space of the building by designing an addition along its secondary rear facade, not the primary façade.

I attended the Site Tour on December 15, 2016 and was impressed by the intact architecture and landscape of the Site – I am now also impressed with the Gudelsky plan to retain and enhance those assets.

A previous letter in support of reuse of the Silver Spring Library was submitted in March 2017, and we again join our colleagues at the Silver Spring Historical Society and Montgomery Preservation, Inc. in support of the Gudelsky plan.

If we can be of any assistance in selecting a proposal or providing expert mid-century preservation and reuse experience, please feel free to call on us.

Sincerely,
Meagan B.
The Petition Signers Below Support the Gudelsky Proposal for the former Silver Spring Library and Its Site,
Described & Illustrated in the Gudelsky Proposal Power Point, as Presented 10/4/17, to the Community,
at the S.S. Civic Bldg; Presented here in Pamphlet form at the Historic S.S. B&O R.R. Station Open House, 12/2/17.

Please Print:

Name          Email Address/Phone          Address
Lance Ball    lanceaball@aol.com           14917 Carriage Square Pkwy 20906
               melisa@gmail.com          1220 Black Mill Rd #507
               ewgibs@gmail.com        55 MD 20718
               mymarlenido@gmail.com   7923 Eastern Ave, #701
               morgankleena@gmail.com  55, MD 20910
               nandori.peter@gmail.com  1220 Black Mill Rd #507
               cburnell@verizon.net     20410
               arshadh@gmail.com       710 Rocker Rd.
               barbaraveronica3@gmail.com #1004
               dviick@verizon.net      1401 Black Mill Rd #507
               rni@ops.org            55, MD 20910
               pregina@yandex.ru
               kentruesdell@gmail.com  7318 Willow Ave
               78 ND 20912

Peter Nandori
Cary Burrell
Hamza Arshad
Barbara Gamers
Devi Virk
Renee Nida
Katarina Regina
Kim Truesdell
The Petition Signers Below Support the Gudelsky Proposal for the former Silver Spring Library and Its Site, Described & Illustrated in the Gudelsky Proposal Power Point, as Presented 10/4/17, to the Community, at the S.S. Civic Bldg; Presented here in Pamphlet form at the Historic S.S. B&O R.R. Station Open House, 12/2/17.

Please Print:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email Address/Phone</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Sicard</td>
<td>kers@<a href="mailto:hil@yahoo.com">hil@yahoo.com</a> 202-370-4542</td>
<td>6050 Fulk St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Sturgeon</td>
<td>Silver Spring MD 20902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Takoma Park, DC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d_sturgeon@msn.com">d_sturgeon@msn.com</a> 202-332-4993</td>
<td>6910 8th St NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Robinson</td>
<td>november@ methane.com</td>
<td>7435 Baltimore Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Takoma Park, MD 20112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Kitaev</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akitaev@outlook.com">akitaev@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>8601 Georgia Ave 20916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Debus-Lopez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kddebus@comcast.net">kddebus@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Silver Spring, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Wray</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tannerwray@comcast.net">tannerwray@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>1103 Dale Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Freshfield</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pfree@att.net">pfree@att.net</a></td>
<td>Silver Spring, MD 20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCants Khalilah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mccantsk@gmail.com">mccantsk@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>1605 Kensington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Spring, MD 20902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1309 Ruxton Rd NW</td>
<td>WDC 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shepherd Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Petition Signers Below Support the Gudelsky Proposal for the former Silver Spring Library and Its Site, Described & Illustrated in the Gudelsky Proposal Power Point, as Presented 10/4/17, to the Community, at the S.S. Civic Bldg; Presented here in Pamphlet form at the Historic S.S. B&O R.R. Station Open House, 12/2/17.

Please Print:

Name                        Email Address/Phone                        Address
-------------------------------------------
Caroline Aiko                Caroline.Simmonds@gmail.com  215-892-0712
Jonathan Cook                jcook07@hmvail.com
Steven Eisen                  2510 Jennings Pl 55116
                            STEVENXO@VERISON.NET 20912
Billy Tolson                  bill.tolson222@gmail.com 801 Bollingbrook pl,
                            301 803-9844 (cell)  Silver Spring md. 20910