



Item #10

January 7, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

VIA: Dan Hardy, Chief, Transportation Planning *DKH*

FROM: Pamela Dunn, Planner Coordinator, Research & Technology Center *PK*

SUBJECT: Mid-Cycle Adoption of School Test Results, FY2010

Recommendation: Adopt Mid-Cycle FY2010 School Test Results to Bring Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Seneca Valley Clusters out of Moratorium Status

The County Council Resolution (No. 16-1187) adopting the 2009-2011 Growth Policy allows the Planning Board to make a mid-cycle finding on adequacy during FY2010. Following adoption of the 2009-2011 Growth Policy, the County Council amended the FY2009-2014 Capital Improvements Program increasing programmed funding for three school clusters. These additional funds provide sufficient capacity within the next five years to bring the Bethesda-Chevy Chase (B-CC) and Seneca Valley clusters out of moratorium, as well as prevent the Northwest Cluster from entering moratorium. However, development approvals within these three clusters will be required to make school facilities payment at time of building permit.

Background:

Typically, the Planning Board conducts an annual review of the school test results in June of each year. The school test results, compiled by the Montgomery County Public School Division of Long Range Planning, compares projected enrollment five years into the future with projected capacity for each of the 25 high school clusters at the elementary, middle and high school levels. The school test results are finalized in May of each year upon the Council's adoption of the Capital Improvements Program. The school test determines if residential subdivisions in any school cluster should be subject to either a school facilities payment or a moratorium.

The annual school test review process has three milestone dates:

- In November, MCPS releases preliminary enrollment forecasts and a Superintendent's Recommended Capital Budget
- The following May, the County Council adopts an MCPS Capital Budget

- In June, based on the November enrollment forecast and the adopted MCPS budget, the Planning Board adopts the school test results that define moratoria and school facility payment status for residential development applications submitted during the fiscal year beginning on July 1.

If projected enrollment at any level exceeds 105 percent of program capacity, residential subdivisions in the affected cluster will be required to make a school facility payment. In addition, if projected enrollment at any level exceeds 120 percent of program capacity, residential subdivisions in the affected cluster will be under moratorium.

Effective July 1, 2009 nine school clusters exceeded the 105 percent program capacity ceiling; eight clusters exceed at the elementary level and one cluster exceeded at both the elementary and middle school level. Thus, residential development in these nine clusters has been subject to a school facility payment. In addition, three school clusters exceeded the 120 percent program capacity ceiling; B-CC, Clarksburg and Seneca Valley school clusters. Residential subdivisions have been in moratorium for FY10 in these three clusters.

During review of the 2009-2011 Growth Policy, the methodology for calculating utilization rates was modified such that rates must be calculated without rounding. This change, upon review by the Planning Board would put the Northwest cluster into moratorium. However, in anticipation of this event, the Council programmed additional capacity for the Northwest cluster in its recent CIP amendment.

The Clarksburg cluster, however, remains in moratorium. The *Superintendent's Recommended FY2011 Capital Budget and FY2011-2016 Capital Improvements Program*, if adopted, would program sufficient capacity to bring the Clarksburg cluster out of moratorium with approval of the FY2011 school test (effective July 1, 2010).

Acceptance of Mid-cycle FY2010 School Test Results:

Planning staff recommends that the Planning Board accept the amended school test results removing the Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Seneca Valley clusters from moratorium and placing them under the requirement of a school facilities payment. These findings are attached on pages 4 and 5 which reflect the Growth Policy resolution Tables 3 and 4 regarding the FY 2010 test (for enrollment conditions in the 2014-2015 school year), modified to incorporate the Council's November 25, 2009 actions on the school CIP amendments.

Once accepted by the Planning Board, these tables (along with the resolution adopted by the Council in November 2009) will constitute Montgomery County's Growth Policy for the remainder of FY2010 as it relates to school capacity.

Preview of FY 2011 School Capacity Conditions

A further review of the *Superintendent's Recommended FY2011 Capital Budget and FY2011-2016 Capital Improvements Program* indicates that, if adopted, eight school clusters would require a school facility payment and one school cluster, Richard Montgomery, would enter moratorium with approval of the FY2011 school test results.

The tables on page 6 summarize the moratorium and school facility payment status for three alternatives:

- A. The current condition for FY 2010, approved by the Planning Board in June 2009,
- B. The proposed condition for the second half of FY 2010 if the Planning Board accepts the staff recommendation in this memorandum
- C. The forecasted condition for FY 2011 if the Council were, in spring 2010, to approve the Superintendent's proposed FY2011-2016 CIP.

This possible outcome for FY 2011 could change if the Council acts on a Richard Montgomery ES Solution PDF prior to July 1, 2010. Staff will bring recommendations on the Executive's proposed FY2011-2016 CIP to the Planning Board on February 4 and will incorporate a separate item regarding school capacity in that worksession.

Table 3: 2014–2015 Test @ 120% Program Capacity

Reflects Amended FY 2009-2014 Capital Improvements Program (CIP), B-CC Cluster ES Solution, Seneca Valley Cluster ES Solution , Northwest Cluster ES Solution, and MCPS Enrollment Forecast, November 2009

Elementary School Enrollment and MCPS Capacity @ 120%						
Cluster Area	Projected August 2014 Enrollment	100% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP and ES Solution PFDs	120% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	Capacity Remaining @ 120% MCPS capacity	Growth Policy 120% Test Result Capacity is:	Cluster Moratorium?
B- CC	3,588	3,077	3,692	104	Adequate	No
Blair	3,932	4,282	5,138	1,206	Adequate	No
Blake	2,462	2,556	3,067	605	Adequate	No
Churchill	2,552	2,784	3,341	789	Adequate	No
Clarksburg	3,712	3,303	3,964	252	Adequate	No
Damascus	1,889	2,105	2,526	637	Adequate	No
Einstein	2,487	2,587	3,104	617	Adequate	No
Gaithersburg	3,855	3,932	4,718	863	Adequate	No
Walter Johnson	3,649	3,444	4,133	484	Adequate	No
Kennedy	2,601	2,593	3,112	511	Adequate	No
Magruder	2,610	2,493	2,992	382	Adequate	No
R. Montgomery	2,586	2,171	2,605	19	Adequate	No
Northwest	4,178	3,662	4,394	216	Adequate	No
Northwood	2,968	2,657	3,188	220	Adequate	No
Paint Branch	2,452	2,309	2,771	319	Adequate	No
Poolesville	571	754	905	334	Adequate	No
Quince Orchard	2,889	2,691	3,229	340	Adequate	No
Rockville	2,570	2,237	2,684	114	Adequate	No
Seneca Valley	2,296	1,993	2,392	96	Adequate	No
Sherwood	2,136	2,416	2,899	763	Adequate	No
Springbrook	2,894	3,200	3,840	946	Adequate	No
Watkins Mill	2,561	2,807	3,368	807	Adequate	No
Wheaton	2,816	2,407	2,888	72	Adequate	No
Whitman	2,272	2,061	2,473	201	Adequate	No
Wootton	2,910	3,072	3,686	776	Adequate	No
Middle School Enrollment and MCPS Capacity @ 120%						
Cluster Area	Projected August 2014 Enrollment	100% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	120% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	Capacity Remaining @ 120% MCPS capacity	Growth Policy 120% Test Result Capacity is:	Cluster Moratorium?
B- CC	1,187	1,037	1,244	57	Adequate	No
Blair	2,015	2,261	2,713	698	Adequate	No
Blake	1,165	1,332	1,598	433	Adequate	No
Churchill	1,458	1,550	1,860	402	Adequate	No
Clarksburg	1,508	1,138	1,366	-142	Inadequate	Yes
Damascus	908	941	1,129	221	Adequate	No
Einstein	1,209	1,461	1,753	544	Adequate	No
Gaithersburg	1,583	1,771	2,125	542	Adequate	No
Walter Johnson	1,675	1,863	2,236	561	Adequate	No
Kennedy	1,246	1,384	1,661	415	Adequate	No
Magruder	1,110	1,607	1,928	818	Adequate	No
R. Montgomery	1,123	973	1,168	45	Adequate	No
Northwest	2,036	1,966	2,359	323	Adequate	No
Northwood	1,136	1,391	1,669	533	Adequate	No
Paint Branch	1,271	1,308	1,570	299	Adequate	No
Poolesville	284	472	566	282	Adequate	No
Quince Orchard	1,300	1,648	1,978	678	Adequate	No
Rockville	898	972	1,166	268	Adequate	No
Seneca Valley	1,229	1,471	1,765	536	Adequate	No
Sherwood	1,202	1,475	1,770	568	Adequate	No
Springbrook	1,068	1,216	1,459	391	Adequate	No
Watkins Mill	1,074	1,247	1,496	422	Adequate	No
Wheaton	1,546	1,646	1,975	429	Adequate	No
Whitman	1,208	1,267	1,520	312	Adequate	No
Wootton	1,407	1,598	1,918	511	Adequate	No
High School Enrollment and MCPS Capacity @ 120%						
Cluster Area	Projected August 2014 Enrollment	100% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	120% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	Capacity Remaining @ 120% MCPS capacity	Growth Policy 120% Test Result Capacity is:	Cluster Moratorium?
B- CC	1,735	1,656	1,987	252	Adequate	No
Blair	2,327	2,876	3,451	1,124	Adequate	No
Blake	1,700	1,715	2,058	358	Adequate	No
Churchill	1,928	1,972	2,366	438	Adequate	No
Clarksburg	1,844	1,593	1,912	68	Adequate	No
Damascus	1,291	1,589	1,907	616	Adequate	No
Einstein	1,553	1,613	1,936	383	Adequate	No
Gaithersburg	1,906	2,067	2,480	574	Adequate	No
Walter Johnson	2,087	2,275	2,730	643	Adequate	No
Kennedy	1,565	1,838	2,206	641	Adequate	No
Magruder	1,606	1,958	2,350	744	Adequate	No
R. Montgomery	1,969	1,949	2,339	370	Adequate	No
Northwest	2,173	2,151	2,581	408	Adequate	No
Northwood	1,474	1,517	1,820	346	Adequate	No
Paint Branch	1,956	1,899	2,279	323	Adequate	No
Poolesville	1,054	1,107	1,328	274	Adequate	No
Quince Orchard	1,788	1,774	2,129	341	Adequate	No
Rockville	1,263	1,584	1,901	638	Adequate	No
Seneca Valley	1,320	1,478	1,774	454	Adequate	No
Sherwood	1,790	2,022	2,426	636	Adequate	No
Springbrook	1,572	2,095	2,514	942	Adequate	No
Watkins Mill	1,438	1,913	2,296	858	Adequate	No
Wheaton	1,222	1,398	1,678	456	Adequate	No
Whitman	1,650	1,891	2,289	619	Adequate	No
Wootton	2,170	2,086	2,503	333	Adequate	No

Table 4: 2014-2015 Test @ 105% Program Capacity

Reflects Amended FY 2009-2014 Capital Improvements Program (CIP), B-CC Cluster ES solution, Northwest Cluster ES Solution, Seneca Valley Cluster ES Solution, and MCPS Enrollment Forecast, November 2009

Elementary School Enrollment and MCPS Capacity @ 105%						
Cluster Area	Projected August 2014 Enrollment	100% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP and ES Solution PDFs	105% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	Capacity Remaining @ 105% MCPS capacity	Growth Policy 105% Test Result Capacity is:	School Facility Payment Required To Proceed?
B- CC	3,588	3,077	3,231	-357	Inadequate	Yes
Blair	3,932	4,282	4,496	564	Adequate	No
Blake	2,462	2,556	2,684	222	Adequate	No
Churchill	2,552	2,784	2,923	371	Adequate	No
Clarksburg	3,712	3,303	3,468	-244	Inadequate	Moratorium
Damascus	1,889	2,105	2,210	321	Adequate	No
Einstein	2,487	2,587	2,716	229	Adequate	No
Gaithersburg	3,855	3,932	4,129	274	Adequate	No
Walter Johnson	3,649	3,444	3,616	-33	Inadequate	Yes
Kennedy	2,601	2,593	2,723	122	Adequate	No
Magruder	2,610	2,493	2,618	8	Adequate	No
R. Montgomery	2,586	2,171	2,280	-306	Inadequate	Yes
Northwest	4,178	3,662	3,845	-333	Inadequate	Yes
Northwood	2,968	2,657	2,790	-178	Inadequate	Yes
Paint Branch	2,452	2,309	2,424	-28	Inadequate	Yes
Poolesville	571	754	792	221	Adequate	No
Quince Orchard	2,889	2,691	2,826	-63	Inadequate	Yes
Rockville	2,570	2,237	2,349	-221	Inadequate	Yes
Seneca Valley	2,296	1,993	2,093	-203	Inadequate	Yes
Sherwood	2,136	2,416	2,537	401	Adequate	No
Springbrook	2,894	3,200	3,360	466	Adequate	No
Watkins Mill	2,561	2,807	2,947	386	Adequate	No
Wheaton	2,816	2,407	2,527	-289	Inadequate	Yes
Whitman	2,272	2,061	2,164	-108	Inadequate	Yes
Wootton	2,910	3,072	3,226	316	Adequate	No
Middle School Enrollment and MCPS Capacity @ 105%						
Cluster Area	Projected August 2014 Enrollment	100% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	105% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	Capacity Remaining @ 105% MCPS capacity	Growth Policy 105% Test Result Capacity is:	School Facility Payment Required To Proceed?
B- CC	1,187	1,037	1,089	-98	Inadequate	Yes
Blair	2,015	2,261	2,374	359	Adequate	No
Blake	1,165	1,332	1,399	234	Adequate	No
Churchill	1,458	1,550	1,628	170	Adequate	No
Clarksburg	1,508	1,138	1,195	-313	Inadequate	Moratorium
Damascus	908	941	988	80	Adequate	No
Einstein	1,209	1,461	1,534	325	Adequate	No
Gaithersburg	1,583	1,771	1,860	277	Adequate	No
Walter Johnson	1,675	1,863	1,956	281	Adequate	No
Kennedy	1,246	1,384	1,453	207	Adequate	No
Magruder	1,110	1,607	1,687	577	Adequate	No
R. Montgomery	1,123	973	1,022	-101	Inadequate	Yes
Northwest	2,036	1,966	2,064	28	Adequate	No
Northwood	1,136	1,391	1,461	325	Adequate	No
Paint Branch	1,271	1,308	1,373	102	Adequate	No
Poolesville	284	472	496	212	Adequate	No
Quince Orchard	1,300	1,648	1,730	430	Adequate	No
Rockville	898	972	1,021	123	Adequate	No
Seneca Valley	1,229	1,471	1,545	316	Adequate	No
Sherwood	1,202	1,475	1,549	347	Adequate	No
Springbrook	1,068	1,216	1,277	209	Adequate	No
Watkins Mill	1,074	1,247	1,309	235	Adequate	No
Wheaton	1,546	1,646	1,728	182	Adequate	No
Whitman	1,208	1,267	1,330	122	Adequate	No
Wootton	1,407	1,598	1,678	271	Adequate	No
High School Enrollment and MCPS Capacity @ 105%						
Cluster Area	Projected August 2014 Enrollment	100% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	105% MCPS Program Capacity With CC Adopted FY09-14 Amended CIP	Capacity Remaining @ 105% MCPS capacity	Growth Policy 105% Test Result Capacity is:	School Facility Payment Required To Proceed?
B- CC	1,735	1,656	1,739	4	Adequate	No
Blair	2,327	2,876	3,020	693	Adequate	No
Blake	1,700	1,715	1,801	101	Adequate	No
Churchill	1,928	1,972	2,071	143	Adequate	No
Clarksburg	1,844	1,593	1,673	-171	Inadequate	Moratorium
Damascus	1,291	1,589	1,668	377	Adequate	No
Einstein	1,553	1,613	1,694	141	Adequate	No
Gaithersburg	1,906	2,067	2,170	264	Adequate	No
Walter Johnson	2,087	2,275	2,389	302	Adequate	No
Kennedy	1,565	1,838	1,930	365	Adequate	No
Magruder	1,606	1,958	2,056	450	Adequate	No
R. Montgomery	1,969	1,949	2,046	77	Adequate	No
Northwest	2,173	2,151	2,259	86	Adequate	No
Northwood	1,474	1,517	1,593	119	Adequate	No
Paint Branch	1,956	1,899	1,994	38	Adequate	No
Poolesville	1,054	1,107	1,162	108	Adequate	No
Quince Orchard	1,788	1,774	1,863	75	Adequate	No
Rockville	1,263	1,584	1,663	400	Adequate	No
Seneca Valley	1,320	1,478	1,552	232	Adequate	No
Sherwood	1,790	2,022	2,123	333	Adequate	No
Springbrook	1,572	2,095	2,200	628	Adequate	No
Watkins Mill	1,438	1,913	2,009	571	Adequate	No
Wheaton	1,222	1,398	1,468	246	Adequate	No
Whitman	1,650	1,891	1,986	336	Adequate	No
Wootton	2,170	2,086	2,190	20	Adequate	No

School Clusters Requiring a School Facility Payment		
July 1, 2009 – January 1, 2010	January 1, 2010 – June 30, 2010*	Tentative Results July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011
Elementary Level	Elementary Level	Elementary Level
Walter Johnson Richard Montgomery Northwest Northwood Paint Branch Quince Orchard Rockville Wheaton Whitman	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Walter Johnson Richard Montgomery Northwest Northwood Paint Branch Quince Orchard Seneca Valley Rockville Wheaton Whitman	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Northwest Northwood Paint Branch Quince Orchard Rockville
Middle School Level	Middle School Level	Middle School Level
Richard Montgomery	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Richard Montgomery	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Northwest Whitman
High School Level	High School Level	High School Level
		Wootton

School Clusters under Moratorium		
July 1, 2009 – January 1, 2010	January 1, 2010 – June 30, 2010*	Tentative Results July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011
Elementary Level	Elementary Level	Elementary Level
Bethesda-Chevy Chase Seneca Valley		Richard Montgomery
Middle School Level	Middle School Level	Middle School Level
Clarksburg	Clarksburg	
High School Level	High School Level	High School Level

* - with Board acceptance of staff recommendation

ATTACHMENT A: Excerpt from Resolution 16-1187: 2009-2011 Growth Policy

Public School Facilities

S1 Geographic Areas

For the purposes of public school analysis and local area review of school facilities at time of subdivision, the County has been divided into 25 areas called high school clusters. These areas coincide with the cluster boundaries used by the Montgomery County Public School system.

The groupings used are only to administer the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance and do not require any action by the Board of Education in exercising its power to designate school service boundaries.

S2 Grade Levels

Each cluster must be assessed separately at each of the 3 grade levels -- elementary, intermediate/middle, and high school.

S3 Determination of Adequacy

Each year, not later than July 1, the Planning Board must evaluate available capacity in each high school cluster and compare enrollment projected by Montgomery County Public Schools for each fiscal year with projected school capacity in 5 years. If at any time during fiscal year 2010 the County Council notifies the Planning Board of any material change in the Montgomery County Public Schools Capital Improvements Program, the Planning Board may revise its evaluation to reflect that change.

S4 Moratorium on Residential Subdivision Approvals

In considering whether a moratorium on residential subdivisions must be imposed, the Planning Board must use 120% of Montgomery County Public Schools program capacity as its measure of adequate school capacity. This capacity measure must not count relocatable classrooms in computing a school's permanent capacity. If projected enrollment at any grade level in that cluster will exceed 120% of capacity, the Board must not approve any residential subdivision in that cluster during the next fiscal year. If the Planning Board revises its measure of utilization during fiscal year 2010 because of a material change in projected school capacity, that revision must be used during the rest of that fiscal year in reviewing residential subdivisions.

Table 3 shows the result of this test for July 1, 2009, to July 1, 2010. Table 3 also shows the remaining capacity, in students, at each grade level in each cluster. Using average student generation rates developed from the most recent Census Update Survey, the Planning Board must limit residential subdivision approvals in any cluster during the fiscal

year so that the students generated by the housing units approved do not exceed the remaining capacity for students at any grade level in that cluster.

S5 Imposition of School Facilities Payment

In considering whether a School Facilities Payment must be imposed on a residential subdivision, the Planning Board must use 105% of Montgomery County Public Schools' program capacity as its measure of adequate school capacity. This capacity measure must not count relocatable classrooms in computing a school's permanent capacity. If projected enrollment at any grade level in that cluster will exceed 105% of capacity but not exceed 120%, the Board may approve a residential subdivision in that cluster during the next fiscal year if the applicant commits to pay a School Facilities Payment as provided in County law before receiving a building permit for any building in that subdivision. If the Planning Board revises its measure of utilization during fiscal year 2010 because of a material change in projected school capacity, that revision must be used during the rest of that fiscal year in reviewing residential subdivisions.

Table 4 shows the result of this test for July 1, 2009, to July 1, 2010. Table 4 also shows the remaining capacity, in students, at each grade level in each cluster. Using average student generation rates developed from the most recent Census Update Survey, the Planning Board must limit residential subdivision approvals in any cluster during the fiscal year so that the students generated by the housing units approved do not exceed the remaining capacity for students at any grade level in that cluster.

S6 Senior Housing

If public school capacity is inadequate in any cluster, the Planning Board may nevertheless approve a subdivision in that cluster if the subdivision consists solely of multifamily housing and related facilities for elderly or handicapped persons or multifamily housing units located in the age-restricted section of a planned retirement community.

S7 De Minimis Development

If public school capacity is inadequate in any cluster, the Planning Board may nevertheless approve a subdivision in that cluster if the subdivision consists of no more than 3 housing units and the applicant commits to pay a School Facilities Payment as otherwise required before receiving a building permit for any building in that subdivision.

S8 Development District Participants

The Planning Board may require any development district for which it approves a provisional adequate public facilities approval (PAPF) to produce or contribute to infrastructure improvements needed to address inadequate school capacity.

S9 Allocation of Staging Ceiling to Preliminary Plans of Subdivision

The Planning Board must allocate available staging ceiling capacity in a high school cluster based on the queue date of an application for preliminary plan of subdivision approval.

S9.1 Assignment of queue date

The queue date of a preliminary plan of subdivision is the date:

- a complete application is filed with the Planning Board; or
- 6 months after the prior queue date if the prior queue date expires under **S9.4**.

S9.2 Calculation of available staging ceiling capacity

The Planning Board must determine whether adequate staging ceiling capacity is available for a project by subtracting the capacity required by projects with earlier queue dates from the remaining capacity on Table 3 as updated periodically. Based on this calculation, the Planning Board may:

- approve a project for which there is sufficient capacity;
- approve part of a project for which there is sufficient capacity, leaving the remainder of the project in the queue until additional capacity becomes available;
- deny an application for a project for which there is insufficient capacity; or
- defer approval of a project and leave the project in the queue until sufficient capacity becomes available for all or part of the project. If insufficient capacity is available, the Board must not schedule a hearing on the application unless the applicant requests one.

If sufficient capacity is available for a project based on the queue date, the Planning Board must not deny an application based on pipeline (but not staging ceiling) changes while the queue date is in effect.

S9.3 Applicability of School Facilities Payment

The Planning Board must determine whether a project is required to pay a School Facilities Payment by subtracting the capacity required by projects with earlier queue dates from the remaining capacity on Table 4 as updated periodically. Based on this calculation, the Planning Board may:

- approve a project for which there is sufficient capacity;
- approve part of a project for which there is sufficient capacity, requiring the remainder of the project to pay the applicable School Facilities Payment until additional capacity becomes available; or
- defer approval of a project and leave the project in the queue until sufficient capacity becomes available for all or part of the project. If insufficient capacity is available, the Board must not schedule a hearing on the application unless the applicant requests one.

If a project must pay a School Facilities Payment, the Planning Board must not deny an application based on pipeline (but not staging ceiling) changes while the Payment requirement is in effect.

S9.4 Expiration of queue date

A queue date for an application for preliminary plan of subdivision approval expires:

- 6 months after the queue date if sufficient staging ceiling capacity was available for the entire project on the queue date and the Planning Board has not approved the application or granted an extension of the queue date; or
- 6 months after sufficient capacity becomes available for the entire project.

The Planning Board may grant one or more 6-month extensions of a queue date if the applicant demonstrates that a queue date expired or will expire because of governmental delay beyond the applicant's control.