

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY – SEPTEMBER 18, 2007

The Meeting was called to order at 7:30 by John Carman.

Items Requiring Future Action

1. Presentation on Traffic Report.
2. Test County BRAC Web Site
3. Prepare timeline for Review and Comment on Draft EIS
4. NNMCM briefing on Draft EIS when released.
5. Committee deliberations on Draft EIS
6. Receive information on other BRAC communities, including OEA video.
7. Process map and chart of organizational relationship among various governmental agencies.

Meeting Summary

- **Phil Alperson provided brief updates on several matters:**

1. **Status of NNMCM Draft EIS:** The release of the Draft EIS, which was to have taken place in mid-September, is delayed to mid-to-late October. The 2011 statutory deadline for completion of the NNMCM BRAC project necessitates that the Draft EIS be released no later than the end of October. Delays largely have been due to attention being paid by top-level Pentagon officials to the military medical integration, the result of the well publicized problems at Walter Reed.
2. **The Governor's BRAC Subcabinet is holding meetings in the various BRAC-impacted counties and will meet in Shady Grove on Thursday, October 18.** Phil reported on the recent Subcabinet meeting in Howard County.
3. **Phil reported that he represents Montgomery County on the Subcabinet's Local Government Subcommittee.** This provides a forum for representatives of BRAC-impacted jurisdictions to share their concerns with the Subcabinet.
4. **NCPC review of proposed concept design for NNMCM BRAC-related construction.** John Carman submitted views on the Committee's behalf expressing concern that NCPC was not focusing on environmental and traffic impacts of the project.
5. **County BRAC Web Site.** The site is expected to go live soon.
6. **Congressional appropriations:** The full House has passed an FY08 transportation funding bill that includes a \$1 million earmark for the Route 355 Corridor study; the full Senate has approved its version of the bill with a \$3 million earmark. The bill needs to go through conference and then must be

signed into law. Hopefully, a conference bill will maintain an earmark, but the President has issued a veto threat based on policy and funding disagreements.

7. **Long-term legislation.** Beginning next year, Congress will begin considering a major transportation funding bill that funds major highway and transit projects over five years, beginning in FY2010. This may be an opportunity to secure funding for BRAC-related projects.
 8. **BRAC Committee's Internal Deadline for consideration of the Draft EIS.** Phil stressed that while the review process is 45 days, that the Committee really has a shorter period of time to conduct its review. The County Executive has a 45 day deadline to submit his comments, but before he can do that the Committee members must first meet with their constituent groups, craft a series of recommendations based on those meetings, give Phil adequate time to process these recommendations for the Executive to review, and give the Executive adequate time to formulate his own comments based on the Committee recommendations and other recommendations he receives. John and Phil will devise a schedule for the Committee to perform its required tasks.
 9. **MDOT Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) for 2008-2013.** MDOT representatives recently met with DPWT and other County official to discuss the draft CTP, which will be presented to the Council on October 4. The CTP does not include new projects that may be BRAC-related priorities but the Council will have an opportunity to stress the need to consider these closely for the next CTP.
 10. **State-wide BRAC Action Plan.** The Governor has instructed the BRAC Subcabinet to produce a plan that consolidates priorities for all the BRAC-impacted jurisdictions. He wants to make this plan public in early December, and has given local jurisdictions a deadline of October 4 to submit their priority lists. This deadline does not conform to the upcoming review of the NNMC Draft EIS, so the Committee will need to consider projects without it.
- **Presentations were given on Transportation Demand Management (TDM).** These are programs designed to encourage the public to use alternative means of transportation and take cars off the road. An effective TDM program at NNMC can address the potential traffic that would be generated by BRAC expansion. Presenters were Sande Brecher (DPWT Commuter Services), Mike Springer of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Peggy Schwartz of the North Bethesda Traffic Management District (NBTMD), and Dan Wheeland who spoke on behalf of transportation planners at NIH. TDM programs include any of a number of components: incentives for car and van pools and ridesharing, employee transit subsidies, charging for employee and/or visitor parking, on-site Metro services, contracting with private shuttle services from park-and-ride lots, and more. Montgomery County has established five TMD Districts that offer alternative transportation programs for people who live and work there. NRC estimates that 46% of

its 2,450 employees use transit or some form of car pools. There was discussion of whether NNMC has reached out to any of these agencies to develop a TDM plan.

- **State-wide BRAC Action Plan.** Phil initiated a discussion of Item #10 mentioned at the beginning of the meeting (see above). He stressed that the Committee needed to consider what projects the Committee should recommend that the County submit for the State's BRAC Action Plan by the Subcabinet's October 4 deadline. He compiled a brief list of potential projects, based on a detailed chart that John had prepared based on Committee discussions last spring, and asked the Committee to study the list, provide feedback and recommend changes. He will discuss with the Executive recommendations from the Committee and other planning sources. **(NOTE: Based on comments made at the meeting, a revised list is attached with this memo).** Related discussion included some members' comments that DOD should be made to pay for off-campus infrastructure improvements required by BRAC expansion at NNMC, especially those that affect campus activities, such as improving access to NNMC gates from state or county roads. It was also discussed that the Navy should make specific on-base changes that will minimize traffic or encourage transit use, such as moving the gates back to help prevent cars from lining up on public roads, providing kiss-and-ride lots and access for bus service. Concern was also expressed about overflow parking in nearby neighborhoods by employees, patients or construction crews.
- **Captain Malanoski, NNMC Deputy Commander, gave an update on the Draft EIS.** He reported that the Draft EIS has been delayed because so much attention has been placed on the integration of national capital military medicine medical by top-level Pentagon officials. Even though this particular BRAC move is not one of the largest moves in the BRAC process, DOD has made it one of the most important of all the BRAC moves. He said that DOD had decided to appoint a three-star joint service Commander who would oversee the integration process, but that selecting the new commander was holding up the EIS process. He announced that the appointment was made very recently, Rear Admiral Mateczun, the former Deputy Surgeon General of the Navy (<http://www.navy.mil/navydata/bios/navybio.asp?bioID=198>). He speculated that this appointment would allow more decisions to be made, including finalizing and releasing the Draft EIS and that the Draft EIS might be released in early October, rather than mid-to-late October, but was not able to confirm this. There was a discussion about whether a determination had been made about the nature of outpatient care at the Hospital after the merger of Army and Navy medicine was complete. It had been noted that the Army typically keeps its outpatients on-base longer than the Navy, which attempts to relocate its outpatients closer to home as soon as possible. There is a concern that visits to the campus by outpatients and their families could be a major source of increased traffic in the area if there is insufficient on-campus housing for them. Captain Malanoski said the nature of outpatient care has not been determined. Discussion with the Committee included a request for early release to the Committee of traffic data that would be used to compile the Draft EIS. Capt Malanoski said that he had made this information available. Phil and John said that the information had been provided to them by the Navy with a strong concern that it not be disseminated widely in the community prior to its official release as part of the Draft EIS. John said that he did not feel it was his place to release

the NNMC data. Based on the Committee's strong desire to study this information, and the time constraints under which the committee is operating, John said he would try to arrange a briefing on the traffic study in the near future, after further discussion with NNMC and government staff who have reviewed the report.

- John Carman solicited comments from the audience. One person who did not identify himself said he believes the Army has agreed to pay for certain BRAC-related infrastructure improvements at Fort Belvoir – even some that are not on the base but that are necessitated by BRAC. George Oberlander shared his concern that attention is focused on traffic on major arteries, such as MD 355, but that little attention is being given to the level of traffic that could be created on arteries such as Greentree Road or Huntington Parkway.
- Deborah Snead of the BCC Services Center observed that, while the next regularly scheduled Committee meeting is Tuesday, October 16, the impending release of the Draft EIS could necessitate more frequent meetings. Therefore, she will place a hold on the meeting room for several dates in October as soon as she can determine which days it may be available.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40. The next regularly scheduled meeting is Tuesday, October 16, 2007, at 7:30 p.m. There may be additional meetings prior to that date.

Committee members in attendance, September 18, 2007:

Phil Alperson, County BRAC Coordinator
Jon Alterman, Bethesda Parkview Citizens Assn.
Pat Baptiste
John Carman, Committee Chairman
Chuck Floyd
Royce Hanson, MNCPPC
Ilaya Hopkins, East Bethesda Citizens Assn.
Ginanne Italiano, GBCCC
Richard Lashley, Bethesda Urban Partnership
Gordon Linton
Janet Maalouf, Maplewood Citizens Assn.
William McGlockton, Stone Ridge School
Deborah Michaels, Glenbrook Village Homeowners Assn.
Sam Minnitte, MDOT
Patrick O'Neill, GBCCCC
Mike Plantamura, Chevy Chase View
Mohammad Siddique, DPWT
David Smith, Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board
Paul Thaler, Locust Hill Citizens Assn.
Melanie Wenger, County Intergovernmental Relations
Daniel Wheeland, NIH Facilities

Ex-officio:

Delegate Bill Bronrott
Joan Kleinman (Rep. Van Hollen)
Rebecca Lord (Councilmember Berliner)
Captain Mike Malanoski (NNMC)
Sue Tabach (Sen. Mikulski)
Randal Treiber (WRAMC)

Other attendees

Sandi Brecher (DPWT Commuter Services)
Andres Buonanno
Mark Canale (Fairfax County DOT BRAC)
Gerald Cichy (MTA)
Dennis Coleman (NIH)
Judy Daniel (MNCPPC)
Shea DeLutis-Smith
Andrew Dempster
Holly Elwood
Joe Fraundorfer
Ellyn Goldkind (NCPC)
Wayne Goldstein
Maria Morasso
Andrea Morris (Arlington County BRAC)
George Oberlander
Capt. Arthur Rawson
Mal Rivkin
Peggy Schwartz (NBTMD)
Mike Springer (NRC)
Paul Wingfield
Julie Woepke (MD DBED)

**DISCUSSION DRAFT: PROPOSED BRAC-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS
(revised 9-19-07):**

1) Transit and pedestrian enhancements:

- i) Construct Purple Line.**
- ii) Enhance pedestrian access to NNMC from the Medical Center Metro station via new entrance on east side of MD 355, or pedestrian overpass or tunnel.**
- iii) Additional and enhanced bike and pedestrian paths around perimeter and along main roads to campus, and link to Capital Crescent Trail.**
- iv) Future enhanced Ride-On service as transit capacity is increased.**

2) Comprehensive NNMC Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, including but not limited to:

- i) NNMC TDM Plan to discourage single occupancy vehicles and encourage transit alternatives to reduce NNMC-related traffic on Beltway and MD 355, 185 and 187 corridors.**
- ii) Schedule NNMC employee shift times and outpatient visiting hours to avoid increasing peak hour traffic.**
- iii) Satellite parking and shuttles to NNMC. Potential sites include State ROW at MD 185 @ 495 and lot at MD 355 @ Montrose Road. Identify other sites, including Upcounty.**
- iv) Charter bus service from outlying areas to NNMC.**

3) I-495 off-ramp between MD 355 (Rockville Pike) & MD 185 (Connecticut Ave.) directly to NNMC campus.

4) Comprehensive Route 355 Corridor study, from Woodmont Avenue to the Beltway interchange, including but not limited to analysis of the following potential improvements (grade separated intersections where feasible):

- i) Widen MD 355 and Jones Bridge Road west and south of NNMC; improve turn lanes, entrances and pedestrian access; right-of-way may be available.**
- ii) Intersection improvements at Cedar Lane @ MD 355 (recommended in Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan).**

- iii) **Intersection improvements at Jones Bridge Road @ MD 355.**
- iv) **Intersection improvements at Jones Bridge Road @ MD 185. SHA has studied.**
- v) **Intersection improvements at Old Georgetown Road (MD 187) @ Cedar Lane.**
- vi) **Upgrade entrances to NNMC; move gates back to help prevent traffic bottlenecks on public roads.**
- vii) **Study potential increases in BRAC-related traffic and mitigations at MD 185 @ Beltway interchange.**

5) Other:

- i) **Additional on-campus outpatient/family housing to reduce commuter traffic.**
- ii) **Extend MD 355 Corridor study farther north of the Beltway, such as to Tuckerman or Nicholson Lanes, and farther south into downtown Bethesda.**

ISSUES FOR COUNTY

1. Understand and respond to demands on County: traffic, homeland security, emergency services, etc.
2. Re-prioritize new or previously lower-priority projects that may need state and/or federal funding due to BRAC-related implications.
3. Note that these projects may compete with current non-BRAC projects for which the state seeks funding – potential change of priorities must be assessed.
4. Limited availability of funds – will BRAC demands siphon funds from other needs?