



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

September 10, 2009

To: Phil Andrews, Council President
From: Isiah Leggett, County Executive
Subject: Draft Gaithersburg West Master Plan

I am pleased to provide comments on the Planning Board Draft Gaithersburg West Master Plan. This Master Plan, with its focus on biosciences -- a cornerstone of the County's economic development strategy -- is one of the most important, defining master plans to be considered by the County Council. With only 4% greenfields development capacity remaining in the County, and without compromising other important policies, the Gaithersburg West Master Plan is a unique opportunity for Montgomery County to establish itself as a leader in the national and global life sciences marketplace. The plan is important to the Gaithersburg West area, the County as a whole, and the State of Maryland.

The core elements of the plan -- higher density near transit, links among the academic, science, and government sectors, a broad array of housing for workers and their families, adequate transit and roads -- if implemented properly will help carry this County through much of the first half of this century. While I will be recommending some modifications to the draft plan, particularly in the overall density outlined in this plan, I support the Planning Board's overall approach and vision represented in its transmittal to you. The plan recognizes the need to create opportunities for economic growth while strategically focusing and staging growth around mass transit, thus avoiding sprawl and protecting the County's long-established commitment to protection of the Agricultural Reserve.

The Planning Board Draft of the Gaithersburg West Master Plan is part of an answer to a call to action that cannot go unheeded. Unfortunately, we are losing scientists and we are losing our competitive advantage in the biotechnology industry as a county, as a state and as a nation. This is a loss we cannot afford. Bio-technology is a fundamental element of Montgomery County's economy. Over the coming decades we can make an increasing contribution to traditional and new value-added activities for worldwide health, energy, and the environment. The draft plan creates the opportunity for the creation of up to 47,200 new high tech and related jobs for this industry. It is estimated that the plan can generate approximately \$1.5 Billion in net revenue to the County over the next thirty years.

We must elevate the profile of life sciences, catalyze tech transfer outcomes, improve and expand our work force, capitalize on our federal and academic assets, facilitate access to capital and strategic alliances, and develop critical infrastructure that supports this initiative. As a first step in this process, last Fall I established a task force of bioscience leaders from the public and private sectors and academia to identify recommendations and develop a strategic plan for a thriving and successful biosciences community in Montgomery County. This group, which is led by David Mott, former CEO of our own home grown MedImmune, will finalize its recommendations this coming October. The Gaithersburg West Master Plan will enable us to have the place for these activities.

We must establish the tools and commit ourselves to create an environment within Montgomery County in which a concentration of higher paying research, service and production jobs can be located to solve problems of modern society through science. We can be the place where solutions are found for the elimination of disease, world hunger, protection of the environment, and a reduction in energy consumption. The Gaithersburg West Master Plan is a critical component in helping the County to achieve this vision by creating a "Community Of Innovation" where the workers and researchers will live, work and play.

President Obama has recognized the imperative need to improve our national standing on scientific research and development. Promising to double funding for research and development and to spend at least 3% of the gross domestic product on scientific research and development, President Obama stated that science is "more essential for our prosperity, our security, our health, our environment, and our quality of life than it ever has been before." Congressional leaders have likewise recognized the importance of science in our nation's continued prosperity and quality of life. At the same time, Governor O'Malley has reemphasized the critical role that bioscience plays in the State's economic development strategy and has established a Maryland Bioscience Center in Montgomery County. Montgomery County's selection for a center indicates our community's central role in sustaining and growing the bioscience industry in Maryland.

As a county we have the key assets that can make us leaders in the area of biosciences and related industry. Montgomery County was one of the very first to start down this path nearly thirty years ago with the Shady Grove Life Sciences Center and we are now home to approximately 230 life sciences companies. It was the vision of the County Council at that time that enabled us to enjoy the successes that we have seen at the Life Sciences Center. But our past successes have not enabled us to hold the leading position that we have had historically. Research parks are changing. Suburban models are being replaced by research villages where researchers can live, work, learn and play. We have the elements for a successful research environment, but to remain a leader, our model must change as well. With competition growing globally, nationally and regionally, it is critical that we define ourselves as a leader in the field of biosciences and that we create exciting and inviting places for these quality jobs within the County. With the federal and state attention to this segment of the economy, we must act definitively and boldly now. Later is too late.

On October 2, 2008, the Association of University Research Parks issued a white paper on the "*Power of Place: A National Strategy for Building America's Communities of Innovation.*" This policy statement has as one of its key recommendations the building of sustainable "Communities of Innovation" through smart growth reflecting best practices to encourage density and mixed-use development in American Innovation Zones. The Planning Board's Draft Gaithersburg West Master Plan seeks to create just such a community.

At Shady Grove we have key ingredients for a world class research village. With the University of Maryland Universities at Shady Grove, Johns Hopkins University, the Shady Grove Life Sciences Center, the Shady Grove Adventist Hospital, and existing companies, we have a good beginning. With proximity to I-370 and I-270, the extension of the Corridor Cities Transitway into the heart of the life sciences area, and the relocation of the Public Safety Training Academy we have the essential elements called for to build a "Community of Innovation." The Gaithersburg West Master Plan can stitch together these elements and provide the framework for a true research village where researchers can live, learn, work, and play in a community that provides access to mass transit and community amenities essential to attracting and retaining the world class workforce needed to sustain our bioscience community well into the twenty-first century.

Transportation and Density

The draft plan proposes a modified alignment for the Corridor Cities Transitway, which I strongly support. The proposed alignment brings the CCT into the heart of our Life Sciences Center, to the Shady Grove Adventist Hospital, Johns Hopkins and much closer to the Universities at Shady Grove. This alignment is logical and creates better mass transit opportunities with the increased ridership from these areas with only a small increase in travel time. The CCT studies have used a planning window through 2030 which assumes density of approximately 18 million square feet of commercial space. With this assumed density, the CCT becomes competitive for federal funding and more achievable. Adoption of the Gaithersburg West Master Plan will help us move forward with achieving the CCT. Implementation of the CCT is one of my priorities and will enable this plan, the recently adopted Germantown Master Plan and the Clarksburg Master Plan to be realized. With the implementation of the Greater Shady Grove Transportation Management District, access between CCT stops and nearby properties such as the Universities at Shady Grove and properties along Key West should be readily achievable.

The draft plan calls for commercial density of 20 million square feet. This is a density that many believe is essential to creating a sense of place for contemporary researchers. In determining the appropriate density for this plan, I believe such density must be achievable, reasonable and accomplish the objectives of a successful place to live, work, learn and play. ***After carefully considering the question of density, I have concluded that the appropriate density for the Gaithersburg West Master Plan should be set at 18 million square feet for commercial development.*** I also believe that we should review the plan in six years to determine if additional density would be needed and achievable into the future. I recognize the importance

of the density to this plan and understand the need to create a “Community of Innovation.” Therefore, my recommendation of density is based on an expectation that it will reduce the costs for needed transportation improvements by eliminating two or more highway interchanges and thereby facilitate the implementation of the plan.

While our master plans have horizons of thirty or more years, it is essential to determine if a plan can actually be implemented within the lifespan of the plan. It is the ability to actually implement the proposed density that leads me to conclude that 18 million square feet of commercial density is the proper number for the Life Sciences Center. A concern that I have about the plan as proposed is that it calls for five State interchanges to be built. These interchanges are costly and the funding of them is not within our control. The draft plan proposes that Stage 3 not proceed unless the two top priority interchanges are completed and three interchanges are fully funded. This raises a serious question as to whether the plan will ever successfully move past Stage 2. Traffic analyses conducted by Park and Planning Staff indicate that at approximately 18 million square feet of planned commercial space, at least two (if not more) interchanges may not be necessary. This would result in a cost savings of approximately \$250,000,000 and increase the likelihood of the plan being implemented.

The County’s Department of Transportation has recommended that extension of Sam Eig into the Belward site be evaluated. With a cumulative commercial density of 18 million square feet and extension of Sam Eig into Belward, the Great Seneca Highway and Muddy Branch interchange may be totally eliminated. This would save an estimated \$120,000,000 to \$150,000,000 plus right-of-way. While this would impact approximately 12 single family units, it would result in saving approximately 60 condominium dwelling units that would otherwise need to be acquired in order to proceed with the CCT and the interchange.

Elimination of this interchange will also have a dramatic impact upon the competitiveness of the CCT because the CCT would otherwise have to reflect the cost of the right-of-way for the interchange including the costs of acquiring the 60 condominium units. Given these expected outcomes, I am asking that the Council have the Planning Board analyze extending Sam Eig into Belward and an overall commercial density of 18 Million square feet to determine how these changes impact the need for interchanges.

While I am recommending a density of 18 million square feet, I believe that any reduction of commercial development capacity should be done strategically. I urge the Council, with guidance from the Planning Board, to look at areas outside of a ¼ mile radius from CCT stations and areas that are not likely to redevelop due to existing uses and configurations. Densities should not be excised from county land which may be leveraged in public private partnerships in the future to help advance our bioscience objectives.

Strategic Location of Housing on the Public Safety Training Academy Site

I support the recommendations in the Plan that promotes mixed-use and residential development for a broad range of income-levels. A strong residential presence in the

plan area will foster the establishment of this area as a livable community as well as a world class sciences center.

The relocation of the Public Safety Training Academy is of critical importance to the proposed plan and to the creation of a live, work research community. As I have noted before, if this site were to remain with its current use, it will require in excess of \$33 Million just for basic renovations. More importantly, I have come to the conclusion that our investment in this critical aspect of our public safety mission should be made elsewhere. It is not in the long term best interests of our community to continue to use this extremely valuable land in the heart of our bioscience community as a training facility for our public safety personnel. Both the Police and Fire Chiefs have outlined the extraordinary advantages to their public safety mission of relocating these facilities while I have outlined the extraordinary advantages to the taxpayer and the broader community of using this land for its most logical use.

The current use of this site is an extreme underutilization of land and actually is a barrier to connectivity among Belward, the Life Sciences Center, the Universities at Shady Grove and the Shady Grove Adventist Hospital. Further investment in this site will diminish the likelihood of achieving a live/work innovation community and will reduce planned ridership that makes the CCT competitive. The relocation of the Public Safety Training Academy will allow the CCT to be realigned closer to the Universities at Shady Grove and through the Life Sciences Center. It will also provide housing needed to support the life sciences industry and growth. With the proper mix of housing types and price points, the PSTA site will provide housing for students, researchers and families. The housing will be oriented to transit with a CCT stop centrally located to the housing. This housing is important to the jobs/housing ratio balance envisioned by the plan as well.

Technical Comments and Fiscal Impact

I am attaching to these comments a statement of infrastructure and other costs called for by the plan. I am also attaching a summary fiscal impact analysis that reflects the expected net fiscal impact of the plan as proposed with 20 million square feet of commercial development. The average annual net fiscal impact is projected to be approximately \$43 Million and the cumulative net fiscal impact over a period of thirty years is approximately \$1.5 Billion. I am also attaching a summary of the anticipated fiscal impact if the plan is approved at 18 million square feet of commercial space. At 18 million square feet, the anticipated average annual net fiscal impact is projected to be \$31 Million with a cumulative net fiscal impact of \$1.1 Billion. The numbers in the fiscal impact analysis reflect assumptions based on information from the draft plan and related studies.

In addition to the comments that I am providing in this memorandum, my staff will provide detailed technical comments to Council staff on aspects of the draft plan. As you know I have also convened a Smart Growth Initiative Implementation Advisory Group which reflects a broad cross section of interests. This group focused on the Gaithersburg West Master Plan over two sessions and has provided me with a list of comments on the Plan. One comment

that came up multiple times is the importance of creating exceptions for projects of strategic economic significance so that the County does not lose economically significant opportunities because of staging restrictions. I agree with the comment and urge the Council to include such a provision. I am attaching both the comments from the group and the list of members of the group.

Vision and Conclusion

With President Obama's and Congress' commitment to increased spending for science, and our proximity and assets, it is essential that we create the tools so that Montgomery County is the place for the growth in this important segment of our economy. With the Shady Grove Life Sciences Center and our East County site, we can create opportunities for an estimated 47,000 quality jobs in the future. We must remove barriers to realization of this important objective.

Both Johns Hopkins University and the Universities at Shady Grove have exciting plans and visions for research and education opportunities in the future. The energy and symbiosis of these institutions with private and public sector researchers cannot be underestimated. The Gaithersburg West Master Plan is the opportunity to create a platform and center for science, education and health care in Montgomery County.

I commend the Planning Board and its staff for an excellent job creating a vision for the Gaithersburg West Master Plan area. It is a vision that creates meaningful economic development opportunities, approaches the Corridor Cities Transitway in a manner that facilitates its realization, orients development to transit, and creates a live, work community with attention to the balance of jobs to housing.

With a horizon of thirty or more years, the Gaithersburg West Master Plan is today's vision of tomorrow. Most of us will not be around to see the vision being implemented. It is important to adopt this visionary plan because of the opportunities it will present for jobs, education and housing for our children and our children's children.

IL:dsj

Attachments (5):

Smart Growth Initiative Implementation Advisory Group Membership List
Comments from 8/19/09 Smart Growth Initiative Implementation Advisory Group Meeting
Executive Branch Staff Technical Comments
Costs Associated with the Gaithersburg West Master Plan
Summary of Projected Net Fiscal Impacts

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, MD**

Comparison of Scenarios

*Gaithersburg West Master Plan - Gaithersburg West Master Plan -
Scenario A Scenario B*

| | <i>(units)</i> | <i>(units)</i> |
|---|---|---|
| Development Comparison | | |
| <i>Residential</i> | 3,300 | 3,300 |
| <i>Existing Residential</i> | | |
| <i>Approved and Proposed Residential</i> | | |
| <i>Condominiums</i> | | |
| Market | 2,708 | 2,708 |
| Moderately priced condos | 143 | 143 |
| <i>Apartments</i> | | |
| Market | 2,708 | 2,708 |
| Moderately priced apartments | 143 | 143 |
| Sub-total approved and proposed residential | 5,700 | 5,700 |
| Total residential | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| | <i>(square feet)</i> | <i>(square feet)</i> |
| Commercial | 6,940,000 | 6,940,000 |
| <i>Existing Commercial</i> | | |
| <i>Approved and Proposed Commercial</i> | | |
| Biotech | 4,200,000 | 3,556,815 |
| Office | 3,000,000 | 2,540,582 |
| Retail | 791,000 | 669,867 |
| Academic | 1,900,000 | 1,609,035 |
| Healthcare | 3,169,000 | 2,683,701 |
| Sub-total approved and proposed commercial | 13,060,000 | 11,060,000 |
| Total commercial | 20,000,000 | 18,000,000 |
| Population | | |
| <i>Total residents</i> | 15,162 | 15,162 |
| <i>Total students</i> | 1,898 | 1,898 |
| <i>Total employees</i> | | |
| Direct | 53,950 | 45,168 |
| Indirect | 32,708 | 27,604 |
| Total employees | 86,658 | 72,772 |
| | <i>Annual (Current Dollars)¹</i> | <i>Annual (Current Dollars)¹</i> |
| Revenues and Expenditures | | |
| <i>Montgomery County Projected Revenues</i> | \$121,353,836 | \$4,088,407,897 |
| <i>Montgomery County Projected Expenditures</i> | | |
| County expenditures | (\$19,085,088) | (\$649,741,564) |
| Capital expenditures ² | (\$31,683,028) | (\$950,490,829) |
| Montgomery County public school system | (\$27,558,702) | (\$996,024,182) |
| Total County expenditures | (\$78,326,817) | (\$2,596,256,575) |
| Net County surplus/(deficit) | \$43,027,019 | \$1,492,151,322 |
| | <i>Annual (Current Dollars)¹</i> | <i>30 Year Cumulative Total</i> |
| | \$108,152,504 | \$3,657,948,186 |
| | (\$17,754,893) | (\$607,408,325) |
| | (\$31,683,028) | (\$950,490,829) |
| | (\$27,558,702) | (\$996,024,182) |
| | (\$76,996,622) | (\$2,553,923,336) |
| | \$31,155,882 | \$1,104,024,850 |

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario Comparison rev. xls\Comparison 10-Sep-09

¹ Assumes full build-out expressed in current dollars.

² Annual projected capital costs represent the average over the assumed thirty year period shown in Scenario A and Scenario B.

³ Scenario A represents the results based on 20 million square feet of existing and proposed commercial development. Scenario B represents the results based on 18 million square feet of existing and proposed commercial development.

Scenario A - 20MSF

Gaithersburg West Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-A: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Fire and Rescue Services¹

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | Amortization Period | First Year Annual Costs |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Operation: | | | |
| Personnel services ² | | | \$2,590,380 |
| Facility maintenance ³ | | | \$94,975 |
| Energy/utilities ⁴ | | | \$71,125 |
| EMS operating costs | | | \$54,000 |
| Sub-total | | | \$2,810,480 |
| One-time costs: | | | |
| Supply costs ⁵ | | | \$84,000 |
| Recruiting costs ⁶ | | | \$1,667,790 |
| Sub-total | | | \$1,751,790 |
| Capital: | | | |
| Building design and construction and new apparatus ⁷ | \$17,361,017 | 20 | \$1,393,093 |
| Total first year annual costs | | | \$5,955,363 |

MuniCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\[Scenario A.xls]XIX-A
10-Sep-09

¹Represents the costs for the new Travilah Fire Station to be located with the Gaithersburg West Master Plan area. Source: Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services and Montgomery County Department of General Services.

²Assumes the following: 4-person engine, 2-person medic unit, collectively requiring 4.5 captains, 9 master firefighters and 13.5 fire fighters during a 27 year work period.

³Based on cost estimate of \$4.36 per square foot. Source: Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services and Montgomery County Department of G

⁴Based on cost estimate of \$3.30 per square foot. Source: Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services and Montgomery County Department of G

⁵Includes EMS and administrative supplies.

⁶Assumes costs for recruiting will occur over the first six months. Includes the following: recruit salaries, instructor overtime for recruitment class and uniforms/gear for 27 recruits.

⁷Represents the CIP cost estimate based upon preliminary figures available as of 8/26/2009. Source: Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services and Montgomery County Department of General Services. Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 20 years at 5%.

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XIX-B: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Department of Transportation

Table 1: County Road Costs Estimates (Includes Land Costs)

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs ² | | | Amortization Period | First Year Annual Costs ³ | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | | Stage 4 2035 | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | Stage 4 2035 |
| Key West Avenue | \$0 | \$28,460,875 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$1,851,421 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Sann Eig Highway | \$0 | \$0 | \$18,875,142 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,227,855 | \$0 |
| Great Seneca Highway | \$0 | \$32,875,125 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$2,138,574 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Great Seneca Highway | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,124,555 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$658,617 | \$0 |
| Muddy Branch Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,610,375 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$690,220 | \$0 |
| Muddy Branch Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$28,538,250 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,856,454 | \$0 |
| Quince Orchard Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,374,750 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,065,201 | \$0 |
| Quince Orchard Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$19,493,750 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,268,096 | \$0 |
| Clopper Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$64,072,500 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,168,008 |
| West Diamond Avenue | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$26,171,700 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,702,507 |
| Darnestown Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,000,000 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$650,514 | \$0 |
| Longdraft Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$29,833,598 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,940,718 | \$0 |
| Riffle Ford Road | \$0 | \$26,013,900 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$1,692,242 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oakmont Avenue | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,581,120 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$493,163 | \$0 |
| Medical Center Drive | \$0 | \$23,850,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$1,551,477 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Decoverly Drive Extension | \$0 | \$0 | \$19,080,000 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,241,181 | \$0 |
| Blackwell Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Blackwell Road Extension | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,296,660 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$539,710 | \$0 |
| New Road A | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,019,489 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$911,988 | \$0 |
| New Road B | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,546,827 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$555,983 | \$0 |
| New Road C | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,048,497 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$263,361 |
| New Road D | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,847,829 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$380,410 |
| New Road E | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,598,664 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$234,098 |
| New Road F | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,071,827 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$52,5084 |
| New Road G | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$13,494,990 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$877,868 |
| New Road H | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,071,827 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$52,5084 |
| New Road I | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,197,328 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$468,197 |
| New Road J | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,947,662 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$386,904 |
| New Road K | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,197,328 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$468,197 |
| New Road L | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,973,831 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$193,452 |
| New Road M | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,274,499 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$82,908 |
| New Road N | \$0 | \$0 | \$11,695,658 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$760,819 |
| Traville Gateway Drive | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10,795,992 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$702,295 |
| Travilah Road Extension | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,349,499 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$87,787 |
| New Road Q | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,598,664 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$234,098 |
| New Road R | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,548,998 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$165,816 |
| Sub-total County road estimates | \$0 | \$135,049,900 | \$201,374,516 | \$187,957,293 | | \$0 | \$8,785,190 | \$13,099,701 | \$12,226,892 |

MontCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario A.xls\XIX-B
10-Sep-09

¹Based on information provided by Montgomery County, Department of Transportation.

²Represents the capital costs assumed to occur within each phase of the development. Based on information provided in The Gaithersburg West Master Plan, Planning Board Draft dated July 2009.

³Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 30 years at 5%.

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-C: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Upcounty Urban District¹

| Costs Type | First Year Annual Costs |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Operation: | |
| Annual staff (14 positions) | \$1,157,060 |
| Annual operating expenditures: | |
| Services/contracts | \$374,365 |
| Charges from others | \$9,364 |
| Communications services | \$6,500 |
| Printing/central duplication services | \$2,580 |
| Mail | \$760 |
| Motor pool | \$36,840 |
| Travel | \$1,000 |
| Education, tuition, training | \$3,200 |
| Office supplies & equipment | \$13,480 |
| Motor vehicle equip and supplies | \$5,000 |
| Uniforms | \$11,300 |
| Other supplies and materials | \$5,900 |
| Rentals and leases | \$2,100 |
| Equipment repairs/maintenance | \$1,700 |
| Equipment repairs/maintenance | \$2,000 |
| Equipment repairs/maintenance | \$2,000 |
| Equipment repairs/maintenance | \$18,141 |
| Total Upcounty Urban District | \$1,653,290 |

MuniCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\[Scenario A.xls]XIX-C

10-Sep-09

¹Source: Montgomery County Upcounty Regional Services Center.

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XIX-D: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Department of General Services¹

Table 1: Total Public Safety Training Academy (PSTA) Relocation Costs

| Costs Type | Total PSTA Costs |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Relocation costs ¹ | \$86,000,000 |
| Site value ² | (\$81,000,000) |
| Total PSTA costs | \$5,000,000 |

Table 2: PSTA Amortized Costs

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | Amortization Period | First Year Amortized Costs ³ |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Net PSTA relocation costs | \$5,000,000 | 20 | \$401,213 |

MuniCap, Inc. M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario A.xls\XIX-D
10-Sep-09

¹Source: Montgomery County, Department of General Services. Includes costs for acquisition, design and construction.

²Assumes Montgomery County will sell the PSTA site at the current appraised value as soon as the current property users have been relocated and apply sales revenues towards offsetting the relocation costs. Represents the appraisal value as of 9/23/2008. Source: Montgomery County Department of General Services.

³Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 20 years at 5%.

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-E: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Montgomery County Public Schools¹

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | Amortization Period | First Year Annual Costs |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Capital: | | | |
| Elementary school building, design and construction ² | \$21,000,000 | 20 | \$1,685,094 |
| Operating: | | | |
| Personnel | | | \$790,000 |
| Operations | | | \$445,000 |
| Total school costs | | | \$2,920,094 |

MuniCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario A.xls\XIX-E
10-Sep-09

¹Source: Montgomery County, Department of General Services.

²Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 20 years at 5%.

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XIX-F: Total Projected County Operating and Capital Costs¹

| Year Ending | Tax Year Beginning | Inflation Factor | Department of Fire and Rescue Services ² | | | Department of Transportation ³ | | | | Total DOT | |
|--------------|--------------------|------------------|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---|------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Operating Costs | One-time Costs | Amortized Capital Costs | Total Fire and Rescue Costs | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | Stage 3 | | Stage 4 |
| 31-Dec-08 | 1-Jul-09 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-09 | 1-Jul-10 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-10 | 1-Jul-11 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-11 | 1-Jul-12 | 103% | \$2,894,794 | \$1,804,344 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,134,024 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-12 | 1-Jul-13 | 106% | \$2,981,638 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,416,524 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-13 | 1-Jul-14 | 109% | \$3,071,087 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,505,973 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-14 | 1-Jul-15 | 113% | \$3,163,220 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,598,106 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-15 | 1-Jul-16 | 116% | \$3,258,117 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,693,002 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-16 | 1-Jul-17 | 119% | \$3,355,860 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,790,746 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-17 | 1-Jul-18 | 123% | \$3,456,536 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,891,422 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-18 | 1-Jul-19 | 127% | \$3,560,232 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,995,118 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-19 | 1-Jul-20 | 130% | \$3,667,039 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,101,925 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-20 | 1-Jul-21 | 134% | \$3,777,050 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,211,936 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-21 | 1-Jul-22 | 138% | \$3,890,362 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,325,247 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-22 | 1-Jul-23 | 143% | \$4,007,072 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,441,958 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-23 | 1-Jul-24 | 147% | \$4,127,285 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,562,170 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-24 | 1-Jul-25 | 151% | \$4,251,103 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,685,989 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-25 | 1-Jul-26 | 156% | \$4,378,636 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,813,522 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-26 | 1-Jul-27 | 160% | \$4,509,995 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,944,881 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-27 | 1-Jul-28 | 165% | \$4,645,295 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,080,181 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-28 | 1-Jul-29 | 170% | \$4,784,654 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,219,540 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-29 | 1-Jul-30 | 175% | \$4,928,194 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,363,079 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-30 | 1-Jul-31 | 181% | \$5,076,040 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,510,925 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-31 | 1-Jul-32 | 186% | \$5,228,321 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,228,321 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-32 | 1-Jul-33 | 192% | \$5,385,170 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,385,170 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-33 | 1-Jul-34 | 197% | \$5,546,725 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,546,725 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-34 | 1-Jul-35 | 203% | \$5,713,127 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,713,127 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-35 | 1-Jul-36 | 209% | \$5,884,521 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,884,521 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$25,600,396 | \$56,813,979 |
| 31-Dec-36 | 1-Jul-37 | 216% | \$6,061,057 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,061,057 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$25,600,396 | \$56,813,979 |
| 31-Dec-37 | 1-Jul-38 | 222% | \$6,242,888 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,242,888 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$25,600,396 | \$56,813,979 |
| 31-Dec-38 | 1-Jul-39 | 229% | \$6,430,175 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,430,175 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$25,600,396 | \$56,813,979 |
| Total | | | \$124,276,194 | \$1,804,344 | \$28,697,714 | \$154,778,252 | \$0 | \$237,702,857 | \$285,724,708 | \$102,401,583 | \$625,829,149 |

MunCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario A.xls\XIX-F
10-Sep-09

¹Capital costs are assumed to increase with inflation. For costs that are assumed to be financed with bonds or other long-term financing vehicles, total inflated costs are assumed to be amortized at 5% and do not increase on an annual basis.

²See Schedule XIX-A.

³See Schedule XIX-B. Represents the total Department of Transportation capital costs to be paid by Montgomery County for all stages

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XIX-F: Total Projected County Operating and Capital Costs (continued)¹

| Year | Tax Year | Inflation Factor | Upcounty Urban District Costs ² | General Services Costs (PSTA Relocation) ³ | Public School Capital Costs ⁴ | | Total Projected Capital Costs |
|--------------|----------|------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | Operating Costs | Amortized Capital Costs | |
| 31-Dec-08 | 1-Jul-09 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-09 | 1-Jul-10 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-10 | 1-Jul-11 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-11 | 1-Jul-12 | 103% | \$1,702,889 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,250,162 |
| 31-Dec-12 | 1-Jul-13 | 106% | \$1,753,975 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,583,749 |
| 31-Dec-13 | 1-Jul-14 | 109% | \$1,806,595 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,725,817 |
| 31-Dec-14 | 1-Jul-15 | 113% | \$1,860,792 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,872,147 |
| 31-Dec-15 | 1-Jul-16 | 116% | \$1,916,616 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,022,868 |
| 31-Dec-16 | 1-Jul-17 | 119% | \$1,974,115 | \$413,249 | \$1,474,655 | \$2,012,091 | \$10,664,855 |
| 31-Dec-17 | 1-Jul-18 | 123% | \$2,033,338 | \$413,249 | \$1,518,894 | \$2,012,091 | \$21,673,669 |
| 31-Dec-18 | 1-Jul-19 | 127% | \$2,094,338 | \$413,249 | \$1,564,461 | \$2,012,091 | \$21,883,932 |
| 31-Dec-19 | 1-Jul-20 | 130% | \$2,157,168 | \$413,249 | \$1,611,395 | \$2,012,091 | \$22,100,503 |
| 31-Dec-20 | 1-Jul-21 | 134% | \$2,221,884 | \$413,249 | \$1,659,737 | \$2,012,091 | \$22,323,571 |
| 31-Dec-21 | 1-Jul-22 | 138% | \$2,288,540 | \$413,249 | \$1,709,529 | \$2,012,091 | \$22,553,332 |
| 31-Dec-22 | 1-Jul-23 | 143% | \$2,357,196 | \$413,249 | \$1,760,815 | \$2,012,091 | \$22,789,984 |
| 31-Dec-23 | 1-Jul-24 | 147% | \$2,427,912 | \$413,249 | \$1,813,639 | \$2,012,091 | \$23,033,737 |
| 31-Dec-24 | 1-Jul-25 | 151% | \$2,500,749 | \$413,249 | \$1,868,048 | \$2,012,091 | \$23,284,802 |
| 31-Dec-25 | 1-Jul-26 | 156% | \$2,575,772 | \$413,249 | \$1,924,090 | \$2,012,091 | \$43,952,307 |
| 31-Dec-26 | 1-Jul-27 | 160% | \$2,653,045 | \$413,249 | \$1,981,812 | \$2,012,091 | \$44,218,662 |
| 31-Dec-27 | 1-Jul-28 | 165% | \$2,732,636 | \$413,249 | \$2,041,267 | \$2,012,091 | \$44,493,007 |
| 31-Dec-28 | 1-Jul-29 | 170% | \$2,814,616 | \$413,249 | \$2,102,505 | \$2,012,091 | \$44,775,583 |
| 31-Dec-29 | 1-Jul-30 | 175% | \$2,899,054 | \$413,249 | \$2,165,580 | \$2,012,091 | \$45,066,637 |
| 31-Dec-30 | 1-Jul-31 | 181% | \$2,986,026 | \$413,249 | \$2,230,547 | \$2,012,091 | \$45,366,421 |
| 31-Dec-31 | 1-Jul-32 | 186% | \$3,075,606 | \$413,249 | \$2,297,464 | \$2,012,091 | \$44,240,314 |
| 31-Dec-32 | 1-Jul-33 | 192% | \$3,167,875 | \$0 | \$2,366,388 | \$2,012,091 | \$44,145,106 |
| 31-Dec-33 | 1-Jul-34 | 197% | \$3,262,911 | \$0 | \$2,437,379 | \$2,012,091 | \$44,472,689 |
| 31-Dec-34 | 1-Jul-35 | 203% | \$3,360,798 | \$0 | \$2,510,501 | \$2,012,091 | \$44,810,100 |
| 31-Dec-35 | 1-Jul-36 | 209% | \$3,461,622 | \$0 | \$2,585,816 | \$2,012,091 | \$70,758,029 |
| 31-Dec-36 | 1-Jul-37 | 216% | \$3,565,471 | \$0 | \$2,663,390 | \$0 | \$69,103,897 |
| 31-Dec-37 | 1-Jul-38 | 222% | \$3,672,435 | \$0 | \$2,743,292 | \$0 | \$69,472,594 |
| 31-Dec-38 | 1-Jul-39 | 229% | \$3,782,608 | \$0 | \$2,825,591 | \$0 | \$69,852,353 |
| Total | | | \$73,106,583 | \$8,678,236 | \$47,856,794 | \$40,241,815 | \$950,490,829 |

MuniCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario A.xls\XIX-F (2)

10-Sep-09

¹Capital costs are assumed to increase with inflation. For costs that are assumed to be financed with bonds or other long-term financing vehicles, total inflated costs are assumed to be amortized at a 5% and do not increase on an annual basis.

²See Schedule XIX-C.

³See Schedule XIX-D.

⁴See Schedule XIX-E.

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XXI: Net Revenues Versus Total Projected County Operating and Capital Costs

| Tax Year Beginning | Inflation Factor | Net County Revenues (Schedule XVIII) | Total Projected County Operating & Capital Costs (Schedule XIX-F) | Net Montgomery County Surplus/(Deficit) |
|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1-Jul-09 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 1-Jul-10 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 1-Jul-11 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 1-Jul-12 | 103% | \$6,184,314 | (\$8,250,162) | (\$2,065,848) |
| 1-Jul-13 | 106% | \$11,229,162 | (\$6,583,749) | \$4,645,413 |
| 1-Jul-14 | 109% | \$16,585,821 | (\$6,725,817) | \$9,860,003 |
| 1-Jul-15 | 113% | \$22,268,023 | (\$6,872,147) | \$15,395,875 |
| 1-Jul-16 | 116% | \$28,290,032 | (\$7,022,868) | \$21,267,164 |
| 1-Jul-17 | 119% | \$34,666,661 | (\$10,664,855) | \$24,001,805 |
| 1-Jul-18 | 123% | \$41,413,289 | (\$21,673,669) | \$19,739,620 |
| 1-Jul-19 | 127% | \$48,545,887 | (\$21,883,932) | \$26,661,955 |
| 1-Jul-20 | 130% | \$56,081,032 | (\$22,100,503) | \$33,980,529 |
| 1-Jul-21 | 134% | \$64,035,931 | (\$22,323,571) | \$41,712,359 |
| 1-Jul-22 | 138% | \$68,480,352 | (\$22,553,332) | \$45,927,020 |
| 1-Jul-23 | 143% | \$73,200,683 | (\$22,789,984) | \$50,410,699 |
| 1-Jul-24 | 147% | \$78,152,799 | (\$23,033,737) | \$55,119,062 |
| 1-Jul-25 | 151% | \$83,345,898 | (\$23,284,802) | \$60,061,096 |
| 1-Jul-26 | 156% | \$88,789,504 | (\$43,952,307) | \$44,837,197 |
| 1-Jul-27 | 160% | \$92,124,554 | (\$44,218,662) | \$47,905,892 |
| 1-Jul-28 | 165% | \$98,076,231 | (\$44,493,007) | \$53,583,224 |
| 1-Jul-29 | 170% | \$104,295,753 | (\$44,775,583) | \$59,520,170 |
| 1-Jul-30 | 175% | \$110,793,661 | (\$45,066,637) | \$65,727,024 |
| 1-Jul-31 | 181% | \$117,580,873 | (\$45,366,421) | \$72,214,452 |
| 1-Jul-32 | 186% | \$124,668,701 | (\$44,240,314) | \$80,428,387 |
| 1-Jul-33 | 192% | \$132,068,861 | (\$44,145,106) | \$87,923,755 |
| 1-Jul-34 | 197% | \$139,793,487 | (\$44,472,689) | \$95,320,797 |
| 1-Jul-35 | 203% | \$147,855,142 | (\$44,810,100) | \$103,045,042 |
| 1-Jul-36 | 209% | \$156,266,838 | (\$70,758,029) | \$85,508,810 |
| 1-Jul-37 | 216% | \$161,015,332 | (\$69,103,897) | \$91,911,435 |
| 1-Jul-38 | 222% | \$165,902,147 | (\$69,472,594) | \$96,429,553 |
| 1-Jul-39 | 229% | \$170,931,183 | (\$69,852,353) | \$101,078,830 |
| Total | | \$2,442,642,151 | (\$950,490,829) | \$1,492,151,322 |

Scenario B - 18MSF

Gaithersburg West Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-A: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Fire and Rescue Services¹

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | Amortization Period | First Year Annual Costs |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Operation: | | | |
| Personnel services ² | | | \$2,590,380 |
| Facility maintenance ³ | | | \$94,975 |
| Energy/utilities ⁴ | | | \$71,125 |
| EMS operating costs | | | \$54,000 |
| Sub-total | | | \$2,810,480 |
| One-time costs: | | | |
| Supply costs ⁵ | | | \$84,000 |
| Recruiting costs ⁶ | | | \$1,667,790 |
| Sub-total | | | \$1,751,790 |
| Capital: | | | |
| Building design and construction and new apparatus ⁷ | \$17,361,017 | 20 | \$1,393,093 |
| Total first year annual costs | | | \$5,955,363 |

MuniCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\[Scenario B.xls]XIX-A
10-Sep-09

¹Represents the costs for the new Travilah Fire Station to be located with the Gaithersburg West Master Plan area. Source: Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services and Montgomery County Department of General Services.

²Assumes the following: 4-person engine, 2-person medic unit, collectively requiring 4.5 captains, 9 master firefighters and 13.5 fire fighters during a 27 year work period.

³Based on cost estimate of \$4.36 per square foot. Source: Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services and Montgomery County Department of G

⁴Based on cost estimate of \$3.30 per square foot. Source: Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services and Montgomery County Department of G

⁵Includes EMS and administrative supplies.

⁶Assumes costs for recruiting will occur over the first six months. Includes the following: recruit salaries, instructor overtime for recruitment class and uniforms/gear for 27 recruits.

⁷Represents the CIP cost estimate based upon preliminary figures available as of 8/26/2009. Source: Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Services and Montgomery County Department of General Services. Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 20 years at 5%.

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XIX-B: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Department of Transportation¹

Table I: County Road Costs Estimates (Includes Land Costs)

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs ² | | | | First Year Annual Costs ³ | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|---------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | Stage 3 | Stage 4 | Amortization | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | Stage 3 | Stage 4 |
| | 2011 | 2017 | 2025 | 2035 | Period | 2011 | 2017 | 2025 | 2035 |
| Key West Avenue | \$0 | \$28,460,875 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$1,851,421 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Sam Eij Highway | \$0 | \$0 | \$18,875,142 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,227,855 | \$0 |
| Great Seneca Highway | \$0 | \$32,875,125 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$2,138,574 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Great Seneca Highway | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,124,555 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$658,617 | \$0 |
| Muddy Branch Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,610,375 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$690,220 | \$0 |
| Muddy Branch Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$28,538,250 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,856,454 | \$0 |
| Quince Orchard Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,374,750 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,065,201 | \$0 |
| Quince Orchard Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$19,493,750 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,268,096 | \$0 |
| Clopper Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$64,072,500 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,168,008 |
| West Diamond Avenue | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$26,171,700 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,702,507 |
| Darnestown Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,000,000 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$650,514 | \$0 |
| Longdraft Road | \$0 | \$0 | \$29,833,598 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,940,718 | \$0 |
| Rifle Ford Road | \$0 | \$26,013,900 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$1,692,242 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oakmont Avenue | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,581,120 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$493,163 | \$0 |
| Medical Center Drive | \$0 | \$23,850,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$1,551,477 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Decoverly Drive Extension | \$0 | \$0 | \$19,080,000 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,241,181 | \$0 |
| Blackwell Road | \$0 | \$23,850,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$1,551,477 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Blackwell Road Extension | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,296,660 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$539,710 | \$0 |
| New Road A | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,019,489 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$911,988 | \$0 |
| New Road B | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,546,827 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$555,983 | \$0 |
| New Road C | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,048,497 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$263,361 |
| New Road D | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,847,829 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$380,410 |
| New Road E | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,598,664 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$234,098 |
| New Road F | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,071,827 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$525,084 |
| New Road G | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$13,494,990 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$877,868 |
| New Road H | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,071,827 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$525,084 |
| New Road I | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,197,328 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$468,197 |
| New Road J | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,947,662 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$386,904 |
| New Road K | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,197,328 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$468,197 |
| New Road L | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,973,831 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$193,452 |
| New Road M | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,274,499 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$82,908 |
| New Road N | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$11,695,658 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$760,819 |
| Traville Gateway Drive | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10,795,992 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$702,295 |
| Travilah Road Extension | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,349,499 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$87,787 |
| New Road Q | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,598,664 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$234,098 |
| New Road R | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,548,998 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$165,816 |
| Sub-total County road estimates | \$0 | \$135,049,900 | \$201,374,516 | \$187,957,293 | | \$0 | \$8,785,190 | \$13,099,701 | \$12,226,892 |

MontCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario B.xls\XIX-B
10-Sep-09

¹Based on information provided by Montgomery County, Department of Transportation.

²Represents the capital costs assumed to occur within each phase of the development. Based on information provided in The Gaithersburg West Master Plan, Planning Board Draft, dated July, 2009.

³Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 30 years at 5%.

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-C: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Upcounty Urban District¹

| Costs Type | First Year Annual Costs |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Operation: | |
| Annual staff (14 positions) | \$1,157,060 |
| Annual operating expenditures: | |
| Services/contracts | \$374,365 |
| Charges from others | \$9,364 |
| Communications services | \$6,500 |
| Printing/central duplication services | \$2,580 |
| Mail | \$760 |
| Motor pool | \$36,840 |
| Travel | \$1,000 |
| Education, tuition, training | \$3,200 |
| Office supplies & equipment | \$13,480 |
| Motor vehicle equip and supplies | \$5,000 |
| Uniforms | \$11,300 |
| Other supplies and materials | \$5,900 |
| Rentals and leases | \$2,100 |
| Equipment repairs/maintenance | \$1,700 |
| Equipment repairs/maintenance | \$2,000 |
| Equipment repairs/maintenance | \$2,000 |
| Equipment repairs/maintenance | \$18,141 |
| Total Upcounty Urban District | \$1,653,290 |

MuniCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario B.xls\XIX-C

10-Sep-09

¹Source: Montgomery County Upcounty Regional Services Center.

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XIX-D: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Department of General Services¹

Table 1: Total Public Safety Training Academy (PSTA) Relocation Costs

| Costs Type | Total PSTA Costs |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Relocation costs ¹ | \$86,000,000 |
| Site value ² | (\$81,000,000) |
| Total PSTA costs | \$5,000,000 |

Table 2: PSTA Amortized Costs

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | Amortization Period | First Year Amortized Costs ³ |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Net PSTA relocation costs | \$5,000,000 | 20 | \$401,213 |

MuniCap, Inc. M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario B.xls\XIX-D
10-Sep-09

¹Source: Montgomery County, Department of General Services. Includes costs for acquisition, design and construction.

²Assumes Montgomery County will sell the PSTA site at the current appraised value as soon as the current property users have been relocated and apply sales revenues towards offsetting the relocation costs. Represents the appraisal value as of 9/23/2008. Source: Montgomery County Department of General Services.

³Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 20 years at 5%.

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-E: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Montgomery County Public Schools¹

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | Amortization Period | First Year Annual Costs |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Capital: | | | |
| Elementary school building, design and construction ² | \$21,000,000 | 20 | \$1,685,094 |
| Operating: | | | |
| Personnel | | | \$790,000 |
| Operations | | | \$445,000 |
| Total school costs | | | \$2,920,094 |

MuniCap, Inc. M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario B.xls\XIX-E
10-Sep-09

¹Source: Montgomery County, Department of General Services.

²Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 20 years at 5%.

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XIX-F: Total Projected County Operating and Capital Costs¹

| Year Ending | Tax Inflation Factor | Department of Fire and Rescue Services ² | | | Department of Transportation ³ | | | | Total DOT | |
|--------------|----------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|---|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | Operating Costs | One-time Costs | Capitalized Costs | Total Fire and Rescue Costs | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | Stage 3 | | Stage 4 |
| 31-Dec-08 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-09 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-10 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-11 | 103% | \$2,894,794 | \$1,804,344 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,134,024 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-12 | 106% | \$2,981,638 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,416,524 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-13 | 109% | \$3,071,087 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,505,973 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-14 | 113% | \$3,163,220 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,598,106 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-15 | 116% | \$3,258,117 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,693,002 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-16 | 119% | \$3,355,860 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,790,746 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-17 | 123% | \$3,456,536 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,891,422 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-18 | 127% | \$3,560,232 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$4,995,118 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-19 | 130% | \$3,667,039 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,101,925 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-20 | 134% | \$3,777,050 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,211,936 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-21 | 138% | \$3,890,362 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,325,247 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-22 | 143% | \$4,007,072 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,441,958 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-23 | 147% | \$4,127,285 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,562,170 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-24 | 151% | \$4,251,103 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,685,989 | \$10,804,675 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,804,675 |
| 31-Dec-25 | 156% | \$4,378,636 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,813,522 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-26 | 160% | \$4,509,995 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$5,944,881 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-27 | 165% | \$4,645,295 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,080,181 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-28 | 170% | \$4,784,654 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,219,540 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-29 | 175% | \$4,928,194 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,363,079 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-30 | 181% | \$5,076,040 | \$0 | \$1,434,886 | \$6,510,925 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-31 | 186% | \$5,228,321 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,228,321 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-32 | 192% | \$5,385,170 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,385,170 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-33 | 197% | \$5,546,725 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,546,725 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-34 | 203% | \$5,713,127 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,713,127 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,213,583 |
| 31-Dec-35 | 209% | \$5,884,521 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,884,521 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$25,600,396 | \$0 | \$56,813,979 |
| 31-Dec-36 | 216% | \$6,061,057 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,061,057 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$25,600,396 | \$0 | \$56,813,979 |
| 31-Dec-37 | 222% | \$6,242,888 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,242,888 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$25,600,396 | \$0 | \$56,813,979 |
| 31-Dec-38 | 229% | \$6,430,175 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,430,175 | \$10,804,675 | \$20,408,908 | \$25,600,396 | \$0 | \$56,813,979 |
| Total | | \$124,276,194 | \$1,804,344 | \$28,697,714 | \$154,778,252 | \$0 | \$237,702,857 | \$285,724,708 | \$102,401,583 | \$625,829,149 |

MuniCorp, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario B.xls\XIX-F 10-Sep-09

¹Capital costs are assumed to increase with inflation. For costs that are assumed to be financed with bonds or other long-term financing vehicles, total inflated costs are assumed to be amortized at 5% and do not increase on an annual basis.

²See Schedule XIX-A.

³See Schedule XIX-B. Represents the total Department of Transportation capital costs to be paid by Montgomery County for all stages

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XIX-F: Total Projected County Operating and Capital Costs (continued)¹

| Year | Tax Year | Inflation Factor | Upcounty Urban District Costs ² | General Services (PSTA Relocation) ³ | Operating Costs | | Amortized Capital Costs | | Total School Costs | Total Projected Capital Costs |
|--------------|----------|------------------|--|---|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | Operating Costs | Capital Costs | Operating Costs | Capital Costs | | |
| 31-Dec-08 | 1-Jul-09 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-09 | 1-Jul-10 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-10 | 1-Jul-11 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 31-Dec-11 | 1-Jul-12 | 103% | \$1,702,889 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,250,162 |
| 31-Dec-12 | 1-Jul-13 | 106% | \$1,753,975 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,583,749 |
| 31-Dec-13 | 1-Jul-14 | 109% | \$1,806,595 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,725,817 |
| 31-Dec-14 | 1-Jul-15 | 113% | \$1,860,792 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,872,147 |
| 31-Dec-15 | 1-Jul-16 | 116% | \$1,916,616 | \$413,249 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,022,868 |
| 31-Dec-16 | 1-Jul-17 | 119% | \$1,974,115 | \$413,249 | \$1,474,655 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,486,745 | \$10,664,855 | |
| 31-Dec-17 | 1-Jul-18 | 123% | \$2,033,338 | \$413,249 | \$1,518,894 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,530,985 | \$21,673,669 | |
| 31-Dec-18 | 1-Jul-19 | 127% | \$2,094,338 | \$413,249 | \$1,564,461 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,576,552 | \$21,883,932 | |
| 31-Dec-19 | 1-Jul-20 | 130% | \$2,157,168 | \$413,249 | \$1,611,395 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,623,486 | \$22,100,503 | |
| 31-Dec-20 | 1-Jul-21 | 134% | \$2,221,884 | \$413,249 | \$1,659,737 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,671,827 | \$22,323,571 | |
| 31-Dec-21 | 1-Jul-22 | 138% | \$2,288,540 | \$413,249 | \$1,709,529 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,721,620 | \$22,553,332 | |
| 31-Dec-22 | 1-Jul-23 | 143% | \$2,357,196 | \$413,249 | \$1,760,815 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,772,905 | \$22,789,984 | |
| 31-Dec-23 | 1-Jul-24 | 147% | \$2,427,912 | \$413,249 | \$1,813,639 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,825,730 | \$23,033,737 | |
| 31-Dec-24 | 1-Jul-25 | 151% | \$2,500,749 | \$413,249 | \$1,868,048 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,880,139 | \$23,284,802 | |
| 31-Dec-25 | 1-Jul-26 | 156% | \$2,575,772 | \$413,249 | \$1,924,090 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,936,181 | \$43,952,307 | |
| 31-Dec-26 | 1-Jul-27 | 160% | \$2,653,045 | \$413,249 | \$1,981,812 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$3,993,903 | \$44,218,662 | |
| 31-Dec-27 | 1-Jul-28 | 165% | \$2,732,636 | \$413,249 | \$2,041,267 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$4,053,358 | \$44,493,007 | |
| 31-Dec-28 | 1-Jul-29 | 170% | \$2,814,616 | \$413,249 | \$2,102,505 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$4,114,596 | \$44,775,583 | |
| 31-Dec-29 | 1-Jul-30 | 175% | \$2,899,054 | \$413,249 | \$2,165,580 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$4,177,671 | \$45,066,637 | |
| 31-Dec-30 | 1-Jul-31 | 181% | \$2,986,026 | \$413,249 | \$2,230,547 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$4,242,638 | \$45,366,421 | |
| 31-Dec-31 | 1-Jul-32 | 186% | \$3,075,606 | \$413,249 | \$2,297,464 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$4,309,555 | \$44,240,314 | |
| 31-Dec-32 | 1-Jul-33 | 192% | \$3,167,875 | \$0 | \$2,366,388 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$4,378,478 | \$44,145,106 | |
| 31-Dec-33 | 1-Jul-34 | 197% | \$3,262,911 | \$0 | \$2,437,379 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$4,449,470 | \$44,472,689 | |
| 31-Dec-34 | 1-Jul-35 | 203% | \$3,360,798 | \$0 | \$2,510,501 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$4,522,591 | \$44,810,100 | |
| 31-Dec-35 | 1-Jul-36 | 209% | \$3,461,622 | \$0 | \$2,585,816 | \$2,012,091 | \$2,012,091 | \$4,597,906 | \$70,758,029 | |
| 31-Dec-36 | 1-Jul-37 | 216% | \$3,565,471 | \$0 | \$2,663,390 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,663,390 | \$69,103,897 | |
| 31-Dec-37 | 1-Jul-38 | 222% | \$3,672,435 | \$0 | \$2,743,292 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,743,292 | \$69,472,594 | |
| 31-Dec-38 | 1-Jul-39 | 229% | \$3,782,608 | \$0 | \$2,825,591 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,825,591 | \$69,852,353 | |
| Total | | | \$73,106,583 | \$8,678,236 | \$47,856,794 | \$40,241,815 | \$88,098,609 | \$950,490,829 | | |

MuniCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario B.xls\XIX-F (2)
10-Sep-09

¹Capital costs are assumed to increase with inflation. For costs that are assumed to be financed with bonds or other long-term financing vehicles, total inflated costs are assumed to be amortized at a 5% and do not increase on an annual basis.

²See Schedule XIX-C.

³See Schedule XIX-D.

⁴See Schedule XIX-E.

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XXI: Net Revenues Versus Total Projected County Capital Costs

| Tax Year Beginning | Inflation Factor | Net County Revenues (Schedule XVIII) | Total Projected County Operating & Capital Costs (Schedule XIX-F) | Net Montgomery County Surplus/(Deficit) |
|--------------------|------------------|---|--|---|
| 1-Jul-09 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 1-Jul-10 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 1-Jul-11 | 100% | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 1-Jul-12 | 103% | \$5,407,233 | (\$8,250,162) | (\$2,842,929) |
| 1-Jul-13 | 106% | \$9,628,594 | (\$6,583,749) | \$3,044,846 |
| 1-Jul-14 | 109% | \$14,113,294 | (\$6,725,817) | \$7,387,477 |
| 1-Jul-15 | 113% | \$18,872,915 | (\$6,872,147) | \$12,000,767 |
| 1-Jul-16 | 116% | \$23,919,487 | (\$7,022,868) | \$16,896,619 |
| 1-Jul-17 | 119% | \$29,265,502 | (\$10,664,855) | \$18,600,647 |
| 1-Jul-18 | 123% | \$34,923,931 | (\$21,673,669) | \$13,250,262 |
| 1-Jul-19 | 127% | \$40,908,239 | (\$21,883,932) | \$19,024,307 |
| 1-Jul-20 | 130% | \$47,232,404 | (\$22,100,503) | \$25,131,901 |
| 1-Jul-21 | 134% | \$53,910,932 | (\$22,323,571) | \$31,587,360 |
| 1-Jul-22 | 138% | \$57,648,656 | (\$22,553,332) | \$35,095,325 |
| 1-Jul-23 | 143% | \$61,629,217 | (\$22,789,984) | \$38,839,232 |
| 1-Jul-24 | 147% | \$65,807,152 | (\$23,033,737) | \$42,773,415 |
| 1-Jul-25 | 151% | \$70,190,280 | (\$23,284,802) | \$46,905,478 |
| 1-Jul-26 | 156% | \$74,786,691 | (\$43,952,307) | \$30,834,384 |
| 1-Jul-27 | 160% | \$77,235,844 | (\$44,218,662) | \$33,017,182 |
| 1-Jul-28 | 165% | \$82,261,375 | (\$44,493,007) | \$37,768,368 |
| 1-Jul-29 | 170% | \$87,512,907 | (\$44,775,583) | \$42,737,323 |
| 1-Jul-30 | 175% | \$92,999,325 | (\$45,066,637) | \$47,932,688 |
| 1-Jul-31 | 181% | \$98,729,835 | (\$45,366,421) | \$53,363,414 |
| 1-Jul-32 | 186% | \$104,713,972 | (\$44,240,314) | \$60,473,658 |
| 1-Jul-33 | 192% | \$110,961,613 | (\$44,145,106) | \$66,816,506 |
| 1-Jul-34 | 197% | \$117,482,984 | (\$44,472,689) | \$73,010,295 |
| 1-Jul-35 | 203% | \$124,288,677 | (\$44,810,100) | \$79,478,577 |
| 1-Jul-36 | 209% | \$131,389,656 | (\$70,758,029) | \$60,631,627 |
| 1-Jul-37 | 216% | \$135,399,051 | (\$69,103,897) | \$66,295,154 |
| 1-Jul-38 | 222% | \$139,525,035 | (\$69,472,594) | \$70,052,440 |
| 1-Jul-39 | 229% | \$143,770,879 | (\$69,852,353) | \$73,918,527 |
| Total | | \$2,054,515,679 | (\$950,490,829) | \$1,104,024,850 |

State Capital Improvements

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XX: Projected State Annual Capital Costs - Department of Transportation¹

Table 2: State Highway Administration Interchange Estimates²

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | | | | First Year Annual Costs ⁴ | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | Stage 4 2035 | Amortization Period | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | Stage 4 2035 |
| Muddy Branch @ MD 119 (Great Seneca) | \$0 | \$0 | \$125,000,000 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,131,429 | \$0 |
| Sam Eig @ Diamondback | \$0 | \$0 | \$75,000,000 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,878,858 | \$0 |
| Shady Grove @ MD 28 (Key West) | \$0 | \$0 | \$150,000,000 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,757,715 | \$0 |
| MD 124 (Quince Orchard) @ MD 119 (Great Seneca) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$113,000,000 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,350,812 |
| MD 119 (Great Seneca) @ MD 28 (Key West) | \$0 | \$125,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$8,131,429 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Sam Eig @ MD 119 (Great Seneca) | \$0 | \$75,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$4,878,858 | \$0 | \$0 |
| I-270 @ Watkins Mill | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$125,000,000 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,131,429 |
| Sub-total SHA interchange estimates | \$0 | \$200,000,000 | \$350,000,000 | \$238,000,000 | | \$0 | \$13,010,287 | \$22,768,002 | \$15,482,242 |

Table 3: Maryland Transit Administration Corridor Cities Transitway Estimates (Two Scenarios)³

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | | | | First Year Annual Costs | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | Stage 4 2035 | Amortization Period | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | Stage 4 2035 |
| Scenario 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| LRT (current master planned route) | \$480,500,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$31,257,215 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| LRT (revised alignment route) | \$65,793,025 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$4,279,931 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Sub-total LRT | \$546,293,025 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | \$35,537,145 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Scenario 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| BRT (current master planned route) | \$280,500,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$18,246,928 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| BRT (revised alignment route) | \$38,907,607 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$2,530,996 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Sub-total BRT | \$319,407,607 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | \$20,777,923 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

MiniCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario A.xls\XX
10-Sep-09

¹Based on information provided by Montgomery County, Department of Transportation. Assumes State Highway Administration capital costs will not be supported by revenues generated from the proposed Gaithersburg West development.

² Assumes Montgomery County will not support SHA interchange costs.

³ Assumes construction of the Corridor Cities Transit will be fully funded before Stage 2 begins. Assumes Montgomery County will not support MTA Corridor Cities Transit costs. Based on information provided in the Gaithersburg West Master Plan, The Planning Board Draft, dated July 2009.

⁴ Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 30 years at 5%.

**Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland**

Schedule XX: Projected State Annual Capital Costs - Department of Transportation¹

Table 2: State Highway Administration Interchange Estimates²

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | | | | First Year Annual Costs ⁴ | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | Stage 4 2035 | Amortization Period | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | Stage 4 2035 |
| Sam Eig @ Diamondback | \$0 | \$0 | \$75,000,000 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,878,858 | \$0 |
| Shady Grove @ MD 28 (Key West) | \$0 | \$0 | \$150,000,000 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,757,715 | \$0 |
| MD 124 (Quince Orchard) @ MD 119 (Great Seneca) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$113,000,000 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,350,812 |
| Sam Eig @ MD 119 (Great Seneca) | \$0 | \$75,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$0 | \$4,878,858 | \$0 | \$0 |
| I-270 @ Watkins Mill | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$125,000,000 | 30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,131,429 |
| Sub-total SHA interchange estimates | \$0 | \$75,000,000 | \$225,000,000 | \$238,000,000 | | \$0 | \$4,878,858 | \$14,636,573 | \$15,482,242 |

Table 3: Maryland Transit Administration Corridor Cities Transitway Estimates (Two Scenarios)³

| Costs Type | Total Capital Costs | | | | First Year Annual Costs | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | Stage 4 2035 | Amortization Period | Stage 1 2011 | Stage 2 2017 | Stage 3 2025 | Stage 4 2035 |
| Scenario 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| LRT (current master planned route) | \$480,500,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$31,257,215 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| LRT (revised alignment route) | \$65,793,025 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$4,279,931 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Sub-total LRT | \$546,293,025 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | \$35,537,145 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Scenario 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| BRT (current master planned route) | \$280,500,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$18,246,928 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| BRT (revised alignment route) | \$38,907,607 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 | \$2,530,996 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Sub-total BRT | \$319,407,607 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | \$20,777,923 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

MuniCap, Inc.

M:\CONSULTING\Montgomery County\Gaithersburg West\Scenario B.xls\XX
10-Sep-09

¹Based on information provided by Montgomery County, Department of Transportation. Assumes State Highway Administration capital costs will not be supported by revenues generated from the proposed Gaithersburg West development.

² Assumes Montgomery County will not support SHA interchange costs.

³ Assumes construction of the Corridor Cities Transit will be fully funded before Stage 2 begins. Assumes Montgomery County will not support MTA Corridor Cities Transit costs. Based on information provided in *The Gaithersburg West Master Plan, The Planning Board Draft*, dated July 2009.

⁴ Annual costs are assumed to be amortized over 30 years at 5%.

Smart Growth Initiative Implementation Advisory Group
Membership List

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Group</u> |
|--------------------|--|
| Bill Robertson | Adventist Healthcare |
| James Clifford | Agriculture Advisory |
| Barry Clifford | Agriculture Advisory |
| Rich Parsons | CCT Coalition |
| Angel Jones | City of Gaithersburg |
| Fred Felton | City of Gaithersburg |
| Susan Swift | City of Rockville |
| David Levy | City of Rockville |
| Kevin Linck | East Village Community |
| Joy Dyer | East Village Community |
| Robert Smith | Flower Hill Homes Association |
| Andrew Oxendine | Flower Hill Homes Association |
| Marilyn Balcombe | Gaithersburg-Germantown Chamber of Commerce |
| Pat Labuda | Greater Shady Grove Citizens Alliance |
| Joni von Vorys | Hunters Woods |
| Anita Stonebraker | Izaak Walton League |
| Elaine Amir | Johns Hopkins University |
| David McDonough | Johns Hopkins University |
| Rachel Hammoudeh | Kentlands Citizens Assembly |
| Joyce Whitman | Kentlands Citizens Assembly |
| Mike Aubrey | Lakelands |
| Steven Robins | At-large |
| Steve Kaufman | At-large |
| Elyse Brown Force | Maryland National Capital Building Industry Association |
| Jim Poulos | Maryland TEDCO |
| Andy Scott | MDOT |
| Terry O'Grady | Mid County Citizens Alliance |
| Chuck Ellison | Miller and Smith |
| Sue Edwards | MNCPPC |
| Georgette Godwin | Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce |
| Joe Lavorgna | Montgomery County Public Schools |
| Janice Turpin | Montgomery County Public Schools |
| Keith Miller | Montgomery County Revenue Authority |
| Mike Boone | Montgomery County Revenue Authority |
| Bob Hydorn | Montgomery Village Foundation |
| Sharon Levine | Montgomery Village Foundation |
| Rick Terselic | North Potomac Citizens Association |
| Diane Jones | Montgomery County, Office of County Executive – Co Chair |
| Cliff Brownstein | Olde Potomac Park |
| Bill Mooney | Co-Chair |
| Mary Lou Gundersen | Quince Orchard Knolls |
| Pete Fosselman | At-large |
| Doug Wrenn | At-large |
| George Donovan | Shady Grove Sector Plan Advisory Committee |
| Stew Edelstein | Universities at Shady Grove |
| Andre Aviles | Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board |
| Darrell Anderson | Washington Grove |
| Nat Bottigheimer | Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority |

8/19/09 - SGIAG – COMMENTS/ADVICE ON GWMP

Vision --

- Universities at Shady Grove --
 - The Planning Board Draft Master Plan supports the USG's vision for the future, but the transportation element should be revised to provide public transportation access to the University. If the CCT cannot come to USG then there needs to be a connection – perhaps a shuttle – from the nearest stop to USG. As laid out, it is too far to walk.
- Science/health vision - the plan can really add to the quality of life in the County.
- Education
- Allowing this plan affects our health; our education; our health – plan for these elements

Design comments –

- Need flexibility to what is allowed to be designed.
- Housing – needs some work; it is too rigid.
- How will we accommodate existing communities?
- Roads are wide which makes them less walkable; Narrow them down and widen the sidewalks.
- Use materials that are green.

Transportation –

- Metro cannot handle the amount of transit that is proposed.
 - CCT's purpose is to serve local traffic and not to provide a connection from upcounty for Metro use.
 - Parking is maxed out at metro - CCT will provide commuter access –
 - Shady Grove metro does not have the capacity.
- Need multiple public transportation options.
- GW and Germantown – in the future will be a reverse commute.
- Plan supports CCT & Plan should not specifically support BRT
- Interchanges – not realistic from CIP/CTP perspective.
- Change Darnestown Road to be more crossable to access the Universities at Shady Grove and to create a better and safer pedestrian connection
- CCT alignment – cuts Belward and outside Muddy Branch – Don't cut through Belward will make community happier.

- Road size and network is critical
- Need to look at cumulative transportation impacts of all of the plans and more mass transit.
- Interchanges are difficult to get done and are a great divide.
- There is a transportation disconnect in the historic planning -- Bulk of jobs are on I-270, but transit is on 355

Land use –

- Plan does not adequately address Crowne Farm.
- LSC's should be designated as an "Urban Area" to get more narrow/walkable streets
- You need expansion capacity to capture growth opportunities
 - Does MC want to be pre-eminent?
- Don't recommend lower density (20 million sf is the min.).
- Embrace the staging plan.
- Plan may constrain opportunities; don't know building form; housing mix
- Loosen staging
- Staging plan – need a release valve for things we want to make happen
- If there is an economically significant opportunity – it should be outside of staging
- BLTs – White Flint and Twinbrook have heavy rail to support greater density; Gaithersburg West and Germantown do not and market can't sustain cost of BLTs
- Supports relocation of PSTA – but it should not be a staging requirement.
- Recommends against site specific staging requirements/can hold up something you want.
- FAR – for residential is way too low
- More FAR/NOT LESS – Still too suburban –
- JHU is giving up 45% of its land to public space in exchange for density.
- Don't do staging – the interchanges will not allow development we want.
- Plan needs more thought on how you actually create the mixed use. Needs more work.
- Needs better flexibility to respond to market forces.
- Needs higher density with transit up front – tie in Crowne Farm.
- Infrastructure plan for the LSC

Communication – need to get the word out

- 20 – 30 years
- Not just Hopkins; Shady Grove Hospital; and Universities at Shady Grove

Miscellaneous

- Look at Police
- Take advantage of housing opportunities wherever they occur.
- Make it happen
- Don't want to be obsolete in 20 years.
- It's a plan and there will need to be adjustments over the life of the plan.
- Look at how you will bring back up quality of life on fringes.
- Opportunity to create a place that defines itself – need vibrant, commercial center.

September 10, 2009

Executive Departments Technical Comments on the Gaithersburg West Master Plan

These technical comments are provided in connection with the County Executive's memorandum to Council President Andrews on the Gaithersburg West Master Plan. The Executive Branch Departments have reviewed the Planning Board Draft of the Gaithersburg West Master Plan and have provided comments that we hope will clarify and strengthen the objectives of the Draft Plan. Executive staff will be available to discuss these suggestions as the County Council reviews the Plan. We look forward to working with Planning Staff and the County Council on this Plan.

Department of Environmental Protection

The Plan has very little discussion of specific environmental issues at this "visioning" stage. The discussion on sustainability starting on page 20 is positive regarding preservation and enhancement of the natural environment; use of environmental site design and green building techniques; utilization of renewable energy; ensuring development encourages environmentally friendly modes of transportation, etc. Incorporating these things at the implementation stage is the critical issue.

DEP suggests that to assist with meeting the requirements of the County's new stormwater permit, it would be helpful if this (and other master plans) would include, to the extent possible, the existing amount of impervious surface, the amount of impervious surface without stormwater management controls, and estimations of the proposed amount of new impervious surface and the amount of the uncontrolled existing impervious surface that would be controlled through redevelopment.

Department of Transportation

General Comments

1. To ensure that the plan is in land use-transportation balance it is critical for the recommended transportation improvements to be implemented. It would be helpful for the plan to include illustrative figures showing its vision of how each of the transportation improvements can be implemented to provide a level of assurance regarding land use-transportation balance.

There are points of conflict between transportation improvements and environmentally sensitive areas which would need to be addressed in order to achieve the envisioned transportation network. Some of the transportation improvements need to be reconciled with “Environmental Features” highlighted in the LSC Open Space Network such as:

- the CCT Belward station
- the CCT Alt. A alignment
- the grade separated interchange between Key West Avenue (MD 28) and Great Seneca Highway (MD 119)
- the widening of Key West Avenue to 8 lanes
- the extension of Blackwell Road (B-1)
- new road B-2
- new road B-5
- new road B-8

Some of the transportation improvements assumed in the Draft Plan are located totally or partially within the boundaries of an incorporated municipality and will need to be coordinated with the municipality’s master plans to minimize a potential source of conflict:

- the grade separated interchange between Great Seneca Highway (MD 119) and Muddy Branch Road (totally in Gaithersburg)
- the grade separated interchange between Sam Eig Highway and Diamondback Drive (totally in Gaithersburg)
- the grade separated interchange between Key West Avenue (MD 28) and Shady Grove Road (partially in Rockville)
- the grade separation between Sam Eig Highway and Fields Road
- the extension of Rio Boulevard (A-23)
- the extension of Diamondback Drive (A-261b)
- the extension of Decoverly Drive (A-284)

Finally, some transportation improvements may potentially impact possible historic resources including:

- the CCT Belward Station
- Darnestown Road (MD 28)
- Oakmont Avenue Relocated (A-255)

2. One of the transit system recommendations is to develop express bus service using value-priced lanes from I-270 and the ICC. The value priced lanes are not included in the Constrained Long Range Plan for the Metropolitan Washington Region, and therefore, inclusion in the Draft is not appropriate. This raises some concern about the I-270 network that was tested since the Transportation Appendix states that the new concept of Express Toll Lanes on I-270 was assumed.
3. The Draft contains references to target speeds and specific design standards for roads in the planning area. All such language should be amended to be consistent with the standard wording which was recently worked out as part of the Germantown Sector Plan.
4. The Plan should contain additional figures that more specifically and clearly show the proposed configuration of, and right-of-way (land area) needed for, certain transportation facilities, particularly highway interchanges.
5. The Draft Plan references Design Guidelines that will be prepared to guide the development proposed in this Plan. MCDOT requests the creation of a process that would give MCDOT the lead, or approval authority, when it comes to application of the Design Guidelines as they relate to the configuration and standards for streets.
6. Specific technical and editorial comments are shown on the “Specific Comments” attachment.

Specific Comments

- | | |
|------------|--|
| p. 10 | add the InterCounty Connector to the figure |
| p. 23 | recommend that the intent of the second bullet under “Buildings” be made more explicit by adding <u>wrapped by residential, office or retail space</u> |
| p. 30 | add bullets for the widening of Key West Avenue (MD 28) to 8 lanes, and for the two interchanges at MD 28 and Shady Grove Road, and MD 28 and MD 119 |
| p. 32 & 33 | move the “MD 28” labels in the figures from Darnestown Road to <u>Key West Avenue</u> |
| p. 33 | add bullets for the widening of Key West Avenue (MD 28) to 8 lanes, and for the interchange at MD 28 and MD 119 |
| - | add an interchange concept plan to show the impact on the forest area |
| p. 37 | add bullets for the widening of Key West Avenue (MD 28) to 8 lanes, and for the three interchanges at MD 28 and MD 119, MD 119 and Sam Eig Highway, and MD 119 and Muddy Branch Road |

- p. 39 add bullets for the widening of Key West Avenue (MD 28) to 8 lanes, and for the three interchanges at MD 28 and Shady Grove Road, MD 28 and MD 119, and MD 119 and Sam Eig Highway
- add a grade separation symbol between Sam Eig Highway and Fields Road to the right hand Figure
- p. 42 the discussion about short, walkable block; street grid; roadway cross-sections; curb radii; multi-modal travel; traffic calming; etc. should be amended to reflect the Executive Regulation for Context Sensitive Roadway Design and operational considerations
- the Plan should not promote installation of special crosswalk pavements. The decision to implement such amenities should be on a case-by-case basis dependent on a variety of factors (such as site location, pedestrian volumes, proximity to significant pedestrian generators, traffic volumes and characteristics, etc.).
- p. 43 add labels to the Figure designating each of the master-planned roads.
- The Draft proposes to reconstruct Sam Eig Highway to include shoulders suitable for peak-period, peak-direction BRT. This may be a good idea, but how does it connect to the highway network/CCT? What is the proposed BRT network and service that would use Sam Eig?
 - delete “Great Seneca Highway” and replace with Darnestown Road in the bottom bullet, for consistency with the master plan roads Table
 - add a grade separation symbol between Sam Eig Highway and Fields Road to the Figure for consistency with Plan text
 - delete any proposed road or interchange totally or partially within a municipality unless said facility is also shown on that municipality’s master plan; MNCPPC does not have planning jurisdiction within these municipalities and this Draft should not over-represent the potential transportation network
- p. 44 revise the first complete bullet to state – Construct grade-separated interchanges at three LSC locations: Great Seneca Highway at Muddy Branch Road, Great Seneca Highway at Key West Avenue, and Key West Avenue at Shady Grove Road
- revise the second complete bullet to state – Delete the proposed grade separated . .
 - revise the third complete bullet by completely deleting the phrase “signed shared roadways/on road bike paths (Class III bikeways along local streets)” because it is duplicative of, and less accurate than, the following phrase
 - delete the second bullet under Recommendations regarding express bus service using value-priced lanes from I-270 and the ICC. The value priced lanes are not

included in the Constrained Long Range Plan for the Metropolitan Washington Region, and therefore, their inclusion in the Plan is not appropriate.

- *...particularly relieving the requirement for smaller properties to self-park.* If the smaller properties are not developed at the same time as larger properties it would seem very difficult to successfully relieve them of any parking requirements.
- delete *Define public garage sites at Preliminary Plan for publicly owned properties...* If publicly owned properties in the PSTA are redeveloped as a residential area as recommended in the Draft Plan a public parking model is unlikely to be sustainable and would not meet the needs of the residential community.

- p. 52 & 53 the maps should identify the possible CCT maintenance shops and yard alternatives and the Master Plan should identify the candidate locations

- p. 55 delete “and provide for a transit station co-located with the MARC station in the City of Gaithersburg” in the third bullet at the top of the page; this location is outside of the McGown Property, and the planning area

- p. 57 add a figure showing the detailed location of the Deer Park (Humpback) Bridge in relation to the master planned alignment of Oakmont Avenue relocated (A-255)
- there is a discrepancy between the limits of Oakmont Avenue shown in the second bullet at the top, and the limits of Oakmont Avenue shown in the Table on page 72; in any case the limits on this page are incorrect and need to include a bridge over the CSX railroad

- p. 60 add text pertaining to the County’s position on future annexation of the Washingtonian Light Industrial Park enclave area
- add text and Figures for two other enclaves; Washingtonian Residential and Hi Wood

- p. 63 the Plan recommends establishing CR zoning, but except as part of the CR Zone plan, parking is not addressed

- p. 65 the complete exemption of health care services development from Stage 1 requirements is too open ended

- p. 66 the complete exemption of health care services development from Stage 1 requirements is too open ended

- p. 67 revise color of Stage 1 highlight from yellow to brown for consistency with the Bar Chart
- p. 69 add a bullet to state – Increase the number of lanes on Key West Avenue within the Plan Area to 8
- p. 70 delete any proposed road or interchange totally or partially within a municipality unless it is also shown on that municipality’s master plan;
- add a grade separation symbol between Sam Eig Highway and Fields Road to the Figure for consistency with Plan text
 - it would be helpful if the transportation figure could be enlarged for legibility
- p. 71 add a listing for “F-9” I-370 to the Freeways
- revise the Limits of the first M-15 listing to state – “Darnestown Road (MD 28) to Decoverly Drive (extended)” for consistency with and to avoid overlapping the third M-15 listing
 - delete the third M-22 listing; it duplicates the CM-22 listing
 - revise the Limits of the first M-26 listing to state – Great Seneca Creek to Longdraft Road”; for consistency with and to avoid overlapping the second M-26 listing
 - revise the second M-26 listing to show West Diamond Avenue for the Name and 6 [only] for the number of Lanes
 - delete the M-28 listing; it duplicates the CM-28 listing
 - change the column heading to state “Design Speed” and add the appropriate footnote as agreed upon for the Germantown Sector Plan
 - recommend Design Standard #2008.10 for Shady Grove Road due to dual bikeway proposed
- p. 72 revise the Limits for A-255 to provide more clarity and specificity about the bridge over the CSX Railroad
- revise the Limits for the first listing of A-261b to state – Plan Boundary to Key West Avenue
 - add a second listing for A-261d for Johns Hopkins Drive from Decoverly Drive to MD 28
 - revise the Limits for the listing of A-284 to state – Muddy Branch Road to Plan Boundary;
 - Add the column header for “Lanes”
 - change the column heading to state “Design Speed” and add the appropriate footnote as agreed upon for the Germantown Sector Plan

- recommend Design Standard #2004.10 with reduced width buffer for Shady Grove Road due to dual bikeway proposed
 - add Design Standard #s for Riffle Ford Road and Oakmont Avenue
 - clarify what “(needs SUP)” means
 - recommend Design Standard #2004.01 for Decoverly Drive east of MD 119, Medical Center Drive, and Diamondback Drive due to bicycle facilities on these roads
- p. 73
- revise the Limits for the third listing of B-1 to state – Darnestown Road to Great Seneca Highway
 - specify the Limits of all roads listed from B-2 through B-15; “proposed new road” is inadequate
 - add a listing for I-1 Gaither Road
 - change the column heading to state “Design Speed” and add the appropriate footnote as agreed upon for the Germantown Sector Plan
- p. 74
- change the column heading to state “Design Speed” and add the appropriate footnote as agreed upon for the Germantown Sector Plan
 - delete the third bullet under “Recommendations”; this is an operational issue
- p. 77 & 78
- the LSC needs to have more on-road designated master planned bikeways, for example along SP-59, LB-1 and LB-4 plus a dual bikeway along Oakmont Avenue

Department of Economic Development

1. Annexation: As the developer of the Shady Grove Life Sciences Center (SGLSC), the Department of Economic Development is strongly opposed to any efforts to annex the property by any jurisdiction. As the Plan notes, the County has invested significant resources in the SGLSC over the past 25 – 30 years, and annexation would result in a substantial loss on this investment, as well as County tax revenues.
2. LSC Central District: The Department of Economic Development strongly supports the Plan's recommendation to rezone the entire LSC Central District to the proposed amended LSC zone. The revised LSC zone will allow for more flexible, mixed-use development and help achieve the Plan's goals of creating a vibrant live-work community.
3. The Department of Economic Development supports the Plan's recommendation that the Public Safety Training Academy site (PSTA) be zoned under the proposed CR zone. DED further recommends that the zoning for the current incubator site at the intersection of Darnestown Road and Great Seneca Highway remain LSC zone or CR 1 C1 R1 H110 to allow the greatest flexibility possible for redevelopment based on market conditions, and to help provide a transition from the LSC Central District to what is envisioned to be predominantly residential on the PSTA site.
4. Parcel Y – a 6.5 acre County-owned site at the intersection of Shady Grove and Darnestown Roads - has been selected as the location for a new County fire station. The land abuts several privately held properties in the LSC Central District whose owners have expressed interest in expansion. DED recommends that Parcel Y be rezoned to the amended LSC zone. This will allow for flexibility for future development in the event that the fire station does not require all 6.5 acres and a small portion of the site can be acquired by one or more adjacent property owners.
5. Staging Plan:
 - Stage 2: Before any Stage 2 new commercial development can occur (a total of 2.8 million square feet), the Staging Plan calls for full funding in the County six year CIP or state CTP of the CCT from the Shady Grove Metro Station to Metropolitan Grove. It also requires full funding to relocate the PSTA from the LSC West District. DED is concerned that linking Stage 2 development to these funding requirements could unnecessarily delay this important phase in realizing the Plan's vision.
 - Stage 4: Before Stage 4 development (4.5 million square feet – the largest tranche) can proceed, the Staging Plan requires the entire CCT from Shady Grove to Clarksburg to be operational, and that several new interchange projects are either completed or fully-funded. DED believes that linking the completion of the CCT will be a strong disincentive to the private sector to invest in the Plan area. The department suggests that the Council consider less stringent Stage 4 requirements. One alternative, for example,

might be to require that the CCT be fully funded – though not constructed – before Stage 4 development can move forward.

6. CIP Projects: It is not clear if any of the CIP projects listed on page 81 of the Plan already have partial funding commitments. It would be useful to add a column with this information.

Department of Housing and Community Affairs

The Department of Housing and Community Affairs has reviewed the Planning Board Draft Gaithersburg West Master Plan. The Department supports the Plan's recommendations to expand residential uses in the Life Sciences Center (LSC) and surrounding Plan areas.

DHCA commends the Planning Board for its policy discussion on housing (p. 21) in the Gaithersburg West area, and several additional references elsewhere in the plan. Housing has not been a permitted use in the LSC, the area that makes up the bulk of the developable land in the Plan area. This plan proposes a residential community of 2,000 units on the site of the Public Services Training Academy. Also, the plan recommends housing as a secondary use in the LSC Central district, with a potential yield of an additional 3,750 units. DHCA supports these Plan recommendations.

Outside the LSC, but in the Gaithersburg West Plan area, the plan notes (p. 40), that "housing would also be compatible" in the 13 acre Rickman R&D site. The Plan proposes PD-22, Planned Development zoning, and supports a waiver of the percentage requirements for dwelling unit types to encourage smaller, denser residential development. DHCA supports this proposed consideration of PD zoning on the Rickman site.

The Draft Gaithersburg West Master Plan Land Use and Zoning recommendations (p. 29) include:

- Amending the LSC Zone to allow mixed use development and greater height and density, and
- Allowing 30 percent of the permitted FAR in the LSC Central Area to be used for housing.

DHCA supports these recommendations.

Department of Health and Human Services

The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) notes that the vision for a Life Sciences Center in Gaithersburg is one of a live/work/shop community. Consistent with its mission of ensuring the health and safety of County residents, DHHS supports the recommendations for promoting “alternatives to car use for local trips”, preserving water and air quality, and acquiring a site for a new local public park (p. 2).

Housing

While the “primary goal” of the plan is to create a world class life sciences center, the achievement of County “housing goals” is also cited (p. 17). While this presumably involves Moderately Priced Dwelling Units and workforce housing, the plan would benefit from an enhanced discussion of which goals are being referenced and who is responsible for meeting them.

Health

There are many notable (p. 21) direct and indirect physical and mental health benefits that can be realized from land use planning. As noted in the draft (p. 6 and throughout), the determinants of a healthy community include “walkability”, active and passive recreation, and the availability of medical services. DHHS is working to develop even more specific health and quality of life indicators within the framework of the built environment. This is consistent with the discussion of future “quality of life indicators” other than traffic and school capacity when considering growth issues (p. 65).

Employment

As the stated “centerpiece of the Plan’s vision,” (p. 61), the development of the Corridor Cities Transitway is certainly related to the provision of new housing and increased jobs. Employment projections related to the staged transit-oriented development should be more explicit. This alignment is made even more important with the proposed future analysis of the “jobs to housing balance” (p. 65).

Department of Fire and Rescue Services

MCFRS is supportive of the draft plan, including the recommended siting of the Travilah Fire Station and the relocation of the Public Safety Training Academy (PSTA). DFRS provides the following comments specific to certain detailed aspects of the draft plan. The comments pertain mostly to fire department access and response time concerns associated with planned development.

Foremost MCFRS wholeheartedly endorses the plan's recommendation for locating the Travilah Fire Station at the County-owned vacant property on the northwest quadrant of the Darnestown Road/Shady Grove Road intersection. This is a centrally-located site from which to serve the area's fire, rescue, and emergency medical services (EMS) needs. It has been determined that a four-bay station will fit on the site and that primary egress/ingress will be along Darnestown Road. A station located on this site will serve the community well.

Likewise the Department endorses the recommended relocation of the PSTA to the Webb Tract site. We look forward to the construction of a modern PSTA that meets the future needs of the County's public safety departments, including the Fire and Rescue Service.

To provide the appropriate fire and rescue services to this area of the County, the Travilah Fire Station should be placed in operation early in the development of this area. Absent this station, fire, rescue, and emergency medical related risk associated with future residents and property will result in even greater risk than that which exists today. The Travilah Station will provide suppression, EMS, and rescue services within adopted response time goals; thus reducing risk to acceptable levels in and around the expanded Life Sciences Center and future Crown Village community (City of Gaithersburg) as well as in Falls Grove (City of Rockville), Traville, and other existing communities in the area.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Fire Station

Pages: 25, 81 (table of proposed CIP projects)

Excerpt: "Accommodate a fire station on the northwest corner of Shady Grove Road and Darnestown Road."

Comment: MCFRS endorses the plan's recommendation for a fire station to be located within the LSC-Central District at the intersection of Darnestown and Shady Grove Roads. Likewise, MCFRS endorses the inclusion of the Travilah Fire Station in the table of proposed CIP projects on page 81 (page lacks a number) and supports the station's completion in conjunction with Stage 1 development as shown in the table.

PSTA Relocation

Page: 27

Excerpt: “The plan supports relocating the PSTA and redeveloping the site....”

Comment: MCFRS supports the plan’s recommendation for relocating the PSTA and redeveloping the property. The PSTA needs to be relocated to the Webb Tract as it is a suitable, equivalent, centrally-located site.

Street and Intersection Design

Pages: 18, 38, 39

Excerpts:

- “Pedestrian-oriented street grid”
- “Business district streets are two lanes with parking on one side (60 ft right-of-way) or both sides (70 or 100 ft right-of-way) and should include curb extensions at crosswalks to further reduce pedestrian exposure to vehicular traffic.”
- “Design local streets and intersections with pedestrian-friendly characteristics such as minimal corner radii, special crosswalk pavement, wide sidewalks, and street trees.”

Comment: Fire department access requirements must be met per Montgomery County Code, Chapter 22 and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard #1, Chapter 18. In addition, size, height, and spacing of street trees must allow for aerial apparatus access to building windows, particularly where buildings are over three stories in height. Per fire code, fire department access must be maintained as follows:

- 20 ft minimum clear travel width not including parking lanes or bicycle lanes. Minimum clear travel width increases to 28 ft when there is on-street parking on one side and to 36 ft when on-street parking is on both sides; more if necessary to allow for dedicated bicycle lanes.
- Minimum interior turning radii of 25 ft, exterior turning radii of 50 ft
- Roads planned as shared-use paths should have increased width for safe bicycle use alongside parked cars as well as width required for large fire department apparatus.

Grade Separations

Page: 39

Excerpts: “Construct urban diamond, grade-separated interchanges at three LSC locations: Great Seneca Highway over Muddy Branch Road, Great Seneca over Key West Avenue, and Key West Avenue over Shady Grove Road.” “...this realignment may require CCT grade separations at Key West Avenue and Great Seneca Highway”

Comment: MCFRS supports these proposed grade-separated interchanges, as they aid traffic movement at major bottlenecks which improves fire-rescue response times.

Commercial-Residential Zone

Pages: 27-28, 35

Excerpt: “CR Zone is recommended for the PSTA and PEPCO parcels” “Rezone DANAC from the I-3 Zone to the CR Zone.”

Comments: The following comments are related directly to the draft ZTA addressing Commercial-Residential Zone establishment dated 6/16/09, provisions of which are recommended in the Gaithersburg West Master Plan:

- **Curb Cuts** [ZTA Section 59-C-15.55, p. 10]:

Excerpt: “Curb cuts to a street must be minimized to no more than 20 feet in width for two-way traffic or two drive aisles each of no more than 10-ft width for one-way traffic.....”

Comment: This provision would not allow adequate width for large fire-rescue vehicles to make the turn from the street, more so if the street is lined with cars parked next to the curb. The largest MCFRS vehicle (i.e., aerial unit) requires a “wall to wall” turning radius of 40 feet – twice the width of the maximum curb cut called for in the draft C-R Zone ZTA. Sufficient and adequate access points to and around buildings - made possible by curb cuts and access ways - must be provided and be as unrestricted as possible to allow access by fire-rescue vehicles. This is particularly important to the proper tactical positioning of large fire apparatus (i.e., pumpers and aerial units) around buildings to execute fire suppression operations and exterior rescues.

- **Alley Access** [ZTA Section 59-C-15.55, p. 10]

Excerpt: “When a site is adjacent to an alley, the primary vehicular access to parking facility must be from that alley.”

Comment: Fire department access is required for all structures. If an alley serves as fire department access to a parking structure, it must meet fire department access requirements for width and turning radii.

- **Parking** [ZTA Section 59-C-15.55, pp. 7 & 10; and Section 59-C-15.733, p. 18]:

Excerpts: “On-street parallel parking,” “on-street parking,” and “parking at the minimum”

Comment: Recent M-NCPPC practice, in an effort to encourage reduced off-street parking in favor of on-street parking has allowed on-street parking to count toward required parking minimums. If on-street parking is necessary to achieve parking minimums, then the street must be sufficiently wide to accommodate both through-travel (by large vehicles such as fire department apparatus) and parked vehicles. Per Fire Code, fire department access must be maintained as follows:

- 20 ft minimum clear travel width not including parking or bicycle lanes. Minimum clear travel width increases to 28 ft when there is on-street parking on one side and to 36 ft when on-street parking is on both sides; more if necessary to allow for dedicated bicycle lanes. Residential streets serving single-family homes, however, can be 26 ft wide with parking on one side only, but must provide 50 ft-long “no parking” zones every 300 ft to provide operational space for fire department apparatus.
- Minimum interior turning radius of 25 ft, exterior turning radii of 50 ft

- Roads planned as shared-use paths should have increased width for safe bicycle use alongside parked cars as well as width required for large fire department apparatus.

Another issue with minimal off-street parking is that no overflow parking is available, thus increasing the occurrence of parking infractions that often lead to restricted emergency vehicle access along streets and along ingress/egress points to any surface parking lots.

- **Trees** [ZTA Section 59-C-15.769, p. 29]:

Excerpt: “Tree canopy”

Comment: Size, height, and spacing of trees planted next to buildings (e.g., along streets, in parking lots, etc.) must allow adequate access for the positioning of aerial ladders and ground ladders to building windows, particularly where buildings are over three stories in height. Poorly placed trees greatly restrict aerial apparatus operations at taller buildings. Tree location and density must be strategically planned to minimize these conflicts.

Department of Public Libraries

MCPL does not see a need for a public library in the Gaithersburg West area as that area will be served by the new Shady Grove Library and would currently be served by the Gaithersburg, Quince Orchard and Rockville Libraries. However, the Department would be open to partnering with any of the colleges that might be involved in developing the research library that has been proposed. We may be able to offer programming in exchange for public access to the special collections this research library may offer on science and biotechnology. We also see the collaboration as a way of maximizing public funding options for libraries in the future.

Because this plan does include the western Quince Orchard neighborhoods and enclave areas, please note that we expect to address concerns about the current size of the Quince Orchard Library (on Quince Orchard Road) during our upcoming Facilities Strategic Planning process. Due to the heavy usage of this library and the restrictions on the size of the library possible on the current site, we will be evaluating whether it would be advisable, due to anticipated service and program plans, to consider moving the library to another location that would allow for a larger size building.

Upcounty Regional Services Center

1. Although the plan suggests that the future North Potomac Community Recreation Center can serve this new community, the plan also suggests that developers will provide recreational and open spaces within the LSC area with private funding. Past experience indicates that developers may very well request the County's participation in financing strategies (i.e. development district) to assist them with amenities. Even if such amenities are provided at their costs, ongoing maintenance may become an expectation of county government. A decision should be made early as to how such partnerships should be structured so that all parties --the County, community and developers --can benefit from them.
2. Similarly, a library is suggested with private funding. How and when that funding is available for this public facility would not be within the County's control, but dependent on the market economy and developer's success as we have experienced in Clarksburg.
3. Gaithersburg West will be a world-class community. Businesses and residents will probably demand an enhanced level of streetscape and roadway maintenance. A maintenance service program may be required and the open campus-like layout may be more costly than the more condensed town center usually found in the county. One service district scenario has been forwarded to OMB for consideration. Potential boundaries for such a district should be proposed early so that property owners/developers will be informed.
4. Successful implementation - Will the "district" format truly allow and encourage a coming together of the various sectors of this focused community (i.e. academic, commercial office, research labs, retail, and residential) as opposed to a more integrated design where energy, synergy and a sense of interdependency might provide sustainability more naturally?
 - a. Retail, amenities and service industries may not get established quickly enough to support the residents and office employees who will more than likely be in place first.
 - b. A substantial increase in commercial development is allowed only after the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) receives full funding for its first phase. Experience with the neighboring Germantown plan indicates that property owners/developers may be unwilling to wait for such a significant commitment on the CCT.
 - c. The LSC is such a significant project with: a) five distinct "neighborhoods;" b) a major economic development initiative; and c) the opportunity to establish a prominent global presence, that supervision is needed as the plan is implemented similar to that for King Farm and The Kentlands communities. A "project manager" should be designated to provide consistent and competent oversight of the implementation of the plan.