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 - Scenario A	*Gaithersburg West Master Plan - Scenario B*
Development Comparison		
Residential	*(units)*	*(units)*
Existing Residential	3,300	3,300
Approved and Proposed Residential		
Condominiums		
Market	2,708	2,708
Moderately priced condos	143	143
Apartments		
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**
Commercial	*(square feet)*	*(square feet)*
Existing Commercial	6,940,000	6,940,000
Approved and Proposed Commercial		
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		
Total residents	15,162	15,162
Total students	1,898	1,898
Total employees		
Direct	53,950	45,168
Indirect	32,708	27,604
Total employees	**86,658**	72,772

	Gaithersburg West Master Plan - Scenario A[3]		*Gaithersburg West Master Plan - Scenario B*[3]	
Revenues and Expenditures	*Annual (Current Dollars)*[1]	*30 Year Cumulative Total*	*Annual (Current Dollars)*[1]	*30 Year Cumulative Total*
Montgomery County Projected Revenues	$121,353,836	$4,088,407,897	$108,152,504	$3,657,948,186
Montgomery County Projected Expenditures				
County expenditures	($19,085,088)	($649,741,564)	($17,754,893)	($607,408,325)
Capital expenditures[2]	($31,683,028)	($950,490,829)	($31,683,028)	($950,490,829)
Montgomery County public school system	($27,558,702)	($996,024,182)	($27,558,702)	($996,024,182)
Total County expenditures	($78,326,817)	($2,596,256,575)	($76,996,622)	($2,553,923,336)
Net County surplus/(deficit)	**$43,027,019**	**$1,492,151,322**	**$31,155,882**	**$1,104,024,850**

MuniCap, Inc.

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.

Net Fiscal Impact at 20MSF and 18MSF

Scenarion A - 20MSF

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-A: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Fire and Rescue Services[1]

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

[1]Represents 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.

[2]Assumes 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.

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

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

[5]Includes EMS and administrative supplies.

[6]Assumes 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.

[7]Represents 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[1]

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

	Total Capital Costs[2]					First Year Annual Costs[3]			
Costs Type	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
Key West Avenue	$0	$28,460,875	$0	$0	30	$0	$1,851,421	$0	$0
Sam 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	$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

MuniCap, Inc.

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

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

[2]Represents 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.

[3]Annual 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 District[1]

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

[1]Source: Montgomery County Upcounty Regional Services Center.

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-D: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Department of General Services[1]

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

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

[2]Assumes 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.

[3]Annual 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 Schools[1]

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

[1]Source: Montgomery County, Department of General Services.
[2]Annual 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 Costs[1]

Year Ending	Tax Year Beginning	Inflation Factor	Department of Fire and Rescue Services[2] Operating Costs	One-time Costs	Amortized Capital Costs	Total Fire and Rescue Costs	Department of Transportation[3] County Road Amortized Costs Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Total DOT
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

MuniCap, Inc.

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

[1]Capital 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.

[2]See Schedule XIX-A.

[3]See 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 Ending	Tax Year Beginning	Inflation Factor	Upcounty Urban District Costs[2]	General Services Costs (PSTA Relocation)[3]	Public School Capital Costs[4] Operating Costs	Amortized Capital Costs	Total School Costs	Total Projected Capital Costs
31-Dec-08	1-Jul-09	100%	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
31-Dec-09	1-Jul-10	100%	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
31-Dec-10	1-Jul-11	100%	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
31-Dec-11	1-Jul-12	103%	$1,702,889	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$8,250,162
31-Dec-12	1-Jul-13	106%	$1,753,975	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$6,583,749
31-Dec-13	1-Jul-14	109%	$1,806,595	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$6,725,817
31-Dec-14	1-Jul-15	113%	$1,860,792	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$6,872,147
31-Dec-15	1-Jul-16	116%	$1,916,616	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$7,022,868
31-Dec-16	1-Jul-17	119%	$1,974,115	$413,249	$1,474,655	$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	$3,530,985	$21,673,669
31-Dec-18	1-Jul-19	127%	$2,094,338	$413,249	$1,564,461	$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	$3,623,486	$22,100,503
31-Dec-20	1-Jul-21	134%	$2,221,884	$413,249	$1,659,737	$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	$3,721,620	$22,553,332
31-Dec-22	1-Jul-23	143%	$2,357,196	$413,249	$1,760,815	$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	$3,825,730	$23,033,737
31-Dec-24	1-Jul-25	151%	$2,500,749	$413,249	$1,868,048	$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	$3,936,181	$43,952,307
31-Dec-26	1-Jul-27	160%	$2,653,045	$413,249	$1,981,812	$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	$4,053,358	$44,493,007
31-Dec-28	1-Jul-29	170%	$2,814,616	$413,249	$2,102,505	$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	$4,177,671	$45,066,637
31-Dec-30	1-Jul-31	181%	$2,986,026	$413,249	$2,230,547	$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	$4,309,555	$44,240,314
31-Dec-32	1-Jul-33	192%	$3,167,875	$0	$2,366,388	$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	$4,449,470	$44,472,689
31-Dec-34	1-Jul-35	203%	$3,360,798	$0	$2,510,501	$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	$4,597,906	$70,758,029
31-Dec-36	1-Jul-37	216%	$3,565,471	$0	$2,663,390	$0	$2,663,390	$69,103,897
31-Dec-37	1-Jul-38	222%	$3,672,435	$0	$2,743,292	$0	$2,743,292	$69,472,594
31-Dec-38	1-Jul-39	229%	$3,782,608	$0	$2,825,591	$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

[1]Capital 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 increas on an annual basis.

[2]See Schedule XIX-C.

[3]See Schedule XIX-D.

[4]See 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

Scenarion B - 18MSF

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-A: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Fire and Rescue Services[1]

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

[1]Represents 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.

[2]Assumes 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.

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

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

[5]Includes EMS and administrative supplies.

[6]Assumes 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.

[7]Represents 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[1]

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

	Total Capital Costs[2]					First Year Annual Costs[3]			
Costs Type	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
Key West Avenue	$0	$28,460,875	$0	$0	30	$0	$1,851,421	$0	$0
Sam 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	$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

MuniCap, Inc.

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

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

[2]Represents 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.

[3]Annual 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 District[1]

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

[1]Source: Montgomery County Upcounty Regional Services Center.

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XIX-D: Projected County Annual Operating and Capital Costs - Department of General Services[1]

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

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

[2]Assumes 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.

[3]Annual 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 Schools[1]

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

[1]Source: Montgomery County, Department of General Services.
[2]Annual 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 Costs[1]

Year Ending	Tax Year Beginning	Inflation Factor	Department of Fire and Rescue Services[2] Operating Costs	One-time Costs	Amortized Capital Costs	Total Fire and Rescue Costs	Department of Transportation[3] County Road Amortized Costs Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Total DOT
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

MuniCap, Inc.

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

[1]Capital 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.

[2]See Schedule XIX-A.

[3]See 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 Ending	Tax Year Beginning	Inflation Factor	Upcounty Urban District Costs[2]	General Services Costs (PSTA Relocation)[3]	Public School Capital Costs[4] Operating Costs	Amortized Capital Costs	Total School Costs	Total Projected Capital Costs
31-Dec-08	1-Jul-09	100%	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
31-Dec-09	1-Jul-10	100%	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
31-Dec-10	1-Jul-11	100%	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
31-Dec-11	1-Jul-12	103%	$1,702,889	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$8,250,162
31-Dec-12	1-Jul-13	106%	$1,753,975	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$6,583,749
31-Dec-13	1-Jul-14	109%	$1,806,595	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$6,725,817
31-Dec-14	1-Jul-15	113%	$1,860,792	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$6,872,147
31-Dec-15	1-Jul-16	116%	$1,916,616	$413,249	$0	$0	$0	$7,022,868
31-Dec-16	1-Jul-17	119%	$1,974,115	$413,249	$1,474,655	$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	$3,530,985	$21,673,669
31-Dec-18	1-Jul-19	127%	$2,094,338	$413,249	$1,564,461	$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	$3,623,486	$22,100,503
31-Dec-20	1-Jul-21	134%	$2,221,884	$413,249	$1,659,737	$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	$3,721,620	$22,553,332
31-Dec-22	1-Jul-23	143%	$2,357,196	$413,249	$1,760,815	$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	$3,825,730	$23,033,737
31-Dec-24	1-Jul-25	151%	$2,500,749	$413,249	$1,868,048	$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	$3,936,181	$43,952,307
31-Dec-26	1-Jul-27	160%	$2,653,045	$413,249	$1,981,812	$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	$4,053,358	$44,493,007
31-Dec-28	1-Jul-29	170%	$2,814,616	$413,249	$2,102,505	$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	$4,177,671	$45,066,637
31-Dec-30	1-Jul-31	181%	$2,986,026	$413,249	$2,230,547	$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	$4,309,555	$44,240,314
31-Dec-32	1-Jul-33	192%	$3,167,875	$0	$2,366,388	$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	$4,449,470	$44,472,689
31-Dec-34	1-Jul-35	203%	$3,360,798	$0	$2,510,501	$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	$4,597,906	$70,758,029
31-Dec-36	1-Jul-37	216%	$3,565,471	$0	$2,663,390	$0	$2,663,390	$69,103,897
31-Dec-37	1-Jul-38	222%	$3,672,435	$0	$2,743,292	$0	$2,743,292	$69,472,594
31-Dec-38	1-Jul-39	229%	$3,782,608	$0	$2,825,591	$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

[1]Capital 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 increas on an annual basis.

[2]See Schedule XIX-C.

[3]See Schedule XIX-D.

[4]See 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

Gaithersburg West
Montgomery County, Maryland

Schedule XX: Projected State Annual Capital Costs - Department of Transportation [1]

Table 2: State Highway Administration Interchange Estimates[2]

Costs Type	Total Capital Costs Stage 1 2011	Stage 2 2017	Stage 3 2025	Stage 4 2035	Amortization Period	First Year Annual Costs[4] 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 Stage 1 2011	Stage 2 2017	Stage 3 2025	Stage 4 2035	Amortization Period	First Year Annual Costs 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 A.xls]XX*
10-Sep-09

[1]Based 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 Transportation[1]

Table 2: State Highway Administration Interchange Estimates[2]

	Total Capital Costs					First Year Annual Costs[4]			
Costs Type	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]

	Total Capital Costs					First Year Annual Costs			
Costs Type	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

[1]Based 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

Name	Group
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 - SGIIAG – 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.