

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS/DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

----- -X
:
PUBLIC HEARING :
Midcounty Corridor Study :
:
----- -X

A hearing in the above-entitled matter was held on
Wednesday, August 7, 2013, commencing at 6:35 p.m., at the
Seneca Valley High School Auditorium, 19401 Crystal Rock
Drive, Germantown, Maryland 20874, before:

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
JOSEPH DAVIA
JACK DINNIE
ERIN SHAW
ABBIE HOPKINS
BRITTANY BANGERT

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT
AMANDA SIGILLITO
WILLIAM SEIGER
SEAN MCKEWEN

Deposition Services, Inc.
6245 Executive Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20852
Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338
info@DepositionServices.com www.DepositionServices.com



APPEARANCES

	<u>PAGE</u>
Joseph Davia	4
Amanda Sigillito	8
Bruce Johnston	10
Charles Barkley	16
Senator Nancy King	19
George Albin	20
Margaret Schoap	22
Richard Wilder	24
Jane Wilder	26
Kelly Blynn	29
Ethan Goffran	32
Bob Hydorn	33
Marie VanWhite	35
Elizabeth Greene	37
Kathy Hulley	39
Jennifer Schiller	41
Barbara Knapp	43
Virginia Nuta	43
Sarah Albert	46
Wallace Garthwright	48
Charles Tilford	50
Bonnie Bell	52/151
Royal Buyer	54
Andrea Butler	56
Robert Nelson	58
Jane Hatch	61
Neil Lerner	63
Kevin Linck	64
Michael Brown	66
Barbara Duchez	67
Dominic Gonzalez	68
Marianne Dolan	70
Rosemary Arkoian	72
Dennis Barnes	75
Claudette Lease	76
Bob Portinova	77
Carol Tilford	80
Gregory Czajkowski	82
Beth Dally	84
Ann Smith	87
Cherian Eapen	88
Mary Jane Goodrick	89
Sharon Dooley	91
Kathleen Sentkowski	93
Mark Firley	94
Phillis Prather Copeland	97
Tricia Pisara	98
Martin Wenk	99
Wendy White	102
Peggy Saunders	104
Sylvia Lake	106
Robert Dyer	108
Susan Wenger	110
Win Wenger	112
Cathy Hekimian	113
Cindy Snow	115
Bill Salvatore	116

APPEARANCES (Continued)

	<u>PAGE</u>
Sam Fanning	118
Steve Henry	118
Maureen Johnson	119
Tina Slater	121
Michael Branch	122
Melanie McMichael	124
Alfman Atay	125
Joanne Atay	128
Diane Cameron	131
Michael Weiler	133
Crystal Bivens	135
Duane Bivens	138
Phillip Mihlmester	140
George Mencinsky	142
Ronit Dancis	144
Terry Lamotte	145
Terry O'Grady	147
Lori Bernstein	149

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. DAVIA: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I
3 want to welcome you to this joint U.S. Army Corps of
4 Engineers and Maryland Department of the Environment public
5 hearing for the Midcounty Corridor Study. My name is Joseph
6 DaVia and I'm chief of Maryland Section Northern and the
7 Regulatory Branch of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
8 Baltimore District. With me here tonight from the Corps is
9 Jack Dinnie, who is the Corps project manager and point of
10 contact for this application, Erin Shaw and Abbie Hopkins
11 greeted you at the registration desk and from our Corps
12 Public Affairs Office, Brittany Bangert is present. Present
13 here at the front table from the Maryland Department of the
14 Environment is the MDE Hearing Officer, Amanda Sigillito,
15 William Seiger and Sean McKewen.

16 It is the responsibility of my office to evaluate
17 applications for Department of the Army permits for work in
18 waters of the United States including jurisdictional
19 wetlands. The Corps authority is found in Section 10 of the
20 Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and Section 404 of the Clean
21 Water Act.

22 The logistics for tonight's meeting are as follows.
23 First, I'll briefly describe where we are in the permit
24 process. I will then make a few opening remarks concerning
25 the purpose of the meeting. I will then call on the State

1 Hearing Officer, Ms. Amanda Sigillito, to make their opening
2 remarks. After these required presentations, the Montgomery
3 County Department of Transportation representative, Mr. Bruce
4 Johnston, will give a brief five to ten minute overview of
5 the proposed project.

6 After the applicant's statement, we will facilitate
7 public statements by calling first, on any elected officials
8 or their representatives to make a statement. We will then
9 call on those of you who indicated on the sign-in sheet that
10 you wish to speak in the order that you signed in. You may
11 provide comment into the record by written statement or oral
12 statement. If you have a written statement, you do not need
13 to provide oral comments. If you didn't sign in to speak but
14 wish to do so, please sign in at the registration desk. When
15 called, please proceed to the microphone, state your name,
16 address and the interest you represent. Recognizing the
17 number of people wishing to speak, please limit your remarks
18 to three minutes.

19 We do not permit cross-examination of the speakers
20 but you may pose questions as part of your statement. This
21 auditorium venue is for the Corps and MDE to hear and record
22 your public comments. If you have specific questions about
23 the proposed project, you should see a Montgomery County
24 representative at the poster session in the cafeteria.

25 The project proposed by the Montgomery County

1 Department of Transportation is to develop transportation
2 improvements in Montgomery County east of I-270 between
3 Clarksburg and Gaithersburg. There are six alternatives
4 retained to detailed study. The alternatives include a no-
5 build alternative, a transportation system management travel
6 demand management alternative and four build alternatives.

7 Waters of the U.S. impacts of the six alternatives
8 range from zero to .87 acres of permanent nontidal wetland
9 impacts, zero to 1,035 linear feet of permanent impacts to
10 perennial and intermittent streams and zero to 247 linear
11 feet of ephemeral streams. The alternatives would convert
12 between zero to 1.7 acres of forested nontidal wetlands to
13 emergent nontidal wetlands. Alternative 9 would relocate
14 approximately 746 linear feet of perennial intermittent
15 stream and 243 linear feet of ephemeral stream. All
16 temporary impacts to nontidal wetlands and streams would be
17 restored upon completion of the project.

18 The applicant is developing a preliminary
19 litigation plan based on the needs of the various build
20 alternatives. Once a preferred alternative is identified, a
21 final mitigation plan will be developed.

22 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to inform you
23 of this project and allow you the opportunity to provide
24 comments to be considered in our public interest review of
25 the proposed work. In compliance with the National

1 Environmental Policy Act, we are preparing an environmental
2 assessment for the proposed project in which your comments
3 will be included and addressed. Your comments are important
4 in our preparation of this document and in our evaluation fo
5 the permit application. Please note that the Corps is
6 neither a proponent or an opponent of any project.

7 The decision on whether or not to issue a permit
8 will be based on an evaluation of the probable impacts
9 including cumulative impacts of the proposed activity on the
10 public interest and compliance with the Clean Water Act,
11 Section 404(b)(1) guidelines. That decision will reflect the
12 national concern for both the protection and utilization of
13 important resources. The benefits which may reasonably be
14 expected to accrue from the proposal will be balanced against
15 its reasonably foreseeable detriments.

16 All factors that may be relevant to the proposal
17 are considered. Among these are conservation, economics,
18 aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands,
19 historic properties, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards,
20 flood plane values, land use, navigation, shoreline erosion
21 and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation,
22 water quality, energy needs, safety, food and fiber
23 production, mineral needs, threatened and endangered species,
24 environmental justice, cumulative impacts, consideration of
25 property ownership and in general, the needs and welfare of

1 the people.

2 The comment period for this project extends to
3 August 21st, 2013. Comments received tonight and throughout
4 the comment period will be considered. This is a joint
5 public hearing with the Maryland Department of the
6 Environment. Therefore, I now want to call on Ms. Amanda
7 Sigillito from MDE to make a statement. Following Ms.
8 Sigillito's statement, we will have the applicant's statement
9 followed by public comments. Amanda?

10 MS. SIGILLITO: Thank you. Good evening. Good
11 evening. My name is Amanda Sigillito and I am Chief of the
12 Nontidal Wetlands Division at the Maryland Department of the
13 Environment. Attending the hearing tonight with me from the
14 Department is Mr. Bill Seiger who is Chief of the Waterway
15 Construction Division, Sean McKewen, who is the Western
16 Region Chief of the Nontidal Wetlands Division, Mr. Hira
17 Shrestha, who is project engineer for the Waterway
18 Construction Division, and Ms. Paula Stonesifer, who is a
19 Wetland Reviewer of the Nontidal Wetlands Division. I would
20 like to welcome everyone here and thank Seneca Valley High
21 School for the use of their facility this evening.

22 We are conducting a public informational hearing
23 pursuant to Subsection 5-204 of the Environment Article in
24 Code of Maryland Regulations 26.23.02.02. The purpose of
25 this evening's public informational hearing is for the

1 applicant to present an analysis of impacts that may be
2 associated with the proposed activity. In addition, the
3 hearing provides the Department with an opportunity to
4 solicit additional information from interested persons.

5 The purpose of this evening's public informational
6 hearing is to consider a permanent application submitted by
7 the Montgomery County Department of Transportation for the
8 Midcounty Corridor Study. Construction of the proposed
9 project requires issuance of a Nontidal Wetlands and
10 Waterways Permit which is Application No. 13-NT-
11 3162/201360802. The Department must also review the
12 application for compliance with state water quality
13 regulations as required by Section 401 of the federal Clean
14 Water Act. The Section 401 review is conducted as part of
15 the Department's permit review process.

16 The Department's decision on the permit application
17 and accompanying information will be sent to the interested
18 person's list as well as to the applicant. The Department
19 decision will be a final agency determination. There will be
20 no further opportunity for administrative review. Any person
21 with standing who is either the applicant or who has
22 participated in the public participation process through the
23 submission of written or oral comments may petition for
24 judicial review in a circuit court in Montgomery County.

25 At this time, I would like to turn the proceedings

1 back over to Mr. DaVia. I do have one announcement though.
2 If you have cell phones with you, if you would please put
3 those on silence, we would appreciate it. Thank you.

4 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Sigillito. All right.
5 Now, I want to call on Mr. Bruce Johnston of the Montgomery
6 County Department of Transportation for the applicant's
7 statement.

8 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Ms. Sigillito, Mr. DaVia
9 and all the many representatives from the different agencies
10 that are here this evening. Good evening, ladies and
11 gentlemen. My name is Bruce Johnston. I am the Chief of the
12 Division of Transportation Engineering in the Montgomery
13 County Department of Transportation. The purpose of my
14 testimony this evening is to present for consideration by the
15 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and by the Maryland Department
16 of the Environment a proposal to develop transportation
17 improvements in Montgomery County east of I-270 between
18 Clarksburg and Gaithersburg. This evening's proceedings are
19 being recorded. The official transcript of the public
20 hearing and any written comments that are submitted will be
21 part of the official record and is considered public
22 information. The hearing record will be held open until
23 August 21st of 2013.

24 The Midcounty Highway, or M-83, was first listed in
25 Montgomery County's master plan of highways in the 1960s and

1 was planned to extend from Ridge Road, or Maryland 27, in
2 Clarksburg through Redland Road in Derwood as an 8.7 mile
3 controlled access, four to six lane major highway. Over the
4 years, three miles of Midcounty Highway were constructed
5 between Shady Grove Road and Montgomery Village Avenue.
6 Between 1986 and 1992, Montgomery County completed
7 preliminary engineering for the extension of M-83 from
8 Montgomery Village Avenue to Ridge Road, Maryland 27, and
9 over 60 percent of the right-of-way was dedicated, protecting
10 it from future development. Due to the national fiscal
11 climate, the project was put on hold and it was decided to
12 widen Maryland 355 first which has been completed.

13 In the early 2000s, the Transportation Policy
14 Review Group reconsidered M-83 and in 2004, Montgomery County
15 DOT initiated the current facility planning study for
16 Midcounty Highway for master plan alignment. Initial
17 planning studies had indicated that the project could
18 potentially cause significant wetland impacts of over 10
19 acres and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers advised that the
20 study must include an evaluation of alternatives to the
21 master plan in accordance with the National Environment
22 Policy Act, also known as NEPA. Today, the master plan
23 alignment impacts less than one acre of wetlands.

24 In January of 2007, the purpose and need was
25 concurred with by the regulatory agencies. Through

1 collaboration with the stakeholder agencies, 11 preliminary
2 alternatives were developed and in December of 2007, the 11
3 alternatives were presented at a public workshop to obtain
4 feedback. Presentations were also made to the Clarksburg
5 Civic Association, the Greater Goshen Civic Association,
6 Montgomery Village Foundation and other neighborhood groups
7 from 2008 to 2013.

8 After performing preliminary engineering on these
9 alternatives and obtaining comments from the agencies and the
10 public, these 11 alternatives were narrowed down to six
11 alternatives retained for detailed study or ARDS, A-R-D-S.
12 The ARDS consisted of five build alternatives and a no-build
13 alternative and were concurred with by the regulatory
14 agencies in January of 2011. MCDOT has completed detailed
15 engineering and environmental analysis for each of the six
16 alternatives and has posed results in the draft environmental
17 effects report which was posted on the project website on May
18 2nd of 2013. In addition, a joint permit application was
19 submitted to the Corps and MDE on April 30th.

20 The purpose and need of the Midcounty Corridor
21 Study is to develop transportation improvements in Montgomery
22 County east of I-270 between Clarksburg and Gaithersburg in
23 order to, one, reduce congestion; two, improve vehicular
24 safety; three, enhance network efficiency and connections
25 between economic centers; four, accommodate planned growth,

1 planned land use and future growth; five, improve bicycle and
2 pedestrian access; six, enhance homeland security; and seven,
3 improve the quality of life. And the purpose is also to
4 design and construct any selected improvement in an
5 environmentally sensitive manner.

6 In the interest of time, I will now briefly discuss
7 the six alternatives retained for detailed study.
8 Alternative No. 1, the no-build alternative, is included to
9 serve as a baseline for comparing the other alternatives.
10 The no-build alternative, and in fact all the alternatives
11 assume that the improvements proposed in the CLRP, or the
12 projects that are showing in red and blue, will be
13 constructed by 2030 including the expansion of I-270 HOV
14 lane, the corridor city transit way, a new interchange at
15 Watkins Mill Road extended at I-270 and other state and
16 county program highway improvements. The no-build
17 alternative also assumes only the proposed improvements for
18 the Midcounty Corridor study will not be built.

19 Alternative No. 2 evaluated minor, low-cost
20 improvements within existing rights-of-way at 16
21 intersections that were projected to have unacceptable levels
22 of congestion by the year 2030. Elements of this alternative
23 may in fact be implemented regardless of the final
24 alternative selected.

25 Alternative 4 modified proposes to widen Ridge Road

1 to six lanes, Brink Road and Wightman Road to four lanes and
2 Snouffer School Road and Muncaster Mill Road to four or six
3 lanes. The total widening from Snowden Farm Parkway to Shady
4 Grove Road would be seven-and-a-half miles long. Goshen Road
5 would be widened to four lanes as a separate capital
6 improvement project.

7 Alternative No. 5 proposes widening Maryland 355 to
8 six lanes to increase capacity and would include intersection
9 improvements and constructing service roads to improve safety
10 along the 6.6 mile route from future Snowden Farm Parkway to
11 the intersection of existing Midcounty Highway and Goshen
12 Road.

13 Alternative No. 9 proposes a construction of the
14 5.7 mile portion of the master plan Midcounty Highway from
15 future Snowden Farm Parkway at Maryland 27 to existing
16 Midcounty Highway. The new highway would be a four lane
17 divided highway with six new signalized intersections and in
18 addition, the existing portion of Midcounty Highway from
19 Montgomery Village Avenue to Goshen Road would be widened to
20 six lanes. There are three northern terminus options being
21 evaluated, options A, B and D, all of which cross the North
22 Germantown Greenway Stream Valley Park. Options B and D
23 would require the displacement of one residential property.

24 Alternative No. 8 would be a truncated version of
25 the Master Plan Alternative No. 9 terminating at Watkins Mill

1 Road and thereby leaving a gap in the Midcounty Highway
2 between Watkins Mill Road and Montgomery Village Avenue. The
3 purpose of this truncation of the master plan alignment is to
4 avoid impacts to the Whetstone Run Stream Valley. The same
5 three northern terminus options that were evaluated with
6 Alternative 9 were evaluated under this alternative.

7 Detailed engineering drawings for all the project
8 alternatives are now displayed in the cafeteria and in
9 addition, the display boards in the cafeteria describe the
10 ability for each alternative to meet the purpose of each
11 criteria and their impacts to the cultural, natural and
12 social environments. This concludes our remarks. Thank you
13 for giving me the opportunity to testify on behalf of
14 Montgomery County Department of Transportation.

15 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Johnston. Okay. Now
16 that housekeeping is out of the way, we want to hear from you
17 now. The way we're going to work this is we have about 80
18 individuals that are signed up so we are going to, MD and the
19 Corps made the decision we're going to limit the remarks to
20 three minutes. What we'd like to do is as you're approaching
21 30 seconds left in your remarks, Jack will hold up a yellow
22 card and then at three minutes, will hold up a red card. If
23 you see the red card, please conclude your remarks with
24 respect to the future people who want to speak. I'd first
25 like to call on elected officials or their representatives,

1 and we have some who have signed up. I'd first like to call
2 on Delegate Barkley.

3 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. I am Delegate Charles
4 Barkley and I reside at 19222 Golden Meadow Drive in
5 Germantown 20876. I am testifying, testifying on behalf of
6 the entire District 39 team, Senator Nancy King who is here
7 in the front row, Delegate Kirill Reznik and Delegate Shane
8 Robinson who are all here with me tonight. First, I want to
9 thank you for having this hearing on the Midcounty Corridor
10 Study.

11 We strongly urge you to reject the permit
12 applications for M-83 due to the environmental community
13 impacts that this destructive highway project will have in
14 our district. We believe that Montgomery County's Department
15 of Transportation environmental effects report predetermined
16 that the roads will be built regardless to the consequences
17 to the environment and the health of the citizens in the
18 effected area. The National Environmental Policy Act
19 requires you to take a serious look at mass transit
20 alternatives. In the more than 1,000 page EER document,
21 there really are less than two pages of token inclusion
22 regarding transit alternatives.

23 Of the six proposed alternatives, the only
24 acceptable alternative is Alternative 2. This alternative
25 makes the best use of our existing infrastructure by making

1 improvements to Maryland 355, it costs the least and it
2 enables the development of a high-quality bus rapid transit
3 system connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points
4 south.

5 We really need traffic relief in the Up County and
6 that's not going to come by building another road and
7 encouraging more people to get in their cars. With the
8 intersection improvements in Alternative 2, we can easily
9 start bus rapid transit on Maryland 355 from Shady Grove
10 Metro to Clarksburg. The complete corridor city transit way
11 needs to be built now and extended through Clarksburg. The
12 300 million plus cost needed to build M-83 could be better
13 spent on the CCT.

14 Since this is an environmental public hearing, let
15 me address some of those concerns. Your job is to avoid,
16 minimize and mitigate impacts to the environment. The
17 compaction of wetlands by bulldozers, excavation equipment
18 and temporary road construction will have a permanent impact
19 on the affected area long after construction is complete. It
20 will destroy habitats for all wildlife and seriously damage
21 the natural filtration causing a change in water quality.

22 Your job is to protect aquatic resources and avoid
23 them from diminishing. I have been told that bridges will be
24 built over the wetlands to protect them. That does not
25 address the damage to the wetlands by the actual construction

1 of the bridges and future pollution from vehicles that will
2 use the new road. Some of the proposed bridge heights are
3 designed to be very low, only about 100 feet from the ground,
4 and also extremely long, 500 feet. Your job is also to take
5 a look at the cumulative impact of other construction
6 projects in the same watershed. Please consider the
7 Clarksburg construction around Ten Mile Creek when you look
8 at this project. Once we lose the wildlife in the wetlands,
9 you just never get it back. A temporary impact to wetlands
10 and streams, in reality, can never actually be restored when
11 the project is completed.

12 Let me finish by briefly talking about some of the
13 other alternatives. We believe that the county is really
14 only interested in getting support for the master plan
15 alignment, Alternative No. 9. Some of the evolved
16 alternatives were actually designed to steer community
17 support to that alternative. Of all the alternatives,
18 Alternative 4 would be the most devastating to our community.
19 Please look at the large number of homes, please look at the
20 large number of homes and business properties that would be
21 affected in this alternative. I think you would quickly
22 agree that this alternative must be eliminated immediately.

23 I ask you to please review the purpose of the
24 Midcounty Corridor Study and make sure that your decision
25 will relieve projected congestions on roadway facilities

1 between Clarksburg and Germantown east of I-270. The
2 proposed M-83 will only make congestion worse. Thank you for
3 listening.

4 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Delegate Barkley. Senator
5 King?

6 MS. KING: Yes. I just wanted to add just a couple
7 things here. Delegate Barkley really expressed the feelings
8 of all four of us in District 39 but I did want to say to you
9 that option 4 is, has been such an emotional issue in
10 Montgomery Village. If that is not something that is
11 actually seriously going to be considered, and we hope it's
12 not, I would request that we take it off the plan. I hear
13 constantly from residents who live in those homes who have
14 this hanging over their head about possibly losing their home
15 to a road like this so if it's not something that is in the
16 plan, let's just take it off the table so that we don't, we
17 can let these people live their lives without any worry about
18 it. Thank you.

19 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Senator King. Is there
20 anyone else from the district team that wants to give
21 comment? No. Okay. Again, I'll do the best in pronouncing
22 your name. I am Italian but I'll do my best. What I'll do
23 is I'll call the first name and then I'll call another name
24 to be on deck. If that person on deck could come down to the
25 front, we have about 80 people who want to speak and so we

1 want to try not to close down this facility but we want to
2 try to move this orderly along. I want to call Mr. George
3 Albin. Mr. Albin, you can sit if you would like.

4 MR. ALBIN: Oh, thank you.

5 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Paula.

6 MR. ALBIN: Thank you, Mr. Spager (phonetic sp.).
7 My name is George Albin and I live at 21000 Brink Court in
8 Goshen Estates. I have raised my family there. I have --
9 sorry. I can't read my own writing -- and I am 50, and I
10 have lived there for 50 years. I am 91 years of age and I
11 was the first original president of the, of the Goshen City
12 Association. My neighbor Wade Palmer (phonetic sp.) and I
13 met with all of the residents of Goshen Estates and we were
14 contesting the enlargement of the airport runway enlargement.
15 And we contested that and as a result, the people of Goshen
16 Estates were heard and the powers that be did rescind that,
17 that enlargement at the airport.

18 Now, I want this, all this body to take and hear
19 and act on my proposal. I am here to give you a small
20 history of the roadway as, known as M-83. I worked at
21 Kettler Brothers for 25 years as vice-president in charge of
22 special projects. Late in 1964, Milton Kettler, Clarence
23 Kettler, Bill Hurley (phonetic sp.), Ed Crowley (phonetic
24 sp.) and an engineer from Dewberry, Neal and Davis, who was
25 named Tom Harley, and I met at the Planning Commission and

1 offered the easement and right-of-way to have the
2 continuation of M-83 construction through a portion of
3 Montgomery Village. The easement is behind the complex known
4 as the Walkers Choice. No. Walkers Choice.

5 Milton Kettler, who was in charge of sales told his
6 salespeople that even though the easement was on the master
7 plan, they should ignore it because as Milton stated, it
8 would take a long time for the county to secure the roadway.
9 An understatement. The easement and right-of-way on the
10 master plan for 49 years is, is on the master plan for 49
11 years. If I recall properly, respective clients were shown
12 to scale model of M-83 and it was on display in the sales
13 office. Obviously, that, M-83 did not interfere with the
14 successful development of Montgomery Village.

15 Since then, the plan has made many studies and, and
16 it comes up to this. There will be some streams and
17 agriculture lands that will be affected and there will be
18 opposition to any plan selected. In my opinion, plan 95, the
19 original M-83 should be adopted. It is the least destructive
20 and most comprehensive. I support the original master plan
21 shown on, you've shown as plan 9A. It is my tax money that
22 produces the studies and I say enough is enough.

23 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Albin?

24 MR. ALBIN: Yes.

25 MR. DAVIA: Would you conclude your remarks?

1 MR. ALBIN: Yes, I will. Get on with it. Select
2 plan 9A. The county has studied the plan to death and its
3 roadway is, if the roadway is important, don't delay the
4 project any longer. Apply plan, approve plan 9A. Get it
5 done. Thank you.

6 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Albin. Mr. Albin, if
7 you'd like to submit your written statement, we'd be happy to
8 accept that. Okay. Next is Ms. Margaret Schoap, and on deck
9 is Richard Wilder.

10 MS. SCHOAP: My name is Margaret Schoap from
11 Germantown. I'm with the TAME Coalition, Transit
12 Alternatives for Midcounty Highway Extended. I want to thank
13 the Corps and MDE for your efforts tonight to protect the
14 sensitive high bio-diverse area in the upper reaches of
15 Seneca Creek Stream Valley and wetlands. I'm also very
16 grateful for the work that DOT and their consultants have don
17 with the study to define the wetlands, the impacts of the
18 proposed highway on plants, on animal life and water quality
19 in the forest and stream valleys that would be lost and
20 degraded if this road was built.

21 The draft EER which we are addressing tonight falls
22 very short of being an adequate base on which to allow this
23 project to be granted the elusive wetlands permit. The
24 environmental impacts are why we are here and are the primary
25 reason not to allow M-83 to be constructed. In spite of many

1 assurances of mitigation, impacts from major construction
2 simply cannot be mitigated. To bisect parkland with a six-
3 lane slot for a highway will essentially eliminate the park.
4 Disruption of wildlife habitats, introduction of air and
5 water contaminates in the high bio-diverse areas, eliminating
6 mature forest canopy, noise elevation and visual impacts,
7 these cannot be mitigating.

8 Specifically, on Alternative 9, the claim that .87
9 acres of wetlands will be impacted for a bridge to cross
10 Dayspring Creek seems inaccurate and disingenuous. This
11 figure ignores the additional construction impacts of
12 equipment access roads and tree removal which will replace,
13 which will place enormous levels of fill into streams and
14 wetlands all along the proposed route, and you are committed
15 to Section 404 to uphold that there isn't this fill that
16 happens.

17 The draft report fails to consider alternatives to
18 be combined with Alternative 2 such as selective improvements
19 of roads, adding innovative transit possibilities. The draft
20 EER only seriously has considered road alternatives and
21 naturally, that is the favored for this highway. Again, this
22 huge draft has one and a quarter pages of token inclusion of
23 transit. It is not seriously explored as an alternative as
24 required by NEPA.

25 And finally, the TAME Coalition believes that you

1 must reject the application for wetlands and other permits.
2 Montgomery County should not follow up with further study of
3 the road options, rather, develop a 21st Century
4 transportation plan. We also support eliminating M-83 from
5 the master plan of highways and to put in its place multiple,
6 viable and available transportation solutions in its place.
7 Thank you.

8 MR. DAVIA: Next is Richard Wilder. On deck is
9 Jane Wilder.

10 MR. WILDER: Good evening. I represent Citizens to
11 Save South Valley Park West Stone Run in Montgomery Village.
12 I want to talk about how the, this study biased the Midcounty
13 Corridor study to the master plan Alternative 9 and I've got
14 a lot of, a list of biases here. It didn't provide a transit
15 alternative. This guaranteed that only a road would be
16 selected which is totally unacceptable to begin with.
17 Limited the study area to only east of I-270 when there's all
18 kinds of development going to the west of 270. Said that
19 another major highway is needed east of I-270 to complement
20 the Great Seneca Highway but we already have Maryland 355.
21 We certainly don't need another major highway within one mile
22 of another.

23 Did not point out that you were relieving traffic
24 in a commercial corridor to provide traffic in a residential
25 corridor. Only allowed one alternative to be selected, not a

1 combination. Set the public hearing halfway through the 60-
2 day comment period. Set the public hearing in August when
3 most people are on vacation, but required speakers sign up at
4 4:30 in the afternoon when people can't get off jobs. Did
5 not follow the (indiscernible) process, which requires that
6 upgrading of existing alternatives come first before building
7 a new highway. And also, he had talked about the alignment
8 which was set up before the Clean Water Act. That should
9 stop this alignment right there.

10 But what if -- I'm disappointed with what's
11 happening in the Corps and the MDE, they can't reject
12 something that was put on there before the Clean Water Act.
13 Did not explain to the public how wetlands will be degraded
14 but not count it as being impacted. I've never heard of
15 that, how you can take forested wetlands and all of a sudden
16 turn them into the lowest form of wetlands and call it gee,
17 no impact. That's wonderful. I wish I could do that with
18 other things. Did not explain to the public how high quality
19 mature forests and wetlands will be mitigated by planting
20 stick trees somewhere else. Put in a poison pill,
21 Alternative 4 modified, which is excessively why, to generate
22 a lot of resident impact and anger. Did not point out how
23 Alternatives 5, 8 and 9 will result in four failed
24 intersections at lower Midcounty Highway, Woodfield,
25 Washington Grove, Miller Fall and Shady Grove Roads. Option

1 2 does help.

2 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Wilder, can you wrap it up?

3 MR. WILDER: I certainly will.

4 MR. DAVIA: Please.

5 MR. WILDER: And one of the major things is the
6 cost. The cost was underestimated to 350 million and when
7 you put inflation in there since 1992 when the cost was 256
8 million, brings it up to 504 million, so that should stop it
9 right there. And so what I'm saying is that we support
10 Alternatives 1, 2 and 5 and we oppose Alternate 4, modified 8
11 and 9. We think Alternate 2 provides the best cost benefit
12 choice and also, we say reject the water, the wetland permit
13 and reject the water quality permit and do your job and
14 protect the wetlands and our water quality. And where is the
15 EPA? EPA should be here because --

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Time's up.

17 MR. WILDER: -- air quality is a factor.

18 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Wilder. Next is Jane
19 Wilder. On deck is Frank Marcus. I'm sorry, not Mr. Marcus.
20 Kelly Blynn. I'm sorry.

21 MS. WILDER: Yes. Jane Wilder with Potomac Valley
22 Environmental Group, a 27-year-old organization that was
23 formed when we first learned about the M-83 Highway. I spoke
24 with Mr. Dinnie this week about the Watkins Mill School.
25 There's a study done by Hopkins scientists showing the impact

1 of the school within 500 feet of a major highway. The ball
2 fields at Watkins Mill Elementary are 50 feet from M-83, a
3 huge intersection with Watkins Mill Road. Mr. Dinnie told me
4 they were going to move the stream and, and put a, a
5 retaining wall in back of it, thereby changing the flood
6 plane but apparently, that's not true and I, according to the
7 planners or the consulting firms, so I had to revise that in
8 my testimony, but I certainly don't approve of that. It will
9 further endanger the children by pushing the flood plane
10 toward them.

11 Anyway, I next want to mention the study itself. I
12 was very disappointed. I foolishly bought it. Well, not
13 foolishly. It's always good to have the original thing to
14 look at, but I could not get through some of the maps. I
15 found that the legends were very difficult. They had hash
16 marks on some of the stream areas. I couldn't tell what that
17 meant, if that was, you know, removing the stream or
18 whatever. In other words, this is what I asked Mr. Dinnie
19 about, what that was. Some of the things, streams just
20 disappear. All of a sudden, there's hash marks and then
21 suddenly it becomes a little line. This is, a lot of this is
22 near where we are versus the South Valley Park Elementary
23 Watkins Mill area. I, I just felt previous studies were much
24 better and I see at least two others, and they were much
25 clearer on where what was and what was happening.

1 However, the thing that bothers me most is the
2 false history that's been going around for years actually,
3 and it was discussed by Mr. Johnston, the history of this
4 project. This project, when I, we moved here in '86, bought
5 from a private owner, knew nothing about this road. The
6 first study was a comparative study between doing M-83 and
7 widening 355. It was an alternative analysis and it was, I
8 learned, got a document from DOT, not from them but somebody
9 got it from them. It says the preferred alternative
10 alignment is the M-83 alignment. Therefore, the actual
11 analysis between the two alternatives would be a minor task.
12 That's to the, that's the RFP.

13 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Wilder, would you wrap it up? We'd
14 be happy to take your written statement.

15 MS. WILDER: Well, I did get false information
16 which I had to decry.

17 MR. DAVIA: We'd be happy to --

18 MS. WILDER: Anyway, the County Council voted
19 against this project in 1992 unanimously when it was brought
20 up. It didn't just fade into the blue and it wasn't a money
21 deal. They did vote against it and only agencies did
22 negative reports on it.

23 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Wilder.

24 MS. WILDER: Um-hum.

25 MR. DAVIA: Kelly Blynn, and on deck is Ethan

1 Goffran I believe.

2 MS. BLYNN: Good evening. Thanks for the
3 opportunity to speak. My name is Kelly Blynn and I work for
4 the Coalition for Smarter Growth. On behalf of my
5 organization and our 150 subscribers who sent in written
6 testimony last week, I urge you to reject the permit
7 application for M-83 due to the environmental and community
8 impacts that this new highway project will cause as well as
9 the failure to consider real transit alternatives to new
10 highway construction.

11 My organization has worked to advocate for smart
12 growth and sustainable transportation options in the D.C.
13 region for 16 years. We have over 4,000 subscribers in
14 Montgomery County that are working actively in favor of a
15 sustainable future for the county. We've been pleased to see
16 many cases in which Montgomery County has been a leader in
17 smart growth from affordable housing to investments in
18 transit but believe the M-83 project would represent a major
19 step backwards.

20 While there are many reasons why this project would
21 harm our local environment, the main issue tonight underlies
22 its potential impact on wetlands and our product resources.
23 Alternatives 4, 8 or 9, alternatives that entail new
24 construction which would travel through wetlands and
25 important stream valleys. While the environmental effects

1 report says only .9 acres of wetland would be impacted
2 because bridges will be built over and through these areas,
3 the construction process to build those bridges, including
4 temporary access roads to bring in bulldozers and heavy
5 equipment, will necessitate filling in parts of the wetland
6 areas and compacting the soils, and soils are key for
7 filtration and other ecosystem functions. Longer term, new
8 impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive
9 more polluted storm water runoff into these important
10 resources that are already threatened by potential major
11 increase and impervious surface from developments nearby such
12 as Ten Mile Creek.

13 In addition to wetland impacts, there are several
14 key environmental issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8 and
15 9 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forest, 48
16 acres of parkland and 31 acres of prime farmland. The report
17 itself admits it may attract additional trips from elsewhere
18 inducing more traffic and causing more air pollution and car
19 emissions. Montgomery County is already struggling to
20 improve its air quality which is in non-attainment with
21 national air quality standards. Today, building this major
22 new highway parallel to two other major highways is
23 unacceptable in the age of climate change.

24 The only acceptable alternative proposed is
25 Alternative 2 which makes the best use of our existing

1 infrastructure. It costs the least, has the least impact on
2 the community in our environment and enables the development
3 of a high quality bus rapid transit service connecting
4 Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The county's
5 own traffic analysis admits that none of the more costly
6 alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing
7 roadways and in fact, would have more failing intersections
8 at Alternative 2.

9 For the same cost of building M-83's favored
10 alignment 9, \$350 million or more, we could build Alternative
11 2 and much of the county's proposed bus rapid transit plan.
12 While MCDOT's report says that rapid transit is too early in
13 the process to consider, I believe it would be an enormous
14 mistake to move forward without due diligence on a real
15 transit alternative to this highway.

16 Thanks for your time. I sill just go on to say
17 that this highway was proposed long before I was born. The
18 times have changed. People are looking to get around in
19 different ways and I hope that you will upgrade your plans to
20 be with the times as well.

21 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Blynn. Next is Ethan,
22 is it Goffran?

23 MR. GOFFRAN: Right.

24 MR. DAVIA: And on deck is Bob, I think, Hydorn
25 with the Montgomery Village Foundation.

1 MR. GOFFRAN: Hi. I'm Ethan Goffran speaking for
2 the Montgomery County Sierra Club and for reasons which
3 previous speakers have put so eloquently, we oppose the M-83
4 extension. Basically, destruction of habitat, destruction of
5 wetlands and stream quality and look at the holistic effects
6 and including developments in Clarksburg and what it's going
7 to do to local streams. I also look at air quality because
8 you are asking more cars, more drivers. We have asthma. We
9 have other respiratory diseases.

10 And I -- stepping back from it, scientists,
11 climatologists, conservation biologists, not only are they
12 saying there's a horrible climate crisis, so why are we doing
13 a plan that's going to put carbon into the air and make it
14 worse, but there's also less discussed but just as bad of
15 bio-diversity and species extinction crisis, so why are we
16 continuing to pave and cover wetlands and destroy species.
17 We need new thinking. The county is actually, in many ways,
18 moving toward new thinking but at the same time, not moving
19 toward new thinking so -- we have great transit. The county
20 is behind it. The state is also very aggressively, as Martin
21 O'Malley announced, funding for the purple line and many
22 other transit projects.

23 We need to, we need a new paradigm. We need to do
24 transit and smart growth around the transit, and the plan
25 just desperately needs to look at not only the CCT but BRT on

1 355, other possibilities like express buses and expanded MARC
2 service which all of these would serve Clarksburg. And
3 Clarksburg was promised retail where people could actually
4 walk or bike to the retail. They never got it, so why don't
5 we do all those. Look at the traffic and compare that and
6 also, the expense of doing that and the environmental impact
7 rather than building yet another big, destructive new road.

8 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Goffran. Bob, could you
9 spell your last name, please?

10 MR. HYDORN: H-Y-D-O-R-N. Hydorn.

11 MR. DAVIA: And on deck is, I think it's Marie
12 VanWhite. Go ahead, Mr. Hydorn.

13 MR. HYDORN: Okay. I'm the -- Bob Hydorn, President
14 of Montgomery Village Foundation, the MVF. The MVF Board and
15 community have long opposed the construction of Highway M-83.
16 There is probably no other issue that affects as many aspects
17 of the quality of life for the approximately 45,000
18 Montgomery Village residents. As the build alternatives have
19 emerged over the years, the Montgomery Village community has
20 carefully considered whether it would support one but the
21 draft EER only confirms our reasons for opposing this
22 roadway.

23 None of the build alternatives will reduce
24 congestion, contribute to the health of our residents,
25 especially our children and seniors, or protect the nearby

1 parks and open spaces that have contributed to Montgomery
2 Village's character as a mature green community over the last
3 50 years.

4 The data collected by the county show that it is
5 questionable that the build alternatives provide benefits
6 sufficient to justify their expense and impact on the
7 community so in not even achieving the purpose and needs
8 identified by the county, these alternatives consume the
9 funding that could be used to build transit projects that
10 would improve conditions for Montgomery Village residents.

11 We trust that the county will select Alternatives
12 1, 2 or 5. These alternatives comply with the principles of
13 the National Environmental Policy Act which prefers an
14 alternative that makes improvements to an existing road
15 rather than building a new highway. Our objections to
16 alternatives 4, 8 and 9 are based on their negative impacts
17 on three areas of great concern to our residents, traffic
18 congestion, health/quality of life and natural resources.

19 Alternative 4 will produce new volumes of traffic
20 on Wightman Road which because of the local road character,
21 has developed over the years with many residential and
22 commercial access points. Alternative 8 would create new
23 very heavy traffic volumes on Stedwick Road, Christopher
24 Avenue as travelers come down to Watkins Mill Road and turn
25 onto Watkins Mill. Alternative 9 will increase traffic on MV

1 roads as drivers seek to access and leave M-83 at connecting
2 roads within Montgomery Village. And we can't forget that we
3 have four schools on Watkins Mill Road.

4 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Hydorn?

5 MR. HYDORN: Yeah.

6 MR. DAVIA: If you could conclude?

7 MR. HYDORN: I will. I will send the written
8 testimony in, but please consider the 45,000 residents. And
9 we understand that our neighbors to the north need to move
10 down county as well as we do from our area. However, not on
11 this. Let's do alternative transportation.

12 MR. DAVIA: Marie VanWhite, and on deck is
13 Elizabeth Greene.

14 MS. VANWHITE: I'll correct you on the last name.
15 It's Marie VanWhite.

16 MR. DAVIA: Thank you.

17 MS. VANWHITE: I have, I've been a resident at
18 Christopher Court for 23 years and that is the first link in
19 M-83. My presentation is going to center on three questions,
20 the ecology that M-83 will destroy, the noise pollution M-83
21 will generate and the housing and parking M-83 will
22 eliminate.

23 What about ecology? M-83 has been on the county's
24 books for a long time. When it came up for approval the last
25 time, the proposed highway was deemed to be an ecological

1 disaster. What's made these alternatives viable now? Anyone
2 can take a walk down Hellingly Place, that's the road that
3 borders my home, and see that there are many, many
4 attractions, a stream bordered by a dog path, bunnies,
5 squirrels, lots and lots of trees. It's really bucolic. As
6 a community, we've taken on fixing up our place. By that, I
7 mean we've put in walkways. We've even corrected the
8 buildings that had stucco on them, made them better, planted
9 and put many trees and replaced those that died.

10 Now, what about the noise? Early on, we were told
11 that noise caused by the extension of a highway would not
12 bring about sound variance. We didn't qualify because this
13 was not an interstate highway. Well, there's a lot of noise
14 right now from Montgomery Village Avenue. Surely there's
15 noise requirements that prohibit excess pollution.
16 Christopher Court has four buildings that face the four-lane
17 highway that's proposed. They are buildings 1, 3, 4 and 5.
18 Building 5 faces a double whammy because not only does it get
19 the noise from Montgomery Village Avenue but if you put in M-
20 83, it's going to get it from the four-lane highway that's --

21 MR. DAVIA: Ms. VanWhite, if you can concluded,
22 please.

23 MS. VANWHITE: Yes, sir. What I'll do is --

24 MR. DAVIA: Submit your statement.

25 MS. VANWHITE: I'll submit the statement.

1 MR. DAVIA: Thank you. Elizabeth Greene, and on
2 deck is Kathy Hulley.

3 MS. GREENE: Thank you. I'm Elizabeth Greene, and
4 I thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm both a
5 homeowner in Montgomery Village and I have a doctorate in
6 planning. In short, I'm here to speak in favor of options 2
7 or possibly 5 but I'm opposed to any of the other
8 alternatives.

9 It's been difficult to dispassionately analyze the
10 options not only because I'm personally impacted but also
11 because the criteria for judgment, although it's been listed,
12 it's not clear which criteria will weigh more heavily in the
13 final outcome. Nevertheless, given the information that I
14 have, clearly, Alternatives 2 and 5 do the least damage to
15 our wetlands and the environment and they also cost the
16 least. They do not improve the community as much but they do
17 not impact private property as much as Alternative 4.

18 But of all the alternatives listed, the three that
19 give me the most distress are the three under option 9. When
20 I first saw these alternatives, I was shocked at the
21 destruction and the damage to the environment. For example,
22 the flood plane impact of Alternative 9 is 10 times greater
23 than that of Alternative 5. The stream mitigation required
24 for these three alternatives under 9 is three to six times
25 greater than under Alternative 5. But forest impact is

1 greater, the wetland impact is greater and it would cost \$350
2 million to do this damage.

3 I am a Montgomery Village resident and as I said,
4 my property will be negatively impacted by Alternative 4 but
5 I am more concerned about the destruction and the damage of
6 the three alternatives under 9. I'm here today to urge you
7 to consider the ecology of our Up County countryside. When
8 these areas are paved over, they will be changed forever. I
9 urge Montgomery County planners to preserve the beauty of the
10 county, its wildlife and its vegetation. Every day we lose
11 more tree cover affecting not only the wildlife but our, the
12 air we breathe. Every day we destroy more habitat. When was
13 the last time any of us ever saw the Baltimore Oriole?

14 The problem with all of these alternatives is that
15 they cater to the privately-owned automobile. If we have any
16 hope of preserving the ecology and the beauty of Montgomery
17 County, we have to start thinking differently. We have to
18 start planning for and putting our money behind mass transit.
19 This is how the towns all over Europe preserve the beauty of
20 their countryside. If we allow the automobile to drive
21 transit construction, the inevitable result will be the loss
22 of flora and fauna. If we put in more mega highways and
23 bridges, we can look to the mixing bowl in Virginia or L.A.
24 for a vision of our future.

25 In conclusion, I'd like to just point out that

1 there's a place on Route 355, there's a marker there put up
2 by the county that shows where George Washington stood and
3 took his leave with his troops. It's a beautiful site and if
4 we aren't careful, that view will be gone in 50 years or
5 less. I hope that our great-grandchildren will be able to
6 see the same view that George Washington saw. Thank you.

7 MR. DAVIA: Kathy Hulley, and on deck is Jenn
8 Schiller.

9 MS. HULLEY: My name is Kathy Hulley. I live at
10 21809 Dilleu Lane, Boyds. You will hear something a lot
11 different from me. Montgomery County plan Clarksburg is the
12 last corridor city in the county. The area was deliberately
13 targeted for intense growth which has arrived and will
14 continue. It was projected that the Clarksburg area would
15 have 40,000 residents. To enable these residents to travel
16 in the county, new roads and transportation were planned in
17 multiple master plans surrounding the town. How can
18 Montgomery County, in good conscience, allow Clarksburg to be
19 built whilst not providing these planned roads and transit,
20 not either or, it's both, now that the residents have
21 arrived?

22 Transit was to be direct from Clarksburg to Shady
23 Grove. Now it's diverted around Science City and will not
24 ever be coming to our town center as planned. Observation
25 Drive has been delayed and our town relies heavily on a very

1 limited number of overburdened roads and commonality of our
2 larger roads is their lack of connection or unbuilt status.
3 This is totally unacceptable. M-83 is the link for Damascus
4 and Clarksburg for Shady Grove. It is the north-south spine,
5 the eastern arterial. Part of it is already built. Snowden
6 Farm Parkway in Clarksburg at the moment is a road to
7 nowhere. M-83 is not merely an additional road. It's the
8 life that was chosen carefully decades ago to avoid historic
9 Prathertown and the Dayspring Center.

10 M-83 was a big selling point when Montgomery
11 Village was built. We all had the obligation to view the
12 master plans when we bought our properties, and I've lived
13 here since 1980 so I know well, so it should have been
14 obvious to all the road was to be there. Clarksburg pays the
15 highest impact transportation fees in the county. It's over
16 \$20,000 for a single-family detached house. Whilst we suffer
17 the most from the increase in the gasoline tax due to our
18 lack of transit options, lack of recreation, retail and
19 employment options, we do not have the option to take transit
20 or shop local. It does not realistically exist. Clarksburg
21 needs M-83. It's a road along the planned alignment. Our
22 town is being built with a road in mind and our
23 transportation transit network relies heavily upon the master
24 plan alignment.

25 We understand the focus is Montgomery County

1 changes but that does not mean the plans already made can be
2 abandoned. Clarksburg asks that we have M-83 be built along
3 with alternate 9 as soon as possible. Please take into
4 account the emissions from cars that are slow moving for long
5 periods of time, long periods of time on 270 and 355 and that
6 will continue if you don't build this road.

7 Transit is fine. I lived in, near Wembley Stadium
8 and my town was built after the stadium was built and the,
9 along, the transit was built first.

10 MR. DAVIA: Thank you.

11 MS. HULLEY: So we got out of our cars. Clarksburg
12 will never be like that. We'll always have to rely on the
13 roads.

14 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Hulley. Jenn Schiller.

15 MS. SCHILLER: Yes.

16 MR. DAVIA: And on deck is Barbara Knapp.

17 MS. SCHILLER: Hi. My name is Jennifer Schiller.
18 I live at 9402 Gentle Circle. I think the wrong address is
19 there because my neighbor had to come at 3:00 or 3:30 to sign
20 me up. But I was sitting at my kitchen table last night
21 thinking about this event and I had some prepared remarks and
22 then I thought I should just introduce you to some of my
23 neighbors at Overlea so that, that's what I have here. One
24 of my neighbors just had their second baby girl. Another
25 neighbor, his kids call it meatless Monday because he's been

1 on furlough from his federal job. My other neighbor actually
2 across the street from me works three part-time jobs and
3 takes the Ride-On bus to work every day. On Saturday, you
4 can see a lot of my neighbors walking to the Giant and to the
5 Safeway and on Sunday, a lot of folks walk to church.

6 This is my neighborhood on the Overlea subdivision
7 within Northgate Homes Corporation, and I'm here this evening
8 to speak on behalf of my many neighbors that are opposed to
9 Alternative 4. My neighborhood is unfortunately situated
10 next to Wightman Road, the road that Alternative 4 would turn
11 into a six-lane highway meaning that walking or taking the
12 bus would be terribly dangerous, not to mention the noise and
13 other dangers of living next to a highway. My neighborhood
14 was also hit very hard by the recession. Many people work
15 nights and weekends just to pay their basic bills.
16 Alternative 4 would further destroy what is left of our home
17 values which have yet to recover and Alternative 4 would
18 really just turn the road in front of my home into a six-lane
19 highway that's not part of a master plan.

20 We bought into a pledge of a planned community and
21 we've kept up our end of any bargaining of being good
22 citizens so we ask you, our government, to honor the pact
23 that we have kept for over 30 years and please stop
24 Alternative 4. Thank you.

25 MR. DAVIA: Barbara Knapp, and on deck is Virginia

1 Nuta, N-U-T-A. Go ahead, Barbara.

2 MS. KNAPP: Yes. My name is Barbara Knapp. I live
3 at 21900 Davis Mill Road, Germantown. I've lived here since
4 1957 when the road was unpaved and my complete address was
5 Route 1, Germantown. Now this narrow curvy road, which is
6 officially a rural rustic road, has become, for many people,
7 a way to avoid the ungodly traffic backed up elsewhere so it
8 is increasingly dangerous to drive on Davis Mill. It's scary
9 to go around the curves except at night when you can tell
10 someone is coming.

11 Over the years, I've been involved in numerous
12 environmental and civic activities including membership in
13 the Clarksburg Citizens Association while it was contributing
14 its ideas to the master plan. That plan included the right-
15 of-way for a direct route east of 270. I strongly urge you
16 to stick to that plan. We've had it long enough. Thank you.

17 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Knapp. Virginia Nuta,
18 and on deck is Sarah Albert.

19 MS. NUTA: Hello. I'm Virginia Nuta from the
20 Northgate Homes Corporation in Montgomery Village. I'm here,
21 we oppose Alternative 4 for several reasons but I'm here to
22 ask to take into account how Alternative 4 would invade more
23 than one area of historic interests in our neighborhood, and
24 one of those is more than 200 years old. That would be Brink
25 Road.

1 Brink Road is one of the oldest roads in Montgomery
2 County and Maryland, was created in 1793. It's part of the
3 Old Baltimore Road that was running from the Potomac River at
4 Monocacy River running to Baltimore to help the farmers get
5 their goods to port. Brink Road has retained its rural
6 appearance for more than two centuries. It edges and then it
7 enters the county agricultural reserve. It was never
8 included in the master plan as an extension of M-83. I'd ask
9 you to consider that a beautiful tree-lined grove that
10 retains the character of a rural landscape is not less
11 important to us, to our environment and our way of life than
12 new growth woods.

13 There is further history to the road. In 1862 when
14 General Lee invaded Maryland, there was concern he might
15 invade D.C. down the Baltimore Road, Brink Road, and then
16 down Georgia Avenue. Troops were sent out to Old Seneca
17 Bridge. That's where Brink Road meets Wightman. On
18 September 6th, the first New York Cavalry arrived. Two days
19 later, 5,000 troops came from General Burnside's 9th Corps.
20 Then a Canawa division, then the first Ohio artillery. All
21 of these troops, they camped out in the area around Seneca
22 Bridge which if Alternative 4 went through, would become a
23 four-lane highway.

24 Leaving that bridge, Alternative 4 -- oh, and I
25 should add that is a designated Maryland historical site.

1 Leaving the bridge, all corps would travel up to Prathertown,
2 which is one of the oldest remaining communities in the
3 county. That community was established by freed slaves and
4 one of the few remaining communities in the county where
5 descendants of those freed slaves still live today. Some of
6 them are here tonight and are going to speak here.

7 The historic houses in that neighborhood,
8 Alternative 4 would remove yards, separating the road from
9 the Thompson Wightman House and the Johnny Benson House.
10 They were respectively built in the 1860s and 1880s. It
11 would strip those houses of their historic settings. It
12 would strip the character of the community. Worse, the Sarah
13 Posey House, which is also on that road, would be completely
14 demolished by Alternative 4. The Sarah Posey House is one of
15 Maryland inventory historic properties.

16 I'd just like to mention another historic area
17 where I live. That's Montgomery Village. I say Montgomery
18 Village is historic because to my knowledge, it was the first
19 planned community in Montgomery County. 1970s when the area
20 around Wightman Road was being built, certainly Wightman Road
21 was never on the master plan as an extension of M-83.

22 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Nuta, if you can conclude.

23 MS. NUTA: Yes. I will.

24 MR. DAVIA: Thank you.

25 MS. NUTA: We never thought it could be widened to

1 105 or 120 feet and the attractive trees and green space
2 would disappear creating a ghetto-like city atmosphere in a
3 green community. Thank you. I have already offered my
4 written testimony.

5 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Nuta. Sarah Albert, and
6 on deck is Wallace Garthwright.

7 MS. ALBERT: Good evening. My name is Sarah
8 Albert. I'm a member of the Northgate Board of Directors and
9 an elementary school teacher. I'm here to speak against
10 Alternative 4. Both as a member of the homeowner's
11 association board and as a teacher, I'm concerned about the
12 safety and welfare of the children living in the communities
13 along Wightman, Brink and Snouffer School roads. Alternative
14 4 would create a highway along roads that have multiple
15 school bus stops. I do not believe this was factored into
16 the analysis of Alternative 4. It is impossible to imagine
17 children crossing a four and six-lane highway in order to
18 catch their school buses. That alone should eliminate
19 Alternative 4 from any further consideration.

20 It is impossible to imagine the teens in our
21 community who work at Lake Forest Mall trying to cross a four
22 and six-lane highway to get to the Ride-On buss that takes
23 them to and from their jobs and home again. It is impossible
24 to imagine the children attending Camp Courage at the
25 Northgate Community Church next to Wightman Road not being

1 impacted by a six-lane highway during their outdoor program,
2 programs which help motivate them in their personal growth
3 with educational activities about nature. It is impossible
4 to imagine children in the Terrific Twos preschool program at
5 the Covenant Methodist Church on Wightman Road having their
6 playground directly next to a six-lane highway.

7 I've been told that people move into neighborhoods
8 and expect that their roads will never change. Change and
9 development are part of living in Montgomery County.
10 However, Alternative 4 would have a devastating impact.
11 Under Alternative 4, more than 350 properties would be
12 destroyed and more than 400 others would be subject to noise
13 impacts. The demands of Clarksburg should not fall on
14 Montgomery Village roadways or beltways. Clarksburg was
15 seemingly developed without thought to the impact on schools,
16 natural resources and roads.

17 Alternative 4 was never in any master plan. Our
18 neighborhoods were built around the roads as they exist.
19 Alternative 4 endangers our community and our children. I am
20 here tonight that you consider it no further. Thank you.

21 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Albert. Mr.
22 Garthwright, before you proceed, let me just make a quick
23 announcement. Thin, rectangular glasses, teal color, were
24 left at the registration table so if you can't see, your
25 glasses might be there. Mr. Garthwright, and on deck is

1 Charles Tilford.

2 MR. GARTHWRIGHT: Thank you. Can you hear me all
3 right?

4 MR. DAVIA: Yes.

5 MR. GARTHWRIGHT: I don't need --

6 MR. DAVIA: Can you get a little closer?

7 MR. GARTHWRIGHT: Good. All right. Yes. I want
8 to direct my comments very much to the Army Corps of
9 Engineers about the permit. I want to suggest that they deny
10 the permit for M-83. I concur with all the objections to the
11 build alternatives that have been made tonight very
12 eloquently. I especially concur that Alternative 4 has been
13 so vastly over-designed with unnecessary paths on each side
14 and huge overblown medians that I see it as a poison pill and
15 an insult and I regret the fact that for four or five years,
16 people wanting to sell in that area have undoubtedly had
17 their homeowner's values depressed. I think that was very
18 unfair.

19 Now, all of that said, I think there's something
20 fundamentally wrong with the study of alternatives, and the
21 reason I want to talk to the Corps is I believe the Corps
22 required that if the permit were to be granted, that
23 alternatives had to be studied. Now, Mr. Johnston came about
24 two months ago to the day to Montgomery Village to give us a
25 briefing of what was involved and it was a very nice briefing

1 and after it was over, I was still reeling because I had gone
2 on the internet and I had looked at the plan and I didn't see
3 something that I expected to see.

4 For over 15 years of my professional career, I did
5 cost benefit and cost effectiveness studies to federal
6 agencies in the military, so I've done this kind of thing
7 before. When we did cost benefit, the Army Corps of Engineer
8 studies were the only textbook we had. They were the gold
9 standard. They still are.

10 We got the presentation and when it was over, I
11 asked this presentation of Mr. Johnston. I said you know,
12 you showed us that there was road improvements to be made on
13 the east side. Although they helped, they weren't really
14 enough. Road improvements could be made on the left side but
15 although they helped Clarksburg, they weren't really enough.
16 That was the end. I said did you ever consider doing an
17 analysis on the computer of being both sets of improvements.
18 The east set and the west set in no way interfere with each
19 other. Remember, I don't like Alternative 4 and its
20 extremely absurd widths. But the principle is Mr. Johnston
21 looked at me and said, no, we never really considered that.

22 Now, if you think about it, if you've looked at
23 these studies and I've looked at them and I've lived with
24 them and I've done them and I've seen people put their thumb
25 on the scales in a complex study. What I'm telling you is if

1 they didn't even, if this is something that an undergraduate
2 traffic training engineer would do in his class, you'd say we
3 haven't answered the question of what can you do without M-83
4 unless they say what if we do all the other alternatives. We
5 haven't answered the question. Can Clarksburg be certain.
6 I'm sorry. I never saw the yellow sheet. I'm sorry. I
7 never did.

8 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Garthwright, can you wrap it up in
9 a few seconds?

10 MR. GARTHWRIGHT: Yes.

11 MR. DAVIA: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. GARTHWRIGHT: So I think the rest of my point
13 is very obvious but I'll just state it anyway. I have to
14 call into doubt that there was ever a sincere attempt to find
15 an alternative when they wouldn't even do that and therefore,
16 I do not think you can grant the permit. Thank you.

17 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Garthwright. Mr.
18 Charles Tilford, and on deck is Bonnie Bell.

19 MR. TILFORD: I'm Charles Tilford speaking on
20 behalf of the Greater Goshen Civic Association. Since the
21 1960s and introduction to master planning in Montgomery
22 County, about 400,000 people have moved into the Up County
23 area which was largely rural with very little infrastructure.
24 An early and important part of master plans was inclusion of
25 two new major roads referred to then as the Western-Eastern

1 Arterial. Western Arterial is now Great Seneca Highway.
2 Master plan process has many successes but one of the
3 failures is the failure to complete the Eastern Arterial.
4 Eastern Arterial includes the Midcounty Highway and the
5 infamous gap. This has been, had a significant detrimental
6 effect on life throughout the county because we are no noted,
7 nationally noted, for our gridlock traffic.

8 Now, I'm glad to hear all of the new adherence we
9 have to blocking Alternative 4 because it truly is a horrible
10 solution to this problem. The -- I'm glad particularly to
11 hear the previous speaker agreed with this because it was
12 only recently that he was encouraging the, both Alternative 5
13 and Alternative 4 be built.

14 The only alternative that gives us significant
15 improvement to help out with the 400,000 people we have is
16 the master plan alignment, Alternative 9A. This is, this was
17 superior for several reasons. First of all, it has a
18 reserved right-of-way so it does not have the impediment of
19 recent development. Secondly, it is, it will or whilst
20 importantly, it will connect the road systems into a system,
21 it will complete the Eastern Arterial and pull traffic off of
22 the congested area roads which range from small rural roads
23 to I-270.

24 And that's right. It will increase the traffic on
25 Big County Highway. That's the intention because this allows

1 for smooth flow of traffic. One of the biggest factors in
2 generating carbon dioxide in our kind of environment is
3 congested traffic, and that's what we have is stop and go
4 which can double and triple the amount of CO2 emissions.

5 There are environmental consequences related to
6 Alternative 9 or M-83 as there was with any development.
7 These have to be placed in context. You don't house 400,000
8 people without doing a lot of environmental damage. You're
9 talking about square, tens of square miles where the trees
10 were cut down, the ground was leveled and then it was
11 replaced with impermeable surfaces.

12 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Tilford --

13 MR. TILFORD: The -- yes.

14 MR. DAVIA: Would you please --

15 MR. TILFORD: The effects of alternative of M-83
16 are minor compared to this and will improve the entire area.

17 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Tilford. Bonnie Bell,
18 and on deck is Royal Buyer.

19 MS. BELL: Good evening. I'm Bonnie Bell. I'm
20 with the Coalition for the Seneca Creek Greenway Trail and
21 also on the board of the Greater Goshen Civic Association. I
22 would like to address a couple of things that we have talked
23 about here. Everyone's talking about bus and bus routes for
24 transit. I'm also very interested in transit, and that's a
25 wonderful alternative and I have been to many of the meetings

1 and hearings and presentations about rapid transit and bus
2 transit, et cetera. What I find is when I ask that there is
3 no parking at any of the stations for the bus rapid transit
4 so from where I live, I have to get into my car even to get
5 to the bus. So telling me that I just, I can't walk to the
6 bus. I have to get into my car. When I get there, there's
7 no parking. Oh, well, maybe you can park in a parking lot at
8 a store.

9 So transit alternatives are not as easy as they
10 seem. I'm going to have to get in my car. And you cannot
11 expect me to get into a bus in Clarksburg and spend 45
12 minutes to get to Shady Grove Metro, which is what the
13 estimation is, and then get on the Metro, so people are going
14 to want to get on a road. What happens when they get on a
15 road if you don't give them unlimited access? They sit in
16 stop and go traffic and air pollution goes up and up and up.
17 There's noise pollution for everyone around.

18 And with all due respect to Montgomery Village,
19 whose population from the time that I moved here in '91 has
20 gone from 35,000 to 45,000 without a lot of building, I don't
21 understand that, they have numerous four-lane roads in and
22 out of their community. Clarksburg has no four-lane roads in
23 and out of their community and they have planned for 40,000.
24 What kind of people put 40,000 people on the ground and then
25 tell them well, you can take the same route that Abe Lincoln

1 took and it's just about as much room as his carriage took
2 going up 355.

3 Alternative 4, said right now, two homes will be
4 lost. There are numerous examples of wells and septic
5 systems. All of Brink and the beginning of Wightman run well
6 and septic. If you lose your well or your septic system,
7 you lose your house unless you're going to run WSSC service
8 down that road. If you do that, there's a big church that's
9 waiting to build a 4,000 seat sanctuary, a K through 12
10 school and a retirement community on Brink Road. We would
11 rather not have that. Thank you very much.

12 And finally, unlike most of the people I heard here
13 tonight, I want to give my hat's off to the Department of
14 Transportation. The original plans here, there were going to
15 be 10 acres of wetlands affected. They have done a
16 tremendous amount of work to mitigate that. Is it going to
17 be -- yeah, lies. They do not lie. I'm sorry. That's a
18 rude comment. The Department of Transportation has tried
19 very hard. Have you ever heard of end on construction? We
20 can do this without destroying the environment, and I hope we
21 will do that. Thank you.

22 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Bell. Royal Buyer, and
23 on deck is Andrea Butler.

24 MR. BUYER: Good evening. I'm Royal Buyer, 15109
25 Sunflower Court in Rockville. My daughter, who is sitting

1 next to me, has a home on Bell Bluff Road in the center of
2 this corridor area. I -- Alternative 9, the master plan
3 alignment, has guided development in the study area for many
4 years. To select another route negating the adopted master
5 plan for this area puts lack of credibility on our planning
6 process. I would like to say this, that I think applause and
7 cat calls are entirely out of place at a public hearing.
8 This should end.

9 Effect of the alternative on the environment has
10 been reduced and minimized. As stated earlier, the 40 acres
11 that were affected by this road have been reduced to one
12 acre. The completion of Snowden Farm Parkway will provide
13 relief to M-355 in the upper quadrant of the study area.

14 The, this alternative presents an improvement over
15 other alternatives, this being Alternative 9. In that, it
16 will, number one, enable drivers to select the least
17 congested of M-355 or I-270 by way of the Watkins Mill Road
18 whose interchange with I-270 has recently been funded, thus
19 achieving the purpose of the proposed project. And two,
20 allow the possibility of in the future of the extension of M-
21 83 to --

22 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Buyer?

23 MR. BUYER: Yes.

24 MR. DAVIA: We'd be happy to accept your written
25 statement. Could you conclude, please?

1 MR. BUYER: Yes. I have just one sentence here.
2 This will provide the extension of to Redland Road of, M-83
3 will provide a direct route to the Shady Grove Metro Station.

4 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Buyer.

5 MR. BUYER: Thank you.

6 MR. DAVIA: You're welcome. Thank you. Andrea
7 Butler, and on deck is Robert Nelson.

8 MS. BUTLER: Good evening. I'll try to speak
9 quickly so you don't have to pull me off of the microphone.
10 My name is Andrea Butler. I live at 2112 Kaul Lane in
11 Germantown. I am on the corner of Kaul Lane and Brink Road
12 so our property is one of the properties that will be
13 substantially affected if Alternative 4 is chosen so needless
14 to say, I am against Alternative 4.

15 I will focus a little bit on the human impact in my
16 discussion, and I support all the eloquently articulated
17 comments of my friends and neighbors who have outlined some
18 of the reasons why Alternative 4 would be such a bad choice
19 but given the time constraints, I'm going to focus on two
20 areas, safety and the well and septic issues.

21 Safety standpoint, there are more than 120
22 driveways or street accesses from cul-de-sac communities that
23 border Brink Road. The only way out of our homes would be
24 turning onto Brink Road into oncoming traffic, presumably
25 traffic that would be going approximately 50 miles an hour.

1 There are no stop lights planned at these intersections. The
2 residents will only be able to make right hand turns into
3 oncoming traffic. This would mean that, for instance, a 10
4 minute right to the middle school or high school if you make
5 a left hand turn now becomes a 20 to 30 minute ride because
6 you have to take a right hand turn and go all the way around
7 and back up to the school. Residents returning home will
8 have to slow down and make turns on their streets and into
9 their driveways which will presumably slow down traffic and
10 potentially cause accidents. School bus routes will be
11 affected. The buses will either have to stop on Brink Road
12 to pick up children or turn into the communities and then
13 pull back out into oncoming traffic again.

14 The proposed road will look much like the Great
15 Seneca Highway placed in the middle of an existing community.
16 The road will run right up to the doorstep of many homes.
17 There are no jersey walls or other barriers planned for the
18 road to protect homes from speeding cars that lose control or
19 vehicular accidents that force cars off the road or overturn.

20 In addition, the impact on this area in terms of
21 well and septic. Most, if not all of the homes, on Brink
22 Road corridor have wells and septic and for some reason, this
23 issue seems to have been glossed over but the impact cannot
24 be ignored. The wells will be contaminated or potentially
25 dried up. Septic tanks will have to be dug up and drainage

1 fields affected. None of the information or reports to date
2 have fully vetted this issue or discussed how these issues
3 will be addressed. Will the County run public water and
4 sewer to the homes on Brink Road? Will they dig new wells?
5 Will they provide new septic tanks or septic fields for each
6 property? Surely, this is also an economic consideration for
7 building this road.

8 I'd be remiss if I did not mention the personal
9 impact of this project. We lose a significant amount of our
10 property. The road comes precariously close to our house,
11 almost to our driveway, but not close enough to be considered
12 a taking. By all measurements, it comes within a few feet of
13 our well which is likely to be contaminated or otherwise
14 compromised by this construction project. We lose a line of
15 pine trees that are on average of at least 30 feet tall and I
16 urge these to be considered, even though it is not considered
17 to be a forest.

18 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Butler?

19 MS. BUTLER: So -- I'm done. Again, so as I was
20 saying, I'm against Alternative 4 because I believe it will
21 destroy the community both environmentally and economically.

22 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Butler. Robert Nelson,
23 and on deck is Jane Hatch.

24 MR. NELSON: My name is Robert Nelson and I'm a
25 resident of Goshen. I support the original master plan route

1 for the Midcounty Highway. I'm holding up today's Gazette
2 newspaper which in its lead story announces Watkins Mill
3 project gets key funding. I-270 interchange to receive \$125
4 million from gas tax increase. This headline highlights the
5 confused state in which we find Up County transportation
6 infrastructure planning. While the state of Maryland thinks
7 that Watkins Mill Road is a major highway, DOT removed
8 Watkins Mill Road from consideration, Alternative 6, when 11
9 options were reduced to the current six alternatives. When
10 completed, the Watkins Mill interchange will dump interstate
11 traffic on what DOT apparently considers a residential
12 street.

13 When Montgomery Village was built a half century
14 ago, the existing streets along the perimeter dating back
15 many centuries were preserved as two-lane country roads but
16 the DOT now considers these streets viable routing for the
17 major Midcounty Highway in a proposed Alternative 4. They
18 envision a four-lane divided highway which completely
19 destroys the character of the Goshen area. Goshen has been a
20 very special part of Montgomery County history bordering on
21 the agricultural reserve. Is a possible reason that
22 Alternative 4 has been proposed is to open the agricultural
23 reserve to major development?

24 As part of my career at NASA, I performed trade-off
25 studies. I find this trade-off study of the six alternatives

1 very misleading. For example, a wrong assumption in the
2 study is that a widened Goshen Road already exists when
3 construction has never even begun. If one adds the cost of
4 the Goshen Road widening to the estimate for Alternative 4,
5 then it is clear that Alternative 4 is the most expensive
6 option being proposed.

7 I find that the proposed cost of the master plan
8 route is Overlea exaggerated. When the Intercounty Connector
9 was built, destroyed wetlands were recreated. One of these
10 wetlands is just around the corner from my home in Goshen
11 Branch Stream Valley Park. The state of Maryland paid 2.6
12 million to recreate 25 acres of wetlands and restore the
13 banks of Goshen Branch, about a mile of bank. Thus, the
14 approximate cost of an acre of new wetlands was \$100,000 but
15 DOT has forced all options of the Midcounty Corridor study to
16 impact less than an acre of wetlands. Thus, the cost of
17 avoiding impacting about 15 acres of wetlands could well be
18 \$150 million. What county planner would possibly select an
19 option that would cost \$10 million to avoid impacting one
20 acre of wetlands when the cost of recreating an acre of
21 wetlands is \$100,000?

22 Development in our Up County region has been
23 predicated on having the Midcounty Highway in place. The
24 people of Goshen are horrified that DOT would seriously
25 consider Alternative 4 as an option for the highway. We want

1 the Midcounty Highway built on the original master plan
2 route.

3 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Nelson. Thank you. Can you
4 conclude?

5 MR. NELSON: Just one more --

6 MR. DAVIA: Please. Thank you. Jane Hatch, and on
7 deck is Neil Lerner.

8 MS. HATCH: Good evening. Thank you for your
9 patience. My name is Jane Hatch and I'm President of the
10 Northgate Homes Corporation, a community of 1149 homes in
11 Montgomery Village. I'm here to ask you to remove
12 Alternative 4 from consideration. Portions of Northgate are
13 directly adjacent to Wightman Road and Alternative 4 would
14 have a devastating impact on the livability of my community.
15 We ask that the community impact surrounding Alternative 4
16 raised her tonight be thoroughly considered, particularly in
17 light of the fact that our 40-year-old neighborhoods were
18 developed around existing roads and Alternative 4 has never
19 been part of any master plan.

20 Alternative 4 would remove green space owned by
21 Northgate and would literally run a highway to the fences of
22 homes in our neighborhoods. A four and six-lane highway
23 would isolate us from our neighbors and amenities in North
24 Village such as Kaufmann Park, walking paths and churches.
25 Access to critical commuter bus lines would be negatively

1 impacted, affecting the working poor who rely on them to get
2 to their jobs. The majority of Northgate residents affected
3 by Alternative 4 is of modest means and would not recover
4 from the decline in property values the highway would cause.
5 Alternative 4 is already having a negative impact on our
6 property values and it is very important that you reject it
7 as soon as possible.

8 Alternative 4 would change the character of our
9 community, our quality of life and our access to public
10 transportation. It would have the worst noise impact of any
11 alternative. The greatest number of residential property
12 impacts and the greatest potential for accidents because of
13 the multitude of intersections.

14 Northgate residents have the perfectly reasonable
15 expectation of continued quiet enjoyment of their homes.
16 Along with our neighbors in East Village, North Village,
17 Prathertown and Goshen, we have a longstanding claim to our
18 quality of life and preservation of property values based on
19 decades of planning decisions made by the existing master
20 plan. The infringement on these rights should not be
21 undertaken when the benefits for the public obtained by
22 Alternative 4 are nonexistent or minima and accomplished at a
23 disproportionate expense and disruption to our community.
24 Thank you.

25 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Hatch. Neil Lerner, and

1 on deck is Kevin Linck.

2 MR. LERNER: Neil Lerner. I'm in the Northgate
3 community of Montgomery Village. For the past 30 years, I've
4 made my living as a consultant and researcher in the field of
5 roadway safety. I routinely conduct studies for the Federal
6 Highway Administration, the National Highway Traffic Safety
7 Administration, National Cooperative Highway Research Program
8 and many other agencies. Over this same 30 years, I've also
9 been a resident of the Northgate community. So I come to you
10 today as someone with expertise in roadway safety who also
11 has eminent personal knowledge of the roads in communities
12 that would be affected by Alt 4. I'm here to explain to you
13 some significant safety concerns that exist for Alt 4 and ask
14 that you delete it as an option.

15 There are three main concerns. First is the
16 excessive number of access points. The current road is a
17 minor two-lane road accessed by many residential driveways
18 and minor roads. It will be very difficult to access
19 Wightman Road from these access points if a higher speed
20 highway, especially at peak periods. Since traffic entering
21 the road here would only be able to turn right, there will be
22 a need for numerous U-turns on this high speed road as well.
23 Local traffic would also be mixed with longer distance
24 commuters resulting in more conflict. So we can anticipate
25 movement conflicts, speed conflicts and gap acceptance

1 issues.

2 The second concern is pedestrian safety. There's
3 bus stops on both sides of the road serving the Shady Grove
4 Metro and other destinations, and this results in many
5 pedestrian crossings, often mid-block. Elsewhere, on one
6 side of Wightman Road is Kaufmann Park which generates a lot
7 of cross-road pedestrian activity, including many dog walkers
8 who use that park. On the opposite side of Wightman Road is
9 an access point to the Seneca Creek Trail with a lot of
10 hikers and families there.

11 The third concern is the large number of
12 intersections from this type of planned road. All forward,
13 features about 35 intersections. That's several times the
14 number in the original plan. Intersections, even if they're
15 well designed, are natural conflict points and they have
16 crash rates far higher than tangent road sections.

17 So in summary, Alt 4 presents problems in traffic
18 conflicts, pedestrian conflicts and numerous intersections.
19 The public safety concerns are significant and more
20 significant than other options and it should not be
21 considered. Thank you.

22 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Lerner. Kevin Linck,
23 sorry about the pronunciation there, and on deck is Michael
24 Brown.

25 MR. LINCK: Members of the MDE and COE, my name is

1 Kevin Linck. I represent the East Village Homes Corporation,
2 a homeowners association in Montgomery County whose purpose
3 is to provide for the maintenance and management of the
4 community property. All of our East Village properties,
5 including streets, green spaces and recreational areas, are
6 open to the general public. Many of East Village's 1,389
7 households are low to moderate income.

8 We request your support to prevent the destruction
9 of our community by stopping or removing the development
10 known as Alternative 4 modified. We all feel that the option
11 would greatly impact our community with added noise and it
12 would be a failed approach for improving the relief for both
13 Up County traffic congestion and environmental needs of the
14 community.

15 We request that you place all your efforts in
16 supporting the development of the master plan route
17 Alternative 9A or M-83. This plan was included in five area
18 master plans and many of our residents originally purchased
19 their homes based on this information within the master plan
20 for each community. It does not make sense, any business
21 sense, to create a working master plan that everyone has
22 followed for many years, to now just throw it away and create
23 a new route system that is headed for complete disaster.

24 Just last week and the County Exec. CIP open public
25 meeting, Mr. Ike Leggett stated that he is opposed to

1 Alternate 4 to all attendees. He stated that if a road is
2 built, he would support the master plan. Based on the data
3 that I've reviewed at the public hearings on the Midcounty
4 Corridor study traffic analysis, that data shows that
5 Alternative 9 master plan alignment would provide the fastest
6 north-south travel route through the study area during the
7 a.m. and p.m. hours. However, one area that needs additional
8 study and analysis is the wetlands mitigation estimations of
9 the size of acres to the cost per option.

10 And if the objective of M-83 is to provide the
11 greatest transportation benefit while providing the best
12 transportation choice, enhance economic competitiveness,
13 support existing communities, value communities and
14 neighborhoods, then you must support and serve our
15 neighborhoods and complete a transportation solution.

16 Last but not least, why not support a new solution
17 for M-83 to Frederick? Or even better, why not support the
18 continuation for the Metro to Frederick? I thank you for the
19 opportunity to speak tonight. That's all I have.

20 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Linck. Michel Brown,
21 and on deck is Barbara D-U-C-H-E-Z.

22 MR. BROWN: I will correct that name as Brown, B-R-
23 O-W-N.

24 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Brown.

25 MR. BROWN: I am a resident of the Northgate

1 community of Montgomery Village. Thank you for the
2 opportunity to speak. I echo the sentiments -- is there a
3 question? No. Sorry. I echo the sentiments previously
4 expressed by all those in my general area against Alternative
5 4 and because most of those reasons have been said better
6 than I could myself, I will speak more to the personal impact
7 of this.

8 Four-and-a-half years ago, my wife and I bought our
9 first home in this neighborhood. It was a foreclosure. We
10 have spent this time fixing that home, putting our time and
11 energy and finances into improving our home and subsequently,
12 the neighborhood. We have seen the birth of two children in
13 that time and all that time, we have had Alternative 4 over
14 our heads not knowing exactly what will happen. I need to
15 mention, I forgot to mention this earlier, that our home is
16 right along Wightman so it would be directly impacted by
17 this. And so with that, I formally register my opposition to
18 Alternative 4. Thank you.

19 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Barbara, and on
20 deck is Dominic Gonzalez is it?

21 MS. DUCHEZ: Good evening. My name is Barbara
22 Duchez. I am, I live at 21304 Long Court, and that's in
23 Germantown, Maryland. It is a cul-de-sac right off of Brink
24 Road. Everyone before me, I can certainly empathize with the
25 people of Clarksburg who have a difficult commute. I can

1 also empathize with the people who bought property 23 years
2 ago who looked at the master plan and didn't see Alternative
3 4, 8, B, D or 9B, D. I want to just say I concur with the,
4 what the people who previously have testified and now I'm
5 going to speak now on a personal note.

6 Mr. Johnston mentioned there was only, proudly
7 mentioned there was only one home that would be impacted by
8 some, by Alternatives 8 and 9. I am that one home. Thank
9 you very much. That's all I wanted to say.

10 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Duchez. Dominic
11 Gonzalez, and on deck is Martha Mallard.

12 MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you for being here tonight,
13 and it looks like a lot more than 40 people or less so thank
14 you for sticking it out even if you aren't speaking. My name
15 is Dominic Gonzalez and I am here representing my wife and
16 young children who can't be with us and my neighbors who are
17 too busy working or maybe too discouraged by this process to
18 speak. I'm grateful for the opportunity to live in a free
19 country where we can speak to these issues civilly. No cat
20 calls, but I'll take cheering.

21 I want to echo our elected representatives at the
22 state level who earlier called on you and our county elected
23 officials as well to stop scaring Montgomery Village
24 residents with an unworkable alternative. I think that is
25 irresponsible. I also want to address our current elected

1 officials and let you know that you can see here tonight
2 there is a committed, passionate community in Montgomery
3 County that wants to stop M-83.

4 I can try to list for you environmental, social and
5 cultural impacts. I could list, for instance, the fact that
6 in Montgomery Village, we stand to gain only 75 households
7 projected by 2040 and less than 3,000 jobs. I could describe
8 in detail the impacts of Alternatives 8 and 9 that have a
9 direct impact on my home, that it is, when you account for
10 Middlebrook development, the most expensive set of
11 alternatives, that they're the second most residences
12 acquired, between 96 and 149, the most parkland impact, the
13 second most pipe stream feed, the most relocated stream feed,
14 the most wetland fill and conversion, the most forest impact,
15 but I won't because you can read that in the report.

16 What I will say instead is this. I want to
17 describe for you quickly one of the neighborhoods that
18 Alternatives 8 and 9 will cut through and change forever.
19 It's a small community of older homes on a quiet street.
20 Like our friends in Northgate, my neighbors walk outside in
21 the evenings, we talk on the front porch while our kids play
22 together, we watch each other's houses when someone's away,
23 we watch our kids grow up, we watch the 4th of July fireworks
24 together. At dusk in my neighborhood and on my street, you
25 can see the occasional deer, listen to the cicadas and the

1 bullfrogs down by the creek and almost hear them completely
2 drown out the traffic on 270.

3 Some folks who grew up on my street still live in
4 the same house that they grew up in. In other words, when we
5 moved here, we believed that this would be an ideal place to
6 live and raise our children so my wife and I carefully
7 planned and spent our life savings on our first house for a
8 young, growing family backing up to green space that county
9 officials, as late as last fall, said would not be developed.
10 We made the decision to buy this house based on their
11 assurances in public. Maybe we should know better since we
12 live this close to D.C.

13 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Gonzalez, if you could wrap it up,
14 please.

15 MR. GONZALEZ: We are watching, county officials,
16 how effectively you will oppose M-83. Not how loudly, how
17 effectively. And I urge the Corps and Maryland Department of
18 Environment not to grant this permit. Thank you.

19 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Gonzalez. Martha
20 Mallard, and on deck is Marianne Dolan. Is Martha, Ms.
21 Mallard here? Marianne Dolan, and on deck is Rosemary
22 Arkoian.

23 MS. DOLAN: My name is Marianne Dolan and I live in
24 Montgomery Village, Ash Hollow Place, and my home backs up to
25 Wightman Road. I come tonight to give you my 36 year lived

1 experience of living on Wightman Road and what I see as one
2 of the human environmental impacts of Alternative 4. Before
3 we moved here in 1977, my husband checked the maps and the
4 plans for future development in the area. We knew of the
5 master plan so a major transportation corridor was not our
6 concern for Wightman Road. Our concern was noise and we did
7 have to adjust. The traffic was light then but we could hear
8 the cars in the morning and in the evening, and there were
9 some lulls during the day.

10 I don't need to tell anyone what has happened in
11 the last 36 years with growth and development in this area,
12 and especially Up County. Now, the heavy traffic begins
13 earlier, trucks barrel at high speed usually around 4:30 to
14 5:00 in the morning. There's lots of disturbed sleep, few
15 lulls any time of the day. We do have a transportation
16 problem and Alternative 4 can't be the answer. That plan,
17 after acquiring 353 properties, bulldozing through
18 established communities that were never planned as a major
19 transportation corridor, then building four-lane and six-lane
20 highways to accommodate this double-door, who knows, traffic,
21 the noise level for 417 residences that are in close
22 proximity to the highway would be unlivable. The economic
23 impact of declining property values would only add to the
24 deterioration of long-established communities.

25 There was a plan. The master plan has been

1 publicly disclosed and reserved for all these years, and we
2 do need a plan to provide safe and sane solutions to our
3 transportation problem, but I urge you to remove Alternative
4 4 from consideration in that endeavor.

5 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Dolan. Rosemary
6 Arkoian. Sorry about the pronunciation.

7 MS. ARKOIAN: Arkoian.

8 MR. DAVIA: Okay. And on deck is Dennis Barnes.

9 MS. ARKOIAN: Pretend the I is a Y, rhymes with the
10 author Saroyan. Hi, Mr. DaVia. Nice to see you again.

11 MR. DAVIA: I remember you, yes.

12 MS. ARKOIAN: You remember me I'm sure.

13 MR. DAVIA: Now I do.

14 MS. ARKOIAN: Now you do. I don't know how this
15 works. Don't count my three minutes.

16 MR. DAVIA: Just --

17 MS. ARKOIAN: I don't know. I'm not -- I'm
18 technologically challenged.

19 MR. DAVIA: Okay. Just stand close so we can hear
20 you.

21 MS. ARKOIAN: Stand close. All right. I have a
22 loud voice however.

23 MR. DAVIA: There we go.

24 MS. ARKOIAN: Okay. Thank you. First of all, my
25 name is Rosemary Arkoian, 20816 Bell Bluff Road,

1 Gaithersburg, Goshen, Maryland. I'm a proud resident of
2 Goshen. It will be 35 years August 22nd of this year. I am
3 against modified Alternative 4 and I am for the original
4 master plan 9A for a myriad of reasons. My husband and I did
5 our due diligence with our two young children. We checked
6 the master plan. I feel badly that some of my fellow
7 residents in Montgomery Village did not do so and now perhaps
8 they have buyer's remorse. One -- most importantly are the
9 following reasons, but I will be sending you a detailed e-
10 mail or letter.

11 The first thing that really speaks to me as an
12 individual, I am speaking as an individual, we need to honor
13 the master plan that people, businesses have looked at before
14 buying their homes or setting up their businesses. This is a
15 travesty if the citizenry cannot count on the master plan. I
16 urge you to issue these permits to our DOT who is trying to
17 make sure they dot there is and cross their Ts so there will
18 be no appeal regarding this long overdue road.

19 Secondarily, I want to say the historicity is,
20 needs to be preserved regarding the historic homes and
21 especially in Prathertown. That is one of the oldest African
22 American communities started by freed slaves in 1883. In
23 2003, we had a 150 year anniversary and we had lots of people
24 there. You cannot allow us to be like our fellow residents
25 in Frederick where they built a playground on cemetery of

1 African Americans and they had to turn around and dig it up.
2 We, in Montgomery County, are better than that. We cannot do
3 that.

4 Thirdly, this is the last frontier, Clarksburg, and
5 I want you all to know that the developers were told they
6 could do this because Arterial 8305, which then became named
7 Snowden Farm Parkway, was going to hitch to Middlebrook Road.
8 There was only the 5.7 miles that went through Montgomery
9 Village. We already have Midcounty Highway from Shady Grove
10 to Montgomery County. The developers are doing that now.
11 We're going to have a road to nowhere? I mean, please, give
12 me a break.

13 The other, the other situation is what people have
14 alluded to, the safety aspect. Getting in and out of the
15 driveways. People are going to have to take a right and a
16 new turn. The stop and go traffic. Congestion. I can't get
17 out of the Bell Bluff Road and I'm taking my life in my
18 hands.

19 Wells and septic. This is a very big problem. We
20 cannot allow our wells and septic to be compromised. In
21 general, the quality of life. I know you all are Army Corps
22 of Engineers and MDE but today, irrespective of what you
23 heard earlier from some of our earlier speakers, there are
24 ways to mitigate and I think we need to look into all those
25 ways.

1 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Arkoian.

2 MS. ARKOIAN: All right. All I --

3 MR. DAVIA: Please, you can submit a written
4 statement or e-mail.

5 MS. ARKOIAN: All right. I want to leave you with
6 one statement.

7 MR. DAVIA: Okay.

8 MS. ARKOIAN: FDR said, President FDR said
9 repetition of a lie doesn't transform it into a truth, and I
10 would like you all to trust what you've heard from the
11 various people here today but I want you to verify it because
12 there have been commission and omission are two ways to not
13 quite tell the truth. Thank you very much.

14 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Arkoian. Thank you.
15 Dennis Barnes, and on deck is Claudette Lease.

16 MR. BARNES: Good evening. I'm Dennis Barnes, 9709
17 Breckenridge Place, Montgomery Village, Maryland here to
18 speak against, also, Alternative 4 from a little different
19 viewpoint. The intersection of Goshen Road and Wightman
20 Road, also Snouffer School, under Alternative 4, if approved,
21 will create a crushing amount of vehicles, approximately
22 26,000 vehicles passing through that daily. This information
23 comes directly from a memorandum from the Deputy Council
24 Director to the Montgomery County Transportation
25 Infrastructure Energy and Environmental Committee, part of

1 the Montgomery County government, dated February 23rd, 2012.

2 This congestion at this intersection would have an
3 immediate negative impact on a stretch of Goshen Road, about
4 three blocks, which would impact on two churches, significant
5 membership, that's Rockville Road and Goshen. Two churches
6 there and a school of 200 students plus the private property
7 negatively impacted by the widening of what would lead into
8 that intersection. The widening of Goshen Road all the way
9 to Midcounty Highway would be 26,000 vehicles, according to
10 that memorandum, passing through that intersection. That
11 would bring negative impact on a, a minority church, African
12 American minority church in that particular part of Goshen
13 Road, a large county park and considerable private property.
14 All of this as a result of widening Goshen Road all the way
15 to Midcounty Highway.

16 So the environmental impact of 26,000 vehicles on
17 this community would have an absolutely sadly and
18 overwhelming impact on us. Thank you very much.

19 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Barnes. Claudette
20 Lease, and on deck is Bob Portinova. I'm sorry about the
21 pronunciation.

22 MS. LEASE: I live in North Village Home
23 Corporation which abuts Wightman Road and South Snouffer
24 School Road. I am the President of the North Village Home
25 Corporation. We have 888 homes. How will we be able to

1 access our homes with only one stop light? And the rest of
2 our roads only right hand turns to get out of our
3 communities, all our roads will be affected by M-83 Alternate
4 4. Morning traffic will back up on Highland Hall Drive and
5 Pleasant Ridge Drive. Pollution will happen in our
6 communities. Our residents will have more health problems.
7 Sound walls next to Essex Place in their backyards will
8 isolate our residents and devalue our homes. We will lose
9 our buffer to the road from Picton, Pleasant Ridge, Essex
10 Place, Salem's Grant and our beloved Kaufmann Park.

11 Our road, Wightman Road, was never in the master
12 plan. If this road goes through, it will affect our quality
13 of life, it will devaluate our homes and our health. You
14 have a big decision to make. Say no to Alternative 4. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. DAVIA: Next is Bob, I'll try this again,
17 Portinova, but before Bob goes, let me just read a statement
18 that the county asked that I read. The county does not have
19 a verbal translator at tonight's meeting but if you would
20 submit a written statement in Spanish, or I'll add for any
21 other language for that matter, it will be translated for the
22 official record.

23 MR. PORTINOVA: Hi. Thank you for letting me
24 speak. I live in Montgomery Village, been there since '87.
25 My name is Bob Portinova. I live about 100 yards from the

1 proposed Option No. 9. I am against Option No. 9 just for
2 the record. I just wanted to say about the process of
3 including first generation immigrants who many of them,
4 thousands live along route, Option No. 9. The clusters at the
5 top, at Midcounty and Montgomery Village Avenue, it is on
6 either side, there are thousands of residents in the
7 Christopher Court complex and the Normandy on the other side.
8 Home to many first generation immigrants that are not
9 represented here. I think you guys in the future need to
10 think about getting your message out to people who may not
11 speak English, may be first generation and I think they're
12 not represented here for that reason. You have to find a way
13 to get this message out better to these working class people.
14 It's not fair because they live along this route.

15 Let me explain the route to you. First of all --
16 and another thing, we're not pros at this. I didn't go to
17 college for, you know, fighting against roads so this isn't
18 my profession. I'm a landscaper and I'm a landscape designer
19 and installer. This is not what I do so this isn't our
20 profession. DOT can set up these meetings and we have to
21 scramble around trying to do our best, nervously, to put
22 together something.

23 I don't know what this road looked like, Option 9,
24 back in 1960 or whatever the hell they had it on the thing
25 but I'm telling you. Now, there are parts of it that need to

1 be in the National Geographic that are absolutely gorgeous.
2 That's the historic part of this. We talk about history. We
3 forget about the pristine gorgeous beautiful firs, 100-year-
4 old sycamores, 130-foot tall sycamores on parts of this
5 route. This route is home to an abundance of wildlife. It
6 is absolutely beautiful. It is home to a vast waterway
7 system. It's a wetland flood plane, a big part of it behind
8 my home which backs up to the Pepco property, okay?

9 But before we get to that point, let's start to
10 talk where we come through a 30-yard strip of forest, on
11 either side there are condominium complexes very close to
12 this strip of forest all the way down to the pool that they
13 swim in, down to their tennis courts that they use. Then we
14 come down to South Valley where there are ponds and there,
15 and then we come down to the softball field, then we come
16 down to the football field, then we come down to a
17 condominium complex on the other side of the football field.
18 On the other side of the football field is something called
19 Heron's Cove. It is another townhouse complex. Next to
20 Heron's Cove, you've got Watkins Mill Elementary School,
21 okay?

22 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Portinova, could you please
23 conclude.

24 MR. PORTINOVA: Sure.

25 MR. DAVIA: Please submit your written statement.

1 MR. PORTINOVA: I will. I will. My point is this.
2 This route is packed with residents and it is packed and
3 loaded with an incredible wildlife habitat that is a critical
4 buffer that we have to maintain.

5 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Portinova. Next is
6 Carol Tilford, and on deck is Greg Czajkowski.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Kathleen Sentkowski?

8 MR. DAVIA: No. It's Greg. It's Carol Tilford and
9 then Greg Czajkowski.

10 MR. CZAJKOWSKI: Czajkowski.

11 MR. DAVIA: Czajkowski. 9540 Wightman Road.

12 MR. CZAJKOWSKI: Okay.

13 MR. DAVIA: Please.

14 MS. TILFORD: Hello. My name is Carol Tilford and
15 I support sticking with the 50 year planned completion of
16 Midcounty Highway, M-83, also known as Alternative 9A. I
17 would like to comment on the no-build option that some
18 citizens are advancing. There seems to be a feeling among
19 some of us, not me, that roads are bad and while we cannot
20 tear up funds we currently have, we should not build new ones
21 anywhere.

22 People advocating this no-build position are
23 thinking, I assume, that it will save trees, decrease future
24 development, force people onto bicycles, buses and into
25 carpools and thereby decrease our carbon footprint. I

1 respect these sentiments. However, I would respect them more
2 if I saw any reasons to be hopeful that car use would
3 decline, thereby making the need for more roads unnecessary.
4 By the way, I had trouble parking this evening because the
5 parking lot was entirely full. I did not see very many
6 bicycles and to be frank, I didn't see that many people or
7 anybody getting off buses.

8 I would be willing to buy into this argument of a
9 no-build if I saw large numbers of people with briefcases
10 waiting for buses or if I saw thousands of bicycles parked at
11 Metro or if the bike paths were crowded or if riding the free
12 school bus to high school became the fashionable green thing
13 to do. I would congratulate anyone who prepared their
14 teenagers for a future with few roads and only commuter
15 transportation by refusing, if they refused to buy them a car
16 and required them to use public transportation. I submit
17 that it's naive to suggest that a no-build position would
18 decrease traffic and reduce CO2 emissions.

19 An inconvenient truth is that having M-83 on the
20 books for the past 50 years has allowed Park and Planning to
21 approve significant new development in Clarksburg, Damascus
22 and Germantown. During the same time period they failed to
23 build the very road upon which these developments were
24 predicated. In other words, the county approval housing
25 projects in these areas has assumed that this road would be

1 built. The county did not stipulate that persons moving into
2 these new developments were required to ride a bike to work,
3 to take a bus to the Metro or even to carpool. On the
4 contrary, they were reassured that M-83 would be built, would
5 link them to the Midcounty Highway and would enable them to
6 drive safely and quickly to shopping centers, daycares, jobs
7 and metro.

8 I would like to see the communities west and north
9 of Gaithersburg enjoy the same access to the Midcounty
10 Highway as do the residents of South Montgomery Village. So
11 please. So please stick with the plan, finish the job, close
12 the gap in this planned 50-year-old roadway. So no to no-
13 build and say no to the ridiculous Alternative 4.

14 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Tilford. Greg.

15 MR. CZAJKOWSKI: Yeah, hi. My name is --

16 MR. DAVIA: On deck is Beth Dally. Go ahead, Greg.

17 MR. CZAJKOWSKI: My name is Gregory Czajkowski. I
18 live at 9540 Wightman Road in Gaithersburg. I'm in
19 Prathertown. A lot of what I was going to say has already
20 been brought up tonight. I think that with my house being
21 right across the street from Kaufmann Park and I have a well
22 in my front beautiful landscape, I'm a horticulturist by
23 trade, landscaper, very unusual plants, pine, walkways, the
24 whole nine yards, all of this will be gone. The impact of
25 what was said before because of my well, you're going to have

1 to buy my property. Well, if Alternate 4 goes through, I
2 hope that they do buy my property because my property value,
3 f the house is left alone, it won't be worth a nickel.

4 Secondly, when I moved into that house 27 years
5 ago, it was woods across the street and I could literally
6 stand on Wightman Road, in the middle of it, on a Sunday and
7 blow leaves back into the woods. Now, because of the
8 development in Clarksburg, in Germantown, the road has just
9 become so dangerous. It's taken on so much more traffic that
10 we do need relief somewhere else.

11 When my kids come to visit with me and they're
12 going back to school, I literally have to walk out to the end
13 of my driveway now and look both ways with the window down
14 telling them okay, hold, hold, hold, okay, now go and you
15 like have to go like a bat out of hell to get out of there.
16 And this is just the two-lane country road. I can't imagine.

17 If I wanted to go to Germantown with the Alternate
18 4, I would have to cross three lanes of traffic coming one
19 way, this is a turn lane, and you go two lanes coming this
20 way. I'm not an idiot. I still have to turn right and go up
21 and make U-turns like everybody else has been talking about
22 tonight.

23 So therefore, I'm totally in favor of Alternate 4.
24 I'd like to see my property values destroyed and I think it
25 will be a great idea to have a highway right in front of my

1 house with, when I walk out my front door, there will be a
2 wall there to block that noise. Thank you.

3 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Greg. Beth Dally, and on
4 deck is Ann Smith.

5 MS. DALLY: I need my reading glasses here. Sorry.
6 Good evening. My name is Beth Dally, and I live in Dickerson
7 which many of you might now is in the Ag Reserve for
8 Montgomery County. For the, for the past 14 years, I've been
9 commuting to work and running errands along Route 355 from
10 Comus Road south through Clarksburg, Germantown. I've seen
11 firsthand the impact development without infrastructure
12 improvement has had on local roads and I am concerned about
13 the increase in traffic congestion but I do not think that M-
14 83, Midcounty Highway, extended is the solution.

15 I am here, I am here this evening to urge you to
16 reject the permit application for M-83 and to support
17 Alternative 2 which improves traffic flow by improving our
18 existing infrastructure, particularly at intersection choke
19 points. And most importantly, instead let's use the dollars
20 to invest in public transit. Yes, the Up County needs
21 traffic relief. It is the fastest growing region in the
22 county, yet many of its residents are not served by a nearby
23 Metro station or any comprehensive transit system, but
24 building a road is not a long-term solution. We need a plan
25 with vision.

1 The estimated 700 million county dollars should
2 instead be utilized to construct transit options to get Up
3 County residents and commuters in Frederick County and beyond
4 off the roads and to work centers, social destinations and
5 back home. For that reason, I support the 355 North Corridor
6 of the rapid transit extended all the way to Clarksburg as
7 well as a third track on the Brunswick Marc line which as you
8 probably know, serves points north of our county and goes all
9 the way down to the more densely populated southern
10 Montgomery County and all the way to Union Station in D.C.

11 If we do not have the dollars to extend the Metro's
12 red line, which it's frustrating to me because it seems like
13 Virginia can find money to do this, then we must provide
14 effective, convenient ways for residents to get to Shady
15 Grove. In fact, the development in Clarksburg was predicated
16 on public transit, and page 22 of the Clarksburg Master Plan
17 states transit is an essential feature of this plan. Without
18 it, the plan's vision cannot be realized. How can the
19 county, in good conscience, go forward with existing
20 development and expect to attract good jobs to the Up County
21 without this essential feature?

22 As a resident of the Ag Reserve, I'm also concerned
23 about the environmental impact of M-83. Particularly, it's
24 long-term effect on the aquifer. Montgomery County residents
25 in the Ag Reserve and elsewhere get their drinking water from

1 underground wells. Clarksburg, which borders the Ag Reserve,
2 is expected to go to 40,000 residents and serve the work
3 center for others. That's a lot of pavement. Pavement
4 forces rain water to become overland runoff depriving the
5 aquifer of recharge volume.

6 The ongoing Clarksburg development, coupled with
7 the construction of M-83, would increase imperviousness and
8 ultimately affect the quality and quantity of underground
9 water sources and degrade the water quality for the entire
10 region. The U.S. ACE and MDE should carefully consider and
11 study the cumulative factor that may lead to construction in
12 conjunction with the already approved development.

13 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Dally.

14 MS. DALLY: Oh, thank you. The one -- thank you.
15 And finally, there is no study that can explain the pain of
16 having your home and your property bulldozed. This is
17 especially unfair to residents who consulted the master plan
18 and Bob Collins with the understanding that M-83 was not part
19 of the neighborhood. It's 2013. Montgomery County has the
20 opportunity to do new transit.

21 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Dally.

22 MS. DALLY: Just building a road isn't going to do
23 it. Thank you.

24 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Dally. Ann Smith, and
25 on deck is Cherian Eapen. Sorry about the pronunciation.

1 Ms. Smith.

2 MS. SMITH: Hi. I'm Ann Smith. I'm the President
3 of Seneca Creek Watershed Partners. It's a new organization.
4 We're the seventh watershed group in Montgomery County.
5 We're assisted by the County DEP. They have assigned
6 employees who work with the watershed. Our group had a board
7 meeting, there's 11 of us, and I want to mention that five of
8 our board members have spoken tonight. We have different
9 views, and they've all spoken clearly. Bonnie Bell, Richard
10 and Jane Wilder, Margaret Schoap and myself. So I want you
11 to know that we are very serious about the Seneca Creek
12 Watershed.

13 It starts at Ten Mile Creek. We're part of the Ten
14 Mile Creek Coalition. It's our source water for most of
15 Montgomery County. So you hear a lot about well water, but
16 you don't hear very much about, city water, okay? So of the
17 watersheds, I picked four today. I have a graph. I'm sorry
18 -- I'll just show it quickly. The green is the poor quality
19 water. This is data from the 2012 DNR IBI studies for water
20 quality with invertebrate. You see at the top with Seneca
21 where there's red, so we are only two-thirds of the poor
22 category. We're the best stream in Montgomery County.

23 We oppose, the Seneca Creek Watershed proposes 8, 9
24 and 4 the way that it's been described. We would like
25 improvements of a lot of roads in Montgomery County and we

1 would like the transit system to be very effective for the
2 people in Clarksburg, especially for their children. That's
3 it. Thank you.

4 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Smith.

5 MS. SMITH: Um-hum.

6 MR. DAVIA: Cherian E-A-P-E-N. I'm sorry about the
7 pronunciation there, sir. And on deck is Mary Jane Goodrick.

8

9 MR. EAPEN: Good evening. Thank you for this
10 opportunity to testify today. Again, my name is Cherian
11 Eapen. Cherian Eapen. I'm a resident of Clarksburg and I'm
12 here to support Alternate 9A which is master plan alignment.
13 And I've heard other people talk about other alignments and
14 I'm here to say, to say build Alternate 9. And the County
15 has done a fabulous job with the, with the study and the hope
16 it will look at the study and consider all alternates and
17 approve the finding that the county has, the Board of
18 Transportation has made as far as the alignment.

19 And as a resident of Clarksburg, I just wanted to
20 say in terms of all the transit alternates and other no-build
21 alternates that were suggested or recommended by speakers
22 here today, we didn't really look at the geography of where
23 Clarksburg is located and the 40,000 people that ultimately
24 will live in Clarksburg. M-83 is the only real alternate for
25 getting us residents of Clarksburg down to Shady Grove Metro

1 station and ultimately, to the connection to ICC to BWI. And
2 really, it's a quality of life issue for all of the residents
3 in Clarksburg and the surrounding communities so I again urge
4 you to look at the facts in the report and, and build
5 Alternate 9.

6 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Eapen.

7 MR. EAPEN: Thank you.

8 MR. DAVIA: Mary Jane Goodrick, and on deck is
9 Laurie Wallace Lanham.

10 MS. GOODRICK: I'm Mary Jane Goodrick, a homeowner
11 in Goshen, Maryland. My family and I oppose Alternative 4
12 modified and support Alternative 9A. The public notice for
13 this hearing stated that the agencies would base their
14 decision for the permit on various considerations but the
15 last phrase, which I consider the most important, is that
16 you'll consider the needs and the welfare of the people, so I
17 hope that that will be a part of every single decision that
18 you will base upon.

19 For example, Alternative 9 will affect a lot of
20 trees but I think it's important to think about how the trees
21 got there. You set aside the land for a highway, you build
22 thousands and thousands of homes based on that highway and
23 then you come back 50 years later and there are a lot of
24 trees on that land. I like trees. In fact, I love trees.
25 We have trees on our property. But one thing about trees, as

1 you environmental people understand, is that it's a renewable
2 resource. You can plant trees other places. And the study
3 says that all of the trees will be mitigated either one to
4 one ratio or one to two ratio. And trees are important but
5 they're not more important than people.

6 Alternative 4 modified presents unacceptable noise
7 levels for about 417 homes, the largest number of all in the
8 study by far. Many of the homes will have ugly sound
9 barriers in front of them because of this noise. What does
10 this noise level mean practically? To people who live on a
11 semi-rural two-lane road that would become a four or six-lane
12 highway, the road that they lived on that was two-lane was
13 never planned or developed to have a four or six-lane highway
14 running back all of the residences of those homes. And if
15 that road is built, it will be a nightmare for all of us who
16 live around that road, for all of us who live elsewhere and
17 will be traveling on that road.

18 Noise adversely affects people. According to the
19 study with Alternatives 8 and 9, increase of noise levels
20 would be the greatest within parklands and open spaces of
21 Alternative 8 and 9. By definition, there will be fewer
22 homes in the parklands and in the open space to affect but
23 thousands of tax paying Montgomery County residents live
24 year-round on Alternative 4 modified proposed route. You can
25 plant more trees but you cannot make whole households along

1 the route of Alternative 4 modified if that alternate is
2 chosen.

3 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Goodrick?.

4 MS. GOODRICK: My family and I hope you will grant
5 a permit for Alternative 9A. Thank you.

6 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Goodrick. Laurie
7 Wallace Lanham, and on deck is Sharon Dooley. Is Laurie
8 here? Okay. Is Sharon Dooley?

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. She's here.

10 MR. DAVIA: Okay. Kathleen Sentkowski is on deck.

11 MS. DOOLEY: Good evening. My name is Sharon
12 Dooley and I'm testifying for the group I represent, Up
13 County Action, which concerns the Southland park with many
14 issues on environmental concerns. The proposed road, M-83,
15 is one of those concerns. Much of the land involved in the
16 chosen route is in environmentally sensitive areas. Several
17 streams in the Seneca Creek Watershed have already been
18 damaged by construction in Clarksburg with creeks showing a
19 decrease in bio-diversity, an increase in overall water
20 temperatures and pollution damage from construction and road
21 runoff. Today I ask of your panel to really look at the
22 problems facing this proposed construction. What is the
23 balance here between the needs of the fragile environment and
24 the desire to some in the community to shave a few minutes
25 off a commute but at what cost?

1 In 2007, according to the documents on the
2 transportation website, the EPA comments were submitted on
3 all the alternatives present at that time and on 1/29/2007,
4 the statement was written, the EPA supports the efforts to
5 accommodate and promote mass transit high occupancy vehicles
6 and alternative designs to address the need to reduce
7 congestion. We look forward to seeing alternatives
8 incorporating the above ideas as discussed in December 2006.

9 Concerns about not building roads or repair are
10 subsequently disregarded despite this information. Oddly,
11 since expansion with rapid transit vehicles along 355 in the
12 CCT route are very much in play today, why have not these
13 choices been further explored? Even the expansion along 355,
14 with much lower cost, has never been adequately or
15 appropriately given an equitable hearing.

16 Montgomery County Department of Transportation
17 apparently sees its mission was road building and never
18 developed a viable transit solution, but the transit solution
19 is more environmentally palatable and will not destroy
20 forests, farms or wetlands so why not look at it seriously.

21 The MCDOT solution to wetlands is to bridge or
22 create culverts for streams or creeks which change allowed
23 free-flowing stream into a water channel which no longer can
24 support aquatic life. The claim that less than an acre of
25 riverbed is impacted is disingenuous where there are multiple

1 places in separate streams that are very much involved and
2 destruction will occur. Each one of these encompass many
3 stream valley habitats and necessary considerations for the
4 requisite stream creek bed buffers are not being considered.
5 Runoff from bridges and construction still harms the waters
6 underneath.

7 The county hopes to build the purple line, the RTV
8 system and the CCT. All are moving forward as systems for
9 the 21st Century. All --

10 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Dooley.

11 MS. DOOLEY: All of them are environmentally
12 designed with little air pollution or damage. So in
13 conclusion, please do not issue a permit for this road to be
14 built as the master plan alignment. Thank you.

15 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Dooley. Kathleen
16 Sentkowski, and on deck is Mark Firley.

17 MS. SENTKOWSKI: Hi. I'm Kathleen Sentkowski. I
18 live in Goshen, Maryland and I am on the Board of the Greater
19 Goshen Civic Association. I'm just going to comment on a few
20 things that were mentioned tonight. First of all, I find it
21 very amusing that the people who really pressed the County
22 into doing this study are most against your report. Probably
23 because it shows that the M-83 is the most logical road that
24 we need in the county.

25 As you can tell, I'm for the M-83. I am against

1 Alternative 4. But I'm also here to ask you or point, and
2 point out to you that we feel that the testimony, and the
3 written testimony in particular, from the residents of
4 Montgomery County should bear more weight than visitors to
5 Montgomery County. And that, what I'm talking about is
6 visitors to Dayspring who do not live here, commute here, go
7 to school here, shop here, vote here or pay taxes here. They
8 aren't vested in how long it takes to get to Shady Grove
9 Road.

10 There's many things been said tonight that are not
11 true but what is true, there is 15,000 residents in Goshen.
12 There's going to be 35,000 more residents, or more residents,
13 in Clarksburg and they need a road to get to work. Someone
14 said we need a 21st Century transportation plan. Is that a
15 bus? Because I have to tell you with all due respect to the
16 politicians and other people who have said this tonight about
17 transit, a transit way, if you have a child you have to get
18 to school or to the baseball game or baseball practice or go
19 shopping, you're not getting on a bus. We need to get there
20 on the road. You can look the other way and think that we're
21 going to get there by bus but I agree with Bonnie Bell,
22 you're going to get in your car and we need M-83. Thank you.

23 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Sentkowski. Mr. Firley,
24 and on deck is Phillis Copeland. Mr. Firley.

25 MR. FIRLEY: Thank you and good evening. I will

1 ask permission to submit extended remarks.

2 MR. DAVIA: Absolutely.

3 MR. FIRLEY: I come before you today as a private
4 citizen to share some concerns and objections to the proposed
5 extension from its terminus in Montgomery Village into
6 Clarksburg. I should point out that at the outset, at least
7 two flaws in the process which I may, which I believe may
8 result in serious concerns.

9 First, that the purpose in these documents
10 originally offered have both methodological and substantive
11 defects which cause me to question the validity of any
12 conclusions drawn from them.

13 There were numerous examples, and I will not tax
14 you with the entire list tonight. Two of the most serious
15 are that at no point the traffic model or the assumptions
16 used to craft it were made transparent or even exposed to the
17 public. The second, as we know from experience, traffic flow
18 can be analogized to a balloon. Squeeze a section and
19 constrict the flow, it bulges out elsewhere to form backups
20 accordingly. The belief that we need this road in this way
21 is belied by a flaw that is inherent in the final
22 projections.

23 Time and words are spent indicating the horrors of
24 backlog in the middle of the Clarksburg/Rockville Corridor.
25 That's very fair. But if this road were to be built in this

1 way, this constriction appears at what theorists would call
2 the terminal node of the network. That is there isn't
3 sufficient inner-connectivity at either end, either at Shady
4 Grove or in Clarksburg, to allow the increased volumes the
5 middle section would drive so we have to build more roads to
6 keep up. We haven't actually solve Clarksburg's problem but
7 we've moved it around at great public expense. We are doomed
8 to repeat ourselves like some modern Sisyphus with a concrete
9 mixer instead of a rock. We have to rework most of
10 Clarksburg's streets, Shady Grove, SRV-55 and bits of I-200
11 to make it all work. Where are the costs in the plan?

12 Another class of objections concerns the insistence
13 of a false dichotomy between road building and doing nothing.
14 There are other ways to solve the problem. Demand
15 management, the most deprecated and orphaned solution
16 includes, among other things, strategies as simple as
17 intelligent signalization. For 10 to 15 percent of the cost
18 of the road, the entire county signal grid could be
19 coordinated and moved toward adaptive timing. Where this has
20 been tried, traffic flow improvements of 15 to 20 percent are
21 common. If you run the numbers through any available
22 simulator, you come to a rather astonishing conclusion. If
23 we were to do adaptive signaling, we would eliminate the need
24 for building this road in its entirety.

25 In this area, we often pride ourselves on forward

1 thinking but when it comes to transportation, we haven't even
2 made the 1990s elsewhere.

3 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Firley.

4 MR. FIRLEY: The same county that trouts smart
5 growth around transit when the construction is renewal and
6 in-fill reverses its emphasis when it's closer to green
7 fields.

8 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Firley.

9 MR. FIRLEY: Thank you.

10 MR. DAVIA: Thank you. Phillis Copeland, and on
11 deck is --

12 MS. COPELAND: Good evening.

13 MR. DAVIA: -- Tricia Pisara. Go ahead, Ms.
14 Copeland.

15 MS. COPELAND: Good evening. My name is Phillis
16 Prather Copeland and I am the eldest daughter of the late
17 Reverend James E. Prather and Edna May Prather who is 95
18 years old and still resides in Prathertown. And I stand here
19 and I, I'm reminded as I stand before you this evening that
20 when God created the Heavens and the Earth, he made man to be
21 caretakers of that which he had created and that included his
22 land. So I'm standing today as the caretaker for the rights,
23 the protection of the, an apostle of land along Brink Road
24 and Wightman Road and in particular, the Prathertown
25 community which was brought and built on the blood, sweat and

1 tears of my ancestors who were slaves on the Blunt Farm off
2 of Brink Road. And for the first five years of my life, I
3 lived in one of the log cabins with my parents on the
4 plantation.

5 For the record, any plan to widen, widen Wightman
6 at Brink Road or to erect a wall in front of the homes along
7 Wightman and Brink Road are strongly disapproved of. More
8 importantly, it would hide the historical plat that has been
9 erected along that stretch of roadway and it would take away
10 from the land and the homes that along, that's along that
11 stretch of road. And for once, it was, it was looked at as
12 being a beautiful countryside. Now -- it was, it was also
13 seen as very peaceful and quiet. Now, that stretch of land
14 is like the 500 Indy Speedway with the two lanes. What would
15 it be like with four lanes. Oh, I forgot. You want to erect
16 a wall and take some of our land, and I do not think that
17 this is the proper way to go so please reconsider your plan.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Copeland. Tricia, could
20 you spell your last name, and on deck is Martin Wenk.

21 MS. PISARA: My last name is P-I-S-A-R-A.

22 MR. DAVIA: Thank you.

23 MS. PISARA: My name is Tricia Pisara and I live at
24 20611 Highland Hall Drive in Montgomery Village, and I've got
25 to say it's a shame that the county built Clarksburg in the

1 first place. They should have never built Clarksburg when
2 they want to make the rest of the county suffer and build
3 more roads and take away houses for a community that
4 shouldn't have been there in the first place.

5 Second of all, I'm against Alternative 4. I don't
6 think that Wightman Road or Goshen should be turned into a
7 four to six-lane highway. You're going to take away people's
8 houses? Where are they going to live in this county with the
9 housing prices so high? They can't afford to go elsewhere.
10 You're going to put up sound barriers? That's not going to
11 do anything. I drive on Wightman Road every day to work as I
12 live in Clarksburg and there's not a lot of traffic right now
13 but there will be. Build the roads and they will come.

14 I'm also against Maryland, M-83. It is not our
15 fault you decided to build Clarksburg and people need roads
16 out that way. Therefore, you should not take people's houses
17 and build through Montgomery Village, M-83, to destroy other
18 people's homes for the county's mistake. Thank you.

19 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Pisara. Martin Wenk,
20 and on deck is Wendy White.

21 MR. WENK: My name is Martin Wenk. I live at 9740
22 Wightman Road. I belong to the Greater Goshen Citizens
23 Association and being at the end of the presentation. I must
24 say that a lot of the points I wanted to make have been made
25 already but let me give you a personal perspective on it from

1 my point of view just as an individual, and I'm sure a lot of
2 other people are in this position too.

3 I come here with the impression that one of these
4 roads will be built. There is no denying that there's a
5 problem with the existing population as it exists now let
6 alone the expanded population expected in the future. I have
7 personally traversed Route 270 over a career of 39 years
8 traveling fortunately in the last portion of it only to
9 Rockville and to the beginning years to Bethesda. 270 is
10 overloaded. It must be relieved. One of these roads will
11 have to be built. I do not believe, for reasons already
12 presented, that public transportation will be a real answer
13 within the new future, at least the near future necessary for
14 the county to relieve existing congestion and that congestion
15 that will build even before mass transit is available.

16 I oppose Alternate 4 for many of the reasons that
17 were expressed already but personally, I live at 9740. It is
18 a property that would lose one-third of its total acreage.
19 On that acreage is a large number of trees that act as a
20 buffer to the noise on Wightman Road. Obviously, nobody
21 speaks of it much but I am not sure who to address here that
22 would be cognizant of it and responsible for it.

23 Many people are afraid of loss of their property
24 value, which has occurred already, from the possibility of
25 this route and might ultimately even be greater if the route

1 is built that way, and I'm sure people in other alternatives
2 have the same gripe but let's call it like it is. I fear
3 that reduction in the value of my property. Some day I will
4 sell it and I will live on the profits of that property. It
5 will affect my life and the quality of my life. I do not
6 believe -- I feel sorry for you folks in your position. A
7 lot is being made of the environmental card, a lot is being
8 made of the historical card and various group cards, be it
9 ethnic or religious. I would think that, certainly for
10 reasons offered already, I am strongly opposed to Alternate 4
11 as I said and I would not like to see this road be built
12 anywhere but I think it will be built. It has to be a
13 limited access road that significantly decreases the time you
14 travel and does not decrease safety.

15 MR. DAVIA: Mister --

16 MR. WENK: At the expense of saying anything else,
17 I'll end that by saying I am strictly opposed to 4 but if the
18 road is built, I would stick to the original plan of
19 establishing M-83 which does not bring forth the problems as
20 Alternate 4 does.

21 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Wenk.

22 MR. WENK: And let me say one more thing just --

23 MR. DAVIA: Quickly.

24 MR. WENK: Mitigation does work. We should look at
25 the south side of Shady Grove Road by ICC and you should look

1 at the street. There's wetlands along Brink Road on the, at
2 the intersection of Brink and Goshen. You'll see what
3 mitigation does.

4 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Wenk. Next is Wendy
5 White, and on deck is Denver and Peggy Saunders.

6 MS. WHITE: Good evening. Thank you for the
7 opportunity to speak. I live at 10717 Wayfarer Road in
8 Germantown, Maryland. I'm a scientist by trade. I've
9 worked in pharmaceutical development for over 20 years and so
10 I'm very data-driven, and I question really what the data is
11 here. And the reason I do that is I'm looking at your
12 purpose and need for the first thing is to reduce congestion.
13 I personally don't understand how moving the traffic from one
14 place to another reduces the congestion, okay? You're going
15 to take a ton of traffic and you're going to move it from one
16 place to another place.

17 The existing roads are not meant to handle this
18 increase in traffic, so I echo the concerns that another
19 gentleman very eloquently brought up, that this is just going
20 to be the beginning. You're going to have to widen and
21 increase all these other roads, okay, because they're not
22 meant to handle this traffic.

23 The second thing is that's on a number of your
24 documents is we're going to ease ability to get to Shady
25 Grove Metro. Am I the only person that reads the state the

1 Metro is in? Okay. The Metro keeps announcing that they're
2 close to bankruptcy. They don't have money to increase the
3 number of cars on their trains, okay? Plus, am I the only
4 person that ever goes to Shady Grove Metro? There's already
5 no place to park. So how is adding more cars to a place
6 where there's no place to park going to help? They're going
7 to get there, they're going to have to go drive somewhere
8 else. There's no place to park, okay?

9 So then there's the issues of the planned growth.
10 Someone else brought up that Clarksburg was supposed to have
11 its own places to shop. Okay, I've lived in Germantown for
12 close to 20 years now. I've seen the terrible impact that
13 Clarksburg has put on the shopping communities within
14 Germantown because Clarksburg residents don't have their own
15 place to shop. So we're not sticking with the plan of
16 providing them with the community that they need so they're
17 always traveling to other places in the county to do their
18 shopping, right?

19 Additionally, it's improved commute time. I'd like
20 to know by how much. How much are we improving commute time
21 for \$350 million of our hard-earned tax paying money? I
22 mean, then there's all the data that other people have
23 brought up that's in your own documents. I mean, the most
24 favored alternative, based on your documents, is 9, the 9s,
25 but the 9s impact the greatest amount of the environment

1 which has been echoed by a number of people here and, yes, I
2 agree we can replant trees but we can't re-purify the water,
3 okay?

4 And additionally, those of you that live along
5 Brink Road, a lot of people have spoken about Brink Road,
6 Wightman Road, everything else like that, we have hunting now
7 three times a year for shooting the deer and the big reason
8 that they shoot the deer is because of all the accidents.

9 MS. SAUNDERS: Ms. White.

10 MS. WHITE: Where are the deer going to go now?
11 You're destroying more land.

12 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. White. Next is Denver
13 and Peggy Saunders, and on deck is Sylvia Lake.

14 MS. SAUNDERS: Good evening. We are the Saunders,
15 Denver and Peggy Prather Saunders. Our address is 9520
16 Wightman Road, Gaithersburg, Maryland, and our home is the
17 gateway to the historical community of Prathertown. We have
18 in our hands here this booklet as we all came together,
19 Prathertown then and now, a collection of memories, that was
20 written by my sister, Sharon Prather. This book represents
21 our life and our love for this community.

22 Prathertown is not a community built by investors
23 but it was founded by and homes built by my ancestors, three
24 slaves in 1883. To build a four-lane highway with a five to
25 nine foot retaining wall on Wightman Road would be a disaster

1 to the community and horrifying to us who live along this
2 stretch of highway. Already, we have witnessed numerous
3 accidents resulting in deaths and many close calls because of
4 the speeding vehicles, curves, heavy traffic now on this
5 road.

6 We live in fear each day when we exit or enter our
7 driveways. Someone has even ran into the back of our
8 neighbors when they were trying to enter their driveway.
9 There have been times when we have tried to enter ours and
10 look and see cars speeding down the highway and out of fear,
11 pass our own driveway to avoid a deadly collision.

12 If a retainer wall is built, how will we exit our
13 drives? How will we make left turns? How will we see around
14 the curve? I once heard someone speak against M-83 say to
15 build this road would interrupt established communities, but
16 I ask you this evening how can anything be more established
17 than the community of Prathertown which was built in 1883,
18 and family members and the founders still have homes and live
19 in this community today. Several houses are over 70 years
20 old and my mother, at 95, still lives in the home that she
21 built with my dad.

22 We realize that the community has changed some over
23 the years. However, the solid foundation of this Prathertown
24 community still stands today. Every town should have some of
25 what we have in Prathertown where you see children playing

1 outside, where you see kids playing in the creek, where you
2 see the joy of living and experience walking through the
3 woods to grandma's house. Every community should have what
4 we have. We have several years ago, we released balloons
5 into the air to just thank our ancestors for what they did
6 and how we hope to have this community for years to come.
7 We, yes, we are for M-83 but we are strongly against
8 Alternative 4. We value exactly what we are and we love this
9 community called Prathertown. May God bless you.

10 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Saunders. Sylvia Lake,
11 and on deck is Robert Dyer.

12 MS. LAKE: Good evening, and thanks for this
13 opportunity to express opposition to M-83 but particularly,
14 the Alt 4 alternative. I just want to say that I seem to
15 remember that not long ago, the corridor city's transit way
16 was the looming road infrastructure improvement bringing
17 people to jobs, technology, evading traffic congestion,
18 linking communities in the I-270 Corridor to industries that
19 we want to see growing and thriving in Montgomery County.

20 Now here, it's almost 20 years since I bought my
21 house in Montgomery Village, joined the Board of Directors
22 and had a family. We've been confronted with the prospects
23 of the webbed light industrial track, the Goshen Road
24 widening, Wightman Road widening and the building of high
25 rises on our golf course track. M-83 was always that 20,000

1 pound gorilla hiding in the back room but all residents were
2 in agreement that the destructive impact of this cross-
3 cutting highway would have to our neighborhoods. No one
4 could understand the necessity to bisect an established four-
5 year-old community with another road to nowhere, at least for
6 our residents. What would it do to promote employment and
7 low impact living, yet, each time it was shaded with a dotted
8 line because the road itself was just not tenable.

9 So I've walked through the trail and all the roads
10 and the backyards that take us through the neighborhoods of
11 clusters 1, clusters 2, the Ridges, Seneca Whetstone,
12 Breckman (phonetic sp.) Ridge, Normandy 1 and 2, and one
13 other. I think there's one other community in Montgomery
14 Village that's impacted directly because it abuts the road
15 pathway, and a couple of adjustments need to be made to those
16 homes and the tracts of public ways adjoining those homes.

17 I've walked those paths and I can just say I can
18 see the destruction it will cause. These are exclusive,
19 moderate income-living neighborhoods that have become
20 accustomed to the peace, the quiet, the tranquility that we,
21 I think, deserve because we give up some of the stronger
22 selling points of other communities. Montgomery Village,
23 again and again, residents have given up the choice between
24 having sexy and sellable spaces and retail to having a green
25 and remote way to live. So we fought hard to maintain our

1 quaint, green, quiet living. We don't want a Starbucks and a
2 Target but we want walking paths and we want links to our
3 neighbors' backyards without getting in a car. So we bought
4 into what we would, what I would call an intentional
5 community that is centered around getting our children to
6 school and to the pool without the need to get on the freeway
7 and in this case, to have to run across it either.

8 So please consider, please, when you consider the
9 revised engineering scopes that say less surface area will be
10 impacted and will allow a quote, unquote, greener alternative
11 route, consider the impacts of cutting the thousands of trees
12 that it's going to take to get there. The erosion alone, the
13 increased salinity to the creeks is going to have such a huge
14 impact on the Seneca Creek Trail and --

15 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Lake.

16 MS. LAKE: -- then the noise and the highways of
17 course. So I encourage you to oppose this permitting. Thank
18 you very much.

19 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Lake. Robert Dyer, and
20 on deck is Susan Wenger.

21 MR. DYER: Thank you. I'm Robert Dyer, a life-long
22 resident of Bethesda, and I'm here to ask you to issue a
23 permit for master plan alignment 9A for M-83. This is the
24 master plan alignment and that's very important here this
25 evening. Every person who purchased or rented property along

1 the M-83 right-of-way had a chance to look at the master plan
2 and know that this long planned road might affect them. The
3 other alternatives violate that public trust. The county
4 allowed all the development in Clarksburg and the Up County
5 but they never built this road to support it. Residents of
6 Clarksburg have been lied to for years by developers and
7 county politicians who promised the town center, light rail
8 and the M-83. So far, they got none of those. With M-83,
9 Alternative 9A, the county can finally deliver on one of
10 those forgotten promises.

11 The hard data on transit use shows that no transit
12 alternative will move as many people as the M-83. The
13 failure to build another Potomac River crossing, the
14 Rockville Freeway and M-83 are responsible for the severe
15 traffic congestion between the American Legion Bridge and
16 Frederic, congestion that pollutes our environment with
17 unnecessary emissions proven to cause thousands of deaths
18 each year. Alternative 9A is the first of three positive
19 steps we can take toward ending gridlock in the county and
20 protecting existing homeowners and the rural character of the
21 Goshen area, agricultural historic properties and rural
22 roads. Nothing is more green than our fantastic rural areas.

23 And finally, as someone who has studied history, I
24 know in Bethesda, we have a kinship community not far from
25 where I grew up. There's nothing left of it. There's no,

1 not much history known about it. To have this great resource
2 and legacy of Prathertown, would be criminal to do anything
3 that would affect that or diminish it so I would ask you to
4 look at the facts, look to the hard data. And I know these
5 are difficult decisions and no one's going to be satisfied
6 100 percent but I hope you will look at these hard numbers
7 and then the final equation is to put the residents and
8 citizens first because they're the highest priority when we
9 have to decide between all the options, so I thank you.

10 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Dyer. Susan Wenger, and
11 on deck is Win Wenger.

12 MS. WENGER: My name is Susan Wenger. I live on
13 Perry, Perry Place, North Village in Montgomery Village,
14 Maryland and I'm here to oppose Alternative 4 or 4 modified.
15 I want to abandon my prepared comments and point out that no
16 one has been in favor of Alternative 4. It's not a practical
17 solution. It appears to be in there just to divide people,
18 one neighborhood against another, but to circumvent any kind
19 of path and route traffic in a great big U shape around just
20 doesn't make any sense. It doesn't alleviate traffic. It
21 won't speed up commuting. It's just going to encourage
22 people from elsewhere in Montgomery County to come over maybe
23 from Olney to take this road and it will not alleviate
24 traffic. It will provide noise pollution, air pollution and
25 it will divide Montgomery Village.

1 I've lived in Montgomery Village since 1980 in the
2 same house. I've raised two lovely, intelligent daughters in
3 my home and now I have three grandchildren. And when they
4 come to visit me, we walk to North Creek Park. We will not
5 be able to walk to North Creek Park if, if this road is
6 built. We will not be able to walk to the tennis courts. We
7 will be cut off from Montgomery Village. They won't even be
8 able to walk to high school. My daughters both walk to
9 Watkins Mill High School. They won't be able to walk if
10 there's, if there's a four-lane or a six-lane road there.

11 And in addition, I live near the baseball field at
12 Hurley Park. It primarily serves the 9 to 12-year-old boys
13 and they mostly run around the base paths because the
14 fielding isn't good. They don't catch the ball well. So
15 anyone who can lay bat on the ball gets to first and then
16 steals second, steals third, steals home and runs around the
17 base paths and they're, we don't want polluted air in their
18 little 9 to 12-year-old lungs. On the other side of me is
19 the new Milton Kaufmann Park with the soccer course. That's
20 going to be a whole bunch of kids running back and forth and
21 back and forth and back and forth, and we don't want polluted
22 air in their little lungs either. So I oppose Alternative 4.

23 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Wenger. Win Wenger, and
24 on deck is Cathy Hekimian. Sorry for the pronunciation. Go
25 ahead, Mr. Wenger.

1 MR. WENGER: Thank you for the opportunity, and I'm
2 Win Wenger and my spouse was preceding me. We are homeowners
3 in Perry Place at Gate Court and have been for a number of
4 years. The beginning of the session, you reported a long
5 list of considerations that had to be juggled in arriving at
6 your plans and I think we can all appreciate deeply what a
7 challenge it is trying to balance these things and come back
8 with a resolution that does the most good and does the least
9 harm.

10 And but I noticed that one thing was not on your
11 list of considerations and this is something that you might
12 want to take from this meeting regardless of the decision as
13 to which road goes where, and that consideration is how many
14 children live in and would be affected by the chosen path and
15 along alternative 4 are extraordinarily high portions of
16 children whose lives and safety and health and well-being
17 would be impacted were that unfortunate choice made.

18 I'd like to focus your attention on just one, one
19 intersection, one corner to illustrate a little bit of the
20 disaster that Alternative 4 is posing. That corner, that
21 intersection is where the end of Montgomery Village Avenue
22 crosses Wightman and vice versa. On two sides of that
23 crossing and right on it are two substantial church schools,
24 and the park is adjacent also. And just a few steps away is
25 a daycare center and so on. You can see that there's a fair

1 number of children impacted. And my concern as a human being
2 obviously but also, a concerned taxpayer, is who and which
3 agencies will be likely to be embarrassed and what are we
4 taxpayers, what are we looking at if for health reasons, the
5 health people start closing down or forcing these schools and
6 playgrounds to move?

7 And so I'll confine my remarks to that just because
8 of the time factor, but I do hope that one thing that you
9 carry away from this session and the things that you've heard
10 here today is that we need to figure the impact on children
11 into the considerations that such planning boards and
12 sessions are directed at.

13 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Wenger.

14 MR. WENGER: Thank you.

15 MR. DAVIA: Cathy Hekimian, and on deck is Cindy
16 Snow who had a question mark as to whether you want to
17 comment or not.

18 MS. SNOW: I'll comment.

19 MR. DAVIA: Yes?

20 MS. SNOW: Yes.

21 MR. DAVIA: Okay. No problem. Go ahead.

22 MS. HEKIMIAN: Hi. I'm Cathy Hekimian and I live
23 on Brink Road. I am very strongly opposed to Alternative 4
24 as you might imagine, and I hope that it would be removed
25 from consideration. I can't say anything more eloquently

1 than everybody who's said these, these things before me but
2 it seems like at the beginning when you had like the goals up
3 there, you had reduce congestion, improve vehicular safety,
4 improve commute time, improve quality of life, enhance
5 network of roads and connecting feeder roads. And then
6 earlier, you had the poster session and the poster for Alt 9A
7 said lowest projected accident rate, so there's your safety,
8 shortest travel times, you know, there's your lower commute
9 time, and a wetland impact of less than one acre.

10 On the other hand, all four have the greatest
11 number of failing intersections, it was the furthest from the
12 Technology Corridor, it had the greatest residential property
13 impacts of 242, it displaces two residential properties and
14 the greatest potential noise impact for 417 residences and
15 the greatest amount of pipe streams, 1,202 feet. So I'm kind
16 of wondering why it's still even under consideration.

17 What you need is a limited access highway, and
18 that's what master plan will give you. The development rose
19 up around the right-of-way and I think that you really
20 shouldn't penalize the people who did consult the master plan
21 before they purchased their property. So if you have the --
22 the current stretch of Midcounty Highway is a great smooth
23 moving road and then it abruptly ends in Montgomery Village
24 Avenue. A limited access highway is what is needed to
25 continue a safe and efficient flow of traffic with minimal

1 interference form existing roads and none from private
2 driveways.

3 Alternative 4 has been projected to impact 90
4 driveways, 90. That is not acceptable. Alternative 4 would
5 also impact 25 unsignalized intersections and 13 signalized
6 intersections leading to 125 access points. This will not
7 promote safe, efficient, high-volume 50 mile per hour traffic
8 flow. Why is it still an option? That's what I don't
9 understand. It's the least safe for pedestrians or vehicular
10 traffic. If you're looking to improve the safety and fuel
11 efficiency on the road as well as accommodate future growth,
12 you should rule out Alt 4 and stick with the master plan
13 alignment. Thank you.

14 MR. DAVIA: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Hekimian.
15 Cindy Snow, and on deck is Carlo Crucino (phonetic sp.).

16 MS. SNOW: Hi. Thank you. My name is Cindy Snow.
17 I live in Germantown. First, I want to thank you for your
18 continued attentiveness during this long hearing. As it has
19 been mentioned earlier, times have changed since the master
20 plan M-83 was first proposed. The value of open space and
21 wetlands have become more obvious. It is increasingly
22 apparent that building more roads doesn't reduce congestion.
23 Providing alternatives to driving does. M-83 is intended to
24 provide traffic relief for Clarksburg which is supposed to be
25 a transit-oriented community but no sufficient transit has

1 been provided to date. One Ride-On bus does not cut it.

2 The major flaw with this project is that no
3 realistic transit alternative has been considered by
4 Montgomery County Department of Transportation. I have
5 repeatedly commented that a full-fledged stand-alone transit
6 alternative needs to be developed. Before tearing down trees
7 and paving valuable environmental systems or disrupting
8 communities with expensive road widening, I request that you
9 deny any permits to build M-83 and send it back to the
10 Montgomery County Department of Transportation with a mandate
11 to design and implement a sufficient transit system for
12 Clarksburg before any further consideration of road
13 alternatives be made.

14 Transit can't work if we keep putting our efforts
15 into building roads. It's time to put that effort into
16 building effective transit systems. Please say no to M-83
17 and yes to transit.

18 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Snow. Carlo Crucino.
19 He has a question mark or she. Okay. Next is Paula Sayers.

20 MS. SAYERS: I decided not to speak.

21 MR. DAVIA: Not to speak. Okay, Ms. Sayers. Bill
22 Salvatore. Is Mr. Salvatore here? And on deck is Sam
23 Fanning.

24 MR. SALVATORE: Good evening. My name is Bill
25 Salvatore. I live on Wild Cherry Lane in Germantown. I have

1 lived in that house for 27 years now and we bought it because
2 it was possible to, for our children to walk to the schools.
3 My wife came over and signed up but she warned me about the
4 parking so I took the bus here. I've happy with the transit
5 options and walking and stuff like that, and I am kind of in
6 favor of no build because I really don't see what's in it for
7 me being in Germantown.

8 I feel sorry for people in Clarksburg who were told
9 that they would have transit but, and are apparently not
10 getting transit, so I am especially against Option 9B because
11 the spring retreat centers (indiscernible) the agricultural
12 reserve in our, in our area. I happen to go there from
13 Germantown. I'm not aware of people coming from all over the
14 county just visiting and not being locally connected but I
15 don't, I don't have details about that. Regarding the
16 business that Goshen will grow from 15,000 to 35,000, maybe
17 if roads are not built, people will say well, maybe I
18 shouldn't go there after all and maybe it won't grow to
19 35,000. So roads are the past. Transit is the future.
20 That's, that's my central point.

21 Somebody who lives in the Whetstone area of
22 Montgomery Village told me today that she's really unhappy
23 about the possibility that the road might come right behind
24 her house, that she, she tried to check into it but the
25 realtor somehow legally assured her that there would be no

1 problems with roads being built in that area. So I'm not
2 sure how that could have happened but I just wonder whether
3 people really had the opportunity to inform themselves. So
4 that's the end of my disconnected remarks.

5 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Salvatore. Sam Fanning,
6 and on deck is Dominic DeBiase. Mr. Fanning?

7 MR. FANNING: Yes. I'm a resident of Montgomery
8 Village. I am Sam Fanning. I've traveled all around the
9 roads that are affected by Alternate 4 and there doesn't
10 really seem to be a problem to me. It doesn't seem
11 congested. The main problem seems to me is when you funnel
12 traffic through that area from other regions. If we could
13 just be left alone, it would be all right. And so I say if
14 you got to do any plan other than no-build, stick with the M-
15 83 if you have to do something. And then while I'm on it,
16 also, too, this expansion on Goshen Road, I don't think
17 that's necessary either. Actually, left the way it is as it
18 is now it's part of the countryside, especially that area up
19 by Warfield and Goshen. It just makes it awfully awkward for
20 access and to the churches that are there so I'd say I think
21 no-build is the best thing.

22 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Fanning. Dominic
23 DeBiase. Not here. Okay. Steve Henry, and on deck is
24 Timothy Harums.

25 MR. HENRY: Good evening. My name's Steve Henry

1 and I'm on the Board of Directors (indiscernible). I'm also
2 the precinct chair in 97 which represents over 3,000
3 homeowners. I am totally against M-83 simply because I live
4 in that area where you're talking about and I've got
5 thousands of senior citizens who also live in that area. We
6 are trying to upgrade the property in that area and by you
7 building M-83, you're going to destroy our tennis courts,
8 you're going to destroy our swimming pool, you're going to
9 destroy all the wetlands and the trees and everything else
10 involved in there.

11 But I'm not against everything now. As I talked to
12 Erona Miller (phonetic sp.) over there and George Wang
13 (phonetic sp.) who, I guess he's not here, I have asked
14 several people to send in letters opposing M-83 but I do
15 agree with Alternative 2. That's all I have to say, and
16 thank you very much.

17 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Henry. Timothy Harums?
18 Mr. Harums is not here. Okay. Maureen Johnson, and on deck
19 is James Kempf.

20 MS. JOHNSON: Hi. I'm Maureen Johnson. I live at
21 9510 Dunbrook Court, and that's in Essex Place right off of
22 Wightman Road in North Village and the Alternative 4, the way
23 it's designed, would come right literally up to my backyard.
24 But I want to -- so I am opposed to, obviously, and for my
25 neighbors too because we would lose all our green space that

1 we have, the little bit we have, but I'd like to echo Mr.
2 Fanning because I've lived there, I have a townhouse. I can
3 see Wightman Road from my living room window. I've lived
4 there 27 years so I've seen the traffic on Wightman Road. I
5 can see it daily, and I use Wightman Road, obviously, a lot.

6 And if there is a positive to it, really, there is
7 a lot of traffic on it, especially through these years, but
8 the worst times of the day for traffic is obviously the
9 morning rush hour, 7:00 to 9:00 about, and the evening rush
10 hour, 4:00 to 6:00. I mean, I can literally, in the morning,
11 see the cars backed up from Montgomery Village Avenue to in
12 front of me and in the evening, it's reversed but the rest of
13 the day, the traffic flows both ways. There really is not,
14 it's not like people are stuck in traffic the rest of the
15 day. Those are the worst two times of the day, those short
16 times.

17 So instead of -- it just occurs to me that if those
18 two choke points, like at the Avenue and Wightman and the
19 three-way stop sign down near Brink and Wightman, there's a
20 stop sign so traffic backs up, if those could sort of be
21 improved to make it flow, there is no reason for a four and
22 six-lane road for the, it doesn't make any sense just for
23 these two short times in the day there's congestion. And I
24 just would like to see some -- it just doesn't make any sense
25 so I'd just like to go on the record as opposing the

1 Alternative 4, and thank you.

2 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Johnson. James Kempf?
3 Is Mr. Kempf here? No. Bill Rymer (phonetic sp.)? Mr.
4 Rymer? Tina Slater? And on deck is Michael Branch.

5 MS. SLATER: Good evening. I'm Tina Slater and I'm
6 president of Action Committee for Transit. We're a
7 Montgomery County based transit advocacy group with 500
8 members and we urge you to reject the permit for M-83.
9 Midcounty Highway extended is being offered up at a time when
10 we can consider real transit alternatives to new highway
11 construction to help plan for a sustainable future for our
12 county. The example of Clarksburg's population growth
13 represents the perfect opportunity for Montgomery County to
14 be progressive in implementing viable mass transit systems
15 that will connect activity centers. For that reason, we
16 support the 355 corridor to Clarksburg. Not only would a
17 solid new transit system serve our own Up County residents.
18 It could also serve through commuters from areas north of our
19 county.

20 Regarding tonight's hearing in particular, the most
21 pressing issue is about constructing M-83 and the potential
22 impact on wetlands and aquatic resources. In addition to
23 those impacts, other alternatives of the M-83 various routes
24 could destroy acres of forest, parkland and farmland. While
25 building M-83 may provide traffic relief for a few years,

1 after that, it too will become congested. And further, we
2 need to pay attention to the regional effects of highway
3 expansion on suburban sprawl.

4 Rather than build M-83, we should approve and
5 upgrade the existing Maryland 355. It will cost much less,
6 has fewer environmental impacts and fully supports the
7 development of the high quality rapid transit connecting
8 Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. While MCDOT's
9 report says that rapid transit is too early in the process to
10 be considered, a serious bus rapid transit plan is being
11 considered by the County Council as we speak. It would be a
12 mistake to not evaluate that real transit alternative to M-
13 83.

14 Maryland is committed to smart growth. Just two
15 weeks ago, our governor reiterated Maryland's goal of a 25
16 percent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. In a
17 time of scarce monetary resources and rising environmental
18 challenges like climate change, we cannot afford to make the
19 wrong investments for our future. We urge you to oppose this
20 permit. Thank you.

21 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Slater.

22 MR. BRANCH: Hi.

23 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Branch. On deck is Jim Lucey.

24 MR. BRANCH: Hi. My name is Michael Branch and I
25 live in Montgomery Village, Maryland and I happen to live in

1 Walkers Choice where M-83 would probably hit or come near to
2 hitting. Now, it's probably obvious I have some opposition
3 to that for a lot of the reasons that have already been
4 detailed and listed and explained and well-explored.
5 However, the thing is, I understand everyone's viewpoint. I
6 understand. I have friends that live in Clarksburg that
7 deserve to have what was promised. I understand that. But
8 the thing is, if you look at Northern Virginia, roads don't
9 work. At least they don't always work. And every time a new
10 road is built, you get, you get more congestion.

11 I happen to work at the FDA and one of the things
12 they provide are transit. Now, transit doesn't work for
13 everyone but there are, there are vanpools that go all the
14 way to Clarksburg. I happen to take one of them because one
15 of the stops is on my way home so they stop, drop me off and
16 then they drop the rest of the folks off. So that's one of
17 the things I honestly strongly believe, that I know that one
18 of these things are going to be done but that has to be taken
19 into, into high consideration.

20 I -- someone actually just mentioned widening 355.
21 I'm more in favor of that than anything else because that one
22 thing probably unites us all is that all of us are using that
23 road at some point rather than the other way around, rather
24 than using M-83 or any other -- that, 355, I mean, everyone
25 gets there, uses it so if we add a few more lanes to it, that

1 gives us, that gives more unity to all of us as a community,
2 all of us as Montgomery County citizens. It gives Clarksburg
3 a lot more access to the things that they can get to and
4 probably will allow more exploration into other alternatives
5 to, other alternatives to getting to 270, getting to, getting
6 to the ICC, getting to the places that allow them to get to
7 D.C., to Silver Spring, to the places where they may be
8 working.

9 But I don't think destroying the places that I live
10 and the community -- there was someone, someone talking from
11 Prathertown, talking about community. Well, we've got a
12 pretty tight community what we have. I mean, my kids have
13 been raised, two kids that went to Watkins Mill Elementary
14 and I've got one at Watkins Road, at Montgomery Village
15 Middle School. We've got two dogs we walk every day in that
16 area and many, and many do. We don't want to destroy one
17 neighborhood in favor of another. Thanks.

18 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Branch. Jim Lucy. Mr.
19 Lucy? Jeff Brush? Mr. Brush? James Orbar? Mr. Orbar? The
20 McMichael family? And on deck is Alfman Affay. I'm sorry
21 about the pronunciation.

22 MS. MCMICHAEL: Hi. My name is Melanie McMichael.
23 I'm representing the rest of my family who is not, who has
24 left early. I'm from Wayridge Drive in Montgomery Village.
25 Twenty years ago, my family was drawn by the amazing beauty

1 of the state parkland behind these homes. We bought the
2 house even more because of the parkland than the actual
3 house. Honestly. For the last 20 years, I've joined
4 Montgomery Village residents and countless others in having
5 been blessed to no end by the beauty of this magnificent
6 forest which includes deer, fox, chipmunks, turtles,
7 woodpeckers, hawks, many kinds of owls and even an all white
8 deer.

9 Furthermore, I'm here to represent hikers, bikers
10 and mountain bikers and I oppose M-83 in all of its highway
11 building forms for the sake of the preservation of wildlife
12 and for aesthetic and recreational purposes of our people.
13 This proposed highway will have a terribly negative effect on
14 hiking, biking and mountain biking on the Seneca Greenway
15 Trail. I encourage and challenge each person in this room to
16 go and experience this awesome trail just north and west of
17 Watkins Mill High School on Watkins Mill Road. This amazing
18 beauty for all of us, this amazing place is beautiful and
19 it's for all of us to experience and enjoy, and please do not
20 turn it into concrete. Thank you.

21 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. McMichael. Alfman Atay.
22 I'm sorry about the pronunciation.

23 MR. ATAY: That's good.

24 MR. DAVIA: And on deck is Joanne Atay.

25 MR. ATAY: Good evening. Thank you for giving the

1 time to address the Council. My name is Alfman Atay. I am a
2 resident of the Goshen community. I am here to recommend
3 that the Alternative 4 should be removed from the
4 consideration. I moved to Montgomery Village with my family
5 in early 1972. Montgomery Village was in its early stage of
6 development. Actually, we had to wait for our home to be
7 constructed. As years passed by and more communities
8 continued to grow as part of the approved county plan in
9 order to connect Upper County to the Metro station. First
10 leg of approved connection, Midcounty Highway was
11 constructed. Continuation of the road M-83 was not to be
12 completed.

13 All the housing development around M-83 was
14 developed in accordance with the county-approved plan. In
15 the meantime, we moved to East Village for a short time and
16 then to our present home on Brink Road. We had all the
17 assurances by the county that Brink Road will not be impacted
18 by any future development. Constructing a highway through
19 Wightman and Brink Roads will result in irrevocable changes
20 in the entire area.

21 Historical impact like Prathertown in the oldest
22 African American community in Montgomery County. I call it a
23 living historical community. The descendants of this
24 community still live in the area. Several houses have been
25 designated by the county as historical buildings. There have

1 been archaeological activities conducted by the county along
2 Brink Road for early American settlements in this region.
3 Sites are marked for future studies. During the American
4 Civil War, President Lincoln stationed Union Army troops
5 along the Brink Road, around the Great Seneca Creek to
6 prevent invasion of the Washington capital. At the time,
7 Brink Road was the only connection between Baltimore and
8 Goshen area.

9 Environmentally, wetlands between Brink Road and
10 Goshen Road are the lifesaver for the Montgomery Village.
11 There have been fatalities due to flooding in the past.
12 These wetlands prevent flooding in the Montgomery Village due
13 to recent construction of the bridges and the developments of
14 the wetlands, reduce the flooding in downstream into the
15 village by holding more water in the upstream along the Brink
16 Road. Considerable amount of trees will be cut down. Most
17 of these trees belong to the individual properties and may
18 not be accounted for. Part of this area is designated as
19 reserved agricultural land.

20 MR. DAVIA: Mr. Atay?

21 MR. ATAY: I'm almost done.

22 MR. DAVIA: You can submit your remarks to us as
23 well.

24 MR. ATAY: May I just finish, because I --

25 MR. DAVIA: Just if you can wrap it up in 10 or 20

1 seconds, please.

2 MR. ATAY: Yes. The serenity of the family
3 neighborhood will be lost forever. The people who live in
4 the Wightman/Brink Road Corridor put their faith in the
5 government. They planned their long-term family decisions in
6 accordance with the county, county planning. These plans
7 cannot and should not be altered to satisfy individual
8 grievances, especially if the individual was fully aware of
9 the original planning before they move into the neighborhood.

10 I strongly urge the county to stop this wasteful
11 effort of alternative studies and return to the original plan
12 to construct M-83. It is time to stop the waste of time,
13 money and valuable resources. If we had proceeded with the
14 originally planned M-83, it would have been finished a long
15 time ago and would have provided much-needed relief in the
16 surrounding communities.

17 MR. DAVIA: Okay, Mr. Atay. Please.

18 MR. ATAY: Thank you.

19 MR. DAVIA: Thank you. Ms. Atay. On deck is
20 Destiny Dryley. There's a question mark as to whether you
21 want to comment or not. Ms. Atay.

22 MS. ATAY: Good evening.

23 MR. DAVIA: Stand a little closer.

24 MS. ATAY: Okay. Good evening. My name is Joanne
25 Atay and I'm President of the Goshen Historical Preservation

1 Committee. Thank you. Before moving to Goshen in 1986, I
2 called the Montgomery County Department of Transportation to
3 find out if there were any plans to widen Brink and Wightman
4 Road. I was assured that there were no plans to widen these
5 roads. I was told that they weren't on the master plan and
6 that they would stay as they are. Now its 27 years later and
7 we have this so-called Alternative 4.

8 If this highway is built, Prathertown, of course
9 one of the oldest African American communities in Montgomery
10 County, will be destroyed. Prathertown is a living
11 historical community. The Sarah Posey house would be
12 demolished. Sarah Posey was one of the first Montgomery
13 County minority women property owners. She was the mid-wife
14 of Goshen, and she purchased her unique house, the Posey
15 house, in 1913. The house still has its original structure,
16 the original roof, tin roof, and the original windowpanes.
17 This house is really still in its original state. The
18 highway will also come up to the doorsteps of the other
19 sections of Prathertown on Wightman Road. Who could live in
20 a house with a highway right up to your front doorsteps.

21 Other areas would be adversely affected. At the
22 Great Seneca Creek bridge, Native American artifacts were
23 discovered. Some of them are thousands of years old. The
24 artifacts were related to a Native American community living
25 on the eastern shore. Brink Road was the old Baltimore Road

1 and the bridge at Great Seneca Creek was the only bridge in
2 this, over this waterway for several centuries. The original
3 wooden bridge was initially built by the Dorsey family whose
4 son served in the American Revolution. During the Civil War,
5 President Lincoln had 5,000 troops stationed at the bridge
6 after the Battle of Antietam for fear that there would be an
7 invasion of Washington.

8 Highways are built to take the traffic out of
9 communities. This highway would not alleviate traffic into
10 our communities but it will literally destroy our Goshen
11 community. Please do not support Option 4, but I have a few
12 more things to say. At one time, there was severe flooding
13 from Great Seneca Creek but we have all of these flood planes
14 now which really have spared Montgomery Village. They've
15 been like a sponge.

16 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Atay.

17 MS. ATAY: Yes.

18 MR. DAVIA: If you can conclude, please.

19 MS. ATAY: Yes. Of course. I'm just saying that
20 the flood planes have been, have acted as a sponge preventing
21 flooding from, from Montgomery Village. In the past, I guess
22 at least even or eight people have been killed by these
23 floods. If it was -- the county had planned to build a dam
24 there to prevent this flooding but it was discovered that
25 there were too many historical houses would be destroyed by

1 this dam so they scuttled the project. Thank you.

2 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Atay. Destiny Dryley?
3 I'm sorry about the pronunciation. Is Destiny here? No.
4 Wendy Wilmowski? Wendy? Diane Cameron? Ms. Cameron? And
5 on deck is Michael Weiler.

6 MS. CAMERON: My name is Diane Cameron. I am
7 Conservation Director for Audubon Naturalist Society located
8 in Chevy Chase, Maryland and our focus is on local clean
9 water protection and restoration. On behalf of the 10,000
10 members and supporter of my organization, I urge you to
11 reject the permit application for M-83 and our reasons center
12 on the water resource, environmental and community losses and
13 damages that this highway project would cause and we support
14 Alternative 2 which makes the best use of our existing
15 infrastructure by making improvements to Maryland 355. It
16 also costs the least and enables the development of a high-
17 quality rapid transit service connecting Clarksburg to
18 Gaithersburg and points south.

19 And I want to give you a couple of more water
20 quality-related points. The Seneca Creek Watershed would be
21 degraded by the construction of any of the other alternatives
22 other than Alternative 2. Since Seneca Creek, including
23 Little Seneca Reservoir, is a crucial part of our region's
24 drinking water supply, we need to make source water
25 protection our top priority for land use decisions in the, in

1 the region, including transportation decisions, specifically
2 in the Seneca Creek Watershed.

3 As the Save Ten Mile Creek Coalition has recently
4 been pointing out, we need Little Seneca Reservoir to be
5 ready to serve three million people in the greater
6 Washington, D.C. region as our emergency drinking water
7 supply in the event of severe drought. We know from the
8 experts that there will be more frequent droughts in the
9 future due to climate change.

10 So part of my point to you is that in decision
11 making about M-83 and again, we ask that you reject the
12 permit application, it's not only Montgomery County interests
13 that are at stake. It's also the entire region's interests
14 regarding Little Seneca Reservoir and Seneca Creek itself
15 which are part of the entire Washington, D.C. region's
16 drinking water supply.

17 I also want to note that Seneca Creek is listed by
18 MDE as impaired for sediment pollution and is subject to a
19 final approved sediment total maximum daily load, and that
20 was approved in 2011. This sediment TMDL calls for a 44.5
21 percent, roughly a 45 percent sediment loading reduction,
22 from storm water sources to Seneca Creek and so we want to
23 pose the question to you, to both MDE and the Corps of
24 Engineers, how would the project managers demonstrate that
25 this high way project will be in compliance with this

1 sediment reduction mandate?

2 MR. DAVIA: Ms. Cameron, if you could conclude,
3 please.

4 MS. CAMERON: Yes. So in conclusion, Audubon
5 Naturalist Society requests that you reject the permit
6 application and on the basis that this highway project is
7 also not, not necessary to, and also would cause unacceptable
8 levels of damage to Little Seneca Reservoir and Seneca Creek.
9 Thank you.

10 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Cameron. Michael
11 Weiler.

12 MS. WEILER: Yes. And I am a woman. Good evening.
13 I don't live in the area, I live closer to Flower Hill, but I
14 have a daughter that has recently moved into the Highland
15 Hall area. But I'm against the Alternative 4 and I'm also
16 against most of the building of more roads. I'm in favor of
17 rapid transit and I feel that, that the county has been
18 letting the residents down because they allow building to go
19 on. Like even with Montgomery Village, they should have
20 allowed land to be put aside for the roads so that they
21 wouldn't have to take anybody's property in the future. They
22 should look to the future to know that there's going to be
23 growth and they should have planned for the public
24 transportation before they even allowed places like
25 Clarksburg or other places. And when you're looking at

1 places like the small town in Gaithersburg of the Kentlands,
2 they can walk everywhere, they don't have to take a car.

3 And I understand people have to get to doctors and
4 other places but if you have like in New York City, every
5 other block there's a stop for you to pick up the public
6 transit, then it would be easier for people to take it and
7 they wouldn't have to drive their car on major roads or,
8 which I live, 10 minutes from the Metro., but they would be
9 able just to walk out their door and pick up the public
10 transit and that would benefit everyone all over the whole
11 county.

12 So they should look to the future before they build
13 the communities and allow the developers to build. They
14 allowed developers to build right up where they know the
15 roads are going to be and suspect, unsuspecting on citizens
16 who, who even they change the plans all the time on people
17 even when they've looked up what the roads are supposed to be
18 because I bought and they told me they were going to build
19 Shady Grove further down and that Muncaster Mill wasn't going
20 to be very busy and that hasn't panned out at all and I
21 looked up the things before I bought. So even people who do,
22 things change on them and then they're stuck. My community
23 didn't go up in value and it was supposed to be the next big
24 thing because we're close to the Metro, close to 370.

25 So I just wish that the, I just want, like, people

1 to think ahead and build the roads or build the, put aside
2 the thing for the Metro going down 355 all the way to
3 Frederick because people work all the way to Frederick and
4 it's backed all the way up. So I would like to just see that
5 they do better planning instead of building bigger roads
6 because they're never going to be big enough when you keep
7 adding more people. But if you have rapid transit that has
8 stops everywhere so people don't have to drive their cars to
9 the Metros, then that would solve a lot of the problems.
10 Thank you for your time.

11 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Weiler. Daniel Hussey,
12 H-U-S-S-E-Y? Is Daniel here? Dana Uehling? Dana Uehling?
13 No? Crystal Bivens? On deck is Duane Bivens. Ms. Bivens?

14 MS. BIVENS: Thank you. It's like the Price is
15 Right. I finally got down here. We're the diehard fans
16 here, right? I'm actually opposed to Alternate 4. I have
17 been a Montgomery County resident my whole entire life. I
18 grew up in Bethesda. I moved to Montgomery Village in the
19 '80s and now I live on 21026 Blunt Road, Germantown,
20 Maryland. We're on the corner of Brink and Blunt. We will
21 be having a wonderful four lane highway within six feet of
22 our house with a retaining wall so of course, I'm very much
23 opposed to Alternative 4.

24 I have here when I moved from Montgomery Village to
25 Germantown, the Germantown Master Plan. I actually went to

1 Park and Planning and I picked this up. And not only did I
2 read it but I actually talked to someone at Park and Planning
3 and it says here it's approved and adopted. Our road wasn't
4 even in the study plan or the master plan. I spoke to people
5 at the Park and Planning and they told me that I would be a
6 great-grandmother before I would have to worry about our road
7 being widened. Although this process has aged me, I do have
8 my eight-year-old son with me tonight so I don't think that
9 we're at that point. I can tell you that they said that the
10 only thing that might be added is turn-off lanes and I think
11 that's a phenomenal idea.

12 Unfortunately, we love our property but the
13 intersection, I'm sure the officer that's behind us here can
14 attest to that, we probably have close to 50 accidents per
15 year at that intersection and we call the police or the fire
16 department emergency. We just have to say the name Bivens
17 and everybody knows where we live. So it is definitely not a
18 very good area and if you make it a four-lane highway, I
19 don't even know exactly how that would work.

20 So anyway, positives. The reason why we moved
21 there was first of all, because we were not in the master
22 plan area. We were far enough from ICC that it would not
23 interfere with us. We lived in Montgomery Village as we love
24 the countryside. We live on a two-lane road, which is Brink
25 Road, and we live on a two-lane road which is Blunt Road. We

1 live on two-and-a-half acres of wooded lots. Part of it is
2 not wooded, part of it has mature trees. We liked it because
3 we got to see deer every night, we got to see chipmunks, we
4 get to see groundhogs. We have just now seen the return of
5 hawks and owls that we didn't have.

6 You know, we picked our place because of the school
7 system. Our school actually got redistricted and we paid a
8 premium to live where we do and now, unfortunately, our son
9 won't even be able to get to the high school that we wanted
10 him to. And we also like that we were located across from
11 Seneca Creek. We wanted a place to be where our son could
12 grow up and he could bring his children to, and I would invite
13 all of you to come sit on my porch and watch the beautiful
14 sunrise and watch the sunset from our back.

15 Unfortunately, we are situated on a very steep
16 hill. Even the police officers of Germantown that we
17 requested to have a camera light set up. It's too dangerous
18 of an intersection and too dangerous because people don't go
19 40 miles an hour down our road. They go 60 and 70 miles an
20 hour. You make it a four-lane highway and you're talking
21 about probably 70 on an average. The decibels are already at
22 70 and 80 in the morning and I understand that they feel that
23 a four-lane highway can go above 70 to 80 decibels.

24 The only other thing that I can say as, again, I'd
25 like you to come also on a snowy day. It is a snow emergency

1 route right now and my husband and I are out there in winter
2 pushing all the cars up the road because it's too steep so
3 they would have to completely re-grade the entire road. So
4 again, I feel that Alternate 4 is definitely not the right
5 choice and I ask that you please take it off of the plan.
6 Thank you.

7 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Bivens. Duane Bivens,
8 and on deck is John Yoscak, Y-O-S-C-A-K. Mr. Bivens?

9 MR. BIVENS: Hi. How are you? I appreciate your
10 time and everybody coming out this evening to listen to
11 everybody. As my wife pretty much covered a lot of the key
12 points that I was going to bring up to, grew up in Montgomery
13 County my whole life. Moved from Kensington to Montgomery
14 Village where I met my wife and we lived there for about 10
15 years. Ran across the property that we own now and, at Blunt
16 and Brink Road. The whole concept was we were upgraded,
17 going to pay the extra money to have what they call an estate
18 home which is basically a lot of property, you know, you
19 don't want to hit your neighbors if you throw a rock, that
20 kind, that kind of concept. Now we're talking about looking
21 at this Alternate 4 plan where basically from our living
22 room, we could pretty much throw a rock and hit the wall that
23 is going to be going through our, the corner of our property
24 if this is approved which is definitely not in my favor.
25 Looking at all the other concepts as far as the

1 well and septic issues, I mean, I've tried to get permits
2 with the county before just to put up either a fence or to
3 re-grade my property and I've been told that that's not
4 possible because you're not allowed to change the topography
5 because of the environmental impact. Now you're going to put
6 a road like this through there. It's not a problem. It's
7 going to reset your wells, going to cut your property level
8 down, put your well and septic, going to get replaced, it's
9 not a big deal. Try to get a permit through the, to do that,
10 it's not going to happen.

11 So I have a lot of issues in that, in that concept
12 as far as the environment, the impact it's going to do on the
13 storm drainage. We have a lot of storm drainage issues now.
14 If you start re-grading and changing the topography of the
15 land, you're going to have a lot of runoff and a lot of
16 additional stuff running down into the Seneca Creek and not
17 to mention the roadway without putting in some type of major
18 drainage system. So I, I'll make it short and sweet. I just
19 definitely oppose. Went out to this type of area, this type
20 or property to get away from the hustle and bustle of
21 everything because the environment and now they're talking
22 about altering it. My, You know, my wife and myself did a
23 lot of research into this will never happen and like she
24 said, my eight-year-old son, and we would be grandparents,
25 and that's not going to happen probably. So I'll just cut

1 off with that. I appreciate your time.

2 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Bivens. John Yoscak, Y-
3 O-S-C-A-K? Is Mr. Yoscak here? Richard Veirs? You have a
4 question mark as to whether you want to speak. Is Mr. Veirs
5 here? No? Phillip Mihlmester, M-I-H-L-M-E-S-T-E-R?

6 MR. MIHLMESTER: Mihlmester.

7 MR. DAVIA: And on deck is Patricia Shuster
8 (phonetic sp.) is it? Sir?

9 MR. MIHLMESTER: Hi. Thanks for sticking around so
10 late and listening to all of the different views. First, I
11 want to go on record. I live in Middlebrook Manor. This
12 would be a subdivision that would be directly bisected, cut
13 in half by 8 and 9 alternatives. I strongly oppose that. I
14 strongly oppose Alternatives 8 and 9. The only alternative I
15 can really endorse, along with my elected delegation as
16 evidenced by Delegate Barkley, is Alternative 2, and I would
17 say a couple of things in support of this and things I think
18 the Corps needs to do and the county needs to do.

19 You know, a lot of talk about the master plan.
20 Master plan was developed before every major environmental
21 statute in the United States. It was developed before the
22 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, it was developed
23 before the Clean Air Act of 1970 and it was developed before
24 the Clean Water Act which was 1972. Thank you very much. So
25 the Army Corps of Engineers, as an organ of the United States

1 Government, is obligated by law to enforce the statute to the
2 United States as currently written, as currently on the
3 books, and the master plan has no such legislative
4 requirement. So I would strongly encourage the Corps to read
5 the statutes and enforce the law as it's currently written.

6 And, you know, I can understand why people go back
7 to the, to the master plan but, you know, in the 1960s, we
8 could build houses out of asbestos. Guess what? We can't
9 anymore. In the 1960s, we could build coal fire power plants
10 that had no environmental controls. Guess what? We can't
11 anymore. So there's a set of environmental statutes and I
12 think they need to be closely adhered to and enforced.

13 A couple of other minor points. The DER has no
14 consideration of climate impacts or greenhouse gas impacts.
15 Recent federal NEPA documents, including the Department of
16 State's NEPA document, Affecting the Keystone XL Pipeline,
17 and the Department of Transportation's NEPA document,
18 Affecting the Mileage Standards, both consider climate
19 impacts and I believe that that is now national policy for
20 NEPA documents to consider climate impacts and need to be
21 considered in this document.

22 And a couple other minor points. I think I read a
23 time statistic that the Alternative 8 and 9 options would
24 save a grand total of commuting time of eight minutes on a
25 commute from Rockville to Clarksburg. Eight minutes?

1 Please. You know, eight minute sin this area is in the
2 noise, okay? You're going to spend \$350 million and tear up
3 half the environment to save eight minutes on a commute?
4 It's a joke. Deer population. The county has not been told
5 the deer population, the accident rate from building
6 Alternatives 8 and 9 would result in how many deaths, and I
7 don't know if you've covered that in your safety analysis.
8 Thank you.

9 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Mihlmester. Patricia
10 Shuster? Is she, Patricia here? 21137 Hickory Forest Way,
11 not here? Okay. Question mark next to Martin Haber. Martin
12 Haber? Okay. Mr. George Mencinsky? Is Mr. Mencinsky here?

13 MR. MENCINSKY: Sure. That's me. I guess you
14 should know me. I've written to you back and forth.

15 MR. DAVIA: And on deck is Brent Taylor.

16 MR. MENCINSKY: Hello. My name is George
17 Mencinsky. I'm a professional engineer. I've been in this
18 business for 40 years. I've done many environmental
19 statements throughout my career for the utility industry.
20 I've been on both sides of the fence, on the federal side and
21 on the utility side and on the consultant side. I also am an
22 active professional planner which was licensed in New Jersey
23 too. But anyway, I came here only because I don't want to
24 see the repeats of New Jersey Housewives or Orange
25 Housewives.

1 But really, what I came here basically is to say
2 that Alternative 4 is not an acceptable option. I've sent
3 you something different, a video, of what was to be construed
4 as destruction of Brink Road and Wightman Road and since I
5 couldn't give it to you directly, the file was too big, I
6 posted it this Monday on YouTube. So anybody in the audience
7 who wants to see what kind of damage Alternative 4 causes to
8 the local community, just type in proposed Midcounty Highway
9 abbreviated Brink Wightman. And that's something that I just
10 sat down in a car with my wife, I just videotaped it, went
11 down from the west side of 355, showed you what Brink Road
12 used to look like when I moved there 20 years ago, what they
13 did after they crossed Route 27, Ridge Road, then what
14 happened after they finished the four-lane highway, what was
15 back to what was originally there. And what you're going to
16 see right after Ridge Road is basically what this highway's
17 going to look like, and it's going to be a mess. A total
18 mess.

19 So as far as I'm concerned, this is a totally
20 unacceptable alternative and I don't understand why anybody
21 in their mind was even thinking about it. Speaking about
22 Prathertown, speaking about the historical significance of
23 Seneca Creek, okay? The destruction of the Montgomery
24 Village where the houses are just basically all on Wightman
25 and you're going to put in a four-lane highway. It's nuts.

1 I don't understand how people of some level of intelligence
2 come to a decision to put something like that on a, on a
3 plan, on a study.

4 And one other thing that I'm really thought
5 somebody from the Council, Mr. Rice, would be here, who
6 represents our community, would have some words to say about
7 what's going on and I don't see him here. I realize we have
8 some people generally here from the government, right, but
9 somebody as important as that who represents our community
10 wasn't even interested to come in here and give us our
11 thoughts, what was on his mind about this whole project and
12 listen, listen to his, to the people who voted for him, all
13 right?

14 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Mencinsky.

15 MR. MENCINSKY: Okay.

16 MR. DAVIA: Thank you very much. Brent Taylor?
17 Mr. Taylor? Ronit Dancis. Dancis? And on deck is Terry
18 Lamotte. Go ahead.

19 MS. DANCIS: Hi. My name is Ronit Bitá Dancis. I
20 actually live Down County and I did take the bus here tonight
21 for the record. Although I don't live where exactly, you
22 know, I don't know where my front yard or my neighbors will
23 be affected, affected, the fact is that traffic and transit
24 are county-wide problems. These are county-wide issues. You
25 know, I have friends and family who live in Gaithersburg and

1 Germantown and Clarksburg. Certainly what happens to them
2 affects me but the fact remains again is that traffic and
3 transit affect all of us.

4 We need really regional solutions. We need area-
5 wide solutions and those solutions need to be effective and
6 they need to be long-term. As we see with I-270, if you
7 build it, they will drive on it. They will drive on it and
8 they will drive on it until you have congested traffic. It
9 is possible that M-83 will alleviate some traffic in this
10 area but not for very long. We live in a time of very scarce
11 government resources. In this county, we have cut back a
12 whole bunch of things. We cannot afford to waste money on a
13 solution that will only work for maybe three or four years.
14 We need a permanent long-term solution. Mass transit is that
15 solution. Building this road is not. Thank you very much.

16 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Dancis. Terry Lamotte,
17 and on deck is Terry O'Grady.

18 MR. LAMOTTE: Hi. My name is Terry Lamotte. I
19 live at 22401 Wildcat Road. We -- I'm going to give you a
20 little bit of background. When we moved to the area, we were
21 just enamored with the landscape and the environment and the
22 wildlife that surrounded where we live now. We bought about
23 21 acres and we had the land at first before we built our
24 house and we've since built our house. Of those 21 acres, we
25 have about 11 acres of pristine old grove forest that are

1 about 100-year-old trees which we actually work with the
2 Department of Natural Resources and Conservation with the
3 county to protect. We're also surrounded by parkland and the
4 Seneca Creek stream beds. We also live on Wildcat Road,
5 which is a rustic road and we are on the cover of one of the
6 most recent Rustic Road Reports.

7 So sort of just giving you all this background, we
8 moved here because we really wanted to come to a place in the
9 county where we would be protected from over-development,
10 overgrowth. We really wanted a place where we could have
11 peace and quiet and value the kind of lifestyle which we
12 really wanted which was we wanted to be surrounded by
13 wildlife, we wanted to hike, et cetera.

14 So I say all this because even though we do live on
15 a rustic road, our road is a cut-through for people trying to
16 get through Damascus. And rather than sit on 27, which has
17 not been expanded as the Department of Transportation has put
18 in their report, they cut through our neighborhood instead
19 and every day we have lots of very fast, speeding traffic on
20 very curvy roads and have numerous accidents. We've actually
21 lost our dog. My children have almost been hit by cars. We
22 can't even go to the mailbox without taking our lives in our
23 hands so it's, it's a problem.

24 So I give you all that background because I really
25 appreciate you all being here tonight and listening to

1 everyone's opinions and thoughts on this because I think it
2 has to be a collective effort. I don't think, you know, we
3 can say it's got to go one way or another in terms of you're
4 a community.

5 My point of saying that is I would hope that in
6 your looking at all the different solutions, that when you
7 consider the personal impact to people, that not only do you
8 consider their houses, their homes, their livelihood, but you
9 also consider the environmental impact in terms of how it
10 affects their drinking water and the air that they breathe,
11 and I would just encourage you to really look closely at all
12 of the data that you have before you to make a very good
13 choice in that respect. So in that, I will just say that I do
14 oppose Alt 4, Alt 9 and Alt 8, and I would encourage you to
15 make improvements on your existing roadways such as 355 and
16 27. Thank you.

17 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Lamotte. Thank you.
18 Terry O'Grady, and on deck is Lori Bernstein.

19 MS. O'GRADY: Okay. I'm Terry O'Grady and I'm
20 actually a resident, East Village, a past president of East
21 Village and also with Midcounty Citizens Alliance Group.
22 I've been sitting here most of the evening and I'm really
23 shocked that our communities are all so close but we're all
24 kind of saying hey, not in my backyard and it's kind of
25 really shocking. And I'm going to say something Steve

1 Silverman a long time ago said. Along time ago, said why
2 should you destroy one community to make another community to
3 look better and I think you really should consider that this
4 evening.

5 Just about a week ago, Governor O'Malley just
6 announced funding for the purple line and for the CCT and was
7 very actively involved in the Science City being developed
8 in the web tract of the county service. And one of the
9 stipulations for the Johns Hopkins Science City was that the
10 CCT would be developed before they would even break ground
11 for their science city because they felt transit was very
12 important to the science city. And it was kind of
13 interesting that they're only going to do five miles of the
14 CCT. They're not going to do the other six until they feel
15 that Up County has the population to grant the other six
16 miles which is kind of interesting.

17 So again, of course, I do Metro every day and I was
18 thinking Alternate 5, widening of 355, that is already there,
19 and I believe there was only a relocation of three businesses
20 if you use Alternate 5, 355. This would go all the way from
21 Frederick, almost to all of Clarksburg, all the way down to
22 Bethesda and they have looking, been looking at, for bus
23 rapid and for light rail but this could be setting the
24 foundation for this. This is 2013/2020. We need to get off
25 the roads and get back into transit and hence, Clarksburg was

1 granted transit. I think that the county needs to look and
2 provide transit for the county, for Clarksburg.

3 I ride Metro every day. Shady Grove, there's no
4 parking. If we're going to be feeding all of this traffic
5 into Shady Grove, what is Shady Grove Metro going to do to
6 accommodate these residents? And if you're coming down
7 Midcounty Highway, Shady Grove Road and Midcounty Highway has
8 already failed. How are you going to handle this traffic
9 coming down Midcounty Highway into Shady Grove Road? That
10 intersection is failed, so what are your plans to have this
11 intersection. Okay.

12 Again, transit is the answer, not building these
13 roads. And I want to see the communities come back together
14 again and work as a team, not as not in my backyard. Let's
15 go -- I've talked to a couple folks in the village and
16 they're all in favor of 1, 2 and 5. I think 5 is your
17 answer, 355. It's there. You're only relocating three
18 businesses. You're not going to take somebody's home.
19 You're not going to go in the wetlands. You're going to be
20 relocate three businesses which will be a lot cheaper. Thank
21 you.

22 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. O'Grady. Lori
23 Bernstein.

24 MS. BERNSTEIN: Thank you for taking notes and
25 listening to us in this late hour. I live on Lake Landing

1 Road in Walkers Choice, and M-83 would go speeding right
2 through there, and I really like what some of the people have
3 said. A lot of people have said really wonderful things.
4 Not in my backyard. It goes so far beyond that but it's
5 partly that.

6 I want to urge you to reject the permit application
7 for M-83. I am in favor of Alternative 2 for many reasons.
8 Demographics is kind of like a chicken and eggs thing where
9 you build the highway because they need it but then really,
10 the highway draws the populous, it draws traffic, it draws
11 people and so in the long term, it makes the problem worse.
12 I strongly endorse Alternative 2 though because it's already
13 planned out and I think it's minimal impact on the
14 environment. The plan was -- I also like what someone else
15 said and endorsed about the environmental impact and the laws
16 of the United States have changed since the 1960s. This
17 isn't 1971, 1968 and there are laws now to protect the
18 environment that didn't exist then.

19 On a more personal level, I fear my property value
20 will go down. We're going to be very nervous. My husband's
21 been furloughed. We're, we're dying as it is and then if our
22 property value, we've poured so much equity into our house.
23 What's going to happen to it? How am I going to send my kids
24 to college? I really worry all the time now. Our property
25 value would go down. And then how am I going to tell my -- I

1 had to come here tonight. I have two young children. I
2 couldn't look them in the eye and say well, I didn't care.
3 They'll build a highway. You won't see that blue heron
4 anymore. What's a blue heron? A symbol of Maryland. It's a
5 state bird. We love that heron.

6 We love those bullfrogs. Maybe those bullfrogs
7 that are frogging at 2:00 a.m., maybe you can fool us and we
8 won't hear that highway so well or so they say, but you won't
9 fool them. They'll know and they'll leave, and they're not
10 renewable. Maybe you can cut down a tree and another one
11 will grow back in its place. So I'm endorsing Alternative 2
12 and mass transportation and, please, don't grant a permit for
13 M-83, especially Alternatives 8 and 9. Thank you.

14 MR. DAVIA: Thank you, Ms. Bernstein. Well, again,
15 thank you for your comments. Would anyone else like to
16 comment? We've covered everyone on the list. Would anyone
17 else like to comment?

18 MS. BELL: May I as a question?

19 MR. DAVIA: You're going to, ma'am, you're going to
20 have to, if you'd like to comment, you're going to have to
21 come down to the microphone to get on the record.

22 MS. BELL: Hi. I --

23 MR. DAVIA: If you could state your name and
24 address.

25 MS. BELL: Bonnie Bell. Goshen, Maryland. I just

1 wanted to know if the transcript will be available on line,
2 tonight's transcript.

3 MR. DAVIA: Bruce, do you know if that's -- will
4 the transcript be on a county website?

5 MR. JOHNSTON: We can make it available, yes.

6 MR. DAVIA: The county indicated they can make it
7 available, Ms. Bell.

8 MS. BELL: Thank you very much. Thank you.

9 MR. DAVIA: You're welcome. Ma'am, in the back, if
10 you'd like to comment, please come down. Okay. Well, I'd
11 like to remind everyone that the public comment period
12 extends to August 21st, 2013. Thank you for attending this
13 meeting and for your attention. This public hearing is
14 adjourned.

15 (Whereupon, at 10:51 p.m., the proceedings were
16 concluded.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

✓ Digitally signed by Josephine Hayes

ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers/Department of the Environment/Department of Public Works and Transportation in the matter of:

PUBLIC HEARING

Midcounty Corridor Study

By:

Josephine Hayes

Josephine Hayes, Transcriber