Dinne, John J NAB

From: Katie Blizzard [kblizzard11@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 12:41 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,
Katie Blizzard

Katie Blizzard
7103 44th Street
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Michael Brown [MichaelBrown172@Gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 12:18 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Michael Brown
12120 Flag Harbor Drive
Germantown, MD 20874

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ann Marie Moriarty [oldhouse@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 12:07 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Ann Marie Moriarty
753 Silver Spring Ave.
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Thomas Hubers [tchubers@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 11:50 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed, Thomas Hubers
9301-B Wescott Pl.

Rockville, MD 20850

Thomas Hubers
9301-B Wescott Pl
Rockville, MD 20850

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Sudheer Shukla [sudheerpshukla@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 11:35 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Sudheer Shukla

Sudheer Shukla
14429 Twig Road
Silver Spring, MD 20905

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ralph Bennett [ralph@bfmarch.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 11:25 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, it would be irresponsbile to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Resources are limited - we need to develop alternatives to the car, not accommodation for more of them.

It's time to try alternatives to the roads - like transit.

Ralph Bennett
115 Southwood Avenue
Silver Spring 20901

Ralph Bennett
115 Southwood Ave
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Susan Valiga [sbvaliga@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 11:14 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Susan Valiga
1616 Marshall Ave
Rockville, MD 20851

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Kendra Holt [kendra_music@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 11:11 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Kendra Holt
1111W.Univ.Blvd.
Wheaton, MD 20902

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Robert Portanova [novaport88@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 12:54 AM
To: rudnick.barbara@epa.gov
Cc: epfister@comcast.net; tamecoalition@gmail.com; tws@wildlife.org; rwi3206724@aol.com; ruta1346@yahoo.com; lapp.jeffrey@epa.gov; trice.jessica@epa.gov; cantileb@gmail.com; wmcp1@verizon.net; Rob.Gibbs@montgomeryparks.org; mkmallonee@wjla.com; coachjackmv@gmail.com; jthompson@mde.state.md.us; Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: Nature at it's Best - STOP M-83 HIGHWAY
Attachments: 7-10 021.jpg; 7-10 005.jpg; 7-10 014.jpg

Ms Rudnick -

I'm not the best communicator - I'll let the attached pictures talk for me.

This is where Mr Johnston and Mr Wettlaufer want to build a highway. This is what most of the 5.7 mile proposed route (option 8 & 9) looks like.

You are with the Environmental Protection Agency - you need to protect the Environment, right ?

Please stand up for nature - it needs your voice.

Bob Portanova
Montgomery Village

Dinne, John J NAB

From: William Agnostak [billagnostak@mris.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 2:27 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, storm-water runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Less Density = Less Crime = Less Traffic= Less Pollution=Less Sick Days...Quit Over-Building...It's Montgomery County....NOT Montgomery City!

Signed,

William Agnostak
2 Joshua Tree Ct
North Potomac, MD 20878

Dinne, John J NAB

From: David Dorsey [david_dorsey@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 3:39 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

Please reject the permit application for M83.

This proposed road has been contemplated far too long. I won't repeat the arguments against it because I am sure that you already are far too familiar with them.

Signed, David B. Dorsey

David Dorsey
9407 St. Andrews Way
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Theresa Robinson [theresakrobinson@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 5:03 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

The Rapid Bus Transit projects that have been planned for clogged roads, including Georgia Avenue between Montgomery General Hospital and Glenmont, should be funded rather than the extention of a road. I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Theresa Robinson
4235 Headwaters Lane
Olney, MD 20832

Dinne, John J NAB

From: wobfra@aol.com
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 11:39 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: Comments on Alternatives - Mdcounty Corridor Study Process

Gentlemen,
We rarely bother to comment on issues like this, but believe that when government is faced with a variety of options, that the simplest or most obvious choice is often not selected. With this in mind, we offer support for Alternative 9 Option A (9A). And, we live in Montgomery County with (1) a bag tax to the save the environment, (2) a state rain tax to save the Bay's waters, and (3) reminders that diversity is part of county decision-making process. Now, be sure to check for a summary in the "P.S" at the end.

Mr. Hwang has spoken eloquently and correctly about how many houses will be lost or how traffic flow will benefit with each option, and I'm sure he has expressed concerns about hydrological damages to floodplains, destruction of fresh water wetlands, and disruption of streams that are a product of Alternative 4-Modified that we oppose. Drives along roads to be swallowed up by Alternative 4 (for example, just off the Brink-Blunt Road area) have signs advertising the County's Agricultural Reserve, and a new trail sign (Greenway/Seneca Creek Trail) with shadows that fall on or near a floodplain with wetlands vegetation. There is an existing park near Wightman Road, also with a meandering stream and floodplain, that will be impacted if Alternative-4 Modified is adopted., and that part of Alternative 9 already crosses. Equally interesting are zones with hydrological communications to aforementioned areas, where the county and/or state are expending funds on two new parks or parking lots? while hopefully saving wetlands. And in addition, controlling sediment runoff to the Bay.(see 2) And not disrupting natural recharge to local aquifers. There are rumors that this work is to accommodate losses from the Inter county County Connector; if accurate, someone has to ask who is managing funds when an active proposal (Alternative 4) will destroy areas that the state and/or County are preserving, and sign posting. The good news is (see 1) that there will no plastic bags littering wetlands, whether preserved or destroyed in the future.

Travel along Goshen Road past an historically black, stable community that has been severely impacted by encroachment from Montgomery Village roads and housing. No wetlands there. But road builders might note that two old large trees -once the entrance to a farm close to Prathertown and now townhouses - and be assured that these will not delay construction Nor will the five black motel units already gone (see 3) in the area, if the dashed lines on Alternative 4 maps are current. . .

We support Alternative 9 (A) which completes the Midcounty Highway, and that has been in the Master Plan for years! We urge state environmental -and Corps of Engineers-scientists to take a leisurely drive along Alternative-4 Modified and weigh what damages will accrue to the landscape and rural culture in the County. And be sure to locate the home barber shop in Prathertown (which we hope is licensed) and if illegal, report it.

Regards,
Frank and Rita Wobber

P.S - OK, one of us with advanced degrees is cheating because he led biological-hydrological mapping of many fresh water- and all tidal flowed-wetlands in New Jersey, and can differentiate arrow arum from Spartina alterniflora. And has experience in stream and tide gauging (if not surveying them in) and analysis of aerial photos to set transects and control plots in wetlands leading to maps that meet National Map Accuracy Standards. And, did not work in Maryland's wetlands. But even all this is politics - I'm willing to point

(not slog through sites in hip boots in the heat) Corps and State people to possible biological-hydrological control sites from past construction along Alternative 9 so that future damages from Alternative 4 Modified can be identified, if there's time. How biased? I don't even live in the buff area that is covered on some County maps for Alternative 4, and can watch all the road building from a distance. But I do hate to see Alternative 4 jerk Prathertown around again, and don't want to drive past the environmental damages that Alternative 4 (modified or not) promises the County on my way to some future hearing in Germantown that I really don't want to attend.

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Anne Harpster [harpster77@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 11:30 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

Thank you for your work on behalf of our communities.

I am writing to ask you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,
Anne Harpster

Anne Harpster
13213 Clifton Rd
Silver Spring, MD 20904

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Paul Nahay [pnahay@sprynet.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2013 8:15 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Paul Nahay
1013 Rosemere Ave.
Silver Spring, MD 20904

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Marty and Susan Hoffman [martysusan@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2013 5:52 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.The success, or failure, of the ICC should be factored into the equation, and the senseless building of more roads should be questioned seriously.

Signed, Susan and Marty Hoffman

Marty and Susan Hoffman
12625 Billington Road
Silver Spring, MD 20904

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Sebastian Smoot [sebsmoot@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2013 3:41 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Sebastian Smoot
1200 Rainbow Dr
Silver Spring, MD 20905

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Linda Miyoshi [healthyplum1@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2013 10:32 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Linda Miyoshi
709 tanley rd
silver spring, MD 20904

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Elizabeth Ashburn [elizabeth.ashburn@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2013 10:13 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I strongly urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and it comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the fewest impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than using our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Elizabeth Ashburn
21000 Father Hurley Blvd
Germantown, MD 20874

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Noel Danforth [danforthbjj@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2013 8:29 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Noel Danforth
118 Swanton lane
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Diacorda Amosapa [diacorda@gmx.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2013 4:29 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. Your leadership in supporting a vision of long-term sustainable transportation would greatly benefit our shared community.

I am troubled by several key environmental and community issues to related to this proposed project. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would also divide existing communities, which is something I am particularly concerned about, not to mention other associated avoidable air pollution and its health impacts and noise impacts.

One other pressing issue about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Let's please keep in mind some of the important functions that wetlands serve for our community. The crucial and practical value of wetlands can sometimes get lost in all the details. Wetlands feed and filtrate downstream waters and groundwater supplies, which directly or indirectly make up our precious drinking water. They also help to reduce the damaging impact of flooding. Lost wetlands can result in our county having to needlessly sypon more money into drinking water treatment and increasing costs to residents for flood insurance.

Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Sincerely,

Diacorda Amosapa

Diacorda Amosapa
4915 Boiling Brook Pkwy
North Bethesda, MD 20852

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Mike Stein [Mkstn5@me.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 9:27 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Mike Stein
Atlantic ave
Rockville, MD 20851

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ari Reeves [areeves@world.oberlin.edu]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 9:04 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Ari Reeves
10315 Brunswick Ave
Silver Spring, MD 20902

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Quon Kwan [qykwan@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 8:51 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Quon Kwan
14913 Bauer Drive
Rockville, MD 20853

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Barbara & Walter Deyhle [deyhles@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 4:15 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustbainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Barbara & Walter Deyhle
10712 Seneca Spring Way
Montgomery Villlage, MD 20886

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Dorothy Tartaglia [dlfifitag01@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 3:10 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Dorothy Tartaglia
2423 Dennis Ave.
Silver Spring, MD 20902

Dinne, John J NAB

From: James Mullins [mullinsj@cua.edu]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 2:01 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

James Mullins
9618 Brunett Ct
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Rick Venable [rick.venable@verizon.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 12:30 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Rick Venable
802 Wade Ave
Rockville, MD 20851

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Steve Sacharoff [stevesacharoff@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 9:29 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Steve Sacharoff
5011 Barkwood Pl
Rockville, MD 20853

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2013 9:01 AM
To: mcavoy.meghan@gmail.com
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Dear Ms. Mcavoy:

Thank you for your email, sharing your thoughts on the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS), and expressing your support for Alternative 2. I hope that you were able to attend the August 7, 2013 Joint Public Hearing and express your concerns.

It has taken close to ten-years to study the eleven different alignments that would provide congestion relief and improve vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility for the corridor east of I-270 between Clarksburg and Gaithersburg. MCDOT will certainly give consideration to the impacts any proposed improvements will have on our social, cultural, and natural resources. As the MCS concludes, I assure you that the Preferred Alignment, when selected, will be designed in an environmentally sensitive manner using measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts.

Your comments below will be forwarded to the US Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District (COE) and the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) for their review and consideration. Again, thank you for taking the time to share your concerns with me.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

cc: sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil

-----Original Message-----
From: Meghan Mcavoy [mailto:mcavoy.meghan@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 11:19 AM
To: Ike Leggett
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4,

8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Meghan Mcavoy
1200 Blair Mill Rd
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Lydia Sullivan [lydiasullivan42@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 7:42 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I oppose M83 Extended. At a time when Montgomery County is in desperate need of public transportation - especially in upcounty - building a six-lane highway is unwise and inevitably will lead to more sprawl. This is at a time when we are ostensibly pushing transit oriented development as a county. It just doesn't make sense. It's 2013, not 1953.

M83 will also despoil the environment in upcounty.

Please do not approve this expensive and unwarranted road. It's so 20th Century. Change spending priorities to public transit like BRT.

Thank you.

Signed,

Lydia Sullivan
5901 Montrose Road, N506
Rockville, MD 20852

SOUTH VILLAGE HOMES CORPORATION

10120 APPLE RIDGE ROAD
MONTGOMERY VILLAGE, MARYLAND 20886-1000

(301) 948-0110 FAX (301) 990-7071 southvillagehc@.mvf.org

July 29, 2013

RECEIVED
DOT

AUG 02 2013

DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION
ENGINEERING

Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager
Midcounty Corridor Study
Div. of Capital Development,
Dept. of Public Works & Transportation
101 Monroe Street, 9th Floor
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear Mr. Hwang:

I am writing on behalf of the South Village Board of Directors to inform you that the Board supports Midcounty Corridor Study Alternatives 1, 2 and 5. The Board continues to ask that the Midcounty Corridor Study Team be directed to expand the study area to include the vicinity west of 1-270 and develop additional options/alternatives in the broadened area that includes Great Seneca Highway. By including Great Seneca Highway in the study corridor, a more accurate north/south traffic congestion pattern between Clarksburg and Gaithersburg would be addressed. Additionally, we think priority should be given for funding to study and implement transit projects like those described in the proposed County Rapid Transit Vehicle (RTV) system.

We believe that the improvements called for in Alternatives 1, 2 and 5, combined with the two significant baseline projects – widening of 1-270 from Shady Grove Metro to 1-270 and building of the Rapid Transit Vehicle System and the broadening of the study area to include Great Seneca Highway will be adequate to accommodate the projected transportation demands. Alternatives 1, 2 and 5 include the baseline transportation projects of every mode that appear in the Constrained Long Range Plan through the year 2030. This is a significant list of improvements.

Alternative 1, No-Build, would have no negative impact on Montgomery Village. Alternative 2 provides for significant intersection improvements along MD Route 355 as well as at other key intersections. Alternative 5 includes more aggressive improvements than Alternative 2 on more intersections on MD Route 355. And, while this requires more right-of-way on MD Route 355, it is a road that *already exists* and, along with 1-270, is the logical route for north-south traffic use.

By way of background, we have long vehemently opposed construction of Highway M-83 for environmental, vehicular and pedestrian safety reasons. The portion of M-83 between Montgomery Village Avenue and Brink Road would, according to data included in the 1992 comprehensive

environmental documentation report prepared for the County by Kaiser Engineers, Inc., cause seven out of eight sub-watersheds in the area to exceed 10% imperviousness. Has this figure changed in the more recent environmental report?

In addition, the overall impact of building M-83 between Montgomery Village Avenue and Brink Road on vehicular and pedestrian traffic along Watkins Mill Road is disturbing. We believe the increased vehicular traffic near the 4 schools along or adjacent to Watkins Mill Road within Montgomery Village would be hazardous to our children every day and particularly hazardous for students, parents and staff of Watkins Mill Elementary School, which is only about 400 feet from a proposed intersection with Watkins Mill Road.

The portion of proposed M-83 from Montgomery Village Avenue north to Brink Road also would negatively impact our immediate neighbors. The M-83 right-of-way slashes through parklands, traversing a flood plain where heavy flooding has occurred in past years, and would necessitate a stream relocation. M-83 would encroach on Blohm Park, Great Seneca Park, and North Germantown Park. M-83 would come perilously close to the Christopher Court and Normandie I condominiums, and portions of the Stedwick community. It would destroy wetlands and require very expensive construction to cross Seneca Creek.

In summary, we support Alternatives 1, 2 and 5 for detailed study, widening the study area to include Great Seneca Highway and prioritizing funding for a multiple line RTV system over adding more new road lane miles. These improvements, when combined with the widening of 1-270 and implementation of RTV, should be sufficient and will not have disastrous environmental consequences or unduly negatively impact the Montgomery Village community.

Sincerely,

Robert Sparks, President
South Village Homes Corporation

cc: The Honorable Ike Leggett
The Honorable Roger Berliner
Bruce Johnston, Chief, Div. of Transportation Engineering
MVF Board of Directors
MVF Presidents' Council

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Stephen Schlaikjer [sschlaikjer@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 10:32 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: M-83 - Despoil Watershed at Great Expense

4 August 2013

Dear Sirs,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Finally, the benefits of this expensive "solution" to transport woes caused by the County Council's own bad planning (clearly influenced years ago by powerful development interests

which have promoted sprawl in the place of job creation) are patently being oversold by the project's boosters within the County Council and staff. For those who commute by automobile from the Upcounty region towards the I-495 Beltway and beyond, all M-83 provides is an alternate route to gridlock, a few more miles of idling in a different pattern on the way to a bottleneck. Nowhere south of the planned M-83 connection to the Mid-County Highway is I-270 going to get any wider than its already massive 12 lanes. Smart transit (mainly bus-to-Metro) options, combined with improvements to existing roadways like the 355 corridor, will be cheaper, reap greater return on investment, and avoid despoiling one of the county's remaining green reserves--which should have been off-limits from the beginning.

Signed,

Stephen A. Schlaikjer
11102 Sceptre Ridge Ter.
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Miti Figueredo [miti.tim@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 9:06 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Miti Figueredo
5 Hilltop Rd
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dinne, John J NAB

From: P. Carol Bullard-Bates [cbb49@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 3:16 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

P. Carol Bullard-Bates
10702 Lombardy Rd
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Mark Firley [mjfirley@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 12:23 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Mark Firley
554 N Frederick Ave #209
Gaithersburg, MD 20877

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Jeremy Nathan Marks [thecavesofaltamira@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 10:52 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Jeremy Nathan Marks
13911 Flint Rock Road
Rockville, MD 20853

Dinne, John J NAB

From: James Campbell [jcampbell@somersetdev.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 10:17 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

James Campbell
5516 Uppingham Street
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ruth Bletzinger [rbletzinger@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 10:13 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Ruth Bletzinger
213 Leighton Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Tom Grass [tgrass60@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 10:05 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Tom Grass
13500 Clear Morning Place
Germantown, MD 20874

Dinne, John J NAB

From: GJM [jurij@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 11:40 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Public Comments on draft EER for the Mid-County Highway Alternatives

Mr. Jack Dinne, CENAB-OP-RMN
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Baltimore District
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715

Mr. Sean McKewen
Maryland Department of the Environment
Wetlands and Waterways Program
160 South Water Street
Frostburg, Maryland, 21532

Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager
Midcounty Corridor Study MC-DOT
100 Edison Park Drive, 4th Floor
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Gentlemen:

This letter provides my initial public comments on the Draft Environmental Effects Report (DEER) on the Midcounty Corridor Study known as Master-Planned route - M83. The public now has an opportunity to present views, opinions and information which will be considered by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) in evaluating Montgomery County Department of Transportation's (MCDOT) permit application. The comment period ends August 21, 2013. The following are my comments with respect to this study for selecting a preferred highway route to complete the Midcounty Highway.

1. The M83 Route in the original master plan should be selected as originally planned which is Alternative 9. This proposed route was on record when I moved here over 20 years ago to Maryland. It provided me then as to how Montgomery Upcounty highway road M83 would be developed in anticipation of population growth. Land was already designated at the time with signs posted in affected areas and land was set aside in some areas to take care of the M83 route under consideration. Deviation from this proposed route will create a situation where all those communities affected by other proposed alternatives will be in disagreement with each other as to a preferred route for M83. Stick to the original master plan and don't create chaos and resentment within the public communities at large by changing from the original proposed selected route.

2. I strongly oppose Alternative 4 (Brink, Wightman, etc). I live along this route and it would be a complete utter environmental disaster to

construct the highway in place of the current 2-lane County road. The road is lined with beautiful dense trees, shrubs and properties on both sides of Brink Road after Wildcat Road going East. It used to be that way going West from Wildcat to Ridge Road (Route 27) until the County decided to turn that portion of Brink from a 2-lane into a 4-lane road. It looks awful with the destruction of the vegetation and trees that used to line that potion of Brink. Now MCDOT wants to do this for the rest of the route known as Alternative 4. That's irresponsible and Alternative 4 should be dismissed as a viable alternate route.

3. Going further East along Brink Rd. you get to the Montgomery County wildlife and Agricultural State Preserve near the Great Seneca Steam Valley Park near the intersection of Brink and Wightman Road. This is State property that was set aside for not to be disturbed. People enjoy this area for hiking along the stream. Also there is a historical site marker at this intersection to describe the importance the bridge crossing carried during the Civil War over Great Seneca stream. The 4-lane highway would cut right through it.

4. Next down the road is Prathertown on Wightman Road. This is a historical area where a small African-American community was founded in 1883 by freed slaves. This proposed highway alignment would cut right through these properties. What is being proposed here is absolutely without merit and by itself should eliminate this Alternative 4 from consideration.

5. We have in this County a task force referred to as Keep Montgomery County Beautiful. I would expect this task force has been involved with this project from the start. In my opinion the county road (Brink) should be designated as a Maryland Scenic By-Way route by the County instead of considering to build a new highway in its place.

6. Selecting Alternative 4 makes no sense as a highway to relieve traffic from upcounty residents. The County never considered Brink/Wightman, etc. as a major thoroughfare ever nor was there ever any kind of public transportation (buses) assigned to this route on Brink and Wightman. This is a East-West alignment instead of a North-South corridor as was planned for M83. The only purpose of M83 as I see it was to connect it to the Shady Grove Metro Station so more people would use public transportation to get to points south toward Washington, DC. Alternative 4 does not accomplish this purpose. There are no major large corporate facilities along this route that would shorten commuting times. This is an alternative where time and money was wasted on studying a dubious route on this project.

7. To quantify results as High, Moderate, and Low provides rudimentary thinking as to the impacts. What is required is to quantify the results with a definition as what the stated category means and what the impact effects are to make it fall in the selected category.

8. There are no words to describe how terribly Alternative 4 will impact the quality of life for those living along this proposed Alternative 4. The destruction of flora, the destruction of the aesthetic beauty, condemnation of prime properties, displacement of property owners, lowering of property values, increased traffic, air pollution, noise pollution, well contaminations, increased road kill due to large local fauna population, construction activities, unsafe traffic situations,

speeding, etc. This is just an irresponsible choice by the County to destroy the peace and tranquility of the present neighborhood community. The negative impacts of Alternative 4 are overwhelming to me.

9. During the August 7, 2013 public meeting I plan to show a short video (7 minutes) of the Brink/Wightman route as it looks today (taken yesterday) and let you visualize what this highway will destroy if it is selected as the preferred route. The video file is too large to attach to this email.

My recommendation is to stick with the original Master Plan for M83 Plan Route and that is Alternative 9.

George J. Mencinsky P.E.
21104 Kaul Lane
Germantown, MD 20876
301-869-3224
August 5, 2013

Dinne, John J NAB

From: GJM [jurij@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 11:40 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Public Comments on draft EER for the Mid-County Highway Alternatives

Mr. Jack Dinne, CENAB-OP-RMN
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Baltimore District
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715

Mr. Sean McKewen
Maryland Department of the Environment
Wetlands and Waterways Program
160 South Water Street
Frostburg, Maryland, 21532

Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager
Midcounty Corridor Study MC-DOT
100 Edison Park Drive, 4th Floor
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Gentlemen:

This letter provides my initial public comments on the Draft Environmental Effects Report (DEER) on the Midcounty Corridor Study known as Master-Planned route - M83. The public now has an opportunity to present views, opinions and information which will be considered by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) in evaluating Montgomery County Department of Transportation's (MCDOT) permit application. The comment period ends August 21, 2013. The following are my comments with respect to this study for selecting a preferred highway route to complete the Midcounty Highway.

1. The M83 Route in the original master plan should be selected as originally planned which is Alternative 9. This proposed route was on record when I moved here over 20 years ago to Maryland. It provided me then as to how Montgomery Upcounty highway road M83 would be developed in anticipation of population growth. Land was already designated at the time with signs posted in affected areas and land was set aside in some areas to take care of the M83 route under consideration. Deviation from this proposed route will create a situation where all those communities affected by other proposed alternatives will be in disagreement with each other as to a preferred route for M83. Stick to the original master plan and don't create chaos and resentment within the public communities at large by changing from the original proposed selected route.

2. I strongly oppose Alternative 4 (Brink, Wightman, etc). I live along this route and it would be a complete utter environmental disaster to

construct the highway in place of the current 2-lane County road. The road is lined with beautiful dense trees, shrubs and properties on both sides of Brink Road after Wildcat Road going East. It used to be that way going West from Wildcat to Ridge Road (Route 27) until the County decided to turn that portion of Brink from a 2-lane into a 4-lane road. It looks awful with the destruction of the vegetation and trees that used to line that potion of Brink. Now MCDOT wants to do this for the rest of the route known as Alternative 4. That's irresponsible and Alternative 4 should be dismissed as a viable alternate route.

3. Going further East along Brink Rd. you get to the Montgomery County wildlife and Agricultural State Preserve near the Great Seneca Steam Valley Park near the intersection of Brink and Wightman Road. This is State property that was set aside for not to be disturbed. People enjoy this area for hiking along the stream. Also there is a historical site marker at this intersection to describe the importance the bridge crossing carried during the Civil War over Great Seneca stream. The 4-lane highway would cut right through it.

4. Next down the road is Prathertown on Wightman Road. This is a historical area where a small African-American community was founded in 1883 by freed slaves. This proposed highway alignment would cut right through these properties. What is being proposed here is absolutely without merit and by itself should eliminate this Alternative 4 from consideration.

5. We have in this County a task force referred to as Keep Montgomery County Beautiful. I would expect this task force has been involved with this project from the start. In my opinion the county road (Brink) should be designated as a Maryland Scenic By-Way route by the County instead of considering to build a new highway in its place.

6. Selecting Alternative 4 makes no sense as a highway to relieve traffic from upcounty residents. The County never considered Brink/Wightman, etc. as a major thoroughfare ever nor was there ever any kind of public transportation (buses) assigned to this route on Brink and Wightman. This is a East-West alignment instead of a North-South corridor as was planned for M83. The only purpose of M83 as I see it was to connect it to the Shady Grove Metro Station so more people would use public transportation to get to points south toward Washington, DC. Alternative 4 does not accomplish this purpose. There are no major large corporate facilities along this route that would shorten commuting times. This is an alternative where time and money was wasted on studying a dubious route on this project.

7. To quantify results as High, Moderate, and Low provides rudimentary thinking as to the impacts. What is required is to quantify the results with a definition as what the stated category means and what the impact effects are to make it fall in the selected category.

8. There are no words to describe how terribly Alternative 4 will impact the quality of life for those living along this proposed Alternative 4. The destruction of flora, the destruction of the aesthetic beauty, condemnation of prime properties, displacement of property owners, lowering of property values, increased traffic, air pollution, noise pollution, well contaminations, increased road kill due to large local fauna population, construction activities, unsafe traffic situations,

speeding, etc. This is just an irresponsible choice by the County to destroy the peace and tranquility of the present neighborhood community. The negative impacts of Alternative 4 are overwhelming to me.

9. During the August 7, 2013 public meeting I plan to show a short video (7 minutes) of the Brink/Wightman route as it looks today (taken yesterday) and let you visualize what this highway will destroy if it is selected as the preferred route. The video file is too large to attach to this email.

My recommendation is to stick with the original Master Plan for M83 Plan Route and that is Alternative 9.

George J. Mencinsky P.E.
21104 Kaul Lane
Germantown, MD 20876
301-869-3224
August 5, 2013

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Mathews, Chris [cmathews@segalco.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 9:28 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: Alternatives to Complete the Midcounty Mill Roads

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen:

I have lived in Montgomery County since 1977, all of those years in Montgomery Village and Germantown. When we moved to Montgomery Village we were aware of the Master Plan to build the Mid-County highway and that the plan included extending it along the M-83 route. It was common knowledge and certainly a point of discussion by residents of Montgomery Village when the Mid-Highway construction was begun and stopped at Montgomery Village Avenue back in the 1990s.

Clearly no one wants a highway built through their neighborhood and deal with the disruption, noise, and pollution that it causes. We all value the green space that has been protected by the Master Plan developed many years ago. The Master Plan was intended to provide guidance and awareness to the public and is in effect a compact between the citizens and government. It seems to be that for the government to violate this compact would require extraordinary circumstances. No such extraordinary circumstances have been presented and without such any change would be a violation of the public trust. We chose to move to the Brink Road/Blunt Road area to find some relief from the congestion of Gaithersburg and Montgomery Village. This decision was made, trusting that the government would honor its compact with the citizens and follow the Master Plan when there was a need to expand roads and infrastructure. We value the beautiful Agricultural Reserve and chose to live near it for its beauty. Now that eco-system is endangered if Brink Road is expanded, putting pressure on those many acres of sensitive marsh lands, forest, and habitats.

The decision to violate the Master Plan should not be a decision to follow the will of the loudest voices, but should be made based on rational planning, the environmental impact, damage to private property, and the result on future traffic flow. To me, the decision is an easy one and very logical. Let me summarize why I am in favor of Option A - M-83 to complete the Midcounty Highway, connect Snowden Farm Parkway, and complete a critical part of the planned transition solution for upper Montgomery County:

* M-83 has been a planned part of the Upcounty transportation system for over 30 years
* There are no extraordinary reasons to change the Master Plan, except politics
* M-83 is part of a system designed and planned to tie together feeder roads, relieve MD 355 of heavy traffic and keep local traffic off I-270, reducing congestion over a wide area.
* The right of way has been well known and publicly disclosed and reserved from development since the 1960s.
* Adjacent development has been designed to be compatible with this highway and as a result,

* there are only 13 intersecting access points (the lowest of all alternatives) for Alt. 9 Option A;
* no homes or businesses will be lost to M-83, if Alt. 9, Option A is chosen;
* traffic safety is greatly reduced with M-83
* travel times are minimized and
* fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emissions are minimized.

* We need mass transit, and in this area busses are the alternative, but busses will not be efficient if the roads they travel are congested. M-83 can be more easily configured with an express lane
* Alternative 9, Option A (M-83) has been a part of the Master Plan for decades, since the 1060's - Gaithersburg Vicinity Master Plan adopted in 1971, January 1985, 1998, 1990; Germantown Master Plan 1989; Clarksburg Master Plan & Hyattstown Special Study Area 1994
* Alternative 9A destroys less than one acre of wetlands.

I appreciate your consideration and urge you to follow the Master Plan and support the compact made with the citizens of Montgomery County and approve the M-83 Option.

Best regards,

Christopher J. Mathews

21500 Blunt Road
Germantown, Md 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Kenneth Landon [kpljr@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:06 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,
Kenneth Landon

Kenneth Landon
10000 Raynor Road
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Denise Kearns [kearns67@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 8:48 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I strongly urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Mid-county Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County that also consider the fiscal responsibility to the county. The County Council recently debated whether M-83, Alternative 9, was the best choice. Rob Robinson, Gaithersburg's city long-range planner, recently stated in The Gazette, that the costs of M-83 Alternative 9, outweigh the benefits.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. It is clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least (about $41 million), has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,
Denise Kearns

Denise Kearns
Yellow Leaf Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Rosemary Ward Mack [srwm06@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 7:55 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

Please!!!!!

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bulldozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted storm-water runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is ALTERNATIVE 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Rosemary Ward Mack

Rosemary Ward Mack
19944 Choctaw Court
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Doug Reed [douglas_reed@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 4:23 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Doug and Carolyn Reed

Doug Reed
1602 tanyard hill road
gaithersburg, md, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Joshua Schuman [Joshuaschuman@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 1:30 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Joshua Schuman
1707 logmill ln
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Donna Brothers [donnabrothers@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 1:13 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Donna Brothers
1701 Logmill Lane
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: feng shi [shifeng6198432@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

feng shi
221 high timber ct
gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: wenlei zhu [minisabba@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 11:24 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

wenlei zhu
221 high timber ct
gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Lonnie Lee [lonniejlee@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 11:50 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Lonnie Lee
1304 Cresthaven Dr.
Silver spring, MD 20903

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Malcolm Munro [coachmunro@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 10:36 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

Dear Army Corps of Engineers, Maryland Department of the Environment, Montgomery County Department of Transportation, the County Executive, Montgomery County Council, Montgomery County Planning Board, and the EPA.

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of

nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,
Malcolm O. Munro

Malcolm Munro
10713 Autumn Leaf Place
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Laura Markus [soldbylaura@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 10:21 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

Good Day,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Laura Markus
1758 Wayfarer Road
Germanton, Md. 20876

Laura Markus
10758 Wayfarer Road
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Barbara McCann [barbara@bmccann.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 6:38 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. We need to upgrade existing roadways and provide more public transportation and more ways for people to walk and bicycle in the mid-county. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and will make it even harder to achieve the type of community that people in Montgomery County want. We know that upgrading 355 would achieve the same ends: let's save money and time and just do that.

Signed,
Barbara McCann
Clarksburg

Barbara McCann
26601 Haines Rd.
Clarksburg, MD 20871

Dinne, John J NAB

From: JB Austria [jbaustria@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 8:08 PM
To: sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB; Dinne, John J NAB
Subject: No to M-83

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewan,

Good day. We are residents of Montgomery Village who commute everyday from Montgomery Village to Silver Spring. The commute is challenging to say the least. It will be nice to have a solution to the I-270 gridlock.

However, we think that M-83 is NOT the solution to the problem. We are very concerned with the study/report provided by the Department of Transportation (DOT) on the various Alternatives to building M-83. Given the possible material impact on the environmental and the community from M-83 or any of the proposed Alternatives, it seems that DOT did not perform its essential task to provide the Council with an impartial and comprehensive study. It is clear that in examination of Alternative 4, due diligence was not performed in assessing a more reasonable, narrower variant; rather, a 6-lane option that exceeds the current 80 foot right of way was proposed. Moreover, Alternative 4 was not studied in tandem with improvement of 355 and thus deprives the County Council of a full and accurate picture of what the no-build options to M-83 truly look like.

As homeowners in the Stedwick neighborhood of Montgomery Village, who would be directly impacted by the M-83 decision, we are very concerned that a less than thorough examination of key alternatives was conducted. Our quality of life, our community and our property values are deeply affected by the decision that will be made about whether to build out M-83 or its various alternatives. Thus, it is absolutely critical that the current study be rejected as a fair and accurate assessment.

Sincerely,

J.B. and Joy Austria

10705 Seneca Spring Way

Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Tina .. [ghuplz@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 6:34 PM
To: greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; arthur.holmes@montgomerycountymd.gov; rudnick.barbara@epa.gov; Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; councilmember.riemer@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.rice@montgomerycountymd.gov; Councilmember.ervin@montgomerycountymd.gov; Councilmember.navarro@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.berliner@montgomerycountymd.gov; Councilmember.Elrich@montgomerycountymd.gov; Councilmember.Leventhal@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.andrews@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.floreen@montgomerycountymd.gov; sos@iwla.org
Subject: RE: reject of m83 through south village, please pass to army corp of engs

Dear Important People in charge of our welfare:

We are encouraged to modify this letter, i suppose to make it sound like our own. But the truth is, i agree 1000% w/it so i won't modify it. I will simply add and beg you NOT to let this road go through South Village. I live on Walkers Choice and rely heavily on the outdoors, ponds, paths, greenery to give me peace of mind when im at my HOME.

I LOVE nature and you will be destroying it and my peace of mind and 100's of thousands more. We paid high prices for these homes and we deserve to live in peace, along with the critters that brighten our days and hte QUIET that consoles our soles as we try for peace at night when we sleep OR RELAX. THIS IS NOOOTTTTTT A GOOD IDEA going through south village. Choose another path for this extension! Snoufers school seems best.

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Tina M. Burton, RESIDENT, not commuter! (well, I do commute but only down the road. And i do feel for fellow commuters but i'm sorry, find an alternate way of making their lives better instead of ripping ours apart!

240 899-8089

Dinne, John J NAB

From: GJM [jurij@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 3:53 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Seneca Valley H.S. Public Hearing Location for MidCounty Highway Route Selection

Gentlemen:

I would like to bring to your attention that the location to hold this public hearing is really an attempt as I see it to minimize the public attendance at this important meeting. It is so far removed from those that would be impacted by the study. This location is west of Interstate 270. All the affected areas for this study are east of Interstate 270. To me it seems the Montgomery County Transportation Department was uncomfortable to have this meeting in the midst of the study area and deal with a substantially larger crowd that wanted to personally air their opinions in a public forum.

Can MCDOT tell us why Watkins Mill H.S. on Apple Ridge Rd was not chosen for this meeting? This high school is in the midst of the study area and is easy to get to by the locals. What I see here is an attempt to move a trial to another county because the local response might be too unpleasant. That's like living in Manhattan but having to travel to Brooklyn to discuss issues concerning Manhattan. This smells to me.

George J. Mencinsky P.E.

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Sheila Yoritomo [sayoritomo@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 12:51 PM
To: sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB; Dinne, John J NAB
Subject: August 7 meeting re: M-83
Attachments: M-83 Testimony_SheilaandLeeY.docx

August 6, 2013
To: Mr. Dinne, CENAB-OP-RMN, and Mr. McKewan, MD DOE
From: Leonard and Sheila Yoritomo, 10701 Seneca Spring Way, Montgomery Village, MD
Re: M-83, Written Testimony for August 7th Hearing on the Midcounty Corridor Study
Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewan,
We would like to register our profound distress with the recent study conducted by the Department of Transportation (DOT) regarding alternatives to building M-83. As homeowners in Montgomery Village for 23 years, we are acutely aware of the enormous effect M-83 and many options under consideration will have on the quality of life for our family and community. A new road would destroy and disrupt our beautiful neighborhood forever. Our family, neighbors, and friends regularly enjoy time in this beautiful parkland, playing, walking dogs, jogging, hiking, and just enjoying the peaceful wooded setting. We, along with perhaps thousands of other residents, enjoy the abundance of wildlife that live in the park and the beauty of Seneca Creek.

We do not need another road; we need more creative forms of public transportation. While we fully appreciate the need for relief of traffic congestion in this area, we do not believe that such decisions should be made with less than complete and impartial data and analysis. Certainly, the potential severe environmental and community impacts of M-83 and its alternatives merit a full, fair and thorough examination of all build/no build options. Yet, it is painfully apparent that DOT did not do its job. Instead of making a realistic assessment of Alternative 4, DOT, for unexplained reasons, considered a 6-lane option that exceeds the current 80-foot right of way. Have you been to the end of our street? There is no room for a six land road. Are you planning on demolishing existing homes? In addition, the impact of Alternative 4 was not assessed in concert with the improvement of 355, thus presenting a distorted picture of this key no-build option. It would be a travesty for the County Council to make a decision based on such a flawed analysis.

As homeowners, active community members, and parents living in the Stedwick neighborhood of Montgomery Village, whose family and neighborhood would be directly impacted by the M-83 decision, we are extremely concerned about the lack of fairness and professionalism evident in the DOT analysis. Whether M-83 or its alternatives are built will have a tremendous impact on our community and property values. Providing the County Council the information it needs to make a fair and balanced decision is essential. Therefore, we strongly urge the rejection of the current study.
Sincerely,
Leonard and Sheila Yoritomo
10701 Seneca Spring Way
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Rudnick, Barbara [Rudnick.Barbara@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 10:33 AM
To: kim@rent4u.us
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB
Subject: Mid County Highway

Dear Ms. Nugent,

Thank you for your comments on the alternatives for the County's M83 project. As you are probably aware, the Army Corps of Engineers is conducting a public hearing tomorrow evening and citizens will have an opportunity to voice their concerns.

EPA has been reviewing the environmental document prepared to support the application made to the Corps for a permit under the Clean Water Act Section 404 (to allow placement of fill in wetlands and/or streams). We will be providing comments to the Corps on the permit application and the project. EPA has concerns about impacts to wetlands and streams and we appreciate the points you raised. The Corps is the lead Federal agency in the decision on the permit, and I have copied the Corps' staff reviewer for the project. As you realize, the County is overall the key decision-maker on this project.

Please feel free to call or reply to me. Thank you for your interest in this project and the environment.

Barbara

Barbara Rudnick, P.G.

NEPA Team Leader

EPA Region III

1650 Arch Street (3EA30)

Philadelphia, PA 19103

215-814-3322

UserWord
human
Word
human
comments
These are the many reasons I support Alternative 2, please review and encourage your organization to STRONGLY support this alternative. Thank you

I believe new road construction is a short term solution - whereas greater use of buses, trains, metro, carpooling - and influencing smart selection of home locations nearer to work and other locations of import are long term and ultimately less costly financially and environmentally. We have limited financial resources in the county and other expenditures which could have a greater return for our quality of life. We also preserve the financial stability of our county by investing what we have and what we don't yet have - wisely.

It is unjust to increase traffic in our HOUSING areas for passer's through on their way to work or shop in COMMERCIAL areas. The solution to their needs should be served by highways like I-270, 355, or by Bus, Train, and Metro. Even by Carpool!

If new highways were built through communities, the residents would be forced to sacrifice the very things that brought them there. For the following reasons and more, they want to or need to stay and want to enjoy things as they are.
+ Children in schools
+ Impossibility for some to attain another mortgage or get approval for a different rental due to job loss or drop in income.
+ Own property that would only sell at a loss
+ Have a lower rent rate based on long tenancy than is available anywhere else
+ Jobs or retired parents or children or grandchildren they want to stay near
+ A long history with where they live and their neighbors - that cannot be replaced
It is unnecessary to make so many undergo these and more sacrifices to shorten the DRIVE time for others.

The sacrifices don't end with the housing communities. All of us and much wildlife would be negatively affected by the impact of most M-83 alternatives on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys.
+ Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.
+ Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek. In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider.
+ Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland.
+ It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions.

The only acceptable alternative proposed appears to me to be Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. With the money saved over the more costly alternatives - we could implement the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County and invest in reducing the congestion problem rather than just treating it. To achieve reduction of the problem, we can invest over time as our county budget permits in:
+ Overall greater use of and access to mass transit.
+ Increasing convenience (more stops and routes with greater reliability), comfort (air conditioning, heat, places to wait out of the elements), real time information about times and stops, ease (help carpoolers connect with each other),
+ Adding walking and biking paths as well as lights and emergency call posts to increase safety after dark.
+ Spreading the word about all that is done relative to the above and help folks who could use mass transit know it and know how

+ Smarter planning. Public administration buildings, libraries, schools, and community centers, even churches, etc. along bus lines or with bus lines planned by them could be constructed, or influenced or have add multi-purpose air-conditioned/ heated space with seating, restrooms, and security cameras for commuters to wait for transit. These spaces would then be available for other uses when commuting is lower on weekends and holidays (space could be used for community events/ public meetings/ church services/ etc.) or in emergencies (space could be used for emergency shelter). Some such places with careful logistics could be night time shelters for homeless. They might even be able to clean the space every evening before settling for the night by rolling bunk beds out of locked storage or other.
+ Influencing more business offerings of smart trip cards etc. with pre-tax dollars.

Signed, Kimberly Nugent

email
kim@rent4u.us
org
Kimberly Nugent, Kimberly Nugent
phone
3016136385
submit
Submit

This information is for tracking purposes only.
Submitting script: /cgi-bin/mail.cgi
Submitting host: c-69-140-221-121.hsd1.md.comcast.net (69.140.221.121)
Browser: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.0) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/28.0.1500.95 Safari/537.36
Referred: http://www.epa.gov/region3/enviro-contact.htm
TSSMS: region03
Mail to File: library.txt

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Rochelle Baker [Rojoda417@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 11:01 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Rochelle Baker
20301 Sandsfield Ter
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Brian Judy [contact@redaphid.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 9:21 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Brian Judy
10428 Kardwright Ct
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Lori Bernstein [Bernsteinlori@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 8:51 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Lori Bernstein
9965 lake landing rd
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ramya Bhagavan [ramyabhagavan69@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 6:37 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Ramya Bhagavan

11147 Yellow Leaf Way
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Michele Weikert [Memphisskye@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 6:09 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Michele Weikert
Watkins Meadow Drive
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Dick Miller [Jrniller24@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 5:19 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Dick Miller
20464 Watkins Meadow dr
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Maureen Matkovich [mwmcem@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 3:51 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Additionally, the additional traffic-generated ozone will be quite problematic for the asthmatics who live in the impacted neigborhoods. I am one of those asthmatics.

Signed,

Maureen Matkovich

Maureen Matkovich
20404 Sandsfield Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Jean Whitman [jean.whitman@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 12:57 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for the 7 August 2013 public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it is clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,
Jean A. Whitman

Jean Whitman
20218 Grazing Way
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Dinne, John J NAB

From: ANGELA TABLADA [ATABLADA@VERIZON.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

ANGELA TABLADA
10712 AUTUMN LEAF PLACE
GERMANTOWN, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Anna Durkin [durkins8@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,
Anna Durkin

Anna Durkin
10708 Risingdale Court
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Kurt Feldmann [kurtiwla@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 10:38 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Kurt Feldmann
20432 Watkins Meadow Drive
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Sharon Feldmann [shelcat1121@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 10:35 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Sharon Feldmann
20432 Watkins Meadow Drive
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Igor Chugunov [igor1409@yahoo.coom]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 10:26 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Igor Chugunov
19217 Gatlin Drive
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Mark Weikert [mark@blrholdingsinc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 10:16 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Mark Weikert
20501 Watkins Meadow Drive
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Maryanne Sacco [saccomaryanne@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 10:12 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Maryanne Sacco
111 Kestrel Ct
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Yevgeniya Chugunova [jane_3005@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 10:07 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Yevgeniya Chugunova
19217 Gatlin drive
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Cameron Ray [cray@rabcospecks.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 9:21 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Cameron Ray
20300 Sandsfield Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Deborah Bell [deb.bell83@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 9:06 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Deborah J. Bell

Deborah Bell
19915 knollcross drive
germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Elizabeth Barbehenn [ebarbehenn@citizen.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 8:32 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Elizabeth Barbehenn
8208 Thoreau Dr
Bethesda, MD 20817

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Andrew Sarno [andysarno@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 8:23 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Andrew Sarno
20332 Watkins Meadow Drive
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Paul Herrmann [pb_herrmann@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 7:57 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Paul Herrmann
Misty Moon Pl
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Mary Jane Siok [maryjane@sioks.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 3:45 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

Please reject the permit application for M83, the Mid-county Highway Extended. This new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers, trucks and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted storm water runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, storm water runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Mary Jane Siok
10717 Autumn Leaf Place
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Jolie Dobre [jolie@artjolie.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 8:14 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Public Hearing on the Midcounty Corridor Study

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Huang

I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified. It is completely incompatible with the Master that are the basis for our community development. It is located well outside the central transportation corridor area it is supposed to support. Passing through an area of long established residential areas with many individual driveways and multiple intersecting roads increases the gridlock and affects safety. This in turn generates excessive air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions.

Alternative 4 Modified bulldozes through long established communities that were never planned for a major transportation corridor.

This Alternative will destroy dozens of homes due to loss of wells and septic systems, leave hundreds more with a major highway on their doorstep, impinge on the Agricultural Reserve, and destroy a living history that includes colonial-area sites and two communities established by freed slaves.

Alternative 4 is a violation of the County's Master Plan pledge to the residents of established communities, does not improve our already bad transportation situation, and seriously increases the emission of greenhouse gases.

I strongly support Alternative 9, Option A (M-83), the Master Plan Route. Alternative 9, Option A is the critical missing link in an effective transportation system.

Alternative 9, Option A will use a Master-Planned right of way dating to the 1960s. Subsequent developments were built with explicit knowledge of the location of this right of way. This minimizes interference between the road and adjacent developments.

Alternative 9, Option A will only intersect 13 established roads or other access points, the lowest of all the alternatives. This provides an efficient flow of traffic with minimal travel times, improved public safety and lower CO2 emissions.

I also would like to see investment in extension of the Metro, or light rail or dedicated bus lines, from Washington DC to Frederick. This would present a sustainable transportation option that would invigorate business along the entire 270 corridor.

Sincerely,

Ginel & Jolie Dobre

21405 Davis Mill Rd

Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Lauraleen O'Connor [lauraileen@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 8:13 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I totally reject the building of M83 Midcounty Highway Extended. It will not only cut through the fragile ecosystem directly behind my house, but will also adversely affect the lives of me, my neighbors, and to th school children who attend Watkins Mill Elementary School! There are other sound options so why are you considering this unsound one?

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of

nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Lauraleen O'Connor
Senior Meteorologist/Engineer

Lauraleen O'Connor
1629 Tanyard Hill Rd
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Edward Pfister [epfister@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 3:18 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

Due to the many health and environmental concerns I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

In my review of the environmental documents I read about impacts but there was no discussion of adverse health outcomes especially on impact vulnerable school children.

Another most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of

nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Edward Pfister
10717 Seneca Spring Way
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Dinne, John J NAB

From: fogelnmc@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 7:03 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Cc: greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Master Plan Route M-83

I strongly support the completion of the Mid-County Highway along the master plan route - Alternative 9, Option A. All adjacent communities were developed an occupied with notice of this roadway. It is designed to minimize interference with adjacent communities and existing roads. It will tie existing roads together into a coherent transportation system and allow optimal communication between up county residential communities, employment centers and commercial areas. It can provide the backbone for an effective bus system,

Norm and Melinda Fogel
20711 Sabbath Court
Gaithersburg, MD 20882

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Rudnick, Barbara [Rudnick.Barbara@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 3:45 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Cc: McCurdy, Alaina
Subject: FW: testimony for M-83 Environmental Hearing

fyi

From: TAME Coalition [mailto:tamecoalition@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 12:04 PM
To: TAME Coalition
Subject: testimony for M-83 Environmental Hearing

Joint Public Hearing for the Midcounty Corridor Study,

For US Army Corps of Engineers and Maryland Dept of Environment

August 7, 2013 in Germantown, Maryland .

My name is Margaret Schoap, TAME Coalition, from Germantown. I want to thank the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) for your efforts here tonight to protect the sensitive, high biodiversity area in the upper reaches of the Seneca Creek stream valley and wetlands. And I am grateful for the work done by McDOT and their consultants in the Midcounty Corridor Study to define the impacts of the proposed highway on plant and animal life and water quality in the forests and stream valleys that would be lost or degraded.

The Draft Environmental Effects Report (EER), which we are addressing tonight, falls short of being an adequate base on which to allow this project to be granted the allusive wetlands permit.

The environmental impacts are why we are here tonight, and are the primary reason not to allow M-83 to be constructed. In spite of many assurances of "mitigation", impacts from major construction simply cannot be mitigated. To bisect parkland with a six-lane swath for a, highway will essentially eliminate the park. Disruption of wildlife habitats, introduction of air and water contaminants to the creek and high---biodiversity areas, elimination of mature forest canopy, noise elevation and visual impacts; these things cannot be mitigated. Specifically, the claimed 0.87 acre wetland impact for a bridge over Dayspring Creek seems inaccurate and disingenuous. This figure ignores the additional construction impacts (i.e. equipment access roads and tree removal) which will place enormous levels of fill into streams and wetlands, all along the proposed route.

The Draft EER fails to consider alternatives which would combine Alternative 2 Transportation Management Strategies, with selected improvements to existing roads, and adding innovative transit possibilities. The Draft EER only seriously considered road alternatives which naturally favored a result of a new highway. In this massive 1000+ page Draft EER document, mass transit is given 1 ¼ pages of token inclusion. It is not seriously explored as an alternative, as required by NEPA.

The TAME Coalition believes that you must reject this application for wetlands and other permits. Montgomery County should not follow up with further study of the road option, but rather with the development of a 21st Century transportation plan. We support eliminating M-83 from the Master Plan of Highways and implementing multiple, viable, and available transportation solutions in its place.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Schoap

Organizer for

Coalition for Transit Alternatives to Mid-County Highway Extended (TAME)
<http://tamecoalition.blogspot.com/>

see our TAME Coalition Blog <http://tamecoalition.blogspot.com/>

240-581-0518

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Bill Wogatske [bwogatske@churchillbuilders.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 3:31 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Subject: M-83

Dear Mr. Dinne

On the eve of yet another environmental meeting regarding M-83 I would like to take this opportunity to voice my displeasure with this unnecessary and unwanted environmental disaster.

I find it hard to believe that a County Council which passes a bill to protect the tree canopy one day can even consider a road which would destroy one of the most beautiful areas of Montgomery County including countless acres upon acres of mature trees, not to mention the wetlands and streams ! We should be using the hundreds of millions that this road would cost to improve public transportation. We will never get rid of the grid lock until there are viable public transportation alternatives.

Mr. Dinne, you are in the unique position to prevent this road from happening. Please have the courage to stand up to our elected officials who seem to be deaf to their electorate. I am sure that will change at the next election.

Please have the wisdom, strength and courage not to issue permits for this environmental disaster!

Roads are like the baseball park in "field of dreams", build it and they will come. The more asphalt we pour the more cars we will have.

My family and I have been in Montgomery County for many years (almost 40) and my wife was born here, we all vote and we will not support anyone who favors M-83. Frankly, with the number of people I have seen who oppose this road I don't understand how it could have possibly gotten this far.

It saddens me beyond words to think that we could bulldoze this beautiful area.

Thank you for this opportunity to contact you !

Bill, Sue, Kyle, Collin and our dog Baron !

William J. Wogatske

11000 Brink Road

Germantown, MD 20876

301-540-1213

Dinne, John J NAB

From: TAME Coalition [tamecoalition@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 12:04 PM
To: TAME Coalition
Subject: testimony for M-83 Environmental Hearing

Joint Public Hearing for the Midcounty Corridor Study,

For US Army Corps of Engineers and Maryland Dept of Environment

August 7, 2013 in Germantown, Maryland .

My name is Margaret Schoap, TAME Coalition, from Germantown. I want to thank the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) for your efforts here tonight to protect the sensitive, high biodiversity area in the upper reaches of the Seneca Creek stream valley and wetlands. And I am grateful for the work done by McDOT and their consultants in the Midcounty Corridor Study to define the impacts of the proposed highway on plant and animal life and water quality in the forests and stream valleys that would be lost or degraded.

The Draft Environmental Effects Report (EER), which we are addressing tonight, falls short of being an adequate base on which to allow this project to be granted the allusive wetlands permit.

The environmental impacts are why we are here tonight, and are the primary reason not to allow M-83 to be constructed. In spite of many assurances of "mitigation", impacts from major construction simply cannot be mitigated. To bisect parkland with a six-lane swath for a, highway will essentially eliminate the park. Disruption of wildlife habitats, introduction of air and water contaminants to the creek and high---biodiversity areas, elimination of mature forest canopy, noise elevation and visual impacts; these things cannot be mitigated. Specifically, the claimed 0.87 acre wetland impact for a bridge over Dayspring Creek seems inaccurate and disingenuous. This figure ignores the additional construction impacts (i.e. equipment access roads and tree removal) which will place enormous levels of fill into streams and wetlands, all along the proposed route.

The Draft EER fails to consider alternatives which would combine Alternative 2 Transportation Management Strategies, with selected improvements to existing roads, and adding innovative transit possibilities. The Draft EER only seriously considered road alternatives which naturally favored a result of a new highway. In this massive 1000+ page Draft EER document, mass transit is given 1 ¼ pages of token inclusion. It is not seriously explored as an alternative, as required by NEPA.

The TAME Coalition believes that you must reject this application for wetlands and other permits. Montgomery County should not follow up with further study of the road option, but rather with the development of a 21st Century transportation plan. We support eliminating M-83 from the Master Plan of Highways and implementing multiple, viable, and available transportation solutions in its place.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Schoap
Organizer for
Coalition for Transit Alternatives to Mid-County Highway Extended (TAME)
<http://tamecoalition.blogspot.com/>
see our TAME Coalition Blog <http://tamecoalition.blogspot.com/>
240-581-0518

Dinne, John J NAB

From: danisak@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 9:35 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Subject: "NO" to making Brink Road a 4 lane road!

I vote AGAINST Alternative 4.
I vote FOR the Master Plan (Alt 9A).

Major facts I vote against are Alt. 4 requires:
1. the largest number of home takings
2. unacceptable noise levels for the remaining community
3. least safe plan
4. impacts well and septic in the area
5. Overall it is one of the least effective solutions to the transportation issues.

Kathleen Danis
Germantown MD

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Way Wan [way.wan@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 7:48 AM
To: ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.berliner@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.andrews@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.elrich@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.ervin@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.floreen@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.leventhal@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.navarro@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.rice@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.riemer@montgomerycountymd.gov
Cc: greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: Mid-County Highway Expansion Concerns (Alternative 4 Modified)

Hello,

Our family has grave concerns with the proposed Alternative 4 Modified plan. We are new home owners off of Brink Road and what brought us to this area was the perceived safety and beauty of the area. With three small children living off of Brink Road, safety is our priority. With the proposed Alterative 4 Modified plan, it would widen Brink Road by taking our land and making the road closer to where our young children play. This is unacceptable.

Additionally, children will have to cross a major highway to go on school buses. The air pollution as a result of the significant traffic that will be generated by small and large vehicles will no doubt affect our children's quality of life.

Montgomery County has always led the state of Maryland in innovation and imagination. If our best plans include taking our mothers' and fathers' homes, our daughters', sons' and neighbors' land then we have failed our community.

The County Executive and Council members would have failed because such a plan was approved. The US Army Corps of Engineers and Maryland Department of the Environment would have failed for proposing such a plan. And county citizens would have failed for not doing enough to stop the plan from becoming reality. We can do better.

In reviewing the various Alternatives for consideration, it would appear that Alternative 9, Option A would be the plan that has the least amount of interference to individual lives, while aligning with the Master Planned M-83. However, we urge county leaders to also consider the no-build Alternative 1 and devise a more green transportation strategy that reduces our carbon footprint in our communities

However, if Alternative 4 or any other variations to expand Brink Road now or in the future, we formally request that a high retaining wall be erected on the Cog Wheel Way side of Brink Road that stretches between Cog Wheel Way and Kaul Lane.

Regards,

The Wan Family

21013 Cog Wheel Lane

Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Jeffrey Oltchick [oltchickj@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 6:34 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Jeffrey Oltchick
11002 Cross Laurel Drive
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Jessica Reynolds [jlgreynolds@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 10:19 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Jessica Reynolds
1022 Paul Dr
Rockville, MD 20851

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Pat Saether [psaether@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 5:41 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I live on Game Preserve Road in Gaithersburg and do not want a highway in my backyard.

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Pat Saether

Pat Saether
10812 Game Preserve Rd
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Nanci Hurt [nancihurt@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 3:14 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Nanci Hurt
9620 Watkins Road
Gaithersburg, MD 20882

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Benjamin Beiter [benjamin.beiter@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 3:04 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

kI urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Benjamin Beiter
9906 Boysenberry Way #118
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Joel Iams [joel_iams@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 2:33 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Joel Iams
Sligo Creek Pkwy
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Peppi DeBiaso [pdebias@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 2:30 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Peppi DeBiaso

Peppi DeBiaso
10704 misty moon place
germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Francesca DeBiaso [francesca.debiaso@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 11:53 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Francesca DeBiaso
Misty Moon Place
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Indhu Balasubramaniam [indhupriya@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Cc: county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Reject M-83 (alternative 9)

I sincerely urge you to reject the permit application for M-83. Our county cannot afford it and neither can the planet for the sprawl and destruction it will bring.

Building new roads to manage traffic is 20th century thinking when we now more than ever urgently need to protect natural resources and invest more on mass transit. Building of these road will result in a criminal destruction of the few wetlands, stream valleys and natural resources we have. No mitigation is going to matter once the destruction starts. Those of us living in DC area know fully well no road whatever the mitigation will ease congestion.

We have a good solution on hand namely - Mass transit which has the potential to ease congestion and will also propel Montgomery County towards a better future in terms of quality of living .

Planet Earth has limited resources. All of us reading the news should be aware of the havoc that construction and destruction of wetlands and habitat have caused to communities all over the globe. While you have spent millions of dollars of tax payer money studying how road building can ease congestion the bulk of money would have been best spent trying to increase mass transit and making it affordable and easy for people to use it without having to drive their cars around.

Yes, people in Clarksburg have to get out. But what where the county executive and the planning commission doing at that time? Why weren't these studies done before building houses? Why were these building permit given out without roads leading out of there? Doesn't the responsibility also lies with the people who bought houses there? Why didn't they think about their modes of transportation before buying their houses there? To now retroactively fix something that was ill conceived and thereby adversely affect everybody else is neither fair nor equitable.

Widening already existing roads should ease the congestion and provide relief seems a much more smart way of managing growth.

As elected representatives and civil servants you have great powers in your hands to define the future of the county and its citizens living here. I sincerely hope that the decisions you take will be fair for not only to the voting adults of today but our children and grand

children who deserve to enjoy the very same natural resources we take for granted and are ready to destroy with a bull dozer.

Destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland brings credit to nobody but shame to all of us who willfully let this happen. Elected representatives should think with foresight than the next election cycle.

Thank you,

Indhu Balasubramaniam

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Robert Goldberg [r.n.goldberg@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 6:03 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg); Leggett Ike; councilmember.navarro@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.andrews@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.floreen@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.elrich@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.leventhal@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.berliner@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.rice@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.riemer@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.ervin@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Comments on Mid-County Corridor Study

August 8, 2013

Mr. Jack Dinne, CENAB-OP-RMN

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Baltimore District

P.O. Box 1715

Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715

Mr. Sean McKewen:

Maryland Department of the Environment

Wetlands and Waterways Program

160 South Water Street

Frostburg, Maryland, 21532

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen:

I am opposed to Alternative 4 (widening Brink and Wightman Roads) and Alternative 9D (cuts through the Montgomery County Agricultural Reserve and severely impacts homes on Brink Road). Alternative 4 would devastate existing communities and do nothing to improve overall traffic flow. These facts are well established by the Mid-County Corridor Study.

Alternative 9D would devastate a very beautiful part of the Montgomery County Agricultural Reserve. The Reserve has been set aside for agricultural use by well-established public policy, by contributions by the County in the form of transfer development rights (TDRs), and by increased density (made possible by the TDRs) in many parts of the County. The use of Agricultural Reserve land for a road would set a poor precedent. Also, Alternative 9D has no advantage over Alternative 9A, the original Master Planned road.

Re: Master Plans. A neighbor's home on Brink Road would be taken if Alternative 9D were adopted and built. Even if the road is not built, their home would be very significantly reduced in value by the selection of Alternative 9D. Citizens rely on Master Plans when they purchase their homes - and my neighbors consulted the Master Plan prior to the purchase of their home. In so far as one's home is often the single largest investment for many citizens, it is poor public policy and very unfair to disregard Master Plans and to make major changes in them in the absence of a compelling public interest.

I have several thoughts on matters that could make a significant difference in how Montgomery traffic moves and there are several questions that need to be answered.

Will keeping a road(s) on the master plan allow for additional development? If the answer to this question is "YES", then I believe that no road(s) should be kept on the Master Plan. The reason for this conclusion is that it is highly unlikely that any road will be constructed within the next 10 to 15 years. And keeping a road on the Master Plan would only to allow additional development which, in turn would lead to increased traffic. However, if the answer to this question is "NO", then it makes sense to keep Alternative 9A in place if, and only if, the answer to the next question is "YES".

Re: the original master plan route 9A. It is not clear what will happen to the traffic that arrives at the south terminus of 9A, i.e., when it intersects with Montgomery Village Avenue. Will the existing traffic jams on routes 355 and 27 be "relieved" by new traffic jams on Montgomery Village Avenue, the MidCounty Highway, and Shady Grove Road? If this is the case, it makes no sense to speed up traffic flow on one road and then have traffic stalled on the connecting roads. A critical question is: Will overall traffic flow be significantly improved by construction of a new road? This question can and should be answered quantitatively by using appropriate traffic flow models. And if the answer to this question is a clear "YES", then I support keeping Alternative 9A in place as the Master Planned route. Otherwise, all Alternatives 9 (9A and 9D) as well as Alternative 4 should be removed from the Mater Plan.

Some additional thoughts follow. It is clear to anyone that our roads are adequate except during rush hour. During rush hour, I observe that the majority of vehicles are occupied by a single person, i.e., the driver. Clearly, if car-pooling could be encouraged and made easier, the number of cars on the road during rush hour could easily shrink by a factor of two. And this would make a huge difference in the rush hour traffic situation. Telecommuting and staggered hours would also have a significant impact on the number of cars on the road.

The worst traffic problems occur when accidents happen. On this basis, it is imperative that reckless drivers be taken off the road. This will require increased enforcement of traffic violations. However, in many cases, I have observed that congestion is caused when the police have stopped a vehicle for a traffic violation and block a traffic lane to write a ticket. Can the police ticket drivers without obstructing traffic flow?

What technology can we expect over the next 10 to 15 years that would improve traffic flow? For example, if every car were equipped with near instantaneous traffic flow information, drivers, using their intelligent GPS units, could choose a route that would minimize travel time and improve overall traffic flow. Also, additional optimization of stop lights would help with traffic flow.

Finally, can effective public transportation be implemented within a reasonable time frame (3 to 15 years)? Would public transportation allow a citizen living in Clarksburg to be able to travel from his/her home to Shady Grove Metro in comparable or less time than driving in his/her car? Can the MARC line be expanded to allow for improved (cost and additional scheduled times) travel from upcounty to Washington, DC? I appreciate the very high cost of extending the Metro to Clarksburg and, perhaps, Frederick. However, this cost needs to be compared with the cost of not doing it and the fact that the need to do it may eventually be inevitable.

I, personally, believe it likely that the combination of technology, public transportation, and other measures (see above) will alleviate the need to build most new, major highways.

I also appreciate that traffic and roads are complex matters and that intelligent decisions will require the consideration of ALL options, the use of the best mathematical models to predict overall traffic flow, and some good projections as to what the future could bring.

Sincerely,

Robert N. Goldberg

Robert N. Goldberg

21404 Davis Mill Road

Germantown, MD 20876

Telephone: 1-301-975-2584

E-mail: robert.goldberg@nist.gov

cc:

Mr. Greg Hwang

Montgomery County Executive, Dr. Isiah Leggett

Montgomery County Council

--

Robert N. Goldberg 21404 Davis Mill Road Germantown, MD 20876 U.S.A. telephone: 1-301-540-2915 e-mail: r.n.goldberg@att.net

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Robert Portanova [novaport88@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 10:19 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Cc: sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; tamecoalition@gmail.com; epfister@comcast.net; coachjackmv@gmail.com; Councilmember.RiemersOffice@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.berliner@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.floreen@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.leventhal@montgomerycountymd.gov; councilmember.rice@montgomerycountymd.gov; bhydorn@mvf.org; bgarthright@comcast.net; dhumpton@mvf.org
Subject: M-83 Hearing

Mr Dinne -

I wish I had more time to defend my position of opposing M-83, but I wasn't able to do that last night.

As I walked around the school and saw all of the Goshen Civic Association members with their labels that read; "Stick With the Plan," it dawned on me later in the evening, what I really should have said when it was my turn to speak. The plan (the Master Plan), as Mr Johnston summarized in his presentation, was created in the 1960's. In the 60's, Montgomery Village was a dairy farm, open pasture, devoid of forests. That was over 40 years ago. Since then, Montgomery Village was built, Seneca Creek State Park was set aside as parkland, trees grew in abundance, understory foliage exploded creating a diverse wildflife habitat, the streams and wetlands drew even more wildlife, and along other parts of this route, homes, townhouses, apartments, condominiums, pools, tennis courts, schools, football fields were built, and a 220 acre state treasure was established, the Day Spring Silent Retreat .

So, when the residents from the Goshen Civic Association were yelling, "Stick With the Plan", well, the plan is not the same plan - we are no longer comparing apples with apples. It is no longer a dairy farm open pasture. It's a different animal now and looks NOTHING like it did over 40 years ago.

If you or Sean would ever take the time to walk the route with me, you will see what I am talking about. Until that's done, you can only imagine.

Thank you.

Bob Portanova
Stedwick

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Robert Smythe [rbsmythe@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 3:01 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Robert Smythe
4807 Wellington Drive
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Soheyla Rafizadeh [srafizadeh@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 1:22 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Soheyla Rafizadeh
11003 Grassy Knoll Ter
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Cindy Connolly [k_connolly7@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 12:48 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Please take a walk through the site to get a feel for all the wildlife and people who use and enjoy the areas. Please think of all the voices you have heard and are hearing that are so against this construction.

Signed,
Cindy Connolly

Cindy Connolly
11001 Grassy Knoll Terr
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Kristen Bush [kristenbush@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 12:35 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for this week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,
Kristen Bush

Kristen Bush
11000 Grassy Knoll Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Kam Leung [kamhleung@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 12:30 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Kam Leung
11036 Grassy Knoll Ter
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Charlie Bailey [csb19815@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 11:56 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The proposed Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355, costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. Even if this transit does not arrive as soon as the improvements are completed, it is crucial to lay the groundwork for it. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Charlie Bailey
Rockville

Charlie Bailey
4 Vallingby Circle
Rockville, MD 20850

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Souri Manoharan [sourimanoharan@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 11:55 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Souri Manoharan

11039 GRASSY KNOLL TER
GERMANTOWN, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Dakshi Pillai [dakshipillai@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 10:46 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Dakshi Pillai
Grassy Knoll Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Colleen Ricketts [Wrick32683@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 11:02 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

If this passes, many families will be moving out of this county. Please consider spending our hard earned tax dollars on something of greater importance.

Signed, Colleen Ricketts

Colleen Ricketts
11047 grassy knoll terr
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Indhu Balasubramaniam [indhupriya@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 2:25 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I sincerely urge you to reject the permit application for M-83 and alternative 9 in particular for the path it will take through our streams and only remaining parkland in the eastern side of Germantown. Our county cannot afford it and neither can the planet for the sprawl and destruction it will bring.

Building new roads to manage traffic is 20th century thinking when we now more than ever urgently need to protect natural resources and invest more on mass transit. Building of these road will result in a criminal destruction of the few wetlands, stream valleys and natural resources we have. No mitigation however big or small is going to matter once the destruction starts. Those of us living in DC area know fully well no road will completely ease congestion without the aid of mass transit.

We have a good solution on hand namely - Mass transit which has the potential to ease congestion and will also propel Montgomery County towards a better future in terms of quality of living .

Planet Earth has limited resources. All of us reading the news should be aware of the havoc that mindless construction brought about by destruction of wetlands and habitat have caused to communities all over the globe. While you have spent millions of dollars of tax payer money studying how road building can ease congestion the bulk of money would have been best spent trying to increase mass transit and making it affordable and easy for people to use it without having to drive their cars around.

Yes, people in Clarksburg have to get out. But what were the county executive and the planning commission doing at that time? Why weren't these studies done before building houses ? Why were these buildings permit issued without roads leading out of there? Doesn't the responsibility also lie with the people who bought houses there? Why didn't they think about their modes of transportation before buying their houses? To now retroactively fix something that was ill conceived and thereby adversely affect everybody else is neither fair nor equitable.

Widening already existing roads to ease congestion seems a much more smart way of managing growth.

As elected representatives and civil servants you have great powers in your hands to define the future of the county and its citizens living here. I sincerely hope that the decisions you take will be fair for not only to the voting adults of today but our children and grand children who deserve to enjoy the very same natural resources we take for granted and are ready to destroy with a bull dozer.

Destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland brings credit to nobody but shame to all of us who willfully let this happen. Elected representatives should think with foresight than the next election cycle.

Indhu Balasubramaniam
11013 Grassy Knoll Ter
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Vijay Kandaswamy [vijay_kandaswamy@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 10:06 AM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

The primary goal for M83 is to ease the rush hour traffic within Montgomery County. During the rest of the day, the roads will be under utilized. So why not invest the time and money into improving the public transportation, instead of wasting valuable tax payer dollars into M83 which is only going to reach it's capacity within next 30 years. After 30 years we will back on the drawing board talking about destroying more natural resources to accomodate more sprawl. Please focus your efforts on making public transportation much more efficient and drop the M83 plan. When you have an efficient and affordable public transportation system people will use it and make it popular. Focus only on serving the commuters who goes to their jobs within Montgomery County area. Trying to serve commuters who go beyond Montgomery County to DC, NoVA or PG county should not be the primary goal of the planners. Spend the $351 million on improving public transportation. It will also add more permanent transportation jobs within the county. Moreover, these days companies are spreading their working hours and allow telecommuting, thereby improving the quality of life of people. Adding more roads will only discourage these employers from taking away these options, thereby affecting the quality of life of people.

Signed,

Vijay Kandaswamy
11013 Grassy Knoll Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Johnston, Bruce [Bruce.Johnston@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 10:50 AM
To: Miller, Aruna; Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Cc: Seirafi, Sogand; Serrano, Holger
Subject: FW: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Greg, Aruna,

For the record...

Bruce E. Johnston

-----Original Message-----
From: Holmes, Arthur
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Johnston, Bruce; Gonzalez, Edgar
Cc: Roshdieh, Al; Erenrich, Gary
Subject: FW: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

FYI

Arthur Holmes, Jr., Director
Department of Transportation
Montgomery County, Maryland
240-777-7170
arthur.holmes@montgomerycountymd.gov
-----Original Message-----
From: Vijay Kandaswamy [mailto:vijay_kandaswamy@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 10:06 AM
To: Holmes, Arthur
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Dear Mr. Holmes,

The primary goal for M83 is to ease the rush hour traffic within Montgomery County. During the rest of the day, the roads will be under utilized. So why not invest the time and money into improving the public transportation, instead of wasting valuable tax payer dollars into M83 which is only going to reach it's capacity within next 30 years. After 30 years we will back on the drawing board talking about destroying more natural resources to accomodate more sprawl. Please focus your efforts on making public transportation much more efficient and drop the M83 plan. When you have an efficient and affordable public transportation system people will use it and make it popular. Focus only on serving the commuters who goes to their jobs within Montgomery County area. Trying to serve commuters who go beyond Montgomery County to DC, NoVA or PG county should not be the primary goal of the planners. Spend the $351 million on improving public transportation. It will also add more permanent transportation jobs within the county. Moreover, these days companies are spreading their working hours and allow telecommuting, thereby improving the quality of life of people. Adding more roads will only discourage these employers from taking away these options, thereby affecting the quality of life of people.

Signed,

Vijay Kandaswamy
11013 Grassy Knoll Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

↓ H

↑ 9A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Karla [kwyeakle@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 10:35 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Cc: greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: M-83

We are strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified and strongly support Master Plan route Alternative 9, Option A.

The land, rights of way for M-83, were reserved long ago, and anyone choosing to live near its path was put on notice that it was in the master plan. Not so for those living long the path of Alternative 4. When we purchased our home off Brink Road approximately 7 years ago, our realtor informed us of our rights to review the master plan, and we did. We do not live along the proposed route for Alternative 4, although many home owners along that route most likely also reviewed the master plan before deciding to purchase their homes.

Like the land set aside for the ICC, M-83 land will provide the best solution for building a new road by extending Mid-County Hwy, which is a great road and very rarely congested.

I grew up in Derwood and, except for my college years, I have lived in this area all of my life. Those of us who choose to live in the "country" part of the county love the beauty of the back roads and open land. All my life, I knew that my neighbors back yards in Winters Run were going to be the ICC someday and I also knew that the land separating Mill Creek Towne was going to be Mid-County Hwy. Please continue to stick to the plan and extend Mid-County Hwy, not destroy our community by building Alt 9, Option A.

The master planned M-83 is long overdue and badly needed.

Sincerely,
Karla Yeakle

Sent from my iPad

9 9A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Marjorie Blanc [mblanc67@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 9:54 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Support for the Master Plan M-83 Alt. 9A

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen;

I am writing to affirm my support for the completion of alternative 9A for M-83 to complete the mid-county highway according to the Master Plan. I have lived in the Goshen area for 30 years and am a witness to the ongoing and dangerous deterioration in the quality of our beautiful rustic area due to ever-increasing auto and truck traffic.

Growing numbers of people now living in the upper county deserve an effective road system. Our daily life - jobs, shopping, daycare, local bus service, etc. require safe and efficient roads. Completing the Midcounty Highway as planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and relieve congestion through out much of the Upcounty with a corresponding decrease in the congestion-associated social, economic and environmental harm.

Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A..

Thank you,

Marjorie Blanc

20920 Lochaven Court

Goshen Maryland 20882

↓ 4

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Sarah Albert [sarah_albert@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 4:27 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Cc: greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Mid County Corridor Study: Oppose Alt. 4
Attachments: Sarah Albert Testimony PDF.pdf

I am writing in opposition to Alternative 4 of the Mid County Corridor Study.

Attached please find a copy of my testimony from the August 7th Public Hearing.

Sarah C. Albert

9727 Shadow Oak Drive

Montgomery Village, MD 20886

301-977-7156

↓4 ↓9B+D ↑9A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Nick van Terheyden [nickvt@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 3:58 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Subject: Stick With the Original Master Plan

Attn: Mr. Jack Dinne
CENAB-OP-RMN
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, MD 21203-1715

Dear Mr Dinne,

I strongly oppose Alternative 4. It is completely incompatible with the Master Plans that are the basis for our community development. It is located well outside the central transportation corridor area it is supposed to support. Passing through an area of long-established residential areas with the impediments of many individual driveways and multiple intersecting roads it will produce manufactured gridlock and much disruption to individual homeowners, businesses and everyone driving in our area. This in turn will generate excessive air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions detrimental to nearby residents and church schools.

I also strongly oppose Options B and D of Alternative 9. These options will devastate several homes located on or near Brink Road and adversely impact the Agricultural Reserve.

I strongly support Alternative 9, Option A. Completion of the Midcounty Highway along the Master Plan route has numerous advantages: All adjacent communities were developed and occupied with full knowledge of this roadway so there is minimal interference with these communities and existing roads. It will allow efficient traffic flow, minimizing travel time, and air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions. It will tie existing roads together into a coherent transportation system and allow optimal communication between upcounty residential communities, employment centers, and commercial areas. It can provide the backbone for an effective bus system.

Alternative 4 will intersect 35 existing roads, cross 90 driveways and require four high-volume multi-lane right angle traffic turns. Alternative 9, Option A (M-83) will not displace homes, intersects only 1 driveway and 11 existing roads, and is configured for smooth traffic flow. I therefore support building M-83 along the original MasterPlan route.

The County created a plan and all development, purchases and planning was based on that plan - there is no basis for changing this plan which will create more traffic, pollution and environmental damage to existing communities. Stick with the plan.

Sincerely,

Nick van Terheyden, MD

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Jerry DePoyster [Jdepoy@mac.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2013 1:43 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed, Jerry DePoyster DVM

Jerry DePoyster
11111 Sceptre Ridge Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

↑ 9A
↓ 4

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Les Cappetta [lcapp30126@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2013 1:52 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Support Midcounty Highway -Alternative 9, Option A; Oppose Alternative 4

Dear Sir,

I strongly support the completion of the Midcounty Highway along the Master Plan route - Alternative 9, Option A. For the last 50 years, the communities and neighborhoods in this area have been designed and built with the anticipation of a transportation network system that would provide citizens with a safe, efficient, and practical route to reach transit centers, jobs, schools, parks, and retail centers.

I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 because it does not provide a safe, nor efficient, nor practical route for up-county commuters and citizens. Widening Brink Road would be a safety nightmare. Crossing multiple lanes of traffic to make a left hand turn would be extremely dangerous. The other option, to make a right hand turn and then U-turn, is not only dangerous but also impractical.

By adhering to the Master Plan (Alternative 9A), there will be minimal interference with existing communities and roads. This plan will allow efficient traffic flow thereby minimizing travel time, air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions and it will tie existing roads together into a coherent transportation system.

Thank you,

Patricia Cappetta
21008 Cog Wheel Way
Germantown, MD 20876

↓ 4 character
more traffic

Dinne, John J NAB

From: jennyf16@verizon.net
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2013 1:02 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Cc: greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Alternative 4 for Mid-County Highway is a terrible choice!

Hello,

I have lived almost my entire life in Montgomery Village. I remember when farms surrounded it. I remember when there was a whole lot less traffic. I just read about Alternative 4 and I am appalled and dismayed that you would choose that option. It is not on the Master Plan and it will greatly change the character of this community. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE do not ruin Montgomery Village and the surrounding areas with multi-lane highways and more traffic than there already is.

↓4

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Sandler, David - FSIS [David.Sandler@fsis.usda.gov]
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; 'sean.mckewen@maryland.gov'
Cc: 'greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov'; 'county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov'; 'ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov'; 'hsandler@adventisthealthcare.com'
Subject: M 83 alternatives

I am writing in strenuous opposition to Alternative 4 of the M-83 project. As a citizen of Montgomery County, living in Montgomery Village and paying taxes for 30+ years, I want to implore you not to allow (understandably needed) development to destroy the character of what we've worked so hard to maintain since the creation of Montgomery Village nearly a half-century ago. Please, please, please come visit the neighborhoods being threatened. These are solid communities with roots deep enough now as to be enviable to many, many other communities across Montgomery County, Maryland, and (I don't think I exaggerate) the U.S. My three kids were born and raised here. They're now off making their ways in the world, and proudly recall their childhoods here in THIS neighborhood. As elected officials and/or people in the position to make these incredibly weighty development decisions, I implore you to understand that your decisions will go far beyond changes to the physical landscape. Folks - you're messing with our hearts and those of our children and grandchildren. Please be very careful. Please do not allow Alternative 4 to get anywhere near reality.

Thank you.

J. David Sandler
Senior Emergency Response Specialist
USDA FSIS
Emergency Coordination Staff
Office of Data Integration and Food Protection
202-690-6356
BB: 202-368-1408

Sent from my BlackBerry

9A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Bob Blanc [blanc.bob@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2013 9:59 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Support for the Master Plan M-83 Alt. 9A

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen;

I am writing to affirm my support for the completion of alternative 9A for M-83 to complete the mid-county highway according to the Master Plan. I have lived in the Goshen area for 30 years and am a witness to the ongoing and dangerous deterioration in the quality of our beautiful rustic area due to ever-increasing auto and truck traffic.
Growing numbers of people now living in the upper county deserve an effective road system. Our daily life - jobs, shopping, daycare, local bus service, etc. require safe and efficient roads. Completing the Midcounty Highway as planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and relieve congestion through out much of the Upcounty with a corresponding decrease in the congestion-associated social, economic and environmental harm.
Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A..

Thank you,

Robert Blanc
20920 Lochaven Court
Goshen Maryland 20882

19A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Dorothy Frederickson [sodcmedia@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2013 8:15 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A..

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen:

I support the Master Plan route, M-83, to complete the Midcounty Highway. I live in the Midcounty Corridor area and someday we hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems for our area, but our transportation problem is here, the problem is now, it is only becoming worse, and we will always need an effective road system. Completing the Midcounty Highway as planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and relieve congestion through out much of the Upcounty with a corresponding decrease in the congestion-associated social, economic and environmental harm.

PLEASE Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A.

Thank you,

Dorothy Frederickson
8201 Goodhurst Drive
Gaithersburg, MD 20882

↑ 9A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Anna Brush [anna.brush7@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2013 8:15 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: M-83, MCS Alternate 9A

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen;

I want to express my support for the Master Plan route, M-83, to complete the Midcounty Highway. I live in the Midcounty Corridor area and daily have to cope with dangerous and time consuming congestion on roads ranging from our small rural rustic roads to I-270. Someday we hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems for our area, but our transportation problem is here, the problem is now, it is only becoming worse, and we will always need an effective road system. Our daily life - jobs, shopping, daycare, local bus service, etc. require safe and efficient roads. Completing the Midcounty Highway as planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and relieve congestion through out much of the Upcounty with a corresponding decrease in the congestion-associated social, economic and environmental harm.

We do know that even after recent design changes there will be environmental disturbance in completing M-83. We regret this but feel that it is necessary to complete an effective road system that will allow us to make the best use of the very large Upcounty residential and commercial development, and the associated environmental disturbance, that has already taken place over the last several decades. The end result will be a net improvement in personal well being, economic health, and carbon dioxide emissions.

Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A..

Thank you,
Anna Brush

↑9A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ann Hess Smith [annhsmith1@verizon.net]
Sent: Saturday, August 10, 2013 12:51 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Fwd: Army Corps & DEP Hearing

Subject: Army Corps & DEP Hearing

21020 Goshen RD Gaithersburg MD 20882
9 August 2013
Re: M-83, MCS Alternate:

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen,

I support selection of the Master Plan route, M-83, Alternative 9A.

I attended the meeting a few weeks ago at the firehouse in Germantown.

I strongly oppose increasing the traffic on the Brink Whitman pathway.

My major concern is SAFETY! I have lived on Goshen Road near Brink for 32 years, in the Midcounty Corridor area, residents have to cope with dangerous and time consuming congestion on roads ranging from our small rural rustic roads to I-270.

There are too numerous problems with the Brink RD Snouffer School Whiteman area arising from the number of driveways that would be feeding out of homes and businesses onto a thruway. Someday we hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems for our area, but our transportation problem is here, Completing the Midcounty Highway as planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and relieve congestion through out much of the Upcounty with a corresponding decrease in the congestion-associated social, economic and environmental . There will be environmental disturbance in any choice,
completing M-83. We regret this but feel that it is necessary to complete an effective road system
that will allow us to make the best use of the very large Upcounty residential and commercial development, and the associated environmental disturbance, that has already taken place over the last several decades. The end result will be a net improvement in personal well being, economic health, and carbon dioxide emissions

Thank you, Ann Smith

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Theodore Farrand [tfarrand@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 2:39 PM
To: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

How can we pursue such an expensive project when expanding existing roads, such as MD355 is a practical move. I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for last week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Theodore Farrand
Grassy Knoll Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

↓ 4
wildlife
air, water, noise
children/safety

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Susan Wenger [susanwengermail@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 12:20 AM
To: sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: M-83 Alternative 4

Dear Mr. McKewen,

On August 7, 2013 I spoke at a hearing at Seneca Valley High School to express my strong opposition to Alternative 4. In addition to what I said there, I want to tell you something that I saw just today.

I was driving home on Wightman Road and I saw a dead animal (probably a groundhog) on the road. This is not an everyday occurrence, but I do see run-over animals from time to time, probably about one every two weeks. I have seen small animals such as squirrels, and skunks and occasionally foxes dead on the road, and I have seen dead deer on Wightman Road as well in the past, but not often - possibly two deer a year. If Wightman Road is widened, reducing wildlife habitat, I think there will be a lot more animals run over, as they lose their habitat and cover and the areas they are accustomed to living in. Please remove Alternative 4 from the list of alternatives, to protect the local environment and wildlife habitat. I fear that the widened road would be devastating to any pet dog or cat who escapes someone's yard, and it will also be dangerous for the many, many children who live in North Village and try to cross Wightman to get to the North Creek
lake, North Creek Nature Center, North Creek pool, and other Montgomery Village attractions. It will also adversely affect air quality, water and air pollution, and noise levels in my neighborhood. The potential route involved will affect many more families and humans as well as wildlife than any of the other alternatives, I believe.

Susan Wenger
9305 Bathgate Court
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

19A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Barbara Knapp [chestnutgrower@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 11:13 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Cc: greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Completion of Mid-County Highway

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

Although I did testify briefly at the hearing on August 7th, I want to add a few comments to what I said then. First of all, I am sorry you had to sit through such an at times rowdy hearing. I do not approve of citizens booing, interrupting with endless clapping, etc. when public servants like you are doing a good job of politely listening. The Mid County Corridor Study was obviously a lengthy and careful effort, and deserved reasonable comments.

I support the Master Plan Route, Alternative 9 A, because it most effectively solves the purpose and need for this project. Compared to all the alternatives it is best because it has the shortest and safest travel time, with fewest intersections, etc. etc. Also it has been the Plan for a long time, and people have known about it, and counted on it. I sympathize with those who are concerned about hurting the environment, but I also care about the effect on people's quality of life, when they have to deal with unpredictable traffic delays and congestion. I have lived in this area, on rural, rustic, Davis Mill Road, since 1957, and the original environment we enjoyed then has been largely destroyed just by the increased development.

It would be lovely to have Mass Transit; it should have been built 30 years ago, but being realistic at the moment our best hope would be a nice straight new road on the Master Plan route, with express buses. Perhaps we could even dream of exclusive lanes for the buses.

I urge you to issue permits for construction of the proposed highway on Alternative 9 A.

Sincerely,

Barbara B. Knapp

21900 Davis Mill Road

Germantown, MD 20876

301-916-6133

Dinne, John J NAB

↑ 9A

From: Kate Simon [kate.w.simon@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 8:42 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A..

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I want to express my support for the Master Plan route, M-83, to complete the Midcounty Highway. I live in the Midcounty Corridor area and daily have to cope with dangerous and time consuming congestion on roads ranging from our small rural rustic roads to I-270. Someday we hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems for our area, but our transportation problem is here, the problem is now, it is only becoming worse, and we will always need an effective road system. Our daily life - jobs, shopping, daycare, local bus service, etc. require safe and efficient roads. Completing the Midcounty Highway as planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and relieve congestion through out much of the Upcounty with a corresponding decrease in the congestion-associated social, economic and environmental harm.

We do know that even after recent design changes there will be environmental disturbance in completing M-83. We regret this but feel that it is necessary to complete an effective road system that will allow us to make the best use of the very large Upcounty residential and commercial development, and the associated environmental disturbance, that has already taken place over the last several decades. The end result will be a net improvement in personal wellbeing, economic health, and carbon dioxide emissions.

Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A..

Thank you,

Kate Simon

20611 Miracle Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20882

9 9A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Amanda Muir [adnamaj66@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 5:10 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Support for Master Plan route, M-83

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen;

We are writing to express our support for the Master Plan route, M-83, in order to complete the existing Midcounty Highway.

We live in the Midcounty Corridor area and on a daily basis have to cope with time consuming congestion on roads, ranging from our small rural rustic roads to I-270. We have lived here for five years and in that time seen a significant increase in traffic and accidents.

In the future we would hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems in our area. But our current transportation problem is increasing now, and it is only becoming worse as time goes by.

We will always need an effective road system. Our daily life - work commutes, shopping, daycare, local bus services etc. require safe and efficient roads.

Completing the Midcounty Highway as planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and, relieve congestion throughout much of the upcounty area. Along with this there would be a decrease in traffic congestion associated with social, economic and environmental harm.

We understand that even after recent design changes there will be an environmental disturbance in completing M-83. Although this is always regretful, we feel this is outweighed by the benefits of an effective road system, allowing the large upcounty residential and commercial developments access to an improved and efficient transportation system. In any case, associated environmental disturbances have already taken place over the last several decades. With the completion of M-83 we feel the end result will be a net improvement in personal well being, economic health, and carbon dioxide emissions.

We are therefore asking you to proceed with the Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A.

Regards, Nick & Amanda Muir

9136 Goshen Valley Drive
Gaithersburg, MD

Dinne, John J NAB

1 9A

From: lou [lou004@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 3:45 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Subject: The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A

Dear Sir;

I want to express my support for the Master Plan route, M-83, to complete the Midcounty Highway. I live in the Midcounty Corridor area and daily have to cope with dangerous and time consuming congestion on roads ranging from our small rural rustic roads to I-270. Someday we hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems for our area, but our transportation problem is here, the problem is now, it is only becoming worse, and we will always need an effective road system. Our daily life - jobs, shopping, daycare, local bus service, etc. require safe and efficient roads. Completing the Midcounty Highway as planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and relieve congestion through out much of the Upcounty with a corresponding decrease in the congestion-associated social, economic and environmental harm.

We do know that even after recent design changes there will be environmental disturbance in completing M-83. We regret this but feel that it is necessary to complete an effective road system that will allow us to make the best use of the very large Upcounty residential and commercial development, and the associated environmental disturbance, that has already taken place over the last several decades. The end result will be a net improvement in personal well being, economic health, and carbon dioxide emissions.

Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A..

Thank you,

B. Loughlin
9301 Huntmaster Rd,
Laytonsville, MD 20882

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Maryann Dolan [maryannbd3@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 3:38 PM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Re- Mid- County Corridor

Dear Mr. John Dinne and Mr. Sean McKewan;

On August 7 at Seneca Valley H.S. I gave my testimony in opposition to Alternative 4 in 2 minutes and 46 seconds. That short statement is on record so I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the Master Plan.

Action on the Mid-County Highway would relieve some of the transportation problems we have NOW. 270 is choked, and the rural roads are unsafe, congested and time consuming. People have dealt with this for years and it doesn't seem to be diminishing. M-83... Alternative 9A would be an improvement in the transportation connectivity for the Mid- County Corridor as well as in people's personal and economic health.

I am concerned about the environmental disturbance in any plan . However, I am trusting that you will use all your expertice and creativity to bring about an effective road system.

Thank you for your consideration.

Maryann Dolan
9501 Ash Hollow Place
Montgomery Village, 20886

↑ 9A
congestion
existing Mid county + proximity to schools
+ properties
properties built after MP approved

Dinne, John J NAB

From: News For Camp Leeds [news4campleeds@verizon.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 9:49 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Mid County Corridor Study

CORPS: CENAB-OP-RMN (Mid County Corridor Study) 2007-07102-M15
MDE Nontidal Wetlands and Waterways: 13-NT-3162/201360802/AI No. 140416

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen,

We are writing to express our support for completing the Midcounty Highway, M-83 as detailed in alternative 9A of the Mid County Corridor Study. There are many reason why we believe that the highway should be completed this way. Basically, the reasons boil down to it's the best option among the alternatives. The Corridor Study seemed to reach this same conclusion.

With the Clarksburg development already well underway, something must be done. The congestion is already a problem. The new development in Clarksburg was allowed to progress with the assumption that Midcounty Highway would be completed. We cannot allow all these new commuters to overload the existing clogged routes. All of the other alternatives in the study don't provide the relief that the completion of the Midcounty Highway would provide.

The main arguments against the completion of the Midcounty Highway are usually cited as the environmental impact and the closeness of the highway to the properties and schools. We do think that we need to be wary of the environmental impacts of new construction like this. However, there are impacts to not building the new road--the extra exhaust of the cars waiting in traffic will negatively impact the environment. As for the properties and schools that will be near the completed Midcounty highway, we have only a small amount of sympathy. The Midcounty Highway has been on the Master Plan since the 1960s. Almost all of the properties were completed after that. Furthermore, there are properties and a school next to the existing Midcounty Highway and also next to Great Seneca Highway.

Finally we would like to add a negative comment for alternative 4. The taking of properties in this alternative is unconscionable given the options available. We understand the need to take properties for the greater good on occasion, but this does not come close to meeting that threshold.

Stick with the Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A.

Thank you,

Daniel and Meg Leeds
20831 Goshen Road
Gaithersburg, MD 20882-4230

↓Alt4
↑9A
transit

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Jolie Dobre [jolie@artjolie.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 9:40 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Subject: M83 Study hearing

Dear Mr. Dinne,

We are strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified. It is completely incompatible with the Master that are the basis for our community development. It is located well outside the central transportation corridor area it is supposed to support. Passing through an area of long established residential areas with many individual driveways and multiple intersecting roads increases the gridlock and affects safety. This in turn generates excessive air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions.

Alternative 4 Modified bulldozes through long established communities that were never planned for a major transportation corridor.

This Alternative will destroy dozens of homes due to loss of wells and septic systems, leave hundreds more with a major highway on their doorstep, impinge on the Agricultural Reserve, and destroy a living history that includes colonial-area sites and two communities established by freed slaves.

Alternative 4 is a violation of the County's Master Plan pledge to the residents of established communities, does not improve our already bad transportation situation, and seriously increases the emission of greenhouse gases.

I strongly support Alternative 9, Option A (M-83), the Master Plan Route. Alternative 9, Option A is the critical missing link in an effective transportation system.

Alternative 9, Option A will use a Master-Planned right of way dating to the 1960s. Subsequent developments were built with explicit knowledge of the location of this right of way. This minimizes interference between the road and adjacent developments.

Alternative 9, Option A will only intersect 13 established roads or other access points, the lowest of all the alternatives. This provides an efficient flow of traffic with minimal travel times, improved public safety and lower CO2 emissions.

I also would like to see investment in extension of the Metro, or light rail or dedicated bus lines, from Washington DC to Frederick. This would present a sustainable transportation option that would invigorate business along the entire 270 corridor.

Sincerely,

Ginel & Jolie Dobre

21405 Davis Mill Rd

Germantown, MD 20876

↓ 4/M
community
noise

Dinne, John J NAB

From: George Wedberg [wedbergg@verizon.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 9:22 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Cc: greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Alternative 4

Mr. Dinne --

I am writing to ask that you reject Alternative 4 for the Mid-County Highway. Alternative 4 would have a devastating effect on Montgomery Village, as it would split it with a six-lane highway.

North Village, Northgate, and East Village are quiet residential communities that would be destroyed by the noise alone. Access to these communities would be made very difficult, and walking or biking to other communities within the Village would be dangerous and difficult.

Please reject Alternative 4.

George Wedberg

wedbergg@verizon.net

301-869-0758

↓4

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Mary%20Tilbury [mary.tilbury@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 8:27 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB
Cc: greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Mid County Highway

Mr. Dinne:

I wanted to take this opportunity to express my firm opposition to Alternative 4 in relation to the Mid County Highway project. There are several other alternatives that better address the goals and objectives that are driving this project , and ones that will better serve and preserve the Montgomery Village community.

Mary S. Tilbury

19817 Greenside Terrace

Montgomery Village, MS 20886

↑ 9A

Alt 2 + existing Rds not enough

↓ 4

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Marty Wenk [mwenk_9@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 3:59 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; Ike Levitt; Greater-Goshen Civic-Assoc.
Subject: Army Corps & DEP Hearing

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen;

I want to express my support for the Master Plan route, M-83, Alt 9A, to complete the Midcounty Highway. We regret the impact on residents in the Alt 9 area, but the long planned construction of M83 was or should have been apparent as it was to others who chose other non-impacted areas to reside in. Changes to that plan would affect the confidence of many in the local government and its credibility. I have lived in the Midcounty Corridor area for 36 years and have had to cope with ever increasing dangerous and time consuming congestion on roads ranging from our small rural rustic roads to I-270. Someday we hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems for our area, but our transportation problem is here, the problem is now, it is only becoming worse, and we will always need an effective road system. Our daily life, jobs, shopping, daycare, local bus service, etc. require safe and efficient roads. The selection of Alt 2 (the improvement of MD 355) and the future long term expansion of mass transit alternatives along that route will not be enough to reduce the congestion already present on that road and existing alternative routes. Its seems more effective to add M-83 Alt 9A as another east of I-270 bypass that together with the Western bypass (Seneca Highway), I-270, M355, M83, and other local proposed linking road included in the Master plan will make the biggest positive impact.

Completing the Midcounty Highway as originally planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and relieve congestion through out much of the Upcounty. It will allow expected and desirable growth and development of the Upcounty and lower Frederick county areas which has already proceeded to a great extent with a corresponding decrease in the congestion-associated social, economic and environmental harm.

We do know that even after recent design changes there will be environmental disturbance in completing M-83. However the small incremental increased damage to the physical environment from the choice of building Alt Modified 4 over Alt 9A will be relatively small. The post construction environmental changes due to traffic, emissions, and watershed affects should be awash for the two roads and possibly greater in the Alt 4 areas where residents depend on well and septic rather than public water supply and sewers and the pollutant-producing stop and go traffic may even be increased (see below). Ecological changes will be mitigated in all cases, and the effectiveness of such efforts can be seen in the restoration efforts in the wetlands north of Brink Road in the Huntmaster Road area and south of Shady Grove Road in the area of the ICC construction. In addition for the lower apparent cost of Modified 4 the county will have wasted that money on a road that will be ineffective at reducing congestion by the inclusion of a much larger number of access points than the designed and long planned limited access Alt 9A plan. The longtime set aside of the M83 right of way resulted in less accesses and a lack of existing homes that would be impacted by the road. The 4A Alt will result in an increase in the number of traffic light controlled intersects and uncontrolled residential, business, and church/school accesses, the complete loss and range of partial

losses of personnel property, a range of property value losses,a reduction of assets for the future cost of living of retired families staying in the area, the damage to or loss of well and septic systems and the cost of added public water and sewage systems, and the cost of a large number of sound barriers. The inability to negotiate left turn paths of travel along the right turn only accesses created by the unintersected portions of the route will create congestion, longer travel times instead of shorter, and increased accidents during u-turns along the high speed road can be expected. Last but not least a larger number of Historical structures and the 130 year old post-civil war Afro-American freed slave community at Preathertown will be seriously impacted.

We it is necessary to complete an effective road system that will allow us to make the best use of the very large Upcounty residential and commercial development, and the associated environmental disturbance, that has already taken place over the last several decades. The end result will be a net improvement in personal well being, economic health, and automotive induced emissions.

Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A.

Thank you,

Martin and Nancy Wenk

Resident on the proposed M83 Alt Modified 4 route

9740 Wightman Road

Gaithersburg, MD 20879

9A

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Marty Wenk [mwenk_9@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 3:45 AM
To: Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov
Cc: Greater-Goshen Civic-Assoc.; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Army Corps & DEEP Hearing

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen;

I want to express my support for the Master Plan route, M-83, to complete the Midcounty Highway. I live in the Midcounty Corridor area and daily have to cope with dangerous and time consuming congestion on roads ranging from our small rural rustic roads to I-270. Someday we hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems for our area, but our transportation problem is here, the problem is now, it is only becoming worse, and we will always need an effective road system. Our daily life - jobs, shopping, daycare, local bus service, etc. require safe and efficient roads. Completing the Midcounty Highway as planned will not only make a big difference in our area, it will complete a major transportation system and relieve congestion through out much of the Upcounty with a corresponding decrease in the congestion-associated social, economic and environmental harm.

We do know that even after recent design changes there will be environmental disturbance in completing M-83. We regret this but feel that it is necessary to complete an effective road system that will allow us to make the best use of the very large Upcounty residential and commercial development, and the associated environmental disturbance, that has already taken place over the last several decades. The end result will be a net improvement in personal well being, economic health, and carbon dioxide emissions.

Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A..

Thank you,

Martin and Nancy Wenk

Resident on the proposed M83 Alt Modified 4 route

9740 Wightman Road

Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 5:48 PM
To: k_connolly7@comcast.net
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Thank you for your feedback on the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS). Public participation is a vital part of the transportation planning process.

By copy of this email, your comments are being forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to be included in the official joint public hearing record.

Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) is committed to public involvement and will continue to engage you and your community as the study progresses. Should have any specific questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager, for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) at greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

-----Original Message-----
From: Cindy Connolly [mailto:k_connolly7@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 12:48 PM
To: Ike Leggett
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will

drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Please take a walk through the site to get a feel for all the wildlife and people who use and enjoy the areas. Please think of all the voices you have heard and are hearing that are so against this construction.
Signed,
Cindy Connolly

Cindy Connolly
11001 Grassy Knoll Terr
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 5:47 PM
To: kristenbush@yahoo.com
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Thank you for your feedback on the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS). Public participation is a vital part of the transportation planning process.

By copy of this email, your comments are being forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to be included in the official joint public hearing record.

Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) is committed to public involvement and will continue to engage you and your community as the study progresses. Should have any specific questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager, for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) at greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

-----Original Message-----
From: Kristen Bush [mailto:kristenbush@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 12:35 PM
To: Ike Leggett
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for this week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,
Kristen Bush

Kristen Bush
11000 Grassy Knoll Terrace
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 5:47 PM
To: csb19815@gmail.com
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Thank you for your feedback on the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS). Public participation is a vital part of the transportation planning process.

By copy of this email, your comments are being forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to be included in the official joint public hearing record.

Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) is committed to public involvement and will continue to engage you and your community as the study progresses. Should have any specific questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager, for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) at greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

-----Original Message-----
From: Charlie Bailey [mailto:csb19815@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 11:56 AM
To: Ike Leggett
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The proposed Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355, costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. Even if this transit does not arrive as soon as the improvements are completed, it is crucial to lay the groundwork for it. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Charlie Bailey
Rockville

Charlie Bailey
4 Vallingby Circle
Rockville, MD 20850

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 5:47 PM
To: kamhleung@aol.com
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Thank you for your feedback on the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS). Public participation is a vital part of the transportation planning process.

By copy of this email, your comments are being forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to be included in the official joint public hearing record.

Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) is committed to public involvement and will continue to engage you and your community as the study progresses. Should have any specific questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager, for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) at greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

-----Original Message-----
From: Kam Leung [mailto:kamhleung@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 12:30 PM
To: Ike Leggett
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Kam Leung
11036 Grassy Knoll Ter
Germantown, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 5:47 PM
To: sourimanoharan@yahoo.com
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Thank you for your feedback on the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS). Public participation is a vital part of the transportation planning process.

By copy of this email, your comments are being forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to be included in the official joint public hearing record.

Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) is committed to public involvement and will continue to engage you and your community as the study progresses. Should have any specific questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager, for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) at greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

-----Original Message-----
From: Souri Manoharan [mailto:sourimanoharan@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 11:55 AM
To: Ike Leggett
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Souri Manoharan
11039 GRASSY KNOLL TER
GERMANTOWN, MD 20876

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 5:46 PM
To: nancihurt@comcast.net
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Thank you for your feedback on the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS). Public participation is a vital part of the transportation planning process.

By copy of this email, your comments are being forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to be included in the official joint public hearing record.

Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) is committed to public involvement and will continue to engage you and your community as the study progresses. Should have any specific questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager, for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) at greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

-----Original Message-----
From: Nanci Hurt [mailto:nancihurt@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 3:14 PM
To: Ike Leggett
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Nanci Hurt
9620 Watkins Road
Gaithersburg, MD 20882

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 5:45 PM
To: benjamin.beiter@gmail.com
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Thank you for your feedback on the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS). Public participation is a vital part of the transportation planning process.

By copy of this email, your comments are being forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to be included in the official joint public hearing record.

Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) is committed to public involvement and will continue to engage you and your community as the study progresses. Should have any specific questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager, for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) at greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

-----Original Message-----
From: Benjamin Beiter [mailto:benjamin.beiter@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 3:04 PM
To: Ike Leggett
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

kI urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Benjamin Beiter
9906 Boysenberry Way #118
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

Dinne, John J NAB

From: Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 5:46 PM
To: jlgreynolds@gmail.com
Cc: Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Thank you for your feedback on the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS). Public participation is a vital part of the transportation planning process.

By copy of this email, your comments are being forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to be included in the official joint public hearing record.

Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) is committed to public involvement and will continue to engage you and your community as the study progresses. Should have any specific questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Greg Hwang, Project Manager, for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) at greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

-----Original Message-----
From: Jessica Reynolds [mailto:jlgreynolds@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 10:19 PM
To: Ike Leggett
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental and community impacts, and comes at a time when we should consider real transit alternatives to new highway construction to help plan for a sustainable future for Montgomery County.

The most pressing issue for next week's public hearing about M83 is the potential impact on wetlands and our aquatic resources. Alternatives 4, 8, or 9 (alternatives that entail new construction, rather than upgrading existing roads) would travel through wetlands and important stream valleys. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) says only 0.9 acres of wetlands would be impacted because they are proposing to build bridges over these areas. Yet it's clear that the construction process to build those bridges -- including temporary access roads to bring in bull dozers and heavy equipment -- will necessitate filling in wetland areas and compacting soil that is key to filtration and other ecosystem functions.

Longer term, new impermeable surfaces directly over the wetlands will drive more polluted stormwater runoff into these important natural resources, which are already threatened by potential increases in impervious surfaces from nearby developments like Ten Mile Creek.

In addition to wetland impacts, there are several key environmental and community issues to consider. Alternatives 4, 8, and 9 of M83 would cause the destruction of up to 67 acres of forests, 48 acres of park land, and 31 acres of prime farmland. It would attract more traffic, causing more air pollution and carbon emissions. Finally, it would divide existing communities and bring associated health and noise impacts.

The only acceptable alternative proposed is Alternative 2, which proposes upgrades to MD355. It costs the least, has the least impacts, and enables the development of high quality Rapid Transit connecting Clarksburg to Gaithersburg and points south. The County's own traffic analysis admits none of the more costly alternatives perform any better than utilizing our existing roadways. For the same cost of M83, estimated at up to $700 million, we could improve existing roadways while implementing the Rapid Transit System to connect Clarksburg to the rest of the County. While MCDOT's report says that Rapid Transit is too early in the process to consider, I believe it would be a mistake to not evaluate a real transit alternative to this highway which will severely impact our natural resources and neighborhoods.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, including its impact on wetlands. Please consider the full impact of construction, stormwater runoff, and the secondary impacts of nearby development, and reject the permit for this project that would enable the destruction and degradation of our wetlands and water resources.

Signed,

Jessica Reynolds
1022 Paul Dr
Rockville, MD 20851