

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** FRFESS@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 10:30 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** rfess@aol.com  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Master - Planned M - 83 With Alternative 9 A

---

Subj: Master - Planned M - 83 With Alternative 9 A

Dear Mr. Dinne:

My husband and I are long time residents of Montgomery County, MD. In fact over the years we have owned five homes in the County between us, including our current residence on Davis Mill Road, a two lane rural, rustic roadway.

Prior to the purchase of each of these homes, we have always done our 'due diligence' in investigating short and/or long term impacts on our neighborhoods...including the previous/now built ICC and the proposed M - 83. It took us five years to locate a home with the serenity and rural appeal of our Davis Mill location and we value our lifestyle here highly.

We are very concerned about the number of people who are opposed to the long - term proposed Master - Planned M - 83 Route. Have you or will you determine how many of these complainants are actually owner/occupants, such as my husband and I are? ...i.e. how many of them have a true investment in the community, other than for their own personal financial gain?

Please be advised that we are definite proponents of the Master - Planned M - 83 Route AND Alternative 9 A.

We reject the other Alternatives and Options for the following reasons:

1.) Adverse effects on the wetlands have been minimized. Trees along the right - of - way are 50 years old BECAUSE the land was set aside for M - 83, were not cut back and are now being used as an excuse to alter the Master Plan.

2.) No Build is not a solution to any of our traffic problems.

3.) Alternative 2 provides 'spot' improvements only...not the required area - wide congestion relief.

4.) Alternative 4 communities were NEVER planned or developed to accommodate a 4/6 lane divided highway. There would be tremendous damage to the community, high collision risk, slow stop and go traffic and no closure of the gap in the Midcounty Highway.

5.) Alternative 5 adds traffic to an already overloaded Route 355 and Montgomery Village Avenue, that includes two of the most congested intersections in the County.

6.) Alternative 8 restricts access to points South of the planned I - 270/Watkins Mill overpass and interchanges AND will dump major traffic onto Watkins Mill Road, Route 355 and Montgomery Village Avenue.

7.0 Options B and D ARE NOT in the Master Plan, destroy houses, damage the shrinking Agricultural Reserve and in the case of Option B...seriously reduces transportation efficiency and safety.

We seriously hope that all parties involved in the decision process elect to build the Master Planned M - 83 WITH Alternative 9 A.

Sincerely,

Thomas and Anne Fessenden

21525 Davis Mill Road  
Germantown, MD 20876 - 4419

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:34 PM  
**To:** paulakoch1@verizon.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Paula Koch [<mailto:paulakoch1@verizon.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 12:31 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, Paula A. Koch

Paula Koch  
20468 Watkins Meadow Drive  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:35 PM  
**To:** billkoch1@verizon.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** William Koch [<mailto:billkoch1@verizon.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 12:40 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, William F. KOCH

William Koch  
20468 Watkins Meadow Dr.  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:33 PM  
**To:** Dcessig@hotmail.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Drew Essig [<mailto:Dcessig@hotmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 3:05 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,

Drew Essig

Drew Essig  
10708 misty moon pl  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:32 PM  
**To:** anassar13@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Amira Nassar [<mailto:anassar13@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 12:51 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,

Amira Nassar  
20361 Watkins Meadow Drive  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:31 PM  
**To:** tirenfamily@verizon.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Cynthia Tiren [<mailto:tirenfamily@verizon.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 8:40 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,

Cynthia Tiren  
20313 Sandsfield Terrace  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:31 PM  
**To:** fmbloom@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Frank Bloom [<mailto:fmbloom@aol.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 8:17 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,

Frank Bloom  
10725 wayfarer rd  
germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:30 PM  
**To:** lstering21@verizon.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Linda Sterling [<mailto:lstering21@verizon.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 8:06 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.

Other than the obvious environmental impact, existing neighborhoods would be divided and destroyed. The problem seems to lie in access to the new developments in Clarksburg. Why should the residents of Gaithersburg and Germantown sacrifice their homes and communities to accommodate a community where poor planning and greed on the part of the builders created this problem? The gridlock is in Clarksburg, not Germantown and Gaithersburg. Take a trip up there during rush hour and see how long you sit on 355 once it narrows down to one lane. Take a

look at Route 27, which cannot accommodate the traffic generated by all the commuters. I feel for the residents of Clarksburg, but not enough to sacrifice my neighborhood for theirs.

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.

Signed,

Linda Sterling  
20508 Watkins Meadow Dr  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:30 PM  
**To:** thetirens@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Craig Tiren [<mailto:thetirens@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 7:46 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,

Craig Tiren  
20313 Sandsfield Terrace  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:29 PM  
**To:** Cgmpsu91@verizon.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Carla Magdamo [<mailto:Cgmpsu91@verizon.net>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 7:18 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,

Carla Magdamo  
20357 Watkins Meadow Dr  
Germantown, MD 20976

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** David Lefkoff [dlefkoff@sreedman.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 9:26 PM  
**To:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)  
**Subject:** RE: Midcounty Corridor Study Joint Public Hearing-August 7, 2013

**Importance:** High

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

We are homeowners of the Points and are house backs up to Montgomery Village Ave close to Wightman. We do NOT need a

Six lane road built in our community. We have lived here since 2000 and cannot afford our property value to diminish. Find another location to build your six lane road!

---

**From:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg) [<mailto:Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 20, 2013 5:39 PM  
**Subject:** Midcounty Corridor Study Joint Public Hearing-August 7, 2013

Dear Midcounty Corridor Study Community:

This email is to inform you of the upcoming Joint Public Hearing for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS).

If you have received MCS newsletters in the past, then you will be receiving a hard copy of the Public Notice. You may also download the Public Notice  
<[http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/corridor/Resources/Files/pdf/PublicHearing/PublicNotice\\_130621.pdf](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/corridor/Resources/Files/pdf/PublicHearing/PublicNotice_130621.pdf)> .

JOINT PUBLIC HEARING      DATE-LOCATION-TIME-PURPOSE

Wednesday, August 7, 2013

Seneca Valley High School, Cafeteria& Auditorium

19401 Crystal Rock Drive, Germantown, MD 20874

Poster (Display) Session @ Cafeteria: 4:30-6:30 PM

Public Testimony @ Auditorium: 6:30-10:30 PM

The Joint Public Hearing will be hosted by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE). The purpose is to provide the public an opportunity to present views, opinions and information which will be considered by COE/MDE in evaluating Montgomery County Department of Transportation's (MCDOT) permit application.

SIGN-UP FOR TESTIMONY

Public hearing sign-up begins at 4:30 pm on the same day as the Joint Public Hearing, August 7, 2013. Sign-up sheets will be available in the auditorium. If we are unable to accommodate you on the speaker's list, you may provide testimony in writing which will be included in the record. Your written testimony will be given the same consideration as oral testimony. Please forward any comments or written testimony to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Baltimore District

Attn: Mr. Jack Dinne, CENAB-OP-RMN

P.O. Box 1715

Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715

e-mail: [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)

Phone: (410) 962-6005

Maryland Department of the Environment

Wetlands and Waterways Program

Attn: Mr. Sean McKewen

160 South Water Street

Frostburg, Maryland, 21532

e-mail: [sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

Phone: (301) 689-1493

The Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) appreciated your continuing interest in the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS). Please feel free to contact me should you have additional concerns.

Best regards,

Gwo-Ruey (Greg) Hwang, P.E.

Midcounty Corridor Study Project Manager

Phone: 240-777-7279

Fax: 240-777-7277

[greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov) <<mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov>>

\*\*\* Midcounty Corridor Study website: [www.montgomerycountymd.gov/midcountycorridorstudy](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/midcountycorridorstudy)  
<<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/midcountycorridorstudy>> \*\*\*

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:29 PM  
**To:** FRFESS@aol.com  
**Cc:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Master - Planned M - 83 With Alternative 9 A

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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov) <<mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov>> .

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett

County Executive

cc:

Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil) <<mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil>>

Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov) <<mailto:Sean,mckewen@maryland.gov>>

---

**From:** [FRFESS@aol.com](mailto:FRFESS@aol.com) [<mailto:FRFESS@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 10:36 AM  
**To:** Ike Leggett  
**Subject:** Master - Planned M - 83 With Alternative 9 A

---

Subj: Master - Planned M - 83 With Alternative 9 A

Dear County Executive Leggett and County Council Members:

My husband and I are long time residents of Montgomery County, MD. In fact over the years we have owned five homes in the County between us, including our current residence on Davis Mill Road, a two lane rural, rustic roadway.

Prior to the purchase of each of these homes, we have always done our 'due diligence' in investigating short and/or long term impacts on our neighborhoods...including the previous/now built ICC and the proposed M - 83. It took us five years to locate a home with the serenity and rural appeal of our Davis Mill location and we value our lifestyle here highly.

We are very concerned about the number of people who are opposed to the long - term proposed Master - Planned M - 83 Route. Have you or will you determine how many of these complainants are actually owner/occupants, such as my husband and I are? ...i.e. how many of them have a true investment in the community, other than for their own personal financial gain?

Please be advised that we are definite proponents of the Master - Planned M - 83 Route AND Alternative 9 A.

We reject the other Alternatives and Options for the following reasons:

1.) Adverse effects on the wetlands have been minimized. Trees along the right - of - way are 50 years old BECAUSE the land was set aside for M - 83, were not cut back and are now being used as an excuse to alter the Master Plan.

2.) No Build is not a solution to any of our traffic problems.

3.) Alternative 2 provides 'spot' improvements only...not the required area - wide congestion relief.

4.) Alternative 4 communities were NEVER planned or developed to accommodate a 4/6 lane divided highway. There would be tremendous damage to the community, high collision risk, slow stop and go traffic and no closure of the gap in the Midcounty Highway.

5.) Alternative 5 adds traffic to an already overloaded Route 355 and Montgomery Village Avenue, that includes two of the most congested intersections in the County.

6.) Alternative 8 restricts access to points South of the planned I - 270/Watkins Mill overpass and interchanges AND will dump major traffic onto Watkins Mill Road, Route 355 and Montgomery Village Avenue.

7.0 Options B and D ARE NOT in the Master Plan, destroy houses, damage the shrinking Agricultural Reserve and in the case of Option B...seriously reduces transportation efficiency and safety.

We seriously hope that all parties involved in the decision process elect to build the Master Planned M - 83 WITH Alternative 9 A.

Sincerely,

Thomas and Anne Fessenden

21525 Davis Mill Road

Germantown, MD 20876 - 4419

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Paul Majewski [pmajewski123@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 9:56 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Cc:** MC Council; anne.kaiser@house.state.md.us; eric.luedtke@house.state.md.us; craig.zucker@house.state.md.us  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Alternative 9a is the best choice for M-83

August 18, 2013

Mr. Jack Dinne, CENAB-OP-RMN  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Baltimore District

Mr. Sean McKewen  
Maryland Department of the Environment  
Wetlands and Waterways Program

Greg Hwang, Project Manager  
Montgomery County Dept. of Transportation

Dear Sirs:

I believe Montgomery County should at this stage choose the Master Planned alignment (alternative 9a) of M-83. If mass-transit or other non-M-83 dreams (telecommuting boom, half-width vehicles, ...) miraculously come to fruition and meet the needs for the area's traffic, then the county can decide later to change plans or cancel M-83 all together. But I don't see dreams (including, for the mid-county area, mass transit) changing enough of the traffic projected. By drastically cutting down on congestion and trip time, alternative 9a cuts down on gasoline emissions and the carbon footprint; and it does not add the cost that massive mass-transit would require.

M-83 will handle local traffic and encourage driving to the Shady Grove (SG) Metro. The traffic need increases as Clarksburg and other local areas are built out. Snowden Farm Parkway will handle much of the traffic generated by the current and future houses in Clarksburg. Traffic from Damascus and other northern areas continues to fill MD-27. The commuters that are traveling locally (like me since 1989) or to SG, need an outlet or MD-27 will stay congested.

Alternative 9a reduces traffic along roads that Master Plans have not planned to be so congested.

The loudest speakers are organized for the environment and against any M-83, especially against 9a. But, environmentally, alternative 9a -

- uses bridges to span some sensitive wetlands;
- results in outstanding reduced speed of trips -- that lessens emissions and lessens congestion on surrounding roads;
- takes away less than an acre of woods - which I'm sure is mitigated by reforestation.
- is one leg of a many-legged stool needed -- mass Transit like BRT may be just one of those legs -- we need these multiple approaches to handle congestion, and to help local travelers when the through traffic is congesting 270 and 355.

Having no M-83 would almost certainly be disasterous for many of us, and even moreso for those living along alternate paths in Goshen and Gaithersburg.

As many others have realized, alternative 4 is the worst.

Paul Majewski, 12233 Piedmont Road, Clarksburg MD, 20871  
Montgomery County resident, District 14 MD  
[pmajewski123@comcast.net](mailto:pmajewski123@comcast.net)  
301-972-6031

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:32 PM  
**To:** gvkemp@hotmail.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** gregory kemp [<mailto:gvkemp@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 9:36 AM  
**To:** Ike Leggett  
**Subject:** Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Please reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extension. An excess of roads is not the answer. Not only will the project threaten highly valued green areas, but it is but another backwards step in solving transportation issues. It is time that we show some sense and do something that will change the culture of urban sprawl. Public transportation is one option. No new road is another. What will happen without M83? It will force people to make smarter transportation decisions. Montgomery county is a leader in so many ways, why not be a leader here.

I use the green areas which would be damaged by some of the road options three or more times per week. This includes running, hiking, mountain biking, and canoeing. These areas are genuine treasures. I cannot believe that there are not smarter alternatives.

Although I am against any M83, the only decent choice (if a choice must be made) is Alternative 2. I am against it overall, but I do see it as best of the options being considered. Keep the traffic to the existing traffic corridor. Protect our precious resources.

Signed,  
Gregory Kemp

gregory kemp  
20309 sandsfield ter  
germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:33 PM  
**To:** robinhorner@verizon.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Robin Horner [<mailto:robinhorner@verizon.net>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 2:44 PM  
**To:** Ike Leggett  
**Subject:** Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I have lived in and around Montgomery Village since 1979. I was informed about M83 at that time. The county has waited TOO LONG communities are well established. BESIDES the REAL need now-2013- is Route 27 - and there is nothing on the table for this MAJOR traffic area - yet the CO continues to give building permits without roads.

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 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.

Please widen #355 above Father Hurley and widen Rt 27 to 6 lanes NOW - not 40yrs from now.

Sincerely,  
Robin Horner

Robin Horner  
20465 Watkins Meadow Dr  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:34 PM  
**To:** jean Gendron  
**Cc:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: M-83

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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov) <<mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov>> .

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett

County Executive

cc:

Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil) <<mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil>>

Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov) <<mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov>>

---

**From:** jean Gendron [<mailto:jg0716@verizon.net>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 8:46 PM  
**To:** Ike Leggett  
**Subject:** Re: M-83

Dear Mr. Leggett:

I urge you to reject the permit application and plans for M-83, especially alternatives 4, 8 and 9.

These would negatively impact our wetlands, and bring noise, pollution and traffic to our quiet, suburban neighborhoods.

Thank you. Sincerely, Jean Gendron, 10307 Watkins Mill Drive

Montgomery Village, MD

20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:33 PM  
**To:** miriamwalks@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Miriam Lieblein [<mailto:miriamwalks@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 3:48 PM  
To: Ike Leggett  
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I am writing in opposition to building M-83. I'm concerned about the loss of green space and wetlands, the impact on wildlife and people, the pollution and noise, and the violation of Smart Growth principles. Current population trends show that people are moving back to cities and urban centers. If this continues, the extra capacity provided by M-83 may not be necessary. Once we damage the wetlands and wildlife habitat by building a road, we can't easily get them back. We can, however, always build the road at some later time. Having significant green space is important to physical and psychological health; those woods and parkland are a great treasure. It also seems to me that building roads to provide another north/south route simply encourages sprawl, which runs counter to Smart Growth principles. If M-83 is built, it's likely that there will be more development along it, consuming the last significant expanse of green space in the area.

On a personal note, I live on Grassy Knoll Terrace, and am concerned about the noise and pollution that M-83 would produce for our neighborhood. Most houses on Grassy Knoll are well above road level; even if sound walls were built, they wouldn't help. I also worry about pollution levels rising significantly for those of us who walk/run/cycle along the popular multi-use paths alongside Midcounty and Middlebrook.

Miriam Lieblein  
Grassy Knoll Ter  
Germantown, MD 20876

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Rosemary Arkoian [rarkoian@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 11:04 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Gwo-Ruey (Greg) Hwang; County Council President; Isiah (Ike) Leggett  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] PLEASE ISSUE PERMIT for COMPLETION of MIDCOUNTY CORRIDOR (M-83)

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

Although I testified at the Public Hearing re the Midcounty Corridor Study on August 7th, I felt I needed to email you with a few more comments. I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to ALTERNATIVE 4 and I am even more STRONGLY FOR COMPLETION of the ORIGINAL MASTERPLAN for M-83, ALTERNATIVE 9, OPTION A.

This road has been in the MasterPlan since 1964 (my husband and I checked on this before we bought our home in 1978) and we realized this road would complete a traffic system for the Upcounty (now numbering @300,000 people). The right of way has been publicly disclosed and reserved from development, the wetlands impact is now less than 1 acre, and Snowden Farm Parkway is now being built, leaving a mere 5.7 miles gap or "hole" from the already completed Midcounty Corridor from Shady Grove Road to Montgomery Village Avenue to Snowden Farm Parkway. The TIME is NOW---we can't afford to wait any longer!! We're drowning in traffic, air pollution has increased, and transit (which is also needed) is far off. We must do what is in the best interests of "the greater good" and not be swayed by a few, vocal individuals (many of whom do not even live in Montgomery County or pay taxes here). The NO BUILD option is not a viable, credible solution---it does NOTHING to help us!!

As I sat through the entire Public Hearing (from 6:30 pm to @ 11:00 pm), while I understood some of the comments from the "opposition", I just couldn't help feel that there was a lot of "smoke and mirrors" being tossed about. I implore you to issue the permits to get on with this very long overdue road. I repeat what I said at the Hearing, "TRUST, but VERIFY what you heard". Also, as President FDR said, "REPETITION DOES NOT TRANSFORM A LIE INTO A TRUTH".

THANK YOU VERY MUCH for your time and consideration of this extremely important matter. I sincerely appreciate it.

Rosemary O. Arkoian  
20816 Bell Bluff Road  
Gaithersburg (Goshen), MD 20879-1112  
[rarkoian@hotmail.com](mailto:rarkoian@hotmail.com)

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Miranda Elliott [miranda.elliott80@btinternet.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 9:59 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support of Alternative 9A (M-83), Master Plan Route

Dear Mr Dinne and Mr McKewen,

Following careful consideration of the proposals for completion of the Midcounty Highway, I am writing in support of Alternative 9A (M-83), the Master Plan route.

Having recently reviewed the Master Plan when making the decision to purchase a family home in the area, and in fact, being influenced by its route, I feel strongly that Alternative 9, Option (A) provides the right solution to the traffic issues in the area whilst not encroaching on our valuable Agricultural Reserve.

Sincerely,

Miranda Elliott

9201 Brink Road  
Gaithersburg  
MD 20882



**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Royal Buyer [royalbuyer5@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 9:18 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on Midcounty Corridor Study

Comments for the record on the Midcounty Corridor Study to the Army Corps of Engineers by Kimball Watts and Janet Buyer August 19, 2013

We have sent an email identical to this to the Maryland Department of the Environment. [sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

We own a home at 20724 Bell Bluff Road, Gaithersburg MD

We have reviewed the Midcounty Corridor Study and find Alternative 9A to offer the most logical solution to the traffic congestion that exists in this area for the following reasons:

1. The right of way for this alternative exists.
2. Closest to I-270 and MD 355 and therefore the alternative that provides the best relief to those major roads.
3. Impacts to wetlands and other environmental issues have been significantly reduced and minimized.
4. Most consistent with our decision to purchase this home, as the Master Plan alignment has been in the books and has guided all development activities for over 40 years.
5. Safest of all options, as it has limited access only at main intersections. No driveway connections. Improved access response time for our fire and rescue and police services
6. Provides the most support for the orderly economic and residential development of all alternatives.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Julia Scherschligt [julia.scherschligt@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 9:18 PM  
**To:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] MD 83 Public Comment

Dear Mr. Jack Dinne and Mr. Sean McKewen-

I am writing to request that the permit for building MD-83 options 9, 8, and 4 (and all variations) not be granted. I believe that these options are damaging to the environment, represent major pedestrian safety hazards, especially for children, and will not adequately address the main intent of reducing traffic congestion.

I live in the Stedwick community of Montgomery Village, and back to the Seneca Creek State Park. My wife and I walk our dogs along the Seneca Creek and the many runs and ephemeral streams that would be negatively impacted. It is a beautiful riparian zone; on our walks we've seen nesting geese, great blue herons, turtles, fox, raccoons, fish, and many other animals. The proposed options 4, 8, and 9 would do great harm to this beautiful wetland area that floods with every rain some 100 feet from the river bank. Even if built with responsible construction practices, the road would inevitably wash more trash and road salt into the streams, and would further fragment habitat that is already crossed by two major highways just a mile away.

The proposed alternative 9 passes right next to Watkins Mill Elementary School, which serves a neighborhood largely comprised of first-generation immigrants. On our way to work every morning during the school year we pass an amazing parade of cultures as neighborhood children walk to school. Some kids safely walk without their parents, and others are accompanied by parents pushing a little brother or sister in a stroller. The proposed options 8 and 9 would place a dangerous highway between where most of these children live and their school. There is no mention of safe pedestrian passage that would make it safe for these children to walk to school, which is so much healthier--for the individual and the community--than being driven by bus or car.

Clearly traffic in our region is bad. We have not adequately developed mass transit alternatives and this poor lack of planning is starting to show the limits of relying on roads to spur our future development. More surface roads with signaled intersections aren't the answer. We need to improve the roads we have, and strive toward legitimate transit options. At the hearing, many complained of poor access to Shady Grove for those living in Clarksburg. On the occasion that I have had to go to Shady Grove, I've been astonished at how full the parking lot is; I wonder, how much more capacity does Shady Grove have to serve the northern suburbs, not just Clarksburg, but Urbana and Frederick? It is time that the red line or some other spur of the Metro be extended north to provide real transit options into Washington, DC. The MARC train is a pitiful excuse for transit. It has a horrible on-time record and very restrictive schedule, and is simply not an option for many commuters.

The cost of options 4, 8 and 9 are excessive. I do not support using my tax dollars to build a new road which will greatly damage wetlands and forest, endanger pedestrian safety, erode a vibrant community, and does little to improve traffic congestion. The master plan was drafted in the 1960's. Much of what we thought was a good idea in the 1960's has either been left by the wayside or shown to be dead wrong - our thinking on civil rights, the environment, and what constitutes good urban planning have all radically evolved since the master plan was drafted. I urge you to deny the permit to build M83 alternatives 4, 8, and 9.

Sincerely-

Julia Scherschligt  
19537 Gallatin Ct  
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Dan Hussey [hussey.dan@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 8:55 PM  
**To:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] MD 83 Public Comment

Dear Mr. Jack Dinne and Mr. Sean McKewen-

I am writing to request that the permit for building MD-83 options 9, 8, and 4 (and all variations) not be granted. I believe that these options are damaging to the environment, represent major pedestrian safety hazards, especially for children, and will not adequately address the main intent of reducing traffic congestion.

I live in the Stedwick community of Montgomery Village, and back to the Seneca Creek State Park. My wife and I walk our dogs along the Seneca Creek and the many runs and ephemeral streams that would be negatively impacted. It is a beautiful riparian zone; on our walks we've seen nesting geese, great blue herons, turtles, fox, raccoons, fish, and many other animals. The proposed options 4, 8, and 9 would do great harm to this beautiful wetland area that floods with every rain some 100 feet from the river bank. Even if built with responsible construction practices, the road would inevitably wash more trash and road salt into the streams, and would further fragment habitat that is already crossed by two major highways just a mile away.

The proposed alternative 9 passes right next to Watkins Mill Elementary School, which serves a neighborhood largely comprised of first-generation immigrants. On our way to work every morning during the school year we pass an amazing parade of cultures as neighborhood children walk to school. Some kids safely walk without their parents, and others are accompanied by parents pushing a little brother or sister in a stroller. The proposed options 8 and 9 would place a dangerous highway between where most of these children live and their school. There is no mention of safe pedestrian passage that would make it safe for these children to walk to school, which is so much healthier--for the individual and the community--than being driven by bus or car.

Clearly traffic in our region is bad. We have not adequately developed mass transit alternatives and this poor lack of planning is starting to show the limits of relying on roads to spur our future development. More surface roads with signaled intersections aren't the answer. We need to improve the roads we have, and strive toward legitimate transit options. At the hearing, many complained of poor access to Shady Grove for those living in Clarksburg. On the occasion that I have had to go to Shady Grove, I've been astonished at how full the parking lot is; I wonder, how much more capacity does Shady Grove have to serve the northern suburbs, not just Clarksburg, but Urbana and Frederick? It is time that the red line or some other spur of the Metro be extended north to provide real transit options into Washington, DC. The MARC train is a pitiful excuse for transit. It has a horrible on-time record and very restrictive schedule, and is simply not an option for many commuters.

The cost of options 4, 8 and 9 are excessive. I do not support using my tax dollars to build a new road which will greatly damage wetlands and forest, endanger pedestrian safety, erode a vibrant community, and does little to improve traffic congestion. The master plan was drafted in the 1960's. Much of what we thought was a good idea in the 1960's has either been left by the wayside or shown to be dead wrong - our thinking on civil rights, the environment, and what constitutes good urban planning have all radically evolved since the master plan was drafted. I urge you to deny the permit to build M83 alternatives 4, 8, and 9.

Sincerely-

Daniel S. Hussey

19537 Gallatin Ct.

Montgomery Village, MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Dana Uehling [theuehlings@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 6:24 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Midcounty Corridor Study Comments  
**Attachments:** Midcounty Corridor Comments Uehling.doc

August 19, 2013

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

I want to express my support for the Master Plan route, Alternative 9A, for M-83, the completion of Midcounty Highway. Alternative 9A best meets the stated needs for the road, development has been approved based on this alignment, and home owners have made plans, including the decision to purchase a home, based on this master plan alignment.

I am against Alternative 4. Alternative 4 impacts a large number of homes and does not meet the stated needs of the road. It would involve a large expense and huge personal impact without meeting the needs for the road.

I am against Alternatives 9D and 9B. Alternative D impacts more residences, more forest, more piped streams, and more farm land than Alternative 9A. The total number of acres negatively impacted is far greater with alternative 9D than with Alternative 9A.

The farm land impacted by Alternative 9D is part of Montgomery County's Agricultural Reserve - an effort to preserve land for agriculture within Montgomery county. A church was denied the ability to build on this land in the Agricultural reserve due to the detrimental impact it would have. A road built on this land would be damaging as well. If we use this agricultural land for a road, what other uses of land within the agricultural reserve will be approved in the future? If the county is serious about preserving the agricultural land, this road should not be built on it.

My family would be directly impacted by Alternatives 9B and 9D. We bought our home for the wooded lot and the fact that it backs up to parkland. We bought it with the intention of keeping it wooded and spending many hours walking in the woods and enjoying nature, which we do regularly. Our children have learned about nature, the changing seasons, and forest lifecycles. They have named areas and tree stumps ("puppy playground", "the kitty cat", etc.), and will be heart-broken if they are destroyed. We enjoy seeing deer, fox, ground hogs, bunnies, and birds (including Pileated Woodpeckers). We bought this property with full knowledge of the M-83 master plan and that the road would be far enough from our home to have little negative impact on us. We considered several different locations when looking for a home, but ruled them out based on the planned route for M-83. We trusted our government to use the land that they own and to stick with their published master plan.

The "parkland" mentioned in Alternative 9A is land that the county bought with the intention to use it for a road. Alternatives 9B & 9D contain land bought by private citizens with the intention of keeping it wooded. It seems wrong to take someone else's land and build a road on it when you already own land that you bought for that same road, especially when there is not a significant difference in the environmental impact.

Since there is not a significant difference in the environmental impact of Alternative 9 Option A versus Option D, and Alternative 9 meets all the of the needs for the road, the master plan alignment, Alternative 9A should be selected as the preferred route for this road. Plans have been made based on this master plan alignment and there is not a good reason to deviate from it.

Please Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A.

Sincerely,

Dana Uehling and Mark Uehling

21300 Lawland Court

Germantown, MD 20876

[theuehlings@verizon.net](mailto:theuehlings@verizon.net)

✓

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Jeff Roberts [jeffroberts5kids@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 6:05 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Our Request Regarding MidCounty Highway

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen (and Mr. Hwang),

My wife and I wish to encourage you to keep MidCounty Highway's extension along the Master Plan route, which we believe is currently referred to as Alternative 9A.

We have lived on Brink Road in Goshen Estates since 1980 and have raised our five children here. We have enjoyed living here, accepting the volume of traffic on Brink Road and the 15-minute drive to go 5 miles to Interstate 270. We have known about the proposed extension of MidCounty Highway for most of this time and, especially, since the construction of the highway as it presently exists. We have taken it for granted that, when it was extended, it would continue on its current trajectory, which we have read about in community publications, seen on published maps (where there was clearly a swath of land set aside for the path of the highway), and noted on signs along the proposed route (such as on Blunt Road).

We have, therefore, been surprised and upset to realize that there is support for other routes - routes that would move the road to other locations - locations that would carve out space from the yards of some of our neighbors, potentially destroying some homes, and making our personal commutes more unpleasant by adding more intersections and more volume of traffic on our nearby streets, and actually creating some instances where our current roads would get co-opted to accept MidCounty Highway traffic.

Please do not alter the original route. Please leave our current roads and neighborhoods intact, especially when the Alternative 9A space has been carved out and reserved for this route for years.

Sincerely,

Jeff and Debbie Roberts  
9301 Brink Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20882  
Home: 301-670-0272  
Cell (Jeff): 240-281-8420

✓

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Jim Orban [jim.orban@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 5:32 PM  
**To:** Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** oemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comment on the Midcounty Corridor

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

Thank you for arranging the hearing on August 7th. I was in attendance but had to leave before I was able to make a statement, and I appreciate this opportunity to do so electronically.

I have lived in Montgomery County since 1961 and in Montgomery Village since 1982. My neighborhood is North Village, the section bounded by Wightman Road, Goshen Road and Warfield Road. I am a proud graduate of our University of Maryland (Go Terps!), where I earned a degree in Fish and Wildlife Management. I am a lover of the outdoors, a supporter of the Izaak Walton League of America and am an Eagle Scout as well as a former Scoutmaster of BSA Troop 207 of Gaithersburg, Maryland. All of this is to say that I believe I have at least as good a grasp on the many nuanced issues involved in this pending decision as any of the speakers I heard on the 7th who were perhaps well-intentioned but mis- or under-informed.

After studying the various options, it seems obvious to me that the best way to address present and future traffic needs while protecting the environment is to implement Alternative 9A.

It was apparent that many people present at the hearing do not have an understanding of the resilience of forests and wetlands to return to their natural state after being disturbed, whether due to natural or man-made phenomena. After reading the materials made available to us, I am convinced that the impact to parkland and wildlife from the construction will be minimal and temporary, and the plans for mitigation and restoration will be sufficient.

Many people call themselves proponents of "smart growth", but often this is a euphemism for "no growth". I am a proponent of "smart use", and as an avid outdoorsman, jogger, hiker and biker, I am looking forward to being able to jog or ride alongside the completed portion of Midcounty Highway when construction is completed. (Perhaps the name should be "Midcounty Parkway" between Ridge Road and Montgomery Village Avenue rather than "Highway".) This roadway will open up a beautiful section of parkland and make it accessible to many people

who otherwise would never have that chance. I'm also pleased that it will improve access from Montgomery Village to Germantown via the planned intersection with Middlebrook Road, which now abruptly ends at the woods.

In summary, after studying the various proposed solutions, it is my unequivocal conclusion that the only viable one is Alternative 9a, so I strongly urge you to adopt Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

Sincerely,

James Orban  
20601 DuBois Court  
Montgomery Village, Maryland 20886

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** walt sonneville [waltsonneville@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 4:23 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Elementary School and M-83

The environmental review of the options for Mid-County Extension ("M-83") neglected to include a key point: the fate of the Watkins Mill Elementary School, under Alternative 9, which would be sited on the very edge of this proposed major highway.

It seems most likely that one can reasonably conclude that emissions from vehicles passing the school grounds will cause significantly increased respiratory health problems. The school may have to be closed. Re-location is highly problematical.

This issue was raised by a detailed memo co-signed by six health professionals in their submittal to the county's M-83 study managers, first by communications of 3-4-05 (to Ms. Jeri Cauthorn) and again on 2-13-08 (to Mr. Greg Hwang).

PLEASE give this matter the attention it deserves.

Walt Sonneville  
314 Wye Mill Court  
Gaithersburg, MD 20879  
301 869 4460

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** cltmcgrew [cltmcgrew@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 4:15 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] PublicTestimony-Midcounty Corridor Study

Fetrows Neighborhood - Wacomor Drive and Ward Avenue: Comment Period Submission

---

Christine L. Trippel McGrew

22708 Ward Avenue

Germantown, Maryland 20876

cltmcgrew@verizon.net

August 19, 2013

U.S. Corps of Engineers

Baltimore District

Attn: Mr. Jack Dinne, CENAB-OP-RMN

P.O. Box 1715  
EMAIL & USPS

SENT VIA

Baltimore, MD 21203-1715

john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil

Maryland Department of the Environment

Wetlands and Waterways Program

Attn: Mr. Sean McKewen

160 Water Street

Frostburg, MD 21532

sean.mckewen@maryland.gov

Reference: Interested Party Concern - Fetrows Neighborhood, Wacomor Drive & Ward Avenue

This project study area and each of the proposed alternatives, including Alternative 1 - No Build, affect our neighborhood. Our safety and property values will be affected by action taken in this matter.

Our homes have been here since the 1960's; both Wacomor Drive and Ward Avenue are dead-end streets with ingress and egress via Route 27/Ridge Road. The amount of traffic on Route 27/Ridge Road has increased with the construction of homes in Clarksburg and more recently, construction of Clarksburg Village. In turn, increased traffic is created by Little Seneca Parkway at Route 27/Ridge Road and more will come from the extension of Snowden Farm Parkway.

We have no relief from traffic at any time of the day - the southbound grade on Route 27/Ridge Road hinders our view of northbound oncoming vehicles. We are trapped by traffic turning right onto Route 27/Ridge Road from Little Seneca Parkway and Skylark as well as oncoming southbound traffic. We have few windows of safe exit or entrance to our neighborhood.

Maryland State Highway refused a request for a traffic signal at Wacomor advising that we should make u-turns at Skylark! Anyone would certainly know that this is impossible given the flow of traffic. We should not have to drive miles out of our way to travel southbound on Route 27/Ridge Road.

With the addition of more traffic signals north of us, any window of traffic relief has been destroyed. The speed limit on Route 27/Ridge Road north of Brink Road is 40 miles per hour; this is ignored and many of the speed limit signs were taken down during recent roadway construction at Clarksburg Village. We need safe access to Route 27/Ridge Road from our neighborhood. It is not clear in the Public Notice materials how the Alternatives and proposed divided lanes on Route 27/Ridge Road will affect the south egress and north ingress to our neighborhood.

In less than two years, a middle school will open at the corner of Little Seneca Parkway and Route 27. The queuing traffic for the school will also be a hindrance for us. Added travel lanes will require drivers to "let us out" - an effort that is almost impossible now.

I am surprised that there was not a concerted effort made to reach out to us -we are an established neighborhood that has only one ingress/egress. Though we do not have a community association, this should not negate communication or mention in the Alternatives. We do not appear on any of the alternative maps. Given our proximity to key intersections, we deserve to have the same consideration and assistance with any chosen plan going forward.

cc: SHA, District 3

We need:

- Clear information on how the Alternatives affect our ingress/egress - none mention or identify our transportation needs
- A safe ingress/egress via a dedicated access lane to connect the traffic signal
  - o Access lanes are mentioned in conjunction with MD355, one is needed for our community, Rt. 27/Ridge Road @ Wacomor
- Better timed traffic flow to allow windows of opportunity between Brink Road and Little Seneca Parkway/Skylark.
- Consideration of the queuing line for traffic at Little Seneca Parkway so that it does not block the entrance/exit of Wacomor Drive at Route 27/Ridge Road.
  - o How will this intersection be signaled?
  - o Controlled right turns from Little Seneca?
  - o Controlled left and u-turns from Route 27/Ridge Road?

I invite you to come and view the situation we currently have and see the challenges that are present each day before 5:00am and that last well into the evening 9:00-10:00pm.

Thank you for your consideration and I hope to hear from you regarding how the Alternatives protect and provide safe egress and ingress for our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

McGrew

Christine L. Trippel

22708 Ward Avenue

Germantown, MD 20876

cltmcgrew@verizon.net

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** agravell@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 3:27 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Mid-County Highway, Montgomery County

Mr. Jack Dine, CENAB-OP-RMN

US Army Corps of Engineers

Baltimore District

PO Box 1715

Baltimore, MD 21203-1715

RE: Mid-County Corridor Study, 2007-07102-M15

MDE- 13-NT-3162/201360802/AI No. 14016

Dear Mr. Dine:

Montgomery County's Mid County Corridor Study contains descriptions of several alternatives for north/south transportation improvements in the project study area. The traffic capacity enhancements for all alternatives were presented but, critically, there was not analysis to show the combined capacity effects of Alternative 4 (Brink, Whitman, Snouffer School, Muncaster Mill Roads) and Alternative 5 (MD 355 service roads) together to determine the transportation capacity improvements of a non-Master Plan alignment option. This is a serious flaw in the County's Study and amounts to an unsound, incomplete and dishonest premise on which the joint application is made. I urge the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) to deny the Montgomery County Department of Transportation's (MCDOT) application for a permit and reject the Mid County Corridor Study.

The Master Plan alignments (Alternatives 8 and 9) contain significant impacts to forestlands, wetlands, floodplains and waterways.

It is contrary to basic environmental planning principles that Alternative 9 is proposed to run parallel to Whetstone Run for approximately 1,800 feet from, generally, Tanyard Hill Road to Capehart Drive. This stream corridor's ecology will be grossly and permanently degraded as a result of the proposed alignment. In addition, this particular section of Alternative 9 will detrimentally impact Watkins Mill Elementary School and numerous residential properties, lowering property values and negatively affecting quality of life for residents.

It must be made clear that the County's description of Alternative 4 (Brink, Whitman, Snouffer School, Muncaster Mill Roads), greatly exaggerates the right-of-way required to build a fully functional 4-lane roadway. A 4-lane divided highway with one sidewalk can realistically be accommodated in an 80-ft right-of-way, which is present on the majority of the existing roads along Alternative 4. This right-of-way overstatement (105 feet) in the County's study is disingenuous; I posit that the intent was to make Alternative 4 appear

much more problematic in terms of property impacts. There is no question that with a smaller right-of-way, Alternative 4 will have, by an order of magnitude, significantly fewer environmental impacts than Alternatives 8 and 9.

The County's Mid County Corridor Study failed to fully and truthfully analyze alternatives to the Mid-County Highway extended as shown on the Transportation Master Plan. The wetland/waterway permit for the Mid County Corridor project should not be granted by USACOE.

Amy Gravell

47 Windbrooke Circle

Gaithersburg, MD 20879

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** rwi3206724@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 2:23 PM  
**To:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Midcounty Corridor Study Additional Testimony from Citizens to save South Valley Park and Whetstone Run  
**Attachments:** Midcounty\_Corridor\_Study\_Stream\_Crossings\_081913.xls

Public hearing testimony on CORPS: CENAB-OP\_RMN (Mid County Corridor Study) 2007-07102-M15 and MDE Nontidal Wetlands and Waterways: 13;NT;3162/201360802/AI No. 140416

Dear Mr. Jack Dinne and Mr. Sean Mckewen:

Attached is a spreadsheet that I put together from the study information showing all wetland and stream impacts for alternate 9, the master plan alignment. This supports the request to reject the wetland and water quality permit applications based upon the number of wetland and stream crossings involved and the fact that this alignment was chosen before the 1972 Clean Water Act. This chart should have been in the study in the first place so that the public could readily see the impacts in one place. The fact that this alignment is selected for a General or Nationwide permit makes a mockery out of the current Federal and State wetlands protection.

Please reject the permits and this alignment.

Richard D. Wilder  
Citizens to Save South Valley Park and Whetstone Run  
9969 Lake Landing Rd.  
Montgomery Village, MD 20886  
(301) 208-1828  
[RWi3206724@aol.com](mailto:RWi3206724@aol.com)

Alternative	Wetland Areas	Stream	Location	Existing Conveyance	Proposed Conveyance	Wetland Fill (SF)	Wetland Conversion (SF)	Stream Relocation (LF)	Bridge Length (LF)	Bridge Width (LF)	Bridge Underclearance (LF)	Culvert Length (LF)
9	WUS66	Whetstone Run	East of MVA near Goshen	Culverts	Longer Culverts			186				150
9	W68	Near Walkers Run	Between Walkers Choice and Christopher	None	Swale			243				
9	W67	Near Walkers Run	Between Walkers Choice and Christopher	None	Fill	3,463						
9	WUS53	Whetstone Run	East of Watkins Mill Rd. North of Windbrooke Condos	Watkins Mill Bridge	Pedestrian Bridge				225	14	5	
9	W57A	Whetstone Run	East of Watkins Mill Rd. North of Windbrooke Condos	None	Fill	1,857						
9		Whetstone Run	Watkins Mill Rd.	Watkins Mill Bridge	Wider Watkins Mill Bridge							
9	W63	Whetstone Run	Blohm Park	None	Fill	9,296	0					
9	W58	Whetstone Run	Westof Watkins Mill Rd.	None	Two Span Bridge and Fill	198	1,986	746	230		11	
9	W61/62	Whetstone Run	Westof Watkins Mill Rd.	None	Fill	161						
9	W64	Whetstone Run	Westof Watkins Mill Rd.	None	Fill	372						
9	W77	Seneca Creek	Seneca Creek	None	Three Span Bridge	21,895	33,894		500		17	
9	WUS78	Seneca Creek	Brandermill Tributary	None	One Span Bridge		11,425		170		25	
9	W79	Seneca Creek	Brandermill Tributary	None	One Span Bridge							
9D	W72	Dayspring Creek	Dayspring	None	Two Span Bridge and Fill	851	21,519		280		16	
9D	WUS1	Seneca Creek Tributary	North of Brink Rd.	None	Pipe Culverts			229				
9D	WUS69	Wildcat Branch	Wildcat Rd.	Culverts	165 ft Longer Culvert			165				165+
<b>Total</b>						<b>38,093</b>	<b>68,824</b>	<b>1,569</b>	<b>1,405</b>			

Alternative	Wetland Areas	Stream	Location	Existing Conveyance	Proposed Conveyance	Wetland Fill (SF)	Wetland Conversion (SF)	Stream Relocation (LF)	Bridge Length (LF)	Bridge Width (LF)	Bridge Underclearance (LF)	Culvert Length (LF)
9	WUS66	Whetstone Run	East of MVA near Goshen	Culverts	Longer Culverts			186				150
9	W68	Near Walkers Run	Between Walkers Choice and Christopher	None	Swale			243				
9	W67	Near Walkers Run	Between Walkers Choice and Christopher	None	Fill	3,463						
9	WUS53	Whetstone Run	East of Watkins Mill Rd. North of Windbrooke Condos	Watkins Mill Bridge	Pedestrian Bridge				225	14	5	
9	W57A	Whetstone Run	East of Watkins Mill Rd. North of Windbrooke Condos	None	Fill	1,857						
9		Whetstone Run	Watkins Mill Rd.	Watkins Mill Bridge	Wider Watkins Mill Bridge							
9	W63	Whetstone Run	Blohm Park	None	Fill	9,296	0					
9	W58	Whetstone Run	Westof Watkins Mill Rd.	None	Two Span Bridge and Fill	198	1,986	746	230		11	
9	W61/62	Whetstone Run	Westof Watkins Mill Rd.	None	Fill	161						
9	W64	Whetstone Run	Westof Watkins Mill Rd.	None	Fill	372						
9	W77	Seneca Creek	Seneca Creek	None	Three Span Bridge	21,895	33,894		500		17	
9	WUS78	Seneca Creek	Brandermill Tributary	None	One Span Bridge		11,425		170		25	
9	W79	Seneca Creek	Brandermill Tributary	None	One Span Bridge							
9D	W72	Dayspring Creek	Dayspring	None	Two Span Bridge and Fill	851	21,519		280		16	
9D	WUS1	Seneca Creek Tributary	North of Brink Rd.	None	Pipe Culverts			229				
9D	WUS69	Wildcat Branch	Wildcat Rd.	Culverts	165 ft Longer Culvert			165				165+
<b>Total</b>						<b>38,093</b>	<b>68,824</b>	<b>1,569</b>	<b>1,405</b>			

To: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District  
Attn: Mr. Jack Dinne  
P. O. Box 1715  
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715  
August 18, 2013

I oppose Alternative 4 Modified  
I support Alternative 9

1. The analysis for Alternative 4 Modified is inadequate - it does not address the likely impacts to the communities through which it passes.
  - a. The increase in traffic volume, congestion, and reduced access to the residents of adjacent communities was not identified in a manner understood by the residents impacted.
  - b. Access to the markets and services that developed to support the communities was not evaluated with regards to access for the residents or accessibility for the businesses.
  - c. Impacts to the daily routines of these vibrant communities were not identified, such as: school bus pick-up; reduced highway access and increased rerouting of traffic through communities to accommodate reduced highway access; commuter access; etc.
2. The analysis does not identify the likely impacts to the Montgomery Village community by bisecting the northern portion of the Village by the 6-lane highway and the effective additional bisecting of the east and west portions of the Village by the increased traffic on Montgomery Village Avenue.
3. With regards to the "Projected Crash Rates Along the Build Alignments"
  - a. The analysis does not identify in clear terms the projected increase in accidents, injuries and deaths that will occur by having a 6-lane highway pass through multiple, medium to high-density communities. The parameters for the model are too narrow and do not take into consideration the rerouting of local traffic through neighborhoods to accommodate reduced access to the highway. This is a simple matter of statistical analysis and broadening the narrow parameters of the current model.
  - b. The analysis provides projections of accidents for Alternative 9, however, they are based on a generalized formula rather than on the actual accident rates for Mid-County Highway - a much more realistic basis for projections and a more accurate representation of continuing Mid-County Highway to Brink.
4. The analysis of environmental impacts for Alternative 9 is flawed by not identifying whether critical habitat will be affected (not all habitat is equal); what effect the proposed environmental impacts will have on identified protected species (flora and fauna); or, what short- or long-term effects will occur to those protected species (if present).
5. The analysis of environmental impacts for Alternative 9 is inadequate because it only addresses one form of mitigation (bridging) of the environmental impacts rather than providing options that have varying effects (short-term and long-term) of the environment.
6. The environmental analysis treats all wetlands as being equal - as though accidental wetlands of associated flood plains are similar to pristine and highly productive wetlands along the coast. The analysis does not address the history of the land or that the area was highly manipulated while farmland; was significantly impacted during the development of the adjacent communities and road systems; and, continues to be heavily impacted due to the inadequate drainage, right of ways, and current use.
7. The analysis does not address the current environmental problems along the current ROW or how mitigation for Alternative 9 could improve the overall environmental quality of the area; rather it only addresses how it will mitigate the immediate effects of implementing Alternative 9.

Over the course of 30 years Montgomery County has been fairly consistent in the planning, design, and development of its roadways and zoning with regards to the development of a Midcounty Corridor.

It built Mid-County Highway specifically as part of that design concept and the communities within that service area were planned and designed for on the basis of the County's published plans. All of the residents of those areas knew of those plans through public meetings, public notices, the local media, and the signing erected by the County identifying the future route of the corridor.

With the exception of its extension, Mid-County Highway meets all of the criteria identified in the "Purpose and Need" document for the Midcounty Corridor Study.

Now we are evaluating alternatives that are at the extreme edge of the study area. Alternatives that will impact dozens of large communities directly and indirectly by increasing traffic, impacting access, and converting local roads needed for local service into a highway corridor that compromises the original development plans, the concept of a Midcounty Corridor, and the communities that it will impact.

From the perspective of Montgomery Village, the impact will be significant. Alternative 4 Modified will directly separate the northern section of the Village from the southern part by going from a 2-lane country road to a 6 lane highway corridor. However, there has been no mention of the clear and obvious consequence of the new alignment. Montgomery Village Avenue will become the shortest route between the new highway and Mid-County Highway. While the County may want to make Goshen more enticing as a cross over, Montgomery Village Avenue will remain a significant if not primary alternative for traffic having as its destination the ICC or Shady Grove Metro. Whereas the development of Montgomery Village, including the location of the schools and services, was based on the continuation of Mid-County Highway.

This mixing of regional and local traffic throughout the length of Snouffer School Road, Muncaster Mill Road, Wightman Road, Goshen Road, and Montgomery Village Avenue is not only inefficient, but will result in a greater number of accidents, reduce the safety of the dedicated bicycle lanes, and create a significant number of potentially dangerous conflict points.

Regarding environmental protection: I strongly support the involvement of the Corps of Engineers, the Maryland Department of the Environment, U. S. Fish and Wildlife, etc. It is absolutely essential that any environmental impacts due to political and/or management decisions be evaluated and weighed. However, in the end a decision must be made that not only takes the environment into consideration but the social, cultural, and economic impacts as well.

Michael Brown  
10006 Maple Leaf Drive  
Montgomery Village, Md. 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Rob Robinson [RRobinson@gaithersburgmd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 12:04 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Amended City of Gaithersburg Comment letter: Midcounty Highway  
**Attachments:** M83 comment comb.pdf

Attached-Hard copies have been sent.

Rob Robinson III, AICP

FCA Qualified Professional

Lead, Long Range Planning

City of Gaithersburg

301-258-6330 Ext. 2122

The opinions expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the City of Gaithersburg Staff, Mayor or Council.

Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Willis, Leesa L [Leesa\_L\_Willis@mcpsmd.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 11:59 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** 'sean.mckewen@maryland.gov'; 'RRobinson@gaitthersburgmd.gov'  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) 2013 Draft Environmental Effects Report Public Comment  
**Attachments:** Public Comment Response to COE re M83.pdf; GASP M-83 Opposition paper.pdf

Mr. Dinne:

Please accept these comments on behalf of the Woodland Hills community whose residents will be directly and adversely affected by the proposed Alternative Nine in the Midcounty Highway Extension plan.

Thank you,

Leesa Willis

President, on behalf of the Board of Directors,  
Woodland Hills Home Owners Association



## Woodland Hills Home Owners Association, Inc.

---

c/o Peggy Toland ~ Community Associations, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1130 ~ Germantown, MD 20875  
(301) 258-7711 ~ Facsimile (301) 258-8362  
e-mail [peggy@communityassn.com](mailto:peggy@communityassn.com)

August 16, 2013 (via e-mail)

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

Dear Mr. Dinne:

It is my understanding that "The Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) 2013 Draft Environmental Effects Report," released May 2, 2013, excludes evaluation of the environmental consequences of Alternative Nine to the respiratory health of the students, faculty and administrative staff at the Watkins Mill Elementary School. The proposed Midcounty Corridor Extension ("M-83"), in its Alternative Nine, would bring this six-lane highway to the very edge of the school campus.

This is a major omission from the study. The attachment provided herein reviews the health risks associated with proposed M-83's proximity to that school. It was prepared and signed by six health professionals. A copy of this attachment, dated March 4, 2005, was sent at that time to Ms. Jeri Cauthorn, the M-83 study manager for the Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation. A follow-up copy was sent February 13, 2008, to Ms. Cauthorn's successor, Mr. Greg Hwang.

Respiratory problems at the school conceivably could reach a point where the school would have to be closed, with re-location sites extremely unlikely.

Public Transportation additions and Alternative 2 appear to represent options that bring the greatest benefits at affordable fiscal levels and minimal environmental disturbances.

Sincerely,

Leesa Willis  
President, on behalf of the Board of Directors  
Woodland Hills Home Owners Association

cc via e-mail: Sean McKewen, Maryland Department of the Environment  
Rob Robinson, City of Gaithersburg

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Keith Sanderson [sandman6944@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 7:06 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,

Keith Sanderson  
811 Leverton  
Rockville, MD 20852

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** William Koch [billkoch1@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 12:40 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, William F. KOCH

William Koch  
20468 Watkins Meadow Dr.  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Paula Koch [paulakoch1@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 12:31 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, Paula A. Koch

Paula Koch  
20468 Watkins Meadow Drive  
Germantown, MD 20876

✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Jim Dlubac [jjdlubac@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 16, 2013 9:45 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Dlubac Jim; Dlubac Donna; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Recommend Alternative 9A

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

We strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

Sincerely,  
Jim and Donna Dlubac  
21608 Stableview Dr.  
Gaithersburg MD 20882

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Dennis Barnes [dennisjbarnes01@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 16, 2013 5:03 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] MidCounty Corridor/Highway Study

Respective Federal/State/County Transportation Leaders:

My name is Dennis Barnes, 9709 Breckenridge Place, Montgomery Village, Md. 20886. I am opposed to Alternative 4 and related Goshen Road widening. The intersection of Goshen Road and Wightman Rd, an intersection bordered by a Safeway store and smaller shops and on the opposite side of the intersection by Giant food and smaller shops, will become a major traffic congested nightmare should this alternative be selected.

The Montgomery County government Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment Committee on February 27, 2012 conducted a meeting to discuss a memorandum signed by Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Staff Director, dated February 23, 2012. The subject was FY-13-18 Capital Improvements Program-transportation: Streetlight Enhancements CBD/Town Center project, pedestrian facilities and bikeways, and road projects. Item 9, Goshen Rd South identifies that this road widening to a 4-lane roadway by 2025 is projected to carry 26,000 vehicles per day. Review of the intersections involved clearly shows that the intersection of Goshen Rd and Wightman Rd is directly impacted, by this daily traffic flow of 26,000 vehicles. Near the corner of Warfield and Goshen Rd there are two churches and a private school of about 300 students. In the opposite direction on Goshen Rd proceeding to Mid County Highway there is an Afro-American Church, a very large county park heavily used, and significant homes with private property abutting Goshen Rd. As previously mentioned there are two major shopping centers at the Goshen Rd. and Wightman Rd.

As is obvious, the widening of Goshen Rd will be a disaster for this part of the community adversely impacting on thousands of residents/voters. This alternative 4 and connection to the widening of Goshen Rd should be totally eliminated from any consideration given the highly negative and crushing results that would follow.

Thank you,

Dennis Barnes

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Candace [catwomanjat@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 16, 2013 4:46 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Mid county corridor study

Please do not destroy any more woods to build more roads. The wildlife doesn't have enough as it is. I see animals hit by cars in the road almost every day. Also to remove more wooded areas would cause more pollution.

Alternative 1 is the best (no build), but if you must build something, then alternative 2 would be the next best (improve existing intersections).

To build more roads would only encourage more traffic. Public transportation use has been increasing, the news stated they can't even keep up with demand. The money would be much better spent on increasing public transportation if possible. Traffic has not gotten any worse, has stayed the same. The public way should be encouraged instead of more driving and traffic.

House values are already lower than some people are paying in mortgage. We certainly don't need more devaluation. A quiet neighborhood would be disrupted by this, and obviously devalued more.

Also Lyme disease is getting to be a big problem. Deer are already in everyone's yard, destroying more of their habitat will only make that even worse.

I hope that you will choose to preserve the little bit of woods that is left around here, not destroy more of nature, wildlife, cause more pollution. And not encourage more traffic, but to encourage more public transportation instead, as more people already are using it.

Sent from my iPhone

✓

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Nancy Williams [nancy.williams@decisionpath.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 16, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Recommend Alternative 9A

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen:

My husband Steve and I are long-time residents of the Goshen area. During the course of living at 9005 Goshen Valley Drive since 1994, we have seen congestion on our local roads increase substantially. We have attended community meetings and reviewed the various alternatives. Based on the information we have seen, we strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options. The Master-Planned completion of the Midcounty Highway will complete a transportation system that will:

- 1) Provide safe, rapid, high-volume traffic on a reserved, limited-access right-of-way that has been protected from interference from neighboring developments.
- 2) Does not destroy houses or businesses and passes through communities that were planned to accommodate the road.
- 3) Ties together the other major local roads relieving their congestion and providing efficient transportation between area residences, jobs, and retail centers.
- 4) Completes a continuous, limited-access highway from the far northwest corner of Clarksburg to Shady Grove and the ICC.
- 5) Can accommodate an express bus lane for high-volume rapid transit.
- 6) Moves traffic efficiently and quickly to save personal time and carbon dioxide emissions. Its connections with other local roads extend these benefits area wide.
- 7) Adverse effects on wetlands have been minimized. Trees along the right of way are 50 years old because the land was set aside fifty years ago for this purpose. Please do not condemn a much-needed arterial because it was planned for in advance.

Thank you for considering our input on this vital subject.

Regards,

Nancy Williams

Vice President

DecisionPath Consulting

554 North Frederick Ave #318

Gaithersburg, MD 20877

301-728-5361

<http://www.decisionpath.com>

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Steve Williams [steve.williams@decisionpath.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 16, 2013 9:12 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; Nancy Williams  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Recommend Alternative 9A

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen:

My wife Nancy and I are long-time residents of the Goshen area. During the course of living at 9005 Goshen Valley Drive since 1994, we have seen congestion on our local roads increase substantially. We have attended community meetings and reviewed the various alternatives. Based on the information we have seen, we strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options. The Master-Planned completion of the Midcounty Highway will complete a transportation system that will:

- 1) Provide safe, rapid, high-volume traffic on a reserved, limited-access right-of-way that has been protected from interference from neighboring developments.
- 2) Does not destroy houses or businesses and passes through communities that were planned to accommodate the road.
- 3) Ties together the other major local roads relieving their congestion and providing efficient transportation between area residences, jobs, and retail centers.
- 4) Completes a continuous, limited-access highway from the far northwest corner of Clarksburg to Shady Grove and the ICC.
- 5) Can accommodate an express bus lane for high-volume rapid transit.
- 6) Moves traffic efficiently and quickly to save personal time and carbon dioxide emissions. Its connections with other local roads extend these benefits area wide.
- 7) Adverse effects on wetlands have been minimized. Trees along the right of way are 50 years old because the land was set aside fifty years ago for this purpose. Please do not condemn a much-needed arterial because it was planned for in advance.

Thank you for considering our input on this vital subject.

Steve Williams

President, DecisionPath Consulting

301-926-2452



## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:40 AM  
**To:** sandman6944@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Keith Sanderson [<mailto:sandman6944@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2013 7:06 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,

Keith Sanderson  
811 Leverton  
Rockville, MD 20852

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 11:48 AM  
**To:** Peggyhop@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Margaret Hopkins [<mailto:Peggyhop@aol.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:39 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,

Margaret Hopkins  
10709 Wayfarer Road  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 11:48 AM  
**To:** Peggyhop@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Margaret Hopkins [<mailto:Peggyhop@aol.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:39 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,

Margaret Hopkins  
10709 Wayfarer Road  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Carol Agayoff [cagayoff@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 2:42 PM  
**To:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)  
**Subject:** Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I 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,

Carol Agayoff  
13300 Bluebeard Terrace  
Clarksburg, MD 20871

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Margaret Hopkins [Peggyhop@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:39 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,

Margaret Hopkins  
10709 Wayfarer Road  
Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 5:02 PM  
**To:** cagayoff@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Carol Agayoff [<mailto:cagayoff@aol.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 2:42 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,

Carol Agayoff  
13300 Bluebeard Terrace  
Clarksburg, MD 20871

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Nancy Rice/John Stephenson [jcs\_nrr@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:50 PM  
**To:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)  
**Cc:** Ike Leggett  
**Subject:** M 83 and alternatives

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

I am writing regarding M-83. I live in Germantown on Davis Mill Road, ¼ mile from where it intersects Brink Road. I will be affected by the road construction and traffic regardless of which alternative is chosen.

The County dismissed the no Build Alternative as follows: "The No-Build Alternative is not a viable solution". I note the County said the same thing years ago about widening Rt. 27 from Brink to Damascus - the "No Widen Alternative is not a viable solution". However, widening Rt. 27 from Brink to Damascus not been done (I wanted it!!). That proves that some road construction the County felt must be built could be postponed for many years.

I prefer the no-build, limit development alternative.

I read the Draft Environmental Effects Report, discussed the various proposals with my neighbors, and reached the following conclusions. If the M83 is to be built: I am strongly in favor of Alternative 9A.

The Draft Report states that alternatives 8 and 9 would provide the most relief from congestion on M 355 and on major intersections throughout the region. Because alternative 9 would be a 4-lane divided highway connecting MD 27 with the Mid County Highway, it would also offer significant relief to traffic on I-270.

Mass transit in the form of express bus traffic would be possible only on alternative 9.

9A has the lowest projected accident rate, shortest travel time, fewest intersecting roads and driveways, and the safest bike and pedestrian path.

I am opposed to options B and D, which are not in the Master Plan, because they pass through established residential communities and the Agricultural Reserve, without offering any transportation advantage.

I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified.

It would pass through long established residential areas that were never planned for a major transportation corridor. Hundreds of homes would suddenly border a major highway.

It would intersect many driveways and other roads, thus limiting its efficiency.

Residents bordering the road would face problems of access into a multi-lane divided highway. I hope you do not want long-existing residents to face terrible County-induced conditions (Rt. 27 analogy).

It would require the largest number of property acquisitions (including residential and business properties) of any of the proposed routes.

Given the location of my house at the Brink/Davis Mill Rd intersection, Alternative 4 Modified would decrease the quality of my life and decrease the value of my home due to greatly increased traffic volume and noise.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

John C Stephenson  
21417 Davis Mill Rd.  
Germantown, MD 20876  
301-357-0104 (cell)

✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Matt Oneil [matjoneil@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:20 PM  
**To:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)  
**Subject:** Opinion on Midcounty corridor study

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I am strongly opposed to alternative 4 modified. The reason these roads currently have traffic is because they are a cut through off of major roads that have been in place for many years and are not working. I do in home sales and I am on the road all day long. What I have noticed is no matter how large you make these roads they will always fill up. A better solution that is not in the plans is to extend mass transit, or make current more effective. You will be destroying what is left of the natural areas we still have. This also will not be the end of it if you make a four to six lane road than a four lane road will be needed where there is currently a two lane road.

Matthew & Stephanie O'Neil  
Warfield ct.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Dennis Barnes [dennisjbarnes01@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 10:31 AM  
**To:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)  
**Subject:** Fwd: MidCounty Corridor/Highway Study

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Dennis Barnes  
**Date:** Aug 16, 2013 5:02:44 PM  
**Subject:** MidCounty Corridor/Highway Study  
**To:** [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)

Respective Federal/State/County Transportation Leaders:

My name is Dennis Barnes, 9709 Breckenridge Place, Montgomery Village, Md. 20886. I am opposed to Alternative 4 and related Goshen Road widening. The intersection of Goshen Road and Wightman Rd, an intersection bordered by a Safeway store and smaller shops and on the opposite side of the intersection by Giant food and smaller shops, will become a major traffic congested nightmare should this alternative be selected.

The Montgomery County government Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment Committee on February 27, 2012 conducted a meeting to discuss a memorandum signed by Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Staff Director, dated February 23, 2012. The subject was FY-13-18 Capital Improvements Program-transportation: Streetlight Enhancements CBD/Town Center project, pedestrian facilities and bikeways, and road projects. Item 9, Goshen Rd South identifies that this road widening to a 4-lane roadway by 2025 is projected to carry 26,000 vehicles per day. Review of the intersections involved clearly shows that the intersection of Goshen Rd and Wightman Rd is directly impacted, by this daily traffic flow of 26,000 vehicles. Near the corner of Warfield and Goshen Rd there are two churches and a private school of about 300 students. In the opposite direction on Goshen Rd proceeding to Mid County Highway there is an Afro-American Church, a very large county park heavily used, and significant homes with private property abutting Goshen Rd. As previously mentioned there are two major shopping centers at the Goshen Rd. and Wightman Rd.

As is obvious, the widening of Goshen Rd will be a disaster

for this part of the community adversely impacting on thousands of residents/voters. This alternative 4 and connection to the widening of Goshen Rd should be totally eliminated from any consideration given the highly negative and crushing results that would follow.

Thank you,

Dennis Barnes

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Aaron Benjamin [abenjamin@cheeburger.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 7:18 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov;  
Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocmemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] fw: M-83

---

**From:** "Aaron Benjamin" <abenjamin@cheeburger.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 7:14 AM  
**To:**  
**Subject:** M-83

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

Sincerely, Aaron Benjamin

21009 Cog Wheel Way  
Germantown, MD

Add your name and address so that you are identified as an area resident with personal knowledge of the situation.

If you have time, personal letters carry more weight (but a form letter carries more weight than no letter). We have received copies of several thoughtful personal letters, and to encourage more of this we offer below material that you can copy and paste, modify, or simply use as a source of relevant points.

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

The Upcounty area, now home to 400,000 people and growing, started 50 years ago with a rural population and infrastructure. The infrastructure has often lagged the population growth, most notably in transportation. We have nationally-ranked congestion that clogs all of our roads from historic Rural Rustic Roads to I-270. The result is personal frustration, economic inefficiency and increased carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles starting and stopping without going very far. We need better transit but our one Metro station (Shady Grove) is desperately over crowded, the Corridors City Transitway extension to Clarksburg was taken out of the budget the week before your hearing, and the glitzy new bus proposals exist only in our dreams. The hyper-congested I-270/Rt 355 corridor has become a barrier that restricts our access to transportation facilities on the western side

Any transportation system must face reality-Our built communities require automobiles for the first and last miles - including access to mass transit. And 150,000 Montgomery County people now live west of Great Seneca Creek and have daily needs to cross the creek. They are joined in this journey by interstate travelers and commuters from neighboring counties. This fast growing population needs a new creek crossing. The Upcounty population increases daily and so of course, we will need continual road and transit improvements. But for starters, we need to address the problem of not providing transportation to serve developments already built, plus a significant number of developments now approved and soon to be built.

These problems were anticipated during the Master Plan development which included from the very beginning two major highways for local traffic, the Western and Eastern Arterials. Great Seneca Highway has been built. It is now urgent to complete the Eastern Arterial - Midcounty Highway and Snowden Farm Parkway. This will give us an efficient and safe road system extending from the far northwest corner of Clarksburg to Shady Grove and the ICC. But its most important feature is a design that ties together all of the major local roads into a system allowing local residents to easily move to local jobs, shopping, schools, etc. The missing link in this system is the gap in the Midcounty Highway between Montgomery Village Ave. and Rt. 27. The different Alternatives proposed to close this gap differ greatly in their effectiveness.

We urge your support of Alternative 9A - The Master-Planned completion of the Midcounty Highway

This completes a transportation system that will:

- 1) Provide safe, rapid, high-volume traffic on a reserved, limited-access right-of-way that has been protected from interference from neighboring developments.
- 2) Does not destroy houses or businesses and passes through communities that were planned to accommodate the road.

- 3) Ties together the other major local roads relieving their congestion and providing efficient transportation between area residences, jobs, and retail centers.
- 4) Completes a continuous, limited-access highway from the far northwest corner of Clarksburg to Shady Grove and the ICC.
- 5) Can accommodate an express bus lane for high-volume rapid transit.
- 6) Moves traffic efficiently and quickly to save personal time and carbon dioxide emissions. Its connections with other local roads extend these benefits area wide.
- 7) Adverse effects on wetlands have been minimized. Trees along the right of way are 50 years old because the land was set aside fifty years ago for this purpose. Please do not condemn a much-needed arterial because it was planned for in advance.

We urge you to not support the following Alternatives:

#### Alternative 1 - No Build

We have a present and growing need for an improved road system and No Build is not a solution, it is another failure. Doing nothing is what got us to our present infamous rank as worst traffic in the country.

#### Alternative 2 - Intersection and traffic signal improvements

Elements of this alternative are needed and should be done, but it provides spot improvements only, not the required area-wide congestion relief.

#### Alternative 4 - Brink, Wightman, Snouffer School and Muncaster Mill Roads.

The established communities along this route were never planned nor developed to accommodate a 4 and 6 lane divided highway. The consequences would be huge community damage, high collision risk, traffic encumbered by the existing community structures, slow stop and go traffic, and no closure of the gap in the Midcounty Highway.

#### Alternative 5 - Widens and adds service lanes to Rt 355 to connect Rt 27 to the Midcounty Highway via. Montgomery Village Ave.

This turns the Master Plan on its head by adding traffic to an already overloaded Rt 355 entangled by historic development and traffic entering and leaving the adjacent I-270. This Alternative would also use an already over burdened Montgomery Village Ave. that includes two of the most congested intersections in the County.

Alternative 8 - A truncated version of Alternative 9

This would serve to provide a northern connection to and from the planned I-270/Watkins Mill overpass and interchange. But access to points further south is very restricted and it will dump major traffic onto Watkins Mill Road, Rt. 355, Montgomery Village Ave, and two of the most congested intersections in the County.

Options B and D - Optional north ends to Alternatives 8 and 9.

These Options are not in the Master Plan, destroy houses, damage the Agriculture Reserve, and in the case of Option B, seriously reduce transportation efficiency and safety.

Transit Only - Corridor Cities Transit Way, Bus Rapid Transit, Metro Rail or Monorail to Frederick, new tracks for the MARC Brunswick line.

At this time there is no Transit Only proposal that is detailed enough to permit a reliable evaluation of its feasibility, cost, and effectiveness.

The CCT is only one of these proposals that has advanced far enough for a credible cost and construction schedule, and the planned extensions from Gaithersburg to Clarksburg was dropped from County budget planning the first week of August.

The most advanced of the other schemes, Bus Rapid Transit, faces problems finding a clear route through the historic Rt. 355 corridor. The most feasible option would be a dedicated express bus lane along the Eastern Arterial which requires completion of Alternative 9A.

All of these proposals and schemes are intended to provide central high-capacity transportation. The rest of the trip has to be made on local buses and/or cars, and they need an effective road system. Nothing will work until we have that.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Nancy Rice/John Stephenson [jics\_nrr@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:47 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M 83 and alternatives

Dear Mr. Dinne,

I am writing regarding M-83. I live in Germantown on Davis Mill Road, 1/2 mile from where it intersects Brink Road. I will be affected by the road construction and traffic regardless of which alternative is chosen.

The County dismissed the no Build Alternative as follows: "The No-Build Alternative is not a viable solution". I note the County said the same thing years ago about widening Rt. 27 from Brink to Damascus - the "No Widen Alternative is not a viable solution". However, widening Rt. 27 from Brink to Damascus not been done (I wanted it!!). That proves that some road construction the County felt must be built could be postponed for many years.

I prefer the no-build, limit development alternative.

I read the Draft Environmental Effects Report, discussed the various proposals with my neighbors, and reached the following conclusions. If the M83 is to be built: I am strongly in favor of Alternative 9A.

The Draft Report states that alternatives 8 and 9 would provide the most relief from congestion on M 355 and on major intersections throughout the region. Because alternative 9 would be a 4-lane divided highway connecting MD 27 with the Mid County Highway, it would also offer significant relief to traffic on I-270.

Mass transit in the form of express bus traffic would be possible only on alternative 9.

9A has the lowest projected accident rate, shortest travel time, fewest intersecting roads and driveways, and the safest bike and pedestrian path.

I am opposed to options B and D, which are not in the Master Plan, because they pass through established residential communities and the Agricultural Reserve, without offering any transportation advantage.

I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified.

It would pass through long established residential areas that were never planned for a major transportation corridor. Hundreds of homes would suddenly border a major highway.

It would intersect many driveways and other roads, thus limiting its efficiency.

Residents bordering the road would face problems of access into a multi-lane divided highway. I hope you do not want long-existing residents to face terrible County-induced conditions (Rt. 27 analogy).

It would require the largest number of property acquisitions (including residential and business properties) of any of the proposed routes.

Given the location of my house at the Brink/Davis Mill Rd intersection, Alternative 4 Modified would decrease the quality of my life and decrease the value of my home due to greatly increased traffic volume and noise.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

John C Stephenson  
21417 Davis Mill Rd.  
Germantown, MD 20876  
301-357-0104 (cell)

✓

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Cherian Eapen [cherianeapen@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:52 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Greg Hwang  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comment Period for M-83 Midcounty Corridor Study

Gentlemen:

I am writing to inquire if the Corps of Engineers (CoE) and the MDE will consider extending the comment period for the M-83 study by couple of weeks which will give Clarksburg residents additional time to provide comments. Residents of Clarksburg are generally new to the area and have a general lack of knowledge regarding the M-83 project. Unlike residents of Montgomery Village, Goshen, and other older areas within the study area, residents of Clarksburg have no history on the project. Due to the summer vacation schedules, it has been difficult to reach out to many local residents. It should be noted that despite MCDOT's outreach efforts, only 2-3 residents testified at the public hearing held on August 7th! In addition, there has been no visible signage by MCDOT in the Clarksburg or Damascus area to inform those residents of the action that CoE and MDE is about to take. Extending the comment due date by couple of weeks will provide the community to be noticed potentially via the local public school system of the pending action by CoE and MDE. Additionally, if MCDOT will post signs along major roadways/routes in Clarksburg regarding Midcounty Corridor Study and the need to provide comments to CoE and MDE, it will help educate a significant number of local residents regarding the significance of the roadway for Clarksburg residents and on the need to provide input to CoE and MDE.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I would really appreciate if my request could be honored, which could help reach out to many more Clarksburg residents.

Regards,  
Cherian Eapen  
23118 Birch Mead Road  
Clarksburg, MD 20871  
240-994-6766

✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** John Reilly [jreilly426@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:48 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; John Reilly  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on Mid County Corridor Study (CENAB-OP-RMN) (2007-07102-M15)

August 20, 2013

Mr. Jack Dinne,  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Baltimore District,  
P.O. Box 1715  
Baltimore, MD 201203-1715

I am writing to urge you to (1) recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and (2) reject the other Alternatives and Options, in particular Alternative 4.

My name is John J. Reilly and I reside at 21410 Blunt Road, Germantown, MD 20876. For more than the last 26 years, I have lived at this address which is located approximately 500 yards east/north of the intersection of Brink and Blunt Roads—a location and community that will be very adversely affected if Alternative 9A is not recommended, Alternative 4 is recommended and if Alternative 1—No Build Option is recommended.

By way of background, my wife and I spent 10 years in townhouse communities abutting Goshen Road from 1975 to 1986. Between 1982 and 1984 we spent considerable time and effort search for a building lot for our home in the area surrounding Montgomery Village. In doing so we considered and gave great weight to the Montgomery County Master plan for the area including the planned construction of both the initial and final legs for Mid-County Highway, M83. In particular, we always avoided available land near or around the posted dedicated right of way for M-83 because we wanted a rural quiet location largely free of intrusive traffic and noise. In doing so we placed our reliance on the County's renowned planning process and expected government officials and elected officials and had faith that these roads would be constructed, especially in light of the fact that they were the primary transportation-related basis for the subsequent planning for, approval of, and development of Clarksburg and other development north of the Montgomery Village/Gaithersburg communities.

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

The Upcounty area, now home to 400,000 people and growing, started 50 years ago with a rural population and infrastructure. The infrastructure has often lagged the population growth, most notably in transportation. We have nationally-ranked congestion that clogs all of our roads from historic Rural Rustic Roads to I-270. The result is personal frustration, economic inefficiency and increased carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles starting and stopping without going very far. We need better transit but our one Metro station (Shady Grove) is desperately over crowded, the Corridors City Transitway extension to Clarksburg was taken out of the budget the week before your hearing, and the glitzy new bus proposals exist only in our dreams. The hyper-congested I-270/Rt 355 corridor has become a barrier that restricts our access to transportation facilities on the western side

Any transportation system must face reality—Our built communities require automobiles for the first and last miles - including access to mass transit. And 150,000 Montgomery County people now live west of Great Seneca Creek and have daily needs to cross the creek. They are joined in this journey by interstate travelers and commuters from neighboring counties. This fast growing population needs a new creek crossing. The Upcounty population increases daily and so of course, we will need continual road and transit improvements. But for starters, we need to address the problem of not providing transportation to serve developments already built, plus a significant number of developments now approved and soon to be built.

These problems were anticipated during the Master Plan development which included from the very beginning two major highways for local traffic, the Western and Eastern Arterials. Great Seneca Highway has been built. It is now urgent to complete the Eastern Arterial - Midcounty Highway and Snowden Farm Parkway. This will give us an efficient and safe road system extending from the far northwest corner of Clarksburg to Shady Grove and the ICC. But its most important feature is a design that ties together all of the major local roads into a system allowing local residents to easily move to local jobs, shopping, schools, etc. The missing link in this system is the gap in the Midcounty Highway between Montgomery Village Ave. and Rt. 27. The different Alternatives proposed to close this gap differ greatly in their effectiveness.

I urge your support of Alternative 9A - The Master-Planned completion of the Midcounty Highway

This completes a transportation system that will:

- 1) Provide safe, rapid, high-volume traffic on a reserved, limited-access right-of-way that has been protected from interference from neighboring developments.
- 2) Does not destroy houses or businesses and passes through communities that were planned to accommodate the road.
- 3) Ties together the other major local roads relieving their congestion and providing efficient transportation between area residences, jobs, and retail centers.
- 4) Completes a continuous, limited-access highway from the far northwest corner of Clarksburg to Shady Grove and the ICC.
- 5) Can accommodate an express bus lane for high-volume rapid transit.

6) Moves traffic efficiently and quickly to save personal time and carbon dioxide emissions. Its connections with other local roads extend these benefits area wide.

7) Adverse effects on wetlands have been minimized. Trees along the right of way are 50 years old because the land was set aside fifty years ago for this purpose. Please do not condemn a much-needed arterial because it was planned for in advance.

I urge you to not support the following Alternatives:

Alternative 1 - No Build--We have a present and growing need for an improved road system and No Build is not a solution, it is another failure. Doing nothing is what got us to our present infamous rank as worst traffic in the country.

Alternative 2 - Intersection and traffic signal improvements--Elements of this alternative are needed and should be done, but it provides spot improvements only, not the required area-wide congestion relief.

Alternative 4 - Brink, Wightman, Snouffer School and Muncaster Mill Roads--The established communities along this route were never planned nor developed to accommodate a 4 and 6 lane divided highway. The citizen who planned and established their homes in this community largely took the time to consider development demands in the area and took stock in the County's planning process. We relied on the County master plan and government to full fill its responsibility to build the northern extension of M83, which should have been done decades ago. The consequences of Alternative 4 would be huge community damage, high collision risk, traffic encumbered by the existing community structures, slow stop and go traffic, and no closure of the gap in the Midcounty Highway.

Alternative 5 - Widens and adds service lanes to Rt 355 to connect Rt 27 to the Midcounty Highway via. Montgomery Village Ave--This turns the Master Plan on its head by adding traffic to an already overloaded Rt 355 entangled by historic development and traffic entering and leaving the adjacent I-270. This Alternative would also use an already over burdened Montgomery Village Ave. that includes two of the most congested intersections in the County.

Alternative 8 - A truncated version of Alternative 9--This would serve to provide a northern connection to and from the planned I-270/Watkins Mill overpass and interchange. But access to points further south is very restricted and it will dump major traffic onto Watkins Mill Road, Rt. 355, Montgomery Village Ave, and two of the most congested intersections in the County.

Options B and D - Optional north ends to Alternatives 8 and 9--These Options are not in the Master Plan, destroy houses, damage the Agriculture Reserve, and in the case of Option B, seriously reduce transportation efficiency and safety.

Transit Only - Corridor Cities Transit Way, Bus Rapid Transit, Metro Rail or Monorail to Frederick, new tracks for the MARC Brunswick line. At this time there is no Transit Only proposal that is detailed enough to permit a reliable evaluation of its feasibility, cost, and effectiveness. The CCT is only one of these proposals that has advanced far enough for a credible cost and construction schedule, and the planned extensions from Gaithersburg to Clarksburg was dropped from County budget planning the first week of August. The most advanced of the other schemes, Bus Rapid Transit, faces problems finding a clear route through the historic Rt. 355 corridor. The most feasible option would be a dedicated express bus lane along the Eastern Arterial which requires completion of Alternative 9A. All of these proposals and schemes are intended to provide central high-capacity transportation. The rest of the trip has to be made on local buses and/or cars, and they need an effective road system. Nothing will work until we have that.

Furthermore, I would like comment on what I see as one very tragic irony associated with the Alternative 9A vs. Alternative 4 consideration. Trees, which were allowed to grow to maturity in the dedicated right of way for Alternative 9A over 30+ years end being counted as a negative environmental impact for that alternative while trees and shrubs planted by caring home owners along the Alternative 4 plan over the same period are not considered environmental losses. I find this a travesty in the environmental impact analysis/assessment process. Had the county wasted money over the last 30+ years to mow and maintain the right of way there would be no mature trees to cut down and count as environmental losses. However, because the County was prudent with its use of tax dollars, it serves as a negative environmental impact on Alternative 9A. This situation is not fair or equitable to those who trusted in the County planning process.

Finally, I appreciate the careful and thoughtful environmental consideration/review process at both the state and federal levels--as we all know that our environment is very important to preserve and protect but so is the Brink Road/Wightman Road community which will be destroyed if Alternative 4 is recommended. I also appreciate the efforts of Montgomery County transportation planning department and process to dramatically reduce the adverse environmental impact of the original M-83 plan. Through their careful attention to the environment, they have helped to improve the environmental protection for the Seneca Creek watershed. I also appreciate your review and consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Signed/John J. Reilly, August 20, 2013

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** David Winfield [davidwinfie@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:50 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean McKewen  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Mid County Corridor Study

Comment on request for permit

This is added written comment to the issues discussed at the recent public meeting at Seneca Valley High School 7 August 2013.

I see great engineering difficulty in Alternative 9 extending present Mid County Highway NNW across Montgomery Viillage Ave. and across Watkins Mill Road. There is a steep drop-off as soon as it crosses Montgomery Viillage Ave. You would have to re-do the recent bridge on Watkins Mill Road and (as proposed to prevent environmental damage) elevate the highway over the wetlands.

I agree with the written testimony of Bing Garthright that the study of Alternatives 8 and 9 is flawed for not considering an improvement of Route 355 to the west of proposed M-83 plus a simultaneous moderately-sized portion of Alternative 4 to the east or proposed M-83.

The mitigation of environmental damage by planting "equivalent" trees in a distant location seems to me far-fetched. I suspect the delicate wetlands would be damaged by the engineering activity of building the highway overhead.

I suggest you should reject the study and not grant any permit,

Respectfully submitted,

David Winfield  
19204 Seneca Ridge Court  
Montgomery Village, MD 20886-3921

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** j.w.powell [j.w.powell@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 11:46 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Mid-County Highway Alternative 4

Dear Sirs,

We in the Montgomery Village and Goshen communities appreciate your listening to us concerning the severe impact Alternative 4 Modified would have on our community. Many in our community expressed our concerns at the large public meetings held by MC DOT last September and recently on August 7. We wish to reiterate the severe impact this road would have on our community in this written message.

I live in the North Village section of Montgomery Village, which abuts Wightman Rd and Snouffer's School Rd to our South and Goshen to the East of most of the community. I am Treasurer of our homes corporation. The potential Wightman Rd widening would be catastrophic to our community in many ways. Many of those impacts were described by our residents in the recent August 7 meeting at Seneca Valley High School. I will emphasize a few that particularly affect our community financing and livelihood.

Residents will need to get to Wightman or Snouffer's School Rd and on to their destination via circuitous re-routing through North Village community streets. The proposed massive boulevard highway covered by Alt 4 would be accessed largely via our just one stoplight in our community—at MV Ave, which becomes Pleasant Ridge Drive at the entrance to our community. Those in Picton will need to trace a route through East Village and lights at East Village Avenue and Goshen at Wightman. This will mean much, much more traffic on our local community roads, with higher costs to maintain them PLUS very considerable increases in commuting/travel times, noise, safety to children and other residents and negative impact on home values. In addition, much of our community property along Wightman Rd will be taken by the county and many will lose some private property.

North Village Homes Corporation owns the streets throughout the community and must pay for all upkeep of them through community assessments. Obviously, increased traffic will take a major toll in \$ for more frequent repair and repaving, much more traffic on our narrow streets, threats to safety of children, noise, pollution, and other headaches. Most of these streets are too narrow to support such traffic and would need to be widened. Please make sure these costs are factored into your analysis of impacts on nearby residents.

Finally, I'd like to say, the northern sections of Montgomery Village have been very concerned that ANY widening of Wightman Rd is threatening to us although some improvements in Wightman will probably be needed. The planned widening of Wightman to the current 80' ROW will itself be a significant intrusion into the Montgomery Village community, with its ramifications for traffic, reduced green space, noise, etc.

Alt-4 Modified to M-83 is a very different, and a catastrophic specter. It would be a chasm separating us from the rest of Montgomery Village. It demands significant property from us. It imposes a wide range of detriment to our quality of life and our cost of living, and threatens to wipe out home values.

Thank you for registering our concerns.

Jeanne (and Ronald) Powell

20316 Highland Hall Drive

North Village, Montgomery Village

301-926-7568

[j.w.powell@verizon.net](mailto:j.w.powell@verizon.net)

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Brent Taylor [betaylor2004@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 11:03 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Question on responses for the mid-county corridor study (UNCLASSIFIED)

Thanks.

You will see something later today. (Nothing too complicated as I have observed that you guy have heard it all already.)

Brent

On 8/20/13 8:21 AM, "Dinne, John J NAB" <[JOHN.J.DINNE@usace.army.mil](mailto:JOHN.J.DINNE@usace.army.mil)> wrote:

> Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
> Caveats: NONE  
>  
> Either format is fine.  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Brent Taylor [<mailto:betaylor2004@comcast.net>]  
> Sent: Monday, August 19, 2013 3:12 PM  
> To: [sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:sean.mckewen@maryland.gov); Dinne, John J NAB  
> Subject: [EXTERNAL] Question on responses for the mid-county corridor study  
>  
> Sean/John:  
>  
> I am planning to submit comments on the subject study.  
>  
> Do you want comments via US Mail or is email acceptable?  
>  
> Thanks in advance,  
>  
> Brent Taylor  
>  
> Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
> Caveats: NONE  
>  
>

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** jennifercross@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:10 PM  
**To:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** ,"WMES PTA; Jennifer\_cross@mcpsmd.org; carolina.harp@gmail.com; dk\_dillet@yahoo.com; njohn1015@yahoo.com; akitahodge@gmail.com; Kelle.Dockery@hq.doe.gov; Stephanie\_g\_spencer@mcpsmd.org  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M-83's effects on Watkins Mill Elementary

The Watkins Mill Elementary PTA is very concerned about the proposal to complete M-83. Having the road so close behind our school would be bad for our students. It would increase pollution in the air our children breathe in everyday at recess on the playground. It would take a way space that our children play in during recess and during physical education classes. In addition a large portion of our students walk to and from school everyday and it poses a great danger to these children's safety to have to cross a major road to get to school and home safely. Please choose another option for improving the counties transit that would not put our students at risk. I would like to know what the plan is for keeping our children safe if the road is built behind the school.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jennifer Cross-Lozano  
Watkins Mill ES PTA President  
cell: 240-620-8206  
<http://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/schools/watkinsmilles/pta/>  
Find us on Facebook: Watkins Mill Elementary PTA  
Follow us on Twitter: WMESPTA

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Hank Jacob [hank@jacobfam.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:38 PM  
**To:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Mid-County Highway Alternative 4 Modified

I am a longtime resident of Montgomery Village and live a block from Wightman Road. I have watched the community grow from a roadside vegetable stand to a Safeway, a Giant etc. Enough is enough. I don't want my property values to go down because of noise and vehicle fumes and I don't want my family to be subjected to these negative influences on our lifestyle too. I have seen the three way stop at Montgomery Village Avenue and Wightman become a fourway stop and then a traffic light. I don't want to see a four lane throughway come through our neighborhood to accommodate my upcounty neighbors in Clarksburg! Let them sit on 270! DO NOT SUPPORT THE MID-COUNTY HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVE 4 - Modified or in any incarnation. Thank you - Henry Jacob, 20728 Highland Hall Drive, Montgomery Village MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Blanc, Cecilia [cmblanc@smcm.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:25 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No Alternative 4

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

I am writing this email to express my concern for Alternative 4 Method. I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified. Not only is it incompatible with the Master Plans that the community was developed upon, but it is outside the central transportation corridor area it is supposed to support, and as a result it will detrimentally affect residential areas.

I strongly support the completion of the Midcounty Highway along the Master Plan route. All the communities along this route were notified that it was going to be built well before now. It is the simplest, most effective route for traffic, and will minimize travel time, and air pollution and carbon emissions along with it. It is the most consistent, cohesive, and beneficial option to support our growing community.

Occam's razor, the famous principle of parsimony, states that the simplest solution is most likely the correct one. The Master Planned M-83 is overdue, badly needed, and the simplest solution with the least amount of complication.

Thank you for your time,  
Cecilia Blanc

✓

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** stundmar326 [stundmar326@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:12 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Alternate 9D for Midcounty Highway

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

This is in regards to the Public Notice Mid County Corridor Study.

Absolutely, Alternate 9D should be built. Alt. 9D substantially adds to the existing road network in the area. I-270 is the primary road. Md-355 is the alternate. Mid County Alt. 9D would be another component of the network.

Alt. 9D is a through road at both the northern and southern ends of Mid County Highway (M-83), a simple connector between a main road in a residential area (Snowden Farm Parkway, Clarksburg) and employment corridor transportation mainstays (Shady Grove Metro, MD-200).

Alt. 9D is a great alternate to I-270 and MD-355 in the Goshen to Middlebrook Roads area. At evening rush hour, both I-270 and MD-355 have heavy traffic in this area.

Northern Terminus Option D is preferred because it adds to the road network in that region and does not impact Seneca Crossing Local Park nor the Dayspring Church Silent Retreat Center.

Finally, by significantly expanding the road network, I believe this road will be sufficient well into the future.

Thank you.

Barbara Stunder  
7 Brook Run Court  
Germantown, MD 20876



✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Kevin Blanc [t.kevin.blanc@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 10:04 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified; Support improvements to 355 or Master Plan M-83

I want to express my dismay that Alternative 4 Modified (Alt 4) is under serious consideration. I am strongly opposed to Alt 4.

- \* The route traced by Alt 4 was never planned nor prepared for to accommodate a major highway. Those of us that checked the master plan should not be subject to the worst possible alternative.
- \* Alt 4 It would destroy homes, yards, wells and septic systems, increase the noises levels, and destroy the commutes of those that live along this rural route.
- \* Alt 4 will impact churches, an historic African American community, a park, and put at risk many of the bus commuters that use stops on this road.
- \* Alt 4 is an alarmingly bad transportation solution, almost doubling the planned commute along M-83, well away from the direct path that was planned for in the 1960s.

I wish no road had to be built. Alternatives involving improvements along 355 would be a much better option in my opinion. I support every effort to avoid building a new highway. But, if it is not avoidable, then the County planned the route for M-83 well, advertised this plan well, and bought the necessary property so that the right-of-way for a new route was ready when it was needed. It allows for the most efficient traffic flow and minimizes commute times and the resultant pollution.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kevin Blanc

1870

1871

1872

1873

1874

1875

1876

1877

1878

1879

1880

1881

1882

1883

1884

1885

1886

1887

1888

1889

1890

1891

1892

1893

1894

1895

1896

1897

1898

1899

1900

1901

1902

1903

1904

1905

1906

1907

1908

1909

1910

1911

1912

1913

1914

1915

1916

1917

1918

1919

1920

1921

1922

1923

1924

1925

1926

1927

1928

1929

1930

1931

1932

1933

1934

1935

1936

1937

1938

1939

1940

1941

1942

1943

1944

1945

1946

1947

1948

1949

1950

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** LYLE AND JANET LEVINE [lyle1janet@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:51 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Mid County Corridor Study Public Comment

**Subject:** Mid County Corridor Study Public Comment (CORPS: CENAB-OP-RMN (Mid County Corridor Study) 2007-07102-M15, MDE Nontidal Wetlands and Waterways: 13-NT-3162/201360802/AI No. 140416)

Dear Sir:

The Alt 8 and Alt 9 options discussed in the Midcounty Corridor Study are extremely damaging to our county ecosystem with virtually no redeeming features! All of the Alt 8 and Alt 9 options require hundreds of feet of piped streams, valuable wetlands filled in, over 50 acres of forest cleared, and affect around 30+ acres of our valuable parkland. Why?! Montgomery county already listed alternatives that have virtually none of these problems, especially Alt 5. Alt 5 improves commute time as much as the Alt 8 options, with far less impact on the environment. This alternate plan has no piped streams, no streams relocated, no wetlands filled in, only 2 acres of forest destroyed, and a parkland impact of just 0.2 acres. The number of homes affected is similar to the environmentally damaging Alt 8 and 9 plans, and much less than Alt 4. Finally, 355 is already an active transportation corridor. Expanding it will not push heavy traffic into previously peaceful neighborhoods. Similarly, Alt 2 is a viable option for the same reasons.

Personally, I would follow the suggestion of Montgomery County Park forester Carole Bergmann and Park ecologist Rob Gibbs who recommended that the stream valley area threatened by Alts 8 and 9 be designated by the County as a special Biodiversity area. This makes much more sense than demolishing this irreplaceable natural habitat area with bulldozers.

Sincerely,

Lyle Levine

11024 Grassy Knoll Terrace

Germantown, MD 20876



✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Mini Varughese [micro385@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:41 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M-83

I wanted to write to support the construction of the M-83 to connect Ridge Road to Montgomery Village Ave. We need a way to connect to the ICC. I enjoy using the ICC but coming home and hitting the 270 traffic is horrible. Considering the Clarksburg community is continuing to grow, we need the infrastructure to support this area.

Please finish the ICC.

--

Sincerely,  
Mini Varughese  
23124 Persimmon Ridge Rd  
Clarksburg, MD 20871

100

100

100

100

100

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Lisa and Kevin Blanc [the.blancs@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:37 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified; Strongly support Master Plan M-83

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to express my concern for the Alternative 4 Modified. I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified Highway for many, varied reasons. First, the route of Alternative 4 was never planned nor prepared for to accommodate a major highway. Next, it would destroy homes, yards, wells and septic systems, increase the noises levels, and adversely affect the health and well-being of the residents here. As a mother, I cannot support a road that will endanger children who have to cross a highway for buses, recreation, or simply because of the close proximity of the highway to their house (so close in some places that a retention wall is needed).

Besides the decrease in well-being for the families, the Alternative 4 Method is not an effective transportation solution. It is not meant to be supported in this area: it does not connect to major feeder roads, it is distant from 355 and I-270, and it is completely facing the wrong direction. Congested traffic will cause excess fuel congestion, carbon dioxide emissions and air pollution, and spillover onto rural roads that are ESPECIALLY not made to support higher traffic.

I do, however, strongly and completely support the Mid-county Highway along the Master Plan route. All of the communities developed along this route were notified from the beginning of this roadway. It is designed expressly to minimize interference with adjacent communities and existing roads. It allows efficient traffic flow, minimizes travel time, air pollution, and optimal communication between residential and commercial areas. It can also provide the backbone for a useful and effective bus system.

Obviously, the best option is to not have to build this highway in the first place but that isn't feasible anymore; development necessitates a highway to accommodate the high traffic, population, and congestion. What is important now is choosing the option that is the lesser of two evils: the plan that simultaneously solves the major problems while creating the least amount of additional problems. That option is the Master Plan M-83 route. The Alternative 4 Modified plan would be a huge step backwards in developing a beautiful, safe, cohesive community capable of flourishing in many ways.

The Master Planned M-83 is long overdue and badly needed.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
Lisa Blanc



✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Carolyn Levine [clevine102@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:31 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment Mid County Corridor Study

**Subject:** Public Comment on CENAB-OP-RMN (Mid County Corridor Study) 2007-07102-M15

Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my opposition to both Alternative 8 - Master Plan Alignment truncated and Alternative 9 - Master Plan Alignment, and to voice my support for Alternative 5 - MD355 with Service Roads and Alternative 2 - Transportation Systems Management, as well as for solving this traffic problem with the extension of the Metro Red Line.

The Master Plan was developed in the 1960's, before the National Environmental Policy Act, Clean Air Act, and Clean Water Act. Had these federal laws been in place at the time, this Master Plan would not have been developed. According to the Midcounty Corridor Study, both Alternatives 8 and 9 impact the environment in terms of linear feet of streams piped and acres of wetlands filled, with Alt. 9 additionally requiring stream relocation. Alternatives 8 and 9 also impact at least 50 acres of forest, including the bisection of a large tract (more than 150 acres) of mature forest. Similar acreage of parkland and farmland will be affected. Alternatives 2 and 5 have virtually no negative impact in any of these areas. An additional significant benefit of Alternatives 2 and 5 is that they increase traffic flow to area businesses, not divert traffic from them.

Sincerely,

Janet Levine

11024 Grassy Knoll Terrace

Germantown, MD 20876



## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** wesleyvillebabe@gmail.com on behalf of Ann Ward [ann@wardworks.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 5:03 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: MidCounty Corridor Study -Opposition Especially to Proposals 4 and 9;

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Ann Ward <ann@wardworks.com>  
**Date:** Tue, Aug 20, 2013 at 5:00 PM  
**Subject:** MidCounty Corridor Study -Opposition Especially to Proposals 4 and 9;  
**To:** [john.j.dinne@usace.army](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army), [sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)  
**Cc:** [greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov), [county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov), [ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov)

Gentlemen:

Please be very assured that we in Montgomery Village, MD, are vehemently opposed to any plans which will funnel more cars through our Village. My husband and I have lived here for 40 years and have seen all manner of plans presented to divide our Village. Montgomery Village was not built to withstand being divided into sections, thereby isolating our individual homes corporations into pockets. We are not happy to know you're back again with more inane ideas to divert more cars and people through our town. More cars mean more emissions, noise, safety hazards for pedestrians plus our school kids, and destruction of our beloved wetlands. Montgomery County lands have been "concreted over" so much so that the wildlife left in the small areas are roaming our streets and green spaces for lack of habitat.

Please drop any ideas other than working on improvements for 355 going north. That's all my husband and I vote for. Fix what you've got!!

To the County Council: Please abandon any idea other than using funds to repair what's already in existence. Among other things, our roads and side streets are in terrible disrepair. I could take thousands of pictures showing "patch upon patch" on many side streets just in my immediate neighborhood. Of course there are many other projects that need attention besides roads.

Ann Ward

Jerry Ward

10513 Wayridge Dr.

Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is arranged in several paragraphs and is mostly centered or slightly left-aligned. The characters are very light and difficult to discern against the yellowed paper background.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** barbara Bell [thebrink21@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 7:59 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov;  
Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 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, Mary Stanfield, Barbara Bell, and Natalie Gooden, 21030 Brink Ct., Gaithersburg, Md.

Faint header text, possibly containing a date or reference number.

Main body of faint text, appearing to be a list or a series of entries.

Second section of faint text, possibly a continuation of the list or a separate set of entries.

Third section of faint text, continuing the list or entries.

Faint footer text, possibly containing a signature or page number.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Jeo, David [David.Jeo@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 5:03 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No to M-83

Dear Mr. Dinne:

I oppose M-83

Below are just a few reasons why I object.

While I understand the necessity for a Master Plan when addressing the future of something as large and complicated as Montgomery County, I believe there needs to be flexibility for review and revision in light of the development of new trends, studies and new technologies. A lot has happened in forty some years. To me the Master Plan is about where people will be living and how they will move around. Two key factors to that are the home and the automobile. Neither remains as they were forty years ago. Economy has demanded and technology has provided the ability to make both more efficient and sustainable. I feel we should expect the same from our Master Plan. Something efficient that will sustain and protect our community for generations to come.

I don't have the answers. I do have questions Like, why on I-270 the major lanes of traffic, in several locations, are allowed to exit into local lanes with-in the same stretch of road were local lanes are allowed merge into the main lanes; thus bringing everything to a stand still. I wonder if large companies systematically staggered the times their employees started their workday if it would help receive congestion. I doubt these are the answers. But that's not my point. My point is that there are people exponentially more intelligent than me (as you've probably figured out) that can come up with something more innovative than, "hey, let's build another road".

Of course the cost of constructing a new road is just the beginning. The cost of trying to maintaining a road and the surrounding environment goes on for decades. Montgomery County is no exception to the documented infrastructure deficiencies through-out the United States. Existing bridges, roads, water systems and the power grid are all in need of attention. It would perhaps be prudent to address current infrastructure deficiencies as a way to increase transportation efficiency. We also might need to consider that growth is not the only measure of success.

Growth. I consider the construction of M-83 contrary to "Smart Growth". As the proposed roads would encourage people (both resident and non-residents; tax payers and non-tax payers) to drive across the County on a regular basis for work and pleasure. I also believe the construction of such roads encourages people to move further away from established

transportation systems to housing developments where they can afford bigger and more luxurious properties. And while I have no right to deny anyone these pleasure, I don't think other communities should be paying for that privilege with their tax-dollars, health and quality of life. The irony of a new major roadway cutting through communities like Montgomery Village is that they were designed to be sustainable/livable communities. Communities where you could live, work, shop and enjoy leisure activities with-out having to drive far or at all. In addition, communities that offer mass transit close at hand; Ride-On, Metro and MARC.

Time and science have proven that our environment is considerably more fragile than we have suspected in the past. I think it's time we stop "mitigating" environmental damage that we cause; and stop creating environmental damage in the first place. As much has been suggested in past rulings by The Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA when they have denied federal funding for M-83 because many of the alternatives would pave over protected, undeveloped parklands that contain tributaries to Great Seneca Creek.

In conclusion, I'll restate that I am saying NO TO M-83. As I don't believe the construction of the proposed new roads will relieve traffic for any sustain period of time; and that the negative effects on the health of our residents, the environment and quality of life will not only be detrimental to the communities directly in the path of the proposed roads, but negatively effect all of Montgomery County and its residents.

David Jeo

Office of Public Information

Montgomery County, Maryland

240-777-6517

<<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/pio/site/home.asp>>  
<<http://www.youtube.com/user/montgomerycountymd>> <<http://www.facebook.com/pages/Rockville-MD/Montgomery-County-Government/53568216648?ref=ts>> <<http://twitter.com/MontgomeryCoMD>>  
<<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/apps/News/Blog/PaperlessBlog.asp?BlogID=20>>  
<<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/311>>

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Timothy Harms [gromit56@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:05 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on the Mid County Corridor Study Permit Application

The following are my comments regarding the permit application submitted by the Maryland Department of the Environment regarding the proposed M-83 Mid County Corridor Study.

I am an Environmental Engineer with 35 years of service in the federal government and a retired Colonel from the U. S. Army/Army Reserves as a Sanitary Engineer. My most recent unit affiliation was with the U.S. Army Public Health Command as a senior technical advisor to the Commander. Over my career I have conducted numerous environmental analysis on water/wastewater projects and been instrumental in preparing large and complex environmental impact statements - one in particular was over 1,700 pages long. Another had one alternative that was estimated to have life cycle costs over \$270 billion dollars. I am an acknowledged expert on the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and conducted extensive training courses on the topic presented across the country.

I am in favor of the no build option and opposed to alternatives 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9 (to include all the sub alternatives).

I attended the public hearing conducted at the Seneca Valley High School on August 7, 2013. While I signed up to speak due to the number of speakers my turn did not come up to speak until past the time I was able to stay. Had I stayed I would have made the following points:

I believe the analysis as presented by Montgomery County is highly inadequate and grossly underestimates the amount of wetlands impacted. This goes for all alternatives. There is no way the described construction could be done with such little impact - in the short or long term. The mitigative measures are also inadequate and in no way compensate for the proposed destruction of undisturbed land (forest and wetlands).

The analysis clearly appears to have a significant bias towards the master plan alignment. The inclusion of an alternative such as #4 appears to be a 'poison pill' and was included to redirect the reader to select option 9. It seemed to me alternative 4 was selected to essentially incite such a clamor that option 9 would look all the better - even though the analysis shows alternative 4 with significantly less impact and cost. The misdirection of the analysis is too blatant to overlook and should not be allowed.

The analysis is only focused on constructing a road project and does not include any analysis of mass transit in any form such as light rail or bus. There is also no analysis for a much reduced cost option of conducting a traffic light timing study. These studies have been proven to be a low cost alternative resulting in significant benefit to traffic flow.

Additionally, separate from this project is road construction already completed in the Clarksburg area. That construction predisposes the need for the project being evaluated which could be construed as segmentation with the intent to circumvent the intent of NEPA. This is a serious problem with the analysis.

In summary, I believe there are serious flaws in the analysis and the county is misleading the citizens so as to placate the people of Clarksburg. I made the decision years ago to move my residence near to where I work (I live and work in Germantown). I see no reason why the county should pay a tremendous amount of tax dollars to make the commute the citizens of Clarksburg chose on their own a little faster - at the additional expense of destroyed wetlands and tremendous expense.

I do not believe the Mid County Corridor project is well thought out and the permit application should be denied.

Respectfully

Timothy Harms  
11108 Knights Court  
Germantown, Maryland 20876

## **Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Neil Blanc [tneilblanc@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:11 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I oppose Alternative 4

To whom it may concern,

I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified. Alternative 4 is incompatible with the Master Plans that are the basis for our community development. Its located well outside the central transportation corridor area it is designed to support. It cuts through areas its designed not to.

There's too many reasons not to take Alternative 4 seriously. It seems Alternative 4 consideration is the response of citizens not taking caution where it was given, and the subsequent attempt to "get away with it." Another citizens mistake is not justification for my degradation, simply because they can yell louder. That's pushover politics; I implore you to read the consequences that directly impact me, as a source of pathos. Let my consequence be the manifestation of poor decision making by the Midcounty Highway authority. Let those effected by alternative 9 be the manifestation of their own decision.

The route of alternative 4 was never planned nor developed to accommodate a major highway. There are major community impacts like; the largest number of property takings, the destruction of two homes, destroying well and septic systems for 20 or more homes, and unacceptable noise levels (which itself causing a chain reaction of degradation to the environment via the exodus of top level predators which unsettles the entire food chain, which equates to more pests and therefore more problems for everyone). Beyond that, Alternative 4 isn't even the safest, quickest, most efficient plan nor does it stick to the original layout. By choosing alternative 4 we would be choosing to deliberately ignore precedence for inefficiency, because people are upset they got what they signed up for.

Let us not dwell in the present but consider the ramifications in the future. By choosing alternative 4, we lose the trust of the people who were told their homes would be safe from development like this. Likewise, if we build here, we initiate a chain reaction that will permanently alter the state of living here in a way we may never return.

Urban growth is a delicate, thought out process where it is necessary to follow reason, critical thinking, analysis, and careful decision making. Urban growth should not be left in the hands of who can make a bigger fuss. I ask you to consider all of this not because I live near where Alternative 4 would occur, but because it is not a strong decision to build here. Urban development isn't a popularity contest, its a thorough process that serves to better the lives of all citizens based on the best possible decision. Alternative 4 is not the best possible decision.

My name is Neil Blanc, and I strongly oppose any decision based on outcry, laziness, or greed. I oppose Alternative 4.

That having been said, there will be changes in the local environment. For 40+ years I have been privileged to enjoy easy access to much of the undeveloped land on or near the Alternative 9A right of way and have hiked it extensively. I particularly enjoy the North Germantown Creek (now designated as Dayspring Creek) valley and a major highway will not improve the experience. But all of the "locals" have known for decades that this area includes the M-83 right of way, we have already found significant changes in our local environment and lifestyle due to continued development and unplanned traffic congestion, so this loss would not be a surprise to any of us. I still regret it, but I am sure that the Dayspring Church of the Savior and others so privileged will join with me—the very few of us—in recognizing that our loss must be weighed against the frustration and loss of time daily experienced by hundreds of thousands of people stuck in congested traffic, the direct economic loss for the entire community, and the decisions of employers and retailers to locate in less congested areas leaving our housing stock under utilized and under valued.

3) I urge your support of Alternative 9A - The Master-Planned completion of the Midcounty Highway

This completes a transportation system that will:

- 1) Provide safe, rapid, high-volume traffic on a reserved limited-access right-of-way that has been protected from interference from neighboring developments.
- 2) Does not destroy houses or businesses and passes through communities that were planned to accommodate the road.
- 3) Ties together the other major local roads relieving their congestion and enabling efficient transportation between area residences, jobs, and retail centers.
- 4) Completes a continuous limited-access highway from the far northwest corner of Clarksburg to Shady Grove and the ICC.
- 5) Can accommodate an express bus lane for high-volume rapid transit.
- 6) Moves traffic efficiently and quickly to save personal time and carbon dioxide emissions. Its connections with other local roads extend these benefits area wide.
- 7) Adverse effects on wetlands and other natural features have been minimized or will be remediated. In much of the right of way trees are 50 years old because the land was set aside fifty years ago for this purpose.
- 8) This road is not perfect - no structure is. But its Master-Planned status and protection makes it uniquely positioned to complete a major transportation system that will serve the entire MCS area with minimal disruption of neighboring communities.

I urge you to not support the following Alternatives:

Alternative 1 - No Build

We have a present and growing need for an improved road system and No Build is not a solution, it is another failure.

## Alternative 2 - Intersection and traffic signal improvements

Elements of this alternative are needed but by itself it provides spot improvements only, not the required area-wide congestion relief.

## Alternative 4 - Brink, Wightman, Snouffer School and Muncaster Mill Roads.

The established communities along this route were never planned nor developed to accommodate a 4 and 6 lane divided highway. The consequences would be huge community damage, high collision risk, traffic encumbered by the existing community structures, slow stop and go traffic, and no closure of the gap in the Midcounty Highway. I hesitate to tempt someone to prove me wrong, but you can't do any worse than Alternative 4.

## Alternative 5 - Widens and adds service lanes to Rt 355 to connect Rt 27 to the Midcounty Highway via. Montgomery Village Ave.

This turns the Master Plan on its head by adding traffic to an already overloaded Rt 355 entangled by historic development and traffic entering and leaving the adjacent I-270. This Alternative would also use an already over burdened Montgomery Village Ave. that includes two of the most congested intersections in the County.

## Alternative 8 - A truncated version of Alternative 9

This would serve to provide a northern connection to and from the planned I-270/Watkins Mill overpass and interchange. But access to points further south is very restricted and it will dump major traffic onto Watkins Mill Road, Rt. 355, Montgomery Village Ave, and two of the most congested intersections in the County.

## Options B and D - Optional north ends to Alternatives 8 and 9.

These Options are not in the Master Plan, destroy homes, damage the Agriculture Reserve, and in the case of Option B, seriously reduce transportation efficiency and safety.

## Transit Only - Corridor Cities Transit Way, Bus Rapid Transit, Metro Rail or Monorail to Frederick, new tracks for the MARC Brunswick line.

At this time there is no Transit Only proposal that is detailed enough to permit a reliable evaluation of its feasibility, cost, and effectiveness.

Metro has only one station in the Upcounty area that houses 40% of the county's population. It is the busiest station in the system, dangerously overloaded during rush hours, but there

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Blanc, Cecilia [cmblanc@smcm.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:25 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No Alternative 4

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

I am writing this email to express my concern for Alternative 4 Method. I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified. Not only is it incompatible with the Master Plans that the community was developed upon, but it is outside the central transportation corridor area it is supposed to support, and as a result it will detrimentally affect residential areas.

I strongly support the completion of the Midcounty Highway along the Master Plan route. All the communities along this route were notified that it was going to be built well before now. It is the simplest, most effective route for traffic, and will minimize travel time, and air pollution and carbon emissions along with it. It is the most consistent, cohesive, and beneficial option to support our growing community.

Occam's razor, the famous principle of parsimony, states that the simplest solution is most likely the correct one. The Master Planned M-83 is overdue, badly needed, and the simplest solution with the least amount of complication.

Thank you for your time,  
Cecilia Blanc



## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** stundmar326 [stundmar326@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:12 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Alternate 9D for Midcounty Highway

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

This is in regards to the Public Notice Mid County Corridor Study.

Absolutely, Alternate 9D should be built. Alt. 9D substantially adds to the existing road network in the area. I-270 is the primary road. Md-355 is the alternate. Mid County Alt. 9D would be another component of the network.

Alt. 9D is a through road at both the northern and southern ends of Mid County Highway (M-83), a simple connector between a main road in a residential area (Snowden Farm Parkway, Clarksburg) and employment corridor transportation mainstays (Shady Grove Metro, MD-200).

Alt. 9D is a great alternate to I-270 and MD-355 in the Goshen to Middlebrook Roads area. At evening rush hour, both I-270 and MD-355 have heavy traffic in this area.

Northern Terminus Option D is preferred because it adds to the road network in that region and does not impact Seneca Crossing Local Park nor the Dayspring Church Silent Retreat Center.

Finally, by significantly expanding the road network, I believe this road will be sufficient well into the future.

Thank you.

Barbara Stunder  
7 Brook Run Court  
Germantown, MD 20876

✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Kevin Blanc [t.kevin.blanc@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 10:04 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified; Support improvements to 355 or Master Plan M-83

I want to express my dismay that Alternative 4 Modified (Alt 4) is under serious consideration. I am strongly opposed to Alt 4.

\* The route traced by Alt 4 was never planned nor prepared for to accommodate a major highway. Those of us that checked the master plan should not be subject to the worst possible alternative.

\* Alt 4 It would destroy homes, yards, wells and septic systems, increase the noises levels, and destroy the commutes of those that live along this rural route.

\* Alt 4 will impact churches, an historic African American community, a park, and put at risk many of the bus commuters that use stops on this road.

\* Alt 4 is an alarmingly bad transportation solution, almost doubling the planned commute along M-83, well away from the direct path that was planned for in the 1960s.

I wish no road had to be built. Alternatives involving improvements along 355 would be a much better option in my opinion. I support every effort to avoid building a new highway. But, if it is not avoidable, then the County planned the route for M-83 well, advertised this plan well, and bought the necessary property so that the right-of-way for a new route was ready when it was needed. It allows for the most efficient traffic flow and minimizes commute times and the resultant pollution.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kevin Blanc

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** LYLE AND JANET LEVINE [lyle1janet@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:51 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Mid County Corridor Study Public Comment

**Subject:** Mid County Corridor Study Public Comment (CORPS: CENAB-OP-RMN (Mid County Corridor Study) 2007-07102-M15, MDE Nontidal Wetlands and Waterways: 13-NT-3162/201360802/AI No. 140416)

Dear Sir:

The Alt 8 and Alt 9 options discussed in the Midcounty Corridor Study are extremely damaging to our county ecosystem with virtually no redeeming features! All of the Alt 8 and Alt 9 options require hundreds of feet of piped streams, valuable wetlands filled in, over 50 acres of forest cleared, and affect around 30+ acres of our valuable parkland. Why?! Montgomery county already listed alternatives that have virtually none of these problems, especially Alt 5. Alt 5 improves commute time as much as the Alt 8 options, with far less impact on the environment. This alternate plan has no piped streams, no streams relocated, no wetlands filled in, only 2 acres of forest destroyed, and a parkland impact of just 0.2 acres. The number of homes affected is similar to the environmentally damaging Alt 8 and 9 plans, and much less than Alt 4. Finally, 355 is already an active transportation corridor. Expanding it will not push heavy traffic into previously peaceful neighborhoods. Similarly, Alt 2 is a viable option for the same reasons.

Personally, I would follow the suggestion of Montgomery County Park forester Carole Bergmann and Park ecologist Rob Gibbs who recommended that the stream valley area threatened by Alts 8 and 9 be designated by the County as a special Biodiversity area. This makes much more sense than demolishing this irreplaceable natural habitat area with bulldozers.

Sincerely,

Lyle Levine

11024 Grassy Knoll Terrace

Germantown, MD 20876

✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Mini Varughese [micro385@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:41 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M-83

I wanted to write to support the construction of the M-83 to connect Ridge Road to Montgomery Village Ave. We need a way to connect to the ICC. I enjoy using the ICC but coming home and hitting the 270 traffic is horrible. Considering the Clarksburg community is continuing to grow, we need the infrastructure to support this area.

Please finish the ICC.

--  
Sincerely,  
Mini Varughese  
23124 Persimmon Ridge Rd  
Clarksburg, MD 20871

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Lisa and Kevin Blanc [the.blancs@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:37 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified; Strongly support Master Plan M-83

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to express my concern for the Alternative 4 Modified. I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified Highway for many, varied reasons. First, the route of Alternative 4 was never planned nor prepared for to accommodate a major highway. Next, it would destroy homes, yards, wells and septic systems, increase the noises levels, and adversely affect the health and well-being of the residents here. As a mother, I cannot support a road that will endanger children who have to cross a highway for buses, recreation, or simply because of the close proximity of the highway to their house (so close in some places that a retention wall is needed).

Besides the decrease in well-being for the families, the Alternative 4 Method is not an effective transportation solution. It is not meant to be supported in this area: it does not connect to major feeder roads, it is distant from 355 and I-270, and it is completely facing the wrong direction. Congested traffic will cause excess fuel congestion, carbon dioxide emissions and air pollution, and spillover onto rural roads that are ESPECIALLY not made to support higher traffic.

I do, however, strongly and completely support the Mid-county Highway along the Master Plan route. All of the communities developed along this route were notified from the beginning of this roadway. It is designed expressly to minimize interference with adjacent communities and existing roads. It allows efficient traffic flow, minimizes travel time, air pollution, and optimal communication between residential and commercial areas. It can also provide the backbone for a useful and effective bus system.

Obviously, the best option is to not have to build this highway in the first place but that isn't feasible anymore; development necessitates a highway to accommodate the high traffic, population, and congestion. What is important now is choosing the option that is the lesser of two evils: the plan that simultaneously solves the major problems while creating the least amount of additional problems. That option is the Master Plan M-83 route. The Alternative 4 Modified plan would be a huge step backwards in developing a beautiful, safe, cohesive community capable of flourishing in many ways.

The Master Planned M-83 is long overdue and badly needed.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
Lisa Blanc

✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Carolyn Levine [clevine102@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:31 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment Mid County Corridor Study

Subject: Public Comment on CENAB-OP-RMN (Mid County Corridor Study) 2007-07102-M15

Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my opposition to both Aternative 8 - Master Plan Alignment truncated and Alternative 9 - Master Plan Alignment, and to voice my support for Alternative 5 - MD355 with Service Roads and Alternative 2 - Transportation Systems Management, as well as for solving this traffic problem with the extension of the Metro Red Line.

The Master Plan was developed in the 1960's, before the National Environmental Policy Act, Clean Air Act, and Clean Water Act. Had these federal laws been in place at the time, this Master Plan would not have been developed. According to the Midcounty Corridor Study, both Alternatives 8 and 9 impact the environment in terms of linear feet of streams piped and acres of wetlands filled, with Alt. 9 additionally requiring stream relocation. Alternatives 8 and 9 also impact at least 50 acres of forest, including the bisection of a large tract (more than 150 acres) of mature forest. Similar acreage of parkland and farmland will be affected. Alternatives 2 and 5 have virtually no negative impact in any of these areas. An additional significant benefit of Alternatives 2 and 5 is that they increase traffic flow to area businesses, not divert traffic from them.

Sincerely,

Janet Levine

11024 Grassy Knoll Terrace

Germantown, MD 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** wesleyvillebabe@gmail.com on behalf of Ann Ward [ann@wardworks.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 5:03 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: MidCounty Corridor Study -Opposition Especially to Proposals 4 and 9;

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Ann Ward <[ann@wardworks.com](mailto:ann@wardworks.com)>  
Date: Tue, Aug 20, 2013 at 5:00 PM  
Subject: MidCounty Corridor Study -Opposition Especially to Proposals 4 and 9;  
To: [john.j.dinne@usace.army](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army), [sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)  
Cc: [greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov), [county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov),  
[ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov)

Gentlemen:

Please be very assured that we in Montgomery Village, MD, are vehemently opposed to any plans which will funnel more cars through our Village. My husband and I have lived here for 40 years and have seen all manner of plans presented to divide our Village. Montgomery Village was not built to withstand being divided into sections, thereby isolating our individual homes corporations into pockets. We are not happy to know you're back again with more inane ideas to divert more cars and people through our town. More cars mean more emissions, noise, safety hazards for pedestrians plus our school kids, and destruction of our beloved wetlands. Montgomery County lands have been "concreted over" so much so that the wildlife left in the small areas are roaming our streets and green spaces for lack of habitat.

Please drop any ideas other than working on improvements for 355 going north. That's all my husband and I vote for. Fix what you've got!!

To the County Council: Please abandon any idea other than using funds to repair what's already in existence. Among other things, our roads and side streets are in terrible disrepair. I could take thousands of pictures showing "patch upon patch" on many side streets just in my immediate neighborhood. Of course there are many other projects that need attention besides roads.

Ann Ward

Jerry Ward

10513 Wayridge Dr.

Montgomery Village, MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** barbara Bell [thebrink21@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 7:59 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov;  
Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 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, Mary Stanfield, Barbara Bell, and Natalie Gooden, 21030 Brink Ct., Gaithersburg, Md.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Jeo, David [David.Jeo@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 5:03 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No to M-83

Dear Mr. Dinne:

I oppose M-83

Below are just a few reasons why I object.

While I understand the necessity for a Master Plan when addressing the future of something as large and complicated as Montgomery County, I believe there needs to be flexibility for review and revision in light of the development of new trends, studies and new technologies. A lot has happened in forty some years. To me the Master Plan is about where people will be living and how they will move around. Two key factors to that are the home and the automobile. Neither remains as they were forty years ago. Economy has demanded and technology has provided the ability to make both more efficient and sustainable. I feel we should expect the same from our Master Plan. Something efficient that will sustain and protect our community for generations to come.

I don't have the answers. I do have questions Like, why on I-270 the major lanes of traffic, in several locations, are allowed to exit into local lanes with-in the same stretch of road were local lanes are allowed merge into the main lanes; thus bringing everything to a stand still. I wonder if large companies systematically staggered the times their employees started their workday if it would help receive congestion. I doubt these are the answers. But that's not my point. My point is that there are people exponentially more intelligent than me (as you've probably figured out) that can come up with something more innovative than, "hey, let's build another road".

Of course the cost of constructing a new road is just the beginning. The cost of trying to maintaining a road and the surrounding environment goes on for decades. Montgomery County is no exception to the documented infrastructure deficiencies through-out the United States. Existing bridges, roads, water systems and the power grid are all in need of attention. It would perhaps be prudent to address current infrastructure deficiencies as a way to increase transportation efficiency. We also might need to consider that growth is not the only measure of success.

Growth. I consider the construction of M-83 contrary to "Smart Growth". As the proposed roads would encourage people (both resident and non-residents; tax payers and non-tax payers) to drive across the County on a regular basis for work and pleasure. I also believe the construction of such roads encourages people to move further away from established

transportation systems to housing developments where they can afford bigger and more luxurious properties. And while I have no right to deny anyone these pleasure, I don't think other communities should be paying for that privilege with their tax-dollars, health and quality of life. The irony of a new major roadway cutting through communities like Montgomery Village is that they were designed to be sustainable/livable communities. Communities where you could live, work, shop and enjoy leisure activities with-out having to drive far or at all. In addition, communities that offer mass transit close at hand; Ride-On, Metro and MARC.

Time and science have proven that our environment is considerably more fragile than we have suspected in the past. I think it's time we stop "mitigating" environmental damage that we cause; and stop creating environmental damage in the first place. As much has been suggested in past rulings by The Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA when they have denied federal funding for M-83 because many of the alternatives would pave over protected, undeveloped parklands that contain tributaries to Great Seneca Creek.

In conclusion, I'll restate that I am saying NO TO M-83. As I don't believe the construction of the proposed new roads will relieve traffic for any sustain period of time; and that the negative effects on the health of our residents, the environment and quality of life will not only be detrimental to the communities directly in the path of the proposed roads, but negatively effect all of Montgomery County and its residents.

David Jeo

Office of Public Information

Montgomery County, Maryland

240-777-6517

<<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/pio/site/home.asp>>  
<<http://www.youtube.com/user/montgomerycountymd>> <<http://www.facebook.com/pages/Rockville-MD/Montgomery-County-Government/53568216648?ref=ts>> <<http://twitter.com/MontgomeryCoMD>>  
<<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/apps/News/Blog/PaperlessBlog.asp?BlogID=20>>  
<<http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/311>>

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Timothy Harms [gromit56@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:05 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on the Mid County Corridor Study Permit Application

The following are my comments regarding the permit application submitted by the Maryland Department of the Environment regarding the proposed M-83 Mid County Corridor Study.

I am an Environmental Engineer with 35 years of service in the federal government and a retired Colonel from the U. S. Army/Army Reserves as a Sanitary Engineer. My most recent unit affiliation was with the U.S. Army Public Health Command as a senior technical advisor to the Commander. Over my career I have conducted numerous environmental analysis on water/wastewater projects and been instrumental in preparing large and complex environmental impact statements - one in particular was over 1,700 pages long. Another had one alternative that was estimated to have life cycle costs over \$270 billion dollars. I am an acknowledged expert on the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and conducted extensive training courses on the topic presented across the country.

I am in favor of the no build option and opposed to alternatives 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9 (to include all the sub alternatives).

I attended the public hearing conducted at the Seneca Valley High School on August 7, 2013. While I signed up to speak due to the number of speakers my turn did not come up to speak until past the time I was able to stay. Had I stayed I would have made the following points:

I believe the analysis as presented by Montgomery County is highly inadequate and grossly underestimates the amount of wetlands impacted. This goes for all alternatives. There is no way the described construction could be done with such little impact - in the short or long term. The mitigative measures are also inadequate and in no way compensate for the proposed destruction of undisturbed land (forest and wetlands).

The analysis clearly appears to have a significant bias towards the master plan alignment. The inclusion of an alternative such as #4 appears to be a 'poison pill' and was included to redirect the reader to select option 9. It seemed to me alternative 4 was selected to essentially incite such a clamor that option 9 would look all the better - even though the analysis shows alternative 4 with significantly less impact and cost. The misdirection of the analysis is too blatant to overlook and should not be allowed.

The analysis is only focused on constructing a road project and does not include any analysis of mass transit in any form such as light rail or bus. There is also no analysis for a much reduced cost option of conducting a traffic light timing study. These studies have been proven to be a low cost alternative resulting in significant benefit to traffic flow.

Additionally, separate from this project is road construction already completed in the Clarksburg area. That construction predisposes the need for the project being evaluated which could be construed as segmentation with the intent to circumvent the intent of NEPA. This is a serious problem with the analysis.

In summary, I believe there are serious flaws in the analysis and the county is misleading the citizens so as to placate the people of Clarksburg. I made the decision years ago to move my residence near to where I work (I live and work in Germantown). I see no reason why the county should pay a tremendous amount of tax dollars to make the commute the citizens of Clarksburg chose on their own a little faster - at the additional expense of destroyed wetlands and tremendous expense.

I do not believe the Mid County Corridor project is well thought out and the permit application should be denied.

Respectfully

Timothy Harms  
11108 Knights Court  
Germantown, Maryland 20876

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Neil Blanc [neilblanc@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:11 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I oppose Alternative 4

To whom it may concern,

I am strongly opposed to Alternative 4 Modified. Alternative 4 is incompatible with the Master Plans that are the basis for our community development. Its located well outside the central transportation corridor area it is designed to support. It cuts through areas its designed not to.

There's too many reasons not to take Alternative 4 seriously. It seems Alternative 4 consideration is the response of citizens not taking caution where it was given, and the subsequent attempt to "get away with it." Another citizens mistake is not justification for my degradation, simply because they can yell louder. That's pushover politics; I implore you to read the consequences that directly impact me, as a source of pathos. Let my consequence be the manifestation of poor decision making by the Midcounty Highway authority. Let those effected by alternative 9 be the manifestation of their own decision.

The route of alternative 4 was never planned nor developed to accommodate a major highway. There are major community impacts like; the largest number of property takings, the destruction of two homes, destroying well and septic systems for 20 or more homes, and unacceptable noise levels (which itself causing a chain reaction of degradation to the environment via the exodus of top level predators which unsettles the entire food chain, which equates to more pests and therefore more problems for everyone). Beyond that, Alternative 4 isn't even the safest, quickest, most efficient plan nor does it stick to the original layout. By choosing alternative 4 we would be choosing to deliberately ignore precedence for inefficiency, because people are upset they got what they signed up for.

Let us not dwell in the present but consider the ramifications in the future. By choosing alternative 4, we lose the trust of the people who were told their homes would be safe from development like this. Likewise, if we build here, we initiate a chain reaction that will permanently alter the state of living here in a way we may never return.

Urban growth is a delicate, thought out process where it is necessary to follow reason, critical thinking, analysis, and careful decision making. Urban growth should not be left in the hands of who can make a bigger fuss. I ask you to consider all of this not because I live near where Alternative 4 would occur, but because it is not a strong decision to build here. Urban development isn't a popularity contest, its a thorough process that serves to better the lives of all citizens based on the best possible decision. Alternative 4 is not the best possible decision.

My name is Neil Blanc, and I strongly oppose any decision based on outcry, laziness, or greed. I oppose Alternative 4.

That having been said, there will be changes in the local environment. For 40+ years I have been privileged to enjoy easy access to much of the undeveloped land on or near the Alternative 9A right of way and have hiked it extensively. I particularly enjoy the North Germantown Creek (now designated as Dayspring Creek) valley and a major highway will not improve the experience. But all of the "locals" have known for decades that this area includes the M-83 right of way, we have already found significant changes in our local environment and lifestyle due to continued development and unplanned traffic congestion, so this loss would not be a surprise to any of us. I still regret it, but I am sure that the Dayspring Church of the Savior and others so privileged will join with me—the very few of us—in recognizing that our loss must be weighed against the frustration and loss of time daily experienced by hundreds of thousands of people stuck in congested traffic, the direct economic loss for the entire community, and the decisions of employers and retailers to locate in less congested areas leaving our housing stock under utilized and under valued.

3) I urge your support of Alternative 9A - The Master-Planned completion of the Midcounty Highway

This completes a transportation system that will:

- 1) Provide safe, rapid, high-volume traffic on a reserved limited-access right-of-way that has been protected from interference from neighboring developments.
- 2) Does not destroy houses or businesses and passes through communities that were planned to accommodate the road.
- 3) Ties together the other major local roads relieving their congestion and enabling efficient transportation between area residences, jobs, and retail centers.
- 4) Completes a continuous limited-access highway from the far northwest corner of Clarksburg to Shady Grove and the ICC.
- 5) Can accommodate an express bus lane for high-volume rapid transit.
- 6) Moves traffic efficiently and quickly to save personal time and carbon dioxide emissions. Its connections with other local roads extend these benefits area wide.
- 7) Adverse effects on wetlands and other natural features have been minimized or will be remediated. In much of the right of way trees are 50 years old because the land was set aside fifty years ago for this purpose.
- 8) This road is not perfect - no structure is. But its Master-Planned status and protection makes it uniquely positioned to complete a major transportation system that will serve the entire MCS area with minimal disruption of neighboring communities.

I urge you to not support the following Alternatives:

Alternative 1 - No Build

We have a present and growing need for an improved road system and No Build is not a solution, it is another failure.

## Alternative 2 - Intersection and traffic signal improvements

Elements of this alternative are needed but by itself it provides spot improvements only, not the required area-wide congestion relief.

## Alternative 4 - Brink, Wightman, Snouffer School and Muncaster Mill Roads.

The established communities along this route were never planned nor developed to accommodate a 4 and 6 lane divided highway. The consequences would be huge community damage, high collision risk, traffic encumbered by the existing community structures, slow stop and go traffic, and no closure of the gap in the Midcounty Highway. I hesitate to tempt someone to prove me wrong, but you can't do any worse than Alternative 4.

## Alternative 5 - Widens and adds service lanes to Rt 355 to connect Rt 27 to the Midcounty Highway via. Montgomery Village Ave.

This turns the Master Plan on its head by adding traffic to an already overloaded Rt 355 entangled by historic development and traffic entering and leaving the adjacent I-270. This Alternative would also use an already over burdened Montgomery Village Ave. that includes two of the most congested intersections in the County.

## Alternative 8 - A truncated version of Alternative 9

This would serve to provide a northern connection to and from the planned I-270/Watkins Mill overpass and interchange. But access to points further south is very restricted and it will dump major traffic onto Watkins Mill Road, Rt. 355, Montgomery Village Ave, and two of the most congested intersections in the County.

## Options B and D - Optional north ends to Alternatives 8 and 9.

These Options are not in the Master Plan, destroy homes, damage the Agriculture Reserve, and in the case of Option B, seriously reduce transportation efficiency and safety.

## Transit Only - Corridor Cities Transit Way, Bus Rapid Transit, Metro Rail or Monorail to Frederick, new tracks for the MARC Brunswick line.

At this time there is no Transit Only proposal that is detailed enough to permit a reliable evaluation of its feasibility, cost, and effectiveness.

Metro has only one station in the Upcounty area that houses 40% of the county's population. It is the busiest station in the system, dangerously overloaded during rush hours, but there

is no political will to correct this. It is much easier to develop big ideas than fix present and well defined problems. And not everyone wants to go Downcounty.

The CCT is only one of the new proposals that is advanced far enough for a credible cost and construction schedule. The planned extension from Gaithersburg to Clarksburg was dropped from County budget planning the week before your hearing.

The most advanced of the other schemes, Bus Rapid Transit, faces problems finding a clear route through the historic Rt. 355 corridor. The most feasible option would be a dedicated express bus lane along the Eastern Arterial, which requires completion of Alternative 9A.

Multi-track all-day MARC service. Has anyone talked to the owners of the railroad right of way? They are notably unhappy about use of their tracks for the present MARC service. What do they say about a third track and the added encumbrance of all-day service? It will be short and not sweet.

We need more transit, but it will have to contend with limited funds, so it will be bus, and any express service faces historic limitations on right of way. A completed Eastern Arterial is our best hope for a working system.

At the end of the line, the rest of the trip has to be made on local buses and/or cars, and nothing will work without an effective road system.

Charles Tilford

9910 Brink Road

Gaithersburg, MD 20882

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Emily Susko [esusko@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:09 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. Not only is this a poor spending choice in an era of constrained financial resources, it is a foolish choice to squander the development lessons we have learned in the five decades since this extension was originally proposed.

1. Clean water is not a luxury, it is a necessity, both now and in perpetuity.

Protecting our water resources, including wetlands that provide critical ecosystem services, must be a top county priority. In fact, Maryland is often a leader in working to address stormwater management to reduce runoff; investing in miles of unnecessary additional impervious surface, through prime remaining wetlands and farmland, seems contradictory.

2. New highways encourage sprawling development and induce highway demand.

Widening and expanding highways at best provide only temporary traffic congestion relief, because they encourage more and more driving and concentrate drivers onto fewer routes. Of course, in this case, M83 does not claim to even temporarily relieve congestion; the county's own traffic models do not show any of the build-alternatives performing better than the status quo. Instead, it simply counteracts other investments the area is making in alternative transportation methods that have a better chance of reducing car congestion while improving quality of life and environmental health.

3. Building costly unnecessary highways is an irresponsible use of transportation funding that could be put toward more sustainable and equitable projects.

For example, of the proposed alternatives, 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. 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.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, which 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.

Please consider the full impact of construction and reject the permit.

Signed,

Emily Susko

Emily Susko  
6815 Eastern Ave, Apt 1



## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:28 AM  
**To:** Auroraherediab@hotmail.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Teresa Lara [<mailto:Auroraherediab@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:02 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.

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,

Teresa Lara  
19007 Capehart Dr  
Gaithersburg, MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:28 AM  
**To:** Cvlara723@hotmail.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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Carlos Lara [<mailto:Cvlara723@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:06 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,

Carlos Lara  
19007 Capehart Dr  
Gaithersburg, MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Carlos Lara [Cvlara723@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:06 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,

Carlos Lara  
19007 Capehart Dr  
Gaithersburg, MD 20886

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** olga Sotiriou [osotiri@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:39 PM  
**To:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fw: M-83 Alternative 4- NO

My husband and I purchased our home in Montgomery Village four years ago after moving from the midwest. We fell in love with the open green spaces, family centered community, walkable streets, and numerous amenities.

However, the changes proposed by the county for the M-83, Alternative 4, as well as Alternatives 8 & 9, threaten every aspect of Montgomery Village and its residents and will ultimately destroy a strong, energetic, and vibrant, community of Montgomery County, resulting in a disjointed, lowering property values and making a large part of Montgomery County UNDESIREABLE!

Alternative 4 in particular, was clearly cited to provide the least improvement to travel time and would have an impact on the greatest number of residential properties, traffic conflict points, like driveways, and historic properties. It also is the only option that is inconsistent with the transportation master plan.

It is also questionable that the build alternatives provide benefits sufficient to justify their expense and impact on the community. So in not even achieving the purpose and needs identified by the County, these alternatives will consume the funding that could be used to build transit projects that would improve conditions for residents.

What is the benefit of destroying communities and quality of life for communities in Montgomery County? There are numerous alternatives to already established roads, 355 for example, including public mass- transit alternatives. We need to be more forward in our thinking than reactive by destroying residences, communities, not to mention green spaces and creeks, and streams, for temporary relief.

The decision makers, engineers, designers, etc... involved in this process must do their due diligence to visit the spaces and communities at risk. Montgomery County elected officials need to take charge of County affairs and own the decisions that affect the citizens who voted them into office.

Sincerely,

Olga Moissakis

Montgomery Village resident

✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** racequine@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:08 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Mid County Corridor Study

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen:

As an actual tax paying resident of upper Montgomery County, I urge you to issue a permit for the M83, Alternative 9A.

The county is in need of roads because of continued development in the upper county and the most logical of the alternatives in 9A. It was promised in conjunction with the issuance of thousands of building permits, and to destroy other neighborhoods with one of the other alternatives is a betrayal to those communities that were never planned with a highway going through them.

I also urge you to immediately remove Alternative 4 from consideration.

Additionally, the comments from actual residents, who live here, take their children to school here, shop here, pay taxes here and vote here should hold greater weight than visitors to Day Spring. Day Spring may have 1000 visitors a year, but there are thousands and thousands of tax paying commuters on a daily basis whose needs should be placed ahead of a casual guest who is not actually providing tax money for the greater good in Montgomery County.

Regards,  
Kathleen Sentkowski  
9821 Wightman Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20879

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Gregory Vinogradov [grishav@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:02 PM  
**To:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; nyegorova@comcast.net  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Alternative 4 of Mid-County Highway

All,

We have been living in the Points community of Montgomery Village for almost 10 years, and we are definitely not happy with the Alternative 4 plan, which would extend the Mid-County Highway to pass essentially next to our house. We are very concerned about the noise and pollution that this highway will inflict on our property, let alone additional traffic. We have selected this community because of the quiet and secure atmosphere that it currently provides.

Thank you,

Gregory Vinogradov  
Nina Yegorova

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Emilie Crown [ecrowncen@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:12 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] My thoughts on M-83

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

I have lived in Montgomery County for the past 57 years and certainly have seen a lot of change! I will never forget how big an improvement it was for me when Mid-County Highway opened and I think we really need for this road to be completed as it was originally planned as soon as possible. I grew up on Davis Mill Road and now visit my mother who still lives there on a daily basis. It used to be a dirt road with only a small amount of traffic, then it was paved and became an official Rustic Road. Now the pavement is a mess and the traffic horrible. Cars speed on this road all the time, and I am afraid to drive it except at night time when I can see headlights coming when going around the corners. People use this road all the time to try to avoid traffic and the pavement is a total mess of pot holes and it is very dangerous to drive on. This roads needs to return to a true rustic road, and the people in Clarksburg and north need a way to get to Metro and down county without sitting in endless traffic. Clarksburg was promised transportation when it was built and does not have it! A significant number of new developments have been approved to be built in the near future, so the problem is only going to get worse! I am all for mass transit, but people need to be able to get to it! Years ago these problems were anticipated and a PLAN was made to combat it. It is LONG overdue for that plan to be completed. Great Seneca Highway has helped but Mid-County Highway abruptly stops and needs to be finished. People who bought in that area were informed about the planned road, and the residents north of them need to be able to get to work, shopping and schools! Please stick with the plan and build the road as soon as possible. Alternative 9A does not destroy houses or businesses and passes through communities that were planned to accommodate the road.

Most sincerely yours,

Emilie Crown

17113 Berclair Terrace, Derwood, MD 20855

--  
Emilie Crown

[ecrowncen@gmail.com](mailto:ecrowncen@gmail.com)

301-740-9844 home phone

240-777-2467 work phone

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** carolyn schmidt-roberts [carolynhome@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 8:43 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Ike Leggett; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; Allan Roberts  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] The Biggest Asset of Our Lives and M-83

Dear Messrs Dinne and McKewen;

Please be advised the decisions made here affect our property, our home, the biggest asset in our lives.

We have lived @ 9600 Brink Road since 1989 and understood that M-83 would be built as planned. We researched to ensure that we purchased a home that was out of any planned highways. With the proposal of alternate 4, the rug is being pulled out from under us. Please understand this is not a case of "NIMBY's" (not in my back yard), we only want what was promised 50 years ago.

First to address the alternate 4 option, which is absurd. Widening a road through an existing area that was developed without the intent of ever supporting a major highway is ludicrous. It is befuddling as to how this option even became one. The multiple cul-de-sacs, homes with septic and well, Great Seneca Park system, and historic sites are all reasons to oppose this option.

Second, M-83 was placed in the plan with land set aside and subsequent development planned around this highway. Daily we contend with congested and dangerous traffic in our rustic neighborhood. This highway should be built as envisioned. It supports Upper Montgomery County development according to the Master Plan. To deviate from the Master Plan places little faith in our government and elected leaders to govern. As a civilized society, we make plans and have government execute those plans. If we simply make plans and do not carry them out, then we are no longer a governed society and as such, let's not waste tax dollars as we are no longer governed. And we no longer need government employees who waffle with these decisions.

Alternate 4 is an absurdity. Proceed as planned with the Master Plan route, M-83, Alternate 9A, and complete Midcounty Highway!

Thank you,

Allan and Carolyn Roberts

9600 Brink Road

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** C. Sadulas [csadula@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 7:33 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please vote to recommend Alternate 9-A

Dear Mr. Dinne

As a resident of Goshen Maryland for 23 years, I have carefully followed the development of M83. Our house backs to Brink Road. We have been waiting for the implimentation of the Master Plan for M-83. Recently we were informed that the Master Plan may not be implemented - instead most of our backyatd, our well and perhaps part of our home - in addition to neighbors homes, yards and wells - would be incorprated into a newly designed M-83!

Not only does this substantially in pact us and a number of our neighbors but it has an effect on the ecologically established rural environement that exists along Brink Road. As you must be aware, there are quite a few small herds of white tail deer which have caused frequent, sometimes fatal automobile accidents on Brink and Blunt Roads. As for our human species; many people from Maryland, and even Northern Virginia and Washinton,DC, enjoy hiking through Seneca Creek Park from the entrance at the intersection of Brink and Wightman Roads. Please help us maintain and enjoy this section of the Ag Reserve by voting to continue the Master Plan and supporting Alternative 9-A.

Thank you for reading my letter.

Sincerely,  
Cynthia Sadula  
21017 Cog Wheel Way  
Germantown, Maryland 20876  
Sent from my NOOK

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Teresa Lara [Auroraherediab@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:02 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.

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,

Teresa Lara  
19007 Capehart Dr  
Gaithersburg, MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** C. Sadulas [csadula@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:21 PM  
**To:** oicemail@montgomerycountymd.com  
**Cc:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)  
**Subject:** Please vote to recommend Alternate 9-A

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear County Executive Leggett and Members of the County Council  
Attached is a copy of my letter to Mr. Dinne expressing some of my concerns regarding the development of M-83. For many reasons, including those listed in my letter to Mr. Dinne, I respectfully request that you vote to follow the Master Plan and choose to implement Alternative 9A

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Sadula  
21017 Cog Wheel Way  
Germantown, MD 20876  
Sent from my NOOK

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** TAME Coalition [tamecoalition@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:19 PM  
**To:** TAME Coalition  
**Subject:** M-83 Extended: Suicide of Our Community

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Mark Firley's profile photo

<<https://apis.google.com/c/u/0/photos/private/AIbEiAIAAABDC00Bu42HrLCTViILdmNhcmRfcGhvdG8qKddhODkxZjVhNDkyYmJmNmU1ZjIzMzA4MDRmMTAxZjliYjZmNTFmOWMwAb55tBCGgIDUq1zPbx1Di3Hg6MkU?sz=90>>

Article by Mark J. Firley

When one confronts the scene of a suicide, there is an almost obscene intimacy that results from being forced to contemplate that most personal act of what was once another life. There are parallels in the life of a community, moments when one identifies a trajectory that ultimately leads to prosperity or ruin.

Watching the August 7 hearings held by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding the proposed extension of MidCounty Highway (M83) was one of those occasions. Montgomery Village and North Germantown-Greenway Park effectively ended their existence to the benefit of a cadre of unelected bureaucrats.

How did that happen? The Montgomery County Department of Transportation selected the old "Master Plan Route" for M-83 (the so-called Alternative 9) that would effectively split Montgomery Village physically and sacrifice it (and its residents) to service the myth that developers pay for infrastructure in the county. To satisfy the technical requirement to produce alternatives, MCDOT whipped up a giant "poison pill" in the form of Alternative 4, which cut through historic neighborhoods, destroyed numbers of homes, and generally could not have been approved by any sane agency.

But the pretense of an alternative was enough. Opposition to M83 coming from Germantown, Gaithersburg and Montgomery Village instantly fractured into two competing "not-in-my-backyard" camps. Instead of focusing on what should be done instead (the so-called "demand management option" or SR355 improvements), the community opposition to this concrete constrictor broke in two - with people agreed only on the fact that they didn't want it in their part of the community, but happy to throw their neighboring subdivision under the non-existent bus of transit we deserve and still don't have.

It was a masterwork of political engineering - MCDOT divided the community and reduced its net message to "NIMBY" all the while knowing that the "Master Plan Route" gained credibility by being the default. By focusing opposition on Alternative 4, the shell game advanced Alternative 9, which is the only "alternative" that has ever been given serious consideration by MCDOT. Montgomery Village, Gaithersburg, and east Germantown will pay the price in noise, pollution, congestion, and aggravation to give no more than a few years' reprieve to Clarksburg, where the cycle of insufficient transportation alternatives is starting all over again. If the consequences were any less awful, one could almost applaud the gamesmanship.

For the citizens of Clarksburg, the consequences may well look like sweet victory - the stars are lining up to give the long-suffering residents some hope that transportation relief will be coming in the form of a big new road. But the benefits will be short lived, since the existence of that road will open the way to even more density and development, until the situation returns to the misery they endure today and worse. They too, are about to offer millions of tax dollars on the altar of road construction which will quickly consume even more of their substance in a loop from which there is no credible exit.

Gaithersburg and Rockville will suffer as the southern end of M83 will have to be rebuilt to accommodate the traffic we're about to pour onto it, not to mention millions more in parking garages if any of the "connectivity to Metro" will work. Remember: even though the Corridor Cities Transitway is also in plan, it will have no impact on the need or use of M83 Extended in any form, at least according to the zampolits running this operation.

Within a year or so of its opening, M-83 extended will be as much of a nightmare as anything that preceded it, but development will have moved on, the county will have opened new tax mines in the form of shiny new subdivisions, and the bulldozing and redevelopment of Montgomery Village into a new revenue source and even more supine polity will be well on the way.

And the game will continue: the County will continue to pretend that "developers" are responsible for the infrastructure costs of new communities, while bankruptcy and other means assure that the real net cost is where it was all along - with the taxpayers. The show will go on, many "leaders" will posture and the county's citizens will pay double and triple to clean up the mess.

The "Frakking" of political opposition [in both senses of the word] means we are to be burdened with hundreds of millions of ultimately wasted tax dollars and no credible way to stop the tarmac from metastasizing. What will be sacrificed to keep the concrete flowing? More schools, library hours, public safety? The benefits of all this asphalt include more carbon emissions, more pollution, more disturbed land, and more congestion. Such a deal!

I want to shout "We can do better!" but then again, I am reminded that in a democracy, in the long haul, you get the government you deserve.

Mark Firley is a resident of Montgomery Village, former board member of Montgomery Village Foundation, member of the Upcounty Citizens' Advisory Board, TAME Coalition contributor.

\*\*portions edited by TAME

Respectfully,

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:** Teresa Lara [Dee52811@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:26 AM  
**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 highway project will greatly impact our lives as we live in Montgomery village and will be greatly affected if this project is accepted. My family and I and our dog greatly enjoy walking through the forest and appreciate the wildlife there. Every day we walk the trail and we are so glad to have nature in our back yards. Please oppose m83, as this will not only destroy wetlands but also cause traffic noise in our neighbor hood and decrease the value of our homes.

We plan to stay here and have not sold our home due to the fact that we love beign so close to nature.

My family and I agree that improving 355 will be a better option as we travel everyday on it. Why destroy nature, wetlands, neighborhoods when there's a simpler option? Alternative 2.

Please reject the permit for this project. Thank you.

Signed,

Teresa Lara  
19007 Capehart dr  
Gaithersburg, MD 20886

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** ClarksburgVillageBlogTeam [ClarksburgVillageBlogTeam@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 1:04 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M-83 letter from MoCo's largest HOA  
**Attachments:** CV Card.pdf

**Importance:** High

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

As you may know, our blog and forum has been on fire yesterday and today concerning M-83. I am penning you today in regards to all the blog chatter. Clarksburg Village represents the largest single voice in Montgomery County. I am reporting on the feeling of many of our residents who support 9A.

Based on what has come through our blog and forum, I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

Additionally, I invite any third official party to perform a survey on our blog and forum which has nearly ½ the total residents, verified, actively performing on our community communications forum.

Please keep me in-the-loop on decisions and updates and I will post them directly on our blog and feel free to contact me.

Best Regards,

David Stein  
ClarksburgVillage Blog Team  
Clarksburg Village Covenants Committee / ARB

ClarksburgVillage Blog & Forum Support Adviser

MHA Associate Member

UCAB Community Link

Clarksburg Community Advocate

. . . Bringing Clarksburg Village Closer to You!

Description: Description: New Bag Law

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 3:49 PM  
**To:** boanoite32@hotmail.com  
**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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Silvia Pillay [<mailto:boanoite32@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:38 AM  
**To:** Ike Leggett  
**Subject:** Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Please do not continue with permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental effects.

My parents live in Montgomery village and their townhouse back into the streams and forest. There are lots of animals that have made it their home there. Lots of deer, rabbits, foxes, blue herons, beavers, ground hogs, and turtles, both big and small. It is also home to a variety of species of birds and humming birds. These lands will be greatly impacted with the new construction. Further the wetlands and the partial forest brings an appeal to montgomery village residents and future residents.

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.

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,

Silvia Pillay  
83 Pontiac way  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 3:26 PM  
**To:** Haber, Martin T  
**Cc:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: M-83

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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov) <<mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov>> .

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett

County Executive

cc:

Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil) <<mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil>>

Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov) <<mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov>>

---

**From:** Haber, Martin T [<mailto:Martin.Haber@fda.hhs.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 2:13 PM

To: Ike Leggett  
Subject: M-83

Dear Ike,

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 our small rural roads. Someday, I hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems for our area, but our transportation problem is here already, the problem is now, it is only becoming worse, and we 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.

I do know that there will be some environmental disturbance in completing M-83. I regret this but feel that it is necessary to complete an effective road system for the large residential and commercial development that has already taken place in Clarksburg. The end result will be a net improvement.

Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A!!

Martin Haber, Ph.D.

9700 Wightman Road

Gaithersburg, MD 20879

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Jacqueline Deitz [jacqueline@deitz.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 8:09 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Midcounty Corridor Study

We strongly support Alternative 9, Option (M-83), THE MASTER PLAN route.

Thanking you in advance!

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Deitz

21012 Brink Court

Gaithersburg, Maryland  
20882-4209

301 330-9418

Sent from my iPad

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ana Dubin [acneiva81@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 7:12 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support for alternative 9a- M83

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options. It's very important that the county continues with the plan that has been on the books for 50 years, that will minimize impact on homes along the route and will ease congestion given that the CCT will not extend to Clarksburg for quite some time. Many Clarksburg residents consider deiving through Montgomery Village their commuter route to Rockville, and given the additional building in Clarksburg to come it's important to accommodate the growth. Please consider this option as the best option for all involved.

Sincerely,

Ana & Jason Dubin

12834 Grand Elm Street

Clarksburg MD 20871

Sent from my iPhone

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Carol Tilford [caroltilford@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 4:06 PM  
**To:** Sean McKewen; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] re: Comments; MCS DEER

Dear Mr. McKewen and Mr. Dinne,

I am opposed to Alternative 4 and ask you to reject this option. The Brink/Wightman/ Snouffer School corridor is lined with homes and businesses close to the existing roads and would not solve the problem of moving traffic quickly and safely. It would cause great damage to existing communities and their wells and septic systems while creating a situation where many home and business owners would find entering and leaving their property very difficult and dangerous. It is not clear how this option would even allow fire and rescue equipment to get to some properties safely.

I would like to see you build M83Alt 9A which has been on the books for the past 50 years and has a reserved right-of-way. This planned limited access highway will link up to the midcounty highway and move traffic rapidly and safely throughout a large part of the up county area.

If the county "goes wobbly" and refuses to build this road they will make a mockery of the planning process and condemn up-county citizens to more years of over-loaded, dangerous country roads.

We moved to Gaithersburg in 1970 and rented a new apartment on Little Pond Place in Montgomery Village. The rural nature of the area was very much in evidence with dairy barns still standing and farmers still farming. Montgomery Village ended at Centerway. We bought a house on Warfield Road and watched as the Montgomery Village area between us and centerway was bull dozed, trees cut down and endless townhouses thrown up. Most everything not built on was paved over. One of the biggest insults to the area's ecology was probably the building of this new town. This not so new town now enjoys easy, rapid access to metro because of the midcounty highway. However, some of these residents now want to "pull up the ladder" so to speak and prevent the planned extension of the midcounty highway.

"Let them use public transit" is the chant.

Stop and go traffic, cruise controls set at 10 miles an hour - or less - pollutes air and increases CO2 emissions. The decision not to build M83 has ecological, environmental costs that need to be balanced against these same costs to build it. Trees are a renewable resource. The reforestation of the Eastern seaboard has been an amazing but real development.

The opponents to M83 are organized, vocal and have encouraged some inaccurate propaganda at times. At one point county council members were flooded with letters from school children at Watkins Mill Elementary asking them not to build this road saying it would go through their school.

I hope you will use common sense and ignore the blatantly false, and carefully evaluate the very real environmental concerns that exist if M83 is built, against the harm a "no build" for M83 will cause.

No one wants a highway near their church, school or residence but almost everyone over the age of 16 owns a car. Many new homes are now

being built with 3 car garages. The 3 car garage is not causing people to buy more cars but is meeting a demand home owners have expressed. Similarly I doubt that building M83 will cause more car sales but it may encourage more metro ridership if an express bus lane can be incorporated. Thank you for your consideration of these remarks.

Sincerely yours,  
Carol Tilford  
9910 Brink Road  
Gaithersburg, Md20882  
(301)926-6751

✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** aldouses@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 11:58 PM  
**To:** john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil.  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M 83

Dear Mr. Dinne & Mr. McKewen,

Please add my name and address to the list of those who support Alternative 9A ( M 83).

As a resident of the upper county for more than forty years I have lived with the changes in the area and watched and waited for the roads described in the area's Master Plans. Many of us were convinced that the development of Clarksburg would finally bring the necessary changes to the transportation network . And still we wait.

I live on Watkins Road, which like many other area roads, was never designed to carry the traffic loads with which we now live.

Ann H. Aldous  
10,100 Watkins Road  
Gaithersburg MD 20882

Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** lryffel@verizon.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 11:10 PM  
**To:** Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Midcounty Highway project

Dear Mr. McKewen and Mr. Dinne,

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the master planned M-83 and reject the other alternatives and options.

The addition of lanes and widening of existing roads would surely result in increased collision rates and pedestrian accidents as non of the surrounding communities were designed to accommodate such traffic. Alternative 9A would serve as an alternate, access controlled, commuter route to an already over-burdened 355 and I270.

It is true that the trees on the proposed 9A alternative are established and a benefit to the area, but I argue that those trees are only there because the Master Plan prevented development of that land. If a different alternative plan were adopted, I believe that land would be otherwise sold or developed for other purposes by the county so it really becomes a moot point.

Sincerely,

Laurie A. Midgley  
Montgomery County Resident

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Bonnie Bell [bonnielbell@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 11:07 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** M-83 Greg Hwang; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Midcounty Corridor Comments

Dear Sirs,

The infrastructure needed to support planned growth in upper Montgomery county was envisioned in the early 1960's when the population of Clarksburg was counted in the hundreds. The State Highway Administration confirmed the need for additional arterial roads, as well as widening Rt. 355, in the 1980's, when Clarksburg's population crept near 1,000. In 2000, Clarksburg had 1,834 residents and the two-lane roads were crowded but adequate. Midcounty Highway was "on hold". By 2010, there were 13,700 people living in Clarksburg, with a projection for Clarksburg's future population to reach 35 to 40,000.

Germantown grew from 55,419 in 2000 to 86,395 in 2010. This area of the upcounty saw an increase of nearly 43,000 from these two census districts alone. Germantown has seen construction of the western arterial, Great Seneca Highway, and Rt. 355 widened from two to six lanes. Meanwhile, Clarksburg has seen... nothing. Clarksburg residents are still using the same two-lane roads that existed when the Master Plan was adopted in 1963. They do have access to that great parking lot known as 270, but they do not have the options of roads and transit accorded other county residents. So, they take the path of least resistance, and commute on roads that were never intended for, nor upgraded to handle, commuter traffic, such as Wildcat and Davis Mill Roads.

All studies agree that there is a need for additional roads to serve this area, even as there is a need for public transit in addition to the new roads. Mass transit is laudable. It also has limits. The much touted "European Model" is wishful thinking. I lived in France for six years, and in Holland for three. A recent European Union study shows that 52.9% of Europeans use their cars as their main mode of transport. Even in Holland, with 31.2% using a bicycle, the car remains the main transport for 48.5% of the population. Who are using cars? Those who live in areas such as upper Montgomery County, where public transit is, and can only be, less effective.

Given the need for improved transportation, I wish to examine the proposed alternatives.

Alt. 1 No-build. Useful for comparison, but we got to this mess by doing nothing. Let's not continue to do so.

Alt. 2 TSM/TDM. By all means, let's do this as soon as possible. But let's not pretend that improving intersections is going to be adequate for the additional 60 to 70,000 residents in the immediate area of Germantown and Clarksburg, and the hundreds of thousands in the wider upcounty.

Alt. 4 Modified. Aside from the perfectly legal but immoral (given that there are other options) mockery that this makes of 50 years of planning, this alternative will not meet the primary goal of reducing congestion on 355 & 270. It provides a fairly good route to Shady Grove Road for some residents, but it swings too far east to offer a viable north/south alternative to 355 or 270. It is also the least safe alternative. The need for excessive piping of streams will doom many struggling habitats to becoming isolated pools of invasive plant species with few surviving fauna even as large as a Box Turtle. Alt. 4 meets none of the seven purposes in the DEER Executive Summary. And does it at great expense.

Alt. 5 This is a "better than nothing" alternative. However, as described, it leaves Rt. 355 north of Ridge Road as a two lane road. To leave Clarksburg on four lane roads would require residents to meander one way or another to Snowden Farm Parkway, turn onto Ridge Road, then back onto 355. Headed for the Metro? Add another turn at Montgomery Village Ave to Midcounty to Shady Grove Road; or pass the bottleneck that is Gaithersburg and turn on 370 or Shady Grove Road. But leaving Clarksburg by a logical trip down 355 is still on a two-lane road. Which century are we in?

Alt. 8 Hardly seems worth going to the expense if the arterial is cut off by a tourniquet.

Alt. 9A In a perfect world, we would not consider building a road along this route. In that world, thousands of acres of forest and farmland would not have already been turned into housing and retail for Germantown and Clarksburg. But those many square miles have been developed, and we aren't done building yet. The main advantage of not having built the road back when Montgomery Village was being developed is that we have the chance to build it with the least environmental impact we can manage. Construction and storm water practices in the 1960's were not what we find acceptable today. The design team has done an admirable job at reducing the impact on the wetlands that must be crossed. Many trees will be lost. Trees can be replanted. Many, perhaps a majority, of the trees to be cut are there because fifty years ago, we set aside land, much of it open farmland, for M-83. It is beyond Kafkaesque to come back fifty years later and use the existence of those very trees as a reason not to build a necessary piece of infrastructure.

Alt. 9D With the extensive parkland that exists in Montgomery County, I object to sacrificing part of the Agricultural Reserve in favor of parkland. Being in private hands, land in the Ag Reserve is slowly but surely being converted to non-agricultural uses. The county owns our parkland, and does not have to convert it. There was a right of way through this corner of parkland. Make plans accordingly; don't push the use to the adjacent Ag reserve.

Conclusion: The upcounty needs both roads and transit. I support both. Alt. 9A is the only option that meets the purpose and need, and can accommodate future growth.

Thank you for your attention. I do apologize for the length of this letter.

Best regards,

Bonnie Bell

20809 Bell Bluff Rd.

Gaithersburg MD 20879

[www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov) <<http://www.census.gov/>>

[http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/flash/fl\\_312\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_312_en.pdf) (See chart pg 30)

<http://www6.montgomerycountymd.gov/apps/gis/imageviewer/index.asp?aYear=1951>

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** mario scherhaufner [mscheri74@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 2:22 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Opposition to Mid-County Highway Alternative 4

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

I would like to state my opposition to Mid-County Highway Alternative 4. This proposed route would run a multi-lane highway through the community my family lives in. One main reason we purchased our home in the Points community in this corner of Montgomery Village, was the peaceful and quiet neighborhood that we found at our first visit. This proposed highway build-out would destroy this important asset. I do not want my child to have to cross a six-lane highway to walk to the community pool or to our church (Methodist Church at the corner of Wightman Road and Montgomery Village Avenue).

Please DO NOT approve this project and try to find another alternative!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mario Scherhaufner  
2 Bethany Court  
Montgomery Village, MD 20886  
Email: [mscheri74@hotmail.com](mailto:mscheri74@hotmail.com)

✓

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Marylou Judis [mljudis@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 1:22 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Option 9A

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options. I am retired. I do not need to fight more traffic than necessary. The 9A plan is definitely an environmentally sound alternative to current traffic.

Yours very truly,

Mary Lou Judis

12608 Horseshoe Bend Circle

Clarksburg, MD 20871

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** Bob Nelson [bobnelson@outlook.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 5:35 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Greg Hwang  
matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org; John Carter; Mary Dolan; Ki Kim; MCP Chair;  
**Cc:** Matthews, Catherine; bruce.johnston@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; County Executive;  
anne.kaiser@house.state.md.us; eric.luedtke@house.state.md.us;  
craig.zucker@house.state.md.us; kathleen.dumais@house.state.md.us;  
brian.feldman@house.state.md.us; aruna.miller@house.state.md.us;  
charles.barkley@house.state.md.us; kirill.reznik@house.state.md.us;  
shane.robinson@house.state.md.us; karen.montgomery@senate.state.md.us; Rob  
Garagiola; nancy.king@senate.state.md.us; Cherian Eapen  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on Midcounty Corridor Study

August 21, 2013

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Baltimore District

P.O. Box 1715

Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715

Attn: Mr. Jack Dinne, CENAB-OP-RMN

Maryland Department of the Environment

Wetlands and Waterways Program

160 South Water Street

Frostburg, Maryland, 21532

Attn: Mr. Sean McKewen

Montgomery County Department of Transportation

Division of Transportation Engineering

100 Edison Park Drive, 4th Floor

Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Attn: Greg Hwang, Project Manager

Ref.

Comments on Midcounty 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

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the Midcounty Corridor Study.

My name is Robert Nelson and I am a resident of Goshen. I support the original Master Plan Route for the Mid-County Highway.

In the August 7 Gazette newspaper the lead story announces "Watkins Mill Project gets key funding: I-270 interchange to receive \$125 million from gas tax increase." This headline highlights the confused state in which we find upcounty transportation and infrastructure planning. While the State of Maryland thinks that Watkins Mill Road is a major highway, MC-DOT removed Watkins Mill Road from consideration (Alternative #6) when 11 options were reduced to the current six alternatives. When completed the Watkins Mill interchange will dump interstate traffic on what MC-DOT apparently considers a residential street.

When Montgomery Village was built a half-century ago, the existing streets along the perimeter dating back many centuries were preserved as two-lane country roads. But the MC-DOT now considers these streets viable routing for the major mid-county highway and have proposed Alternative 4. They envision a four-lane divided highway which completely destroys the character of the Goshen area. Goshen has been a very special part of Montgomery County history bordering on the Agricultural Reserve. Is a possible reason that Alternative 4 has been proposed is to open the Agricultural Reserve to major development?

As part of my career at NASA, I have performed trade-off studies. I find this trade-off study of the six alternatives very misleading. For example, a wrong assumption of this study is that a widened Goshen Road already exists when construction has never even begun. If one adds the cost of the Goshen Road widening to the estimate for Alternative 4, then it is clear that Alternative 4 is the most expensive option being proposed.

I find that the proposed cost of the Master Plan route is overly exaggerated. When the Inter-County Connector was built, destroyed wetlands were recreated. One of these wetlands is just around the corner from my home in Goshen Branch Stream Valley Park. The State of Maryland paid \$2.6 million to recreate 25 acres of wetlands and restore the banks of Goshen Branch. Thus the approximate cost of an acre of new wetlands was \$100,000. But MC-DOT has

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Cherian Eapen [cherianeapen@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 11:49 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Greg Hwang  
matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org; John Carter; Mary Dolan; Ki Kim; MCP Chair;  
**Cc:** Catherine Matthews; bruce.johnston@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; County Executive;  
anne.kaiser@house.state.md.us; eric.luedtke@house.state.md.us;  
craig.zucker@house.state.md.us; kathleen.dumais@house.state.md.us;  
brian.feldman@house.state.md.us; aruna.miller@house.state.md.us;  
charles.barkley@house.state.md.us; kirill.reznik@house.state.md.us;  
shane.robinson@house.state.md.us; karen.montgomery@senate.state.md.us; Rob  
Garagiola; nancy.king@senate.state.md.us  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on Midcounty Corridor Study

August 21, 2013

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Baltimore District

P.O. Box 1715

Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715

Attn: Mr. Jack Dinne, CENAB-OP-RMN

Maryland Department of the Environment

Wetlands and Waterways Program

160 South Water Street

Frostburg, Maryland, 21532

Attn: Mr. Sean McKewen

Montgomery County Department of Transportation

Division of Transportation Engineering

100 Edison Park Drive, 4th Floor

Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Attn: Greg Hwang, Project Manager

Ref.

Comments on Midcounty 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

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the Midcounty Corridor Study.

As a Clarksburg/Germantown resident since 2002, I would like to express my strong support for the completion of M-83 with the Alternative 9A or Master Plan Alignment, the extension of Midcounty Highway between its current terminus at Montgomery Village Avenue and Ridge Road (MD 27) at Snowden Farm Parkway (A-305). This is a long overdue project and it is important to note that the Clarksburg Civic Association and the Mayor/City Council of the City of Gaithersburg have also endorsed Alternative 9A or the Master Plan Alignment. As documented in the Midcounty Corridor Study Draft Environmental Effects Report (DEER), Alternative 9 provides the highest transportation effectiveness among all alternatives considered. Additionally, through bridging, alignment shifts, and retaining walls, I believe Alternative 9A minimizes its impact to wetlands, streams, forest, floodplains, and parklands. The DEER also proposes substantial mitigation to forest and parkland losses to fully offset any impact from Alternative 9A.

The master plan alignment for M-83 has been on area master plans for over half a century, and was recently confirmed in the 1994 Clarksburg Master Plan. If Alternative 9A alignment is not chosen, the County will be renegeing on its long-standing promise to residents in the Upcounty and especially in Clarksburg (and generally to all who live and do business in the County), who were sold on many infrastructure projects (such as the Corridor Cities Transitway or CCT, in addition to M-83; and more recently on a shared-road MD 355 BRT extension from Germantown to Clarksburg that Planning staff did not even include in the initial Public Hearing Draft of the Countywide Transitway Corridor Functional Master Plan) that were to provide residents the basic necessary Quality of Life access to jobs, mass-transit, transportation corridors, airports, and economic/activity centers.

Upcounty residents, especially in Clarksburg have made educated decisions on their purchase of residences just as residents in other older developments/neighborhoods within the study area made their decisions - by relying on area master plans. Additionally, the M-83 alignment was the basis (and continues to be the basis) for growth and development within the study area for over 50 years. The efforts and arguments now to oppose the master plan alignment and to stall progress on the project through support for infeasible alternatives (such as BRT along MD 355 as a way to get Clarksburg residents to Shady Grove) and misinformation are detrimental to the economic growth, quality of life, and daily well-being of a substantial number of residents in the Upcounty area. I believe some opposed to the Alternative 9A are being hypocritical as well (for example, the opposition to the Master Plan Alignment by Action Committee for Transit and Coalition for Smarter Growth for environmental reasons, who at the same time support construction of Purple Line construction over parkland/forested

areas and streams in the Capital Crescent Trail area) and do not mind denying the same comforts they enjoy to residents of Upcounty.

Over the last 10 years, considerable residential development has occurred in Clarksburg at a blistering pace, all predicated on transit and roadway capacity being available. Significant additional retail development with regional draw is also now being proposed in Clarksburg and the new Holy Cross Hospital is nearing completion along Middlebrook Road in East Germantown. The very reason for "growth capacity" in Clarksburg and East Germantown and approval of development in these areas can be linked directly to projects such as M-83 and CCT, as evidenced by the inclusion of these projects in the past and current County growth policies. However, with no prospect of CCT or the Countywide BRT system coming to Clarksburg in the near future or CCT ever being a viable "jobs access" option for residents in Clarksburg, it is extremely important and crucial that the County expeditiously move towards building the master plan alignment for M-83 as the only viable, rational, common-sense transportation infrastructure project. This alignment will make a huge difference in the lives of residents in Upcounty, especially in Clarksburg where MD 355, MD 27, and Observation Drive - some of the major roadways that were master planned to provide access, circulation, and emergency services to its residents - are still many years from being completed (despite Clarksburg paying the highest transportation and school impact taxes).

The benefits of this project could be far-reaching, as it could enhance transit and economic options not just for residents of Clarksburg, but also for communities to the southeast and southwest in Germantown, Gaithersburg and Montgomery Village and communities to the northeast and northwest of Clarksburg extending into Damascus and Frederick County. The master plan alignment of M-83 is essential for the economic well-being of Upcounty and the County as well since without the roadway and the ensuing congestion, it would only become easier for Upcounty residents to travel to Urbana and to Frederick for shopping (instead of shopping at the Lakeforest Mall or at other shops in Gaithersburg, Great Seneca, or Rockville) and for jobs (instead of jobs within Montgomery County). The revenue and economic impact of such a scenario to the Upcounty would be damaging.

A successful, vibrant community to the east side of I-270 is necessary just as the west side of I-270, which is held together by Great Seneca Highway, a roadway similar to Mid County Highway.

Thank you again for your consideration of my comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Cherian Eapen

23118 Birch Mead Road

Clarksburg, MD 20871

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Anil Giragani [anilnjos@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 11:30 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I recommend Alternative 9A

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

Sincerely,  
Anil Giragani  
2208 Kerrydale Ct  
Clarksburg MD 20871-3366.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 10:02 AM  
**To:** Caroline Woods  
**Cc:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: No to M-83

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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov) <<mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov>> .

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett

County Executive

cc:

Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil) <<mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil>>

Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov) <<mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov>>

From: Caroline Woods [<mailto:woodscar@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:40 PM  
To: Ike Leggett  
Subject: No to M-83

Dear Mr. Leggett,

I am writing to let you know that I am strongly opposed to construction of Mid-County Highway Extended. I am convinced that M-83 will pollute our air, further reduce our property values, destroy valued wildlife areas, and diminish the quality of our lives. My neighbors and I love the park and wooded areas near our homes. We are also worried about the potential danger to school children if this highway is extended. People purchasing property in more remote areas should expect longer commutes using established routes, instead of opting for the encroachment of others' property and communities to reduce their own travel time. Thank you for letting concerned residents voice their opinions.

Sincerely,  
Caroline Woods

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 10:02 AM  
**To:** esusko@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Emily Susko [<mailto:esusko@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:09 PM  
**To:** Ike Leggett  
**Subject:** Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

I urge you to reject the permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. Not only is this a poor spending choice in an era of constrained financial resources, it is a foolish choice to squander the development lessons we have learned in the five decades since this extension was originally proposed.

1. Clean water is not a luxury, it is a necessity, both now and in perpetuity.

Protecting our water resources, including wetlands that provide critical ecosystem services, must be a top county priority. In fact, Maryland is often a leader in working to address stormwater management to reduce

runoff; investing in miles of unnecessary additional impervious surface, through prime remaining wetlands and farmland, seems contradictory.

2. New highways encourage sprawling development and induce highway demand.

Widening and expanding highways at best provide only temporary traffic congestion relief, because they encourage more and more driving and concentrate drivers onto fewer routes. Of course, in this case, M83 does not claim to even temporarily relieve congestion; the county's own traffic models do not show any of the build-alternatives performing better than the status quo. Instead, it simply counteracts other investments the area is making in alternative transportation methods that have a better chance of reducing car congestion while improving quality of life and environmental health.

3. Building costly unnecessary highways is an irresponsible use of transportation funding that could be put toward more sustainable and equitable projects.

For example, of the proposed alternatives, 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. 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.

There are many reasons to oppose this project, which 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.

Please consider the full impact of construction and reject the permit.

Signed,

Emily Susko

Emily Susko  
6815 Eastern Ave, Apt 1  
Takoma Park, MD 20912

✓

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Rudnick, Barbara [Rudnick.Barbara@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 25, 2013 11:44 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; McCurdy, Alaina  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] FW: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

they are still coming, more of them now are not just form letters...

---

**From:** Silvia Pillay <[boanoite32@hotmail.com](mailto:boanoite32@hotmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:38 AM  
**To:** Rudnick, Barbara  
**Subject:** Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Dear Ms. Rudnick,

Please do not continue with permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental effects.

My parents live in Montgomery village and their townhouse back into the streams and forest. There are lots of animals that have made it their home there. Lots of deer, rabbits, foxes, blue herons, beavers, ground hogs, and turtles, both big and small. It is also home to a variety of species of birds and humming birds. These lands will be greatly impacted with the new construction. Further the wetlands and the partial forest brings an appeal to montgomery village residents and future residents.

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.

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,

Silvia Pillay  
83 Pontiac way  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Rudnick, Barbara [Rudnick.Barbara@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 25, 2013 11:33 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; McCurdy, Alaina  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] FW: No to M-83

Jack, I am still getting these at a rate of about 10 a day. How about you? I'm on vacation, but checking email on occasion.

---

**From:** Caroline Woods <[woodscar@gmail.com](mailto:woodscar@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:42 PM  
**To:** Rudnick, Barbara  
**Subject:** No to M-83

Dear Ms. Rudnick,

I am writing to let you know that I am strongly opposed to construction of Mid-County Highway Extended. I am convinced that M-83 will pollute our air, further reduce our property values, destroy valued wildlife areas, and diminish the quality of our lives. My neighbors and I love the park and wooded areas near our homes. We are also worried about the potential danger to school children if this highway is extended. People purchasing property in more remote areas should expect longer commutes using established routes, instead of opting for the encroachment of others' property and communities to reduce their own travel time. Thank you for letting concerned residents voice their opinions.

Sincerely,  
Caroline Woods

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 9:46 AM  
**To:** Stlara82@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Sandra Lara [<mailto:Stlara82@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2013 1:13 PM  
To: Ike Leggett  
Subject: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Dear All,

I go to visit my parents home in Montgomery village. And love walking through the trail behind their home. We walk almost everyday through the trail with our dog. And if my dog could speak he would say he loves the trail! A highway in that area does not seem like a good option for the people who live around there. Besides the noise that it will create, it would completely change the scenery and will displace many of the wild life that I have seen live in that area. .I CAN NOT imagine that the best option is to replace nice tranquil scenery and wild life for messy construction and loud traffic. Please I urge you to consider other options. Thank you.

Sandra Lara  
83 Pontiac way  
Gaitgersburf, MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Bing Garthright [bgarthright@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 5:32 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Testimony re Midcounty Corridor Study&13-NT-3162/201360802/A1 No. 140416  
**Attachments:** M-83 Alternatives not Combined by MCDOT.doc; M-83 Alt. 4 is a poison pill.doc

Gentlemen: Pls accept the attached position papers that expand and make much more clear my earlier written and verbal testimony concerning Montgomery County, MD Dept. of Transportation's study of alternative road improvements in the Midcounty Corridor. Thank you,  
Wallace E. "Bing" Garthright

## ALTERNATIVE 4 TO M-83 IS A POISON PILL

A Position Paper by W. E. "Bing" Garthright  
bgarthright@comcast.net  
August 24, 2013

The figurative term "poison pill" refers to a contrived situation designed to make some action too painful to take. This note will demonstrate that Montgomery County's Department of Transportation (MCDOT) designed Alternative 4 to M-83 (also called Midcounty Highway Extended) as a poison pill that would pressure the county council not to find any acceptable alternative to building M-83.

The essence of the poison pill approach was to offer only an unnecessarily wide roadway design that would extend the damage potential to its maximum. A little history will make this clear.

Because of the environmental impact of proposed M-83, MCDOT was required to perform a study of alternatives to see whether it could satisfy transportation needs without building M-83. Alternative 4 was the widening from 2 to 4 lanes of Brink Road and Wightman Road and related widening and improving of Snouffer School Road and other local roads. This would enable more commuters from Clarksburg to travel south and back in a shorter time. It would also, of course, increase the traffic along that route, with noise and congestion consequences for homes on the route. It would also merit the addition of a traffic light to help residents exit from North Village during the morning rush hour. The main impact on nearby homes would occur in Montgomery Village, on Wightman Road. Although these comments apply also to Brink Road and elsewhere, the effects on Wightman will be enough to show the poison pill effects.

For over a decade, perhaps more than 20 years, the official position of the Montgomery Village Foundation (MVF), through its Transportation Policy, was to support the widening of Wightman Road from 2 to 4 lanes with a safety median. The purpose was greater safety for drivers. The county held an 80-foot right of way, more than sufficient room to make this improvement. Such an improvement would satisfy all the automobile traffic and safety advantages of Alt. 4, but was not what MCDOT designed. Instead, Alt. 4 was 105 feet wide for most of Wightman, and 6-lanes wide and 127 feet wide for a substantial portion ending at Goshen Road. The MVF has rightly opposed Alt. 4.

Designing Alt. 4 far outside the existing right of way had several poison pill effects. First, it takes away private property alongside the current right of way, severely injuring the economic value of those properties and the enjoyment of them by their owners.

Second, because it was wider than existing plans, the ground rules of the impact study appear to have meant that secondary effects such as noise and visual changes could be counted as impacts on properties that were not physically contacted. (This might be incorrect for the final study, but was explained as ground rules some years ago. This

contrasted with the ground rules that imposed no value to impacts on private homes along M-83 where it stayed within the master plan right of way.)

Third, by altering land in a wider than necessary swath, the over-design increased the environmental impact damage for Alt. 4.

Why do I conclude that MCDOT did this consciously as a poison pill? On August 25, 2011, I spoke for more than 30 minutes with Greg Hwang, project manager of the M-83 study, and then emailed him notes from our conversation--all speaking to the points above. The notes are attached to this paper, and show that my conversation with Mr. Hwang had left me with optimism that MCDOT would study a narrower Alt. 4 also. I asked him to see that the study also studied another version of Alt. 4 that would stay within the 80 foot right of way, so that the county council could see a realistic alternative in addition to the politically impossible one. In his email response to me, Mr. Hwang wrote the following.

"Per your request, we will review your concern regarding the narrow right-of-way along Wightman Road between Montgomery Village Avenue and Goshen Road and identify potential impact minimization options. The MCDOT is sensitive to the community's concerns and will do our best to develop an Alternative 4 Modified that reasonably addresses the purpose and need of the study while respecting the impacts to the adjacent communities."

So what was the actual result? At that time, I recall only a four lane, 105-foot width being described in the public exhibits for Alt. 4. The design now in the final study report not only retains that 105-foot width, but adds an elongated 6-lane, 127 foot wide section to the alternative. This resulted in an impressive high number of private properties damaged by the design. The only excuse given by MCDOT for this over-wide design is a county policy that promotes adjacent hiking and biking paths. These would never merit such destruction of long existing private properties.

All this is clear proof that MCDOT had and has still no intention of respecting the anxieties of residents near Alt. 4. On the contrary, MCDOT has cynically used their fear and outrage to pressure elected officials to inveigh against Alt. 4. MCDOT appears to have succeeded totally in nullifying any serious consideration of improvements to the east of M-83.

*Notes about the author:*

*W. E. "Bing" Garthright, is Chair, Government and Public Utilities Committee, Stedwick Homes Corporation, a homeowner's association of 1260 homes in Montgomery Village. He has been a Stedwick board member for 8 years and served as president and vice president for four of those years. He is Stedwick's representative within the TAME (Transportation Alternatives to Midcounty Highway Extended) Coalition. He holds a Ph.D. in mathematics from Duke University and worked 20 years in operations research and 15 years in biostatistics before retiring.*

(Attachments follow.)

heavier burden than if the other side were also able to carry more traffic. This heavier burden means that the traffic analysis is dealing with more traffic than necessary, and the resulting intersection problems, congestion periods, and travel times are not as good as they would be in a combination of all the alternatives. But there is no straightforward way to say how much better the combination would function. It must be analyzed using the lower traffic intensities on each side. And further difficulty is that the effects of reduced traffic intensity have a nonlinear relationship to the final results.

Probably 99% of the total study effort was already spent when the alternatives were analyzed separately. It would have been easy to combine the improved parts from those earlier modeling exercises and do the analysis one more time. I say this from my own 20 years of experience as an operations research analyst and mathematical modeler. If the individual alternatives failed separately to meet Clarksburg's needs, then it was obvious to any beginning engineering student, and to most laypersons, that the combinations of alternatives should be studied. But MCDOT didn't even consider doing this!

Sadly, this failure to act in good faith with the taxpayers and council of Montgomery County has further implications. The environmental studies and traffic analyses are too technical for laypersons and council members to verify. We are asked to trust that MCDOT has done the study with honest intentions and in good faith. This glaring failure to act in good faith now throws all the other elements into question. I see no reason to trust any element of a study performed in an environment of such powerful bias. My earlier paper exposing the poison pill that is Alternative 4 showed how MCDOT took steps to guarantee an unfavorable reception for any improvement east of M-83. Now this bad faith failure to combine alternatives makes me unwilling to accept the validity of the tables of environmental impact and cost estimates. It is easy to bias such studies in dozens of small ways that combine to large effect.

It is unclear that a study this large and complex can be validated or fixed without great expense, but it could be tried. The study would first need extensive independent technical auditing, with probable corrections. Then an independent study team would be needed to analyze the combined alternatives. (The poison pill that is Alt. 4 would obviously also need to be scaled far down in width.) Only then could our elected leaders have an accurate basis for a decision on M-83.

*Notes about the author: W. E. "Bing" Garthright, is Chair, Government and Public Utilities Committee, Stedwick Homes Corporation, a homeowner's association of 1260 homes in Montgomery Village. He has been a Stedwick board member for 8 years and served as president and vice president for four of those years. He is Stedwick's representative within the TAME (Transportation Alternatives to Midcounty Highway Extended) Coalition. He holds a Ph.D. in mathematics from Duke University and worked 20 years in operations research and 15 years in biostatistics before retiring.*

## NOT COMBINING M-83 ALTERNATIVES MEANS MCDOT FAILED

A Position Paper by W. E. "Bing" Garthright  
bgarthright@comcast.net  
August 24, 2013

Montgomery County's Department of Transportation (MCDOT) has long wanted to build Midcounty Highway Extended, called M-83 for brevity, from Montgomery Village Avenue to Clarksburg. Because its previous road designs had major negative environmental impacts, MCDOT could not obtain the federal environmental permits until it completed environmental studies and a study of alternatives. The study of alternatives had one purpose: to see whether MCDOT could satisfy transportation needs without building M-83. MCDOT failed to complete that study, and they failed in a manner that makes clear that they had no intention of finding that M-83 was not necessary. This lack of good faith calls into question the credibility of the entire report.

In another position paper, I have described the bad faith evident in only studying one badly over-broad, and hence over-damaging design for road improvement to the east of M-83. In this paper, I will focus on the most basic of failures to study in good faith--the failure to study any combinations of the separate alternatives.

To give first a simple analogy:

Suppose we studied ways to support a table, and one alternative was a central post, a second alternative was two legs on the left, and a third alternative was two legs on the right. Each of the two-leg alternatives would fail, and the center post would be the only alternative to succeed. But any child would see that our study was incomplete. A complete study would have combined the left and right sets of legs. Then we'd have two alternatives to choose from: center post vs. corner legs.

That simple analogy is obvious, but it is equally obvious that the MCDOT study is just as incomplete as any study that did not combine table legs.

MCDOT studied an improvement to the east of M-83 (Alt. 4). MCDOT studied two improvements to the roads and intersections west of M-83. Each alternative, by itself, was judged not adequate to meet all the needs of Clarksburg. All three of these alternatives could be done together in perfect harmony. The obvious final step would be to combine those non-M-83 alternatives to see whether doing all of them would be adequate. Not only does the finished study show no combinations, but Bruce Johnston, the MCDOT manager in charge of the people doing the study, admitted at a recent meeting of a Montgomery Village committee that MCDOT never even considered evaluating any combinations of alternatives.

MCDOT's failure is profound because no one can take the independent results and combine them. In the study of improved capacity on either side of M-83, each improved side is paired with the unimproved other side. Thus each improved side must bear a

ATTACHMENTS:

August 25, 2011

Note to: Greg Hwang, Project Manager, Mont. County Department of Transportation  
From: W. "Bing" Garthright, Pres., Stedwick Homes Corp.  
10632 Seneca Spring Way, Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Re: Midcounty Corridor Study—Alternatives retained for detailed study.

Thank you for the valuable information that you gave me in our telephone conversation this morning. I write to put in print my suggestion that your office include at least one option in studying Alternative 4 Modified, Brink-Wightman-Goshen-Snouffer School-Muncaster Mill:

Between Montgomery Village avenue and Goshen Rd, include in your detailed study an option 4b (or some such name) that narrows that stretch to near the 80-foot right of way of the existing plans and saves the many homes that would otherwise be demolished.

You made a good point that you need, for strict modeling comparisons, to keep your alternatives as comparable as possible, so I don't ask that you not to study Alt. 4 as it stands. I do feel that you will do the entire county—residents, council, and agencies—a big favor, however, if you also evaluate the narrowed stretch at the same time as the academically similar Alt. 4. Most reasonable observers would say that it is obvious that any further consideration of Alt. 4 would probably end with it narrowing through that tight stretch between homes and a church over 30 years in place. Apparently (I haven't verified this) the very broad, maximum right of way in your study plan would require the demolition of more than 50 homes. (Such is the claim of some very serious residents.)

Since it would be inevitable that any realistic alternative 4 would narrow there, it would save money and time if you studied that also in the next phase. You would not set a bad precedent, because I doubt that you will not find another place in your remaining alternatives that result in demolition of anything approaching 50 homes. You would, on the contrary, put your county executive, other officials, and council members in a stronger position with having this information in hand. Don't leave them out there to face wrath for an act that they clearly won't take.

If you would need to clear such an expansion of your study with our county executive, I feel confident he would rather know sooner than later what consequences that narrowing would have. He strikes me as businesslike, and wanting to know all the facts, and too kind to prolong worry on his constituents' minds. The key here is that alternatives be genuine, and analyzed as far as possible as they would actually be realized. Please give some emotional relief to our very worried Village residents.

Sincerely,  
/s/ Bing Garthright

Dear Mr. Garthright:

Thank you for your August 25, 2011 letter to the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) and sharing your concerns regarding Alternative 4 Modified which proposes widening along the Brink-Wightman-Snouffer School-Muncaster Mill-Goshen Roads corridor.

As part of the detailed study for the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS), the Department will perform preliminary engineering for the five (5) build alternatives, including Alternative 4 Modified, that are retained for the detailed study. The analysis will provide greater information on the potential benefits and impacts the proposed alignments will have on the adjacent properties and homes. The Detailed Study is anticipated to be completed by December 2012 and will recommend a preferred alternative which is subject to public review /comment and approval of the County's elected officials and the federal and state environmental regulatory agencies.

Per your request, we will review your concern regarding the narrow right-of-way along Wightman Road between Montgomery Village Avenue and Goshen Road and identify potential impact minimization options. The MCDOT is sensitive to the community's concerns and will do our best to develop an Alternative 4 Modified that reasonably addresses the purpose and need of the study while respecting the impacts to the adjacent communities.

The community has requested a meeting to discuss the Midcounty Corridor Study. It is scheduled for Tuesday, September 27, 2011 at 7:30 PM, at the Goshen Elementary School's Multi-Purpose Room. The meeting will provide the community an overview on the development of the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS) and an opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback. We encourage you to attend if your schedule permits.

Thank you for taking the time to provide us your thoughts, and we sincerely appreciate the helpful suggestions you have offered.

*Sincerely,*  
**Gwo-Ruey (Greg) Hwang, P.E.**  
*Midcounty Corridor Study Project Manager*  
*Phone: 240-777-7279*  
*Fax: 240-777-7277*  
*greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov*

**Dinne, John J NAB**

*forward after*

**From:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg) [Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 27, 2013 10:25 AM  
**To:** jlbuyer@verizon.net  
**Cc:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Comments on Midcounty Corridor Study

*initial submitted  
to MD5/Coops  
w/ C.P.*

Dear Ms. Buyer:

Thank you for your interest in the Midcounty Corridor Study (MCS) and your input on this project.

Any public written comments and information, including yours, that were received by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE)/MD Department of the Environment (MDE) by the closing date, August 21, 2013, of the comment period for the August 7, 2013, COE/MDE Joint Public Hearing will be included as part of the public record on the MCS and will be considered by COE/MDE in evaluating Montgomery County Department of Transportation's (MCDOT) permit application for the MCS.

Greg Hwang

**From:** [jlbuyer@verizon.net](mailto:jlbuyer@verizon.net) [<mailto:jlbuyer@verizon.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2013 12:33 PM  
**To:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Comments on Midcounty Corridor Study

Hello Greg,

Can you confirm my e-mail below is entered as part of the public record on the Study?

Thank you,

Janet Buyer

-----Original Message-----

From: [jlbuyer@verizon.net](mailto:jlbuyer@verizon.net)  
Date: Aug 21, 2013 7:30:42 PM  
Subject: Comments on Midcounty Corridor Study  
To: [sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:sean.mckewen@maryland.gov), [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil), [greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov)

Mr. McKewen and Mr. Dinne,

These are comments for the record on the Midcounty Corridor Study by Kimball Watts and Janet Buyer. We own a home at 20724 Bell Bluff Road, Gaithersburg MD

We have reviewed the Midcounty Corridor Study and find Alternative 9A to offer the most logical solution to the traffic congestion that exists in this area for the following reasons:

1. The right of way for this alternative exists.
2. Closest to I-270 and MD 355 and therefore the alternative that provides the best relief to those major roads.
3. Impacts to wetlands and other environmental issues have been significantly reduced and minimized.
4. Most consistent with our decision to purchase this home, as the Master Plan alignment has been in the books and has guided all development activities for over 40 years.
5. Safest of all options, as it has limited access only at main intersections. No driveway connections. Improved access response time for our fire and rescue and police services
6. Provides the most support for the orderly economic and residential development of all alternatives.

Please confirm receipt of this e-mail by replying.

Thank you,  
Janet Buyer

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 27, 2013 11:18 AM  
**To:** donirene4555@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

cc:  
Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)  
Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Donald Fewell [<mailto:donirene4555@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2013 10:42 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,

Donald Fewell  
8000 Eastern Dr, #202  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 10, 2013 12:02 PM  
**To:** shirlgunder@YAHOO.COM  
**Cc:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Dear Ms. Gunderson:

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](mailto:sean.mckewen@maryland.gov)  
[john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shirley Gunderson [<mailto:shirlgunder@YAHOO.COM>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 10, 2013 10:12 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,

Shirley Gunderson

Shirley Gunderson  
19914 Silverfield Dr  
Gaithersburg, MD 20886

forced all options of the Mid-County Corridor study to impact less than an acre of wetlands. Thus the cost of avoiding impacting about 15 acres of wetlands could very well be \$150 million. What county planner would possibly select an option that would cost \$10 million to avoid impacting one acre of wetlands when the cost of recreating an acre of wetlands is \$100,000?

Development in our upcounty region has been predicated on having the Mid County Highway in place. The people of Goshen are horrified that MC-DOT would seriously consider Alternative 4 as an option for this highway. We want the Mid-County Highway built on the original Master Plan route. We don't need CIP projects for the widening of Snouffer School and Goshen Roads. We need to see the Mid-County Highway construction funding immediately added to the Capital Improvement Program. Let's delay funding for the Public Safety Training Academy relocation and fast-track the construction of the Mid-County Highway. I urge you to keep the promises made to county residents in the Master Plans.

Thank you again for your consideration of my comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Robert Nelson  
22104 Goshen School Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20882-1404

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Fred Kelly [fredtkelly@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 5:33 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@marlyand.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I support Alternative 9, Option A (M-83)

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen

I strongly support the original master plan that has been publically disclosed since the 1960s. We bought our house based on that plan. Other alternatives will put more traffic on Goshen Road and Montgomery Village Avenue. Traffic that wants to go towards Damascus or the eastern up-county area.

The speed limits on Goshen Road and Montgomery Village Avenue will need to be lower than a limited access extension to the current mid-county highway envisioned in the M-83 plan. People going up county will game the roads - selecting the road that gets them north more quickly. Sometimes this will be Goshen Road Alt 4 or Montgomery Village Ave Alt 3 depending on the time of day or traffic. If Alt 4 is implemented, which I strongly oppose, people will still use Alt 3 to get to their destination. The quickest route north will always be original master plan road - the M-83.

In addition the original Alternative 9 Option A does not

1. Encroach on the Agricultural Reserve
2. Has the lowest projected accident rate
3. Shortest travel time
4. Safest bike and pedestrian paths
5. Fewer intersecting roads
6. No lost residences
7. Fewer intersecting roads and driveways
8. And less than one acre of wetlands displace, which can be made up by expanding the creek area around dead man's curve.

Most important why have a master plan with people buying properties based on that plan and then scrap that plan.

Sincerely

Fred and Barbara Kelly

8700 Lochaven Drive

Laytonsville, MD 20882

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** George Ryffel [gryffel@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 5:11 PM  
**To:** Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Midcounty Corridor Study

George Ryffel  
August 15, 2013

9212 Huntmaster Rd.

Gaithersburg, MD

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

As you can see from the date I first started this note, I have been debating how to succinctly put forth my objections to most of the plans, particularly Alt. 4 as that is the one that impacts me most and the one with which I am most familiar.

You are already immersed in all of the details and effects of the different plans, so I will dwell on only a couple of areas that are not so technical or broad based addressing the whole transit system.

The Master Plan: We purchased our house eighteen months ago (Goshen area two to four acre lots). We factored in a few surrounding area and roadway issues into our decision

- A wetland being constructed or refurbished at the end of the road.
- The only new construction in the area (Davis Mill rd., ½ mi. from Brink rd.) was very low density and maintained forest and grasslands.
- MOST IMPORTANT: The Master Plan did not show the possible roadway expansion of nearby Brink Rd. from a windy two lane road going by quiet houses to a six lane highway.

While I realize that the Master Plan is not sacrosanct, for the trust of the residents of the County and their choices, it must be adhered to, not discarded.

I realize the Master Plan will not be strictly adhered to, therefore I highly recommend Alt. 9A as the plan that will utilize elements of the Master Plan and create extensions with the least impact on residents and the semi-rural quality of the area.

Please do not turn another rural road into a Highway just because it already exists and appears to be an easy shortcut.

Shortcuts: Well, commuters will be commuters and if there is a shortcut to be found, they will use it. My little two lane road is already a commuter cut-through to get to Brink and Goshen. The Alt. 4 expansion does not and by it's nature of going through residential areas cannot have restricted access.

All of the roads going toward Brink, Wightman, and Snouffer Shool road will turn into commuter routes. Huge amounts of residential areas, actually away from Brink rd. will be impacted.

These are impacts that the studies do not show.

Planning: All of the best studies often do not end up reflecting actual outcome. I can best look at the creek by the recently restored Davis Mill. With every hard rainfall, trees that have stood on the banks for twenty years are eroded away and the water reaches three to four feet above the bridge roadway. Some development created this and I'm sure that none of the studies predicted it.

This segues into my thought that all of the acres that will not be disturbed by Alt. 4 are already set aside by the County and will be developed in the future. I think this reality mitigates the long-term impact differences.

I appreciate your taking the time to consider my thoughts and again ask you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83.

Regards,

George Ryffel II

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** lynn fantle [lfantle@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 5:05 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on Midcounty Corridor Study

August 21, 2013

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

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

Montgomery County Department of Transportation  
Division of Transportation Engineering  
100 Edison Park Drive, 4th Floor  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878  
Attn: Greg Hwang, Project Manager

Ref.

Comments on Midcounty 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

I have lived in the Germantown and Clarksburg areas since 1995. When we bought our first house in Germantown, I read the Master Plan for that area. When we bought our home in Clarksburg, I did the same. I was very concerned about planned road and transit infrastructure improvements in both cases, due to the rapid growth of the area and our need to commute to jobs around the metropolitan Washington area. With these comments, I am expressing my strong support for the completion of M-83 at the Master Planned alignment, to meet Snowden Farm Parkway in Clarksburg, Alternative 9A. This project is already long overdue and it is important to note that the Clarksburg Civic Association and the Mayor/City Council of the City of Gaithersburg have also endorsed Alternative 9A or the Master Plan Alignment. The Midcounty Corridor Study Draft Environmental Effects Report (DEER), shows that Alternative 9 provides the highest transportation effectiveness among all alternatives considered. Presumably this is due to the high number of intersections currently at near-failure which would be tipped into totally paralysis without an additional roadway, even accounting for widened existing roads. Through bridges, alignment shifts, and other improvements, current Alternative 9A minimizes impact on wetlands, streams, forest, floodplains, and parklands. The DEER also proposes substantial mitigation to forest and parkland losses to fully offset any impact from Alternative 9A. This is a reasonable position to take.

The master plan alignment for M-83 has been on no fewer than FIVE area master plans for over half a century. It is a spine road for the Clarksburg Master Plan, approved in 1994, and predicated on the connection of Snowden Farm Parkway to M-83. If Alternative 9A alignment is not chosen, the County will be renegeing on yet another long-standing promise to residents of the upcounty area, especially in Clarksburg, who were sold on many infrastructure projects (such as the Corridor Cities Transitway or CCT, in addition to M-83; BRT; Observation Drive; and other transportation and infrastructure improvements) that were to provide residents the basic quality of life, including access to jobs, mass transit, transportation corridors, airports, hospitals, schools, activities and commerce. As you might be aware, commerce and activities in Clarksburg are severely limited by the lack of transportation infrastructure available to residents. As an exercise in exploration, try to plan summer camp for an elementary-age child who lives in Clarksburg. You would find that county recreation options are severely limited, to the point of necessitating a 30-minute daily drive at a minimum. And that is without rush-hour traffic. There are no viable transit options available.

Upcounty residents, especially in Clarksburg, made educated decisions on their home choices, just as residents in other neighborhoods within the study area made their decisions - by relying on area master plans and publicly available information, such as the signs posted in Montgomery Village, or the documents signed at closing on a house. Arguments to now oppose the Master Plan alignment and to stall progress on the project through support for infeasible alternatives (such as BRT along MD 355 as a way to get Clarksburg residents to Shady Grove) or continual misinformation are exceptionally detrimental to the economic growth, quality of life, and daily well-being of residents in the upcounty area. It is such antics that increasingly convince my neighbors to move to other counties or even to other local states rather than stay in Montgomery. It could be posited as well that opponents to Alternative 9A are hypocritical as well (for example, the opposition to the Master Plan Alignment by Action Committee for Transit and Coalition for Smarter Growth for "environmental reasons," yet support Purple Line construction as more important); these committees apparently do not mind denying basic comforts they enjoy to residents of upper Montgomery County.

Clarksburg has grown exponentially in the 11 years I've lived here, all predicated on transit and roadway capacity being constructed in lockstep with residences. Significant retail development with regional draw is also proposed in Clarksburg and the new Holy Cross Hospital is nearing completion along Middlebrook Road in Germantown. Growth capacity in Clarksburg and Germantown and approval of development in these areas can be directly sourced to projects such as M-83 and CCT, as evidenced by the inclusion of these projects in the past and current County-wide growth policies. However, with no prospect of CCT or the Countywide BRT system coming to Clarksburg in the near future or, in the case of CCT - ever -- a commuting option for residents in Clarksburg, it is vital and crucial that the County expeditiously move towards building the master plan alignment for M-83 as the only rational, common-sense transportation infrastructure project proposed today. This alignment will make a significant difference in the lives of residents, especially in Clarksburg where MD 355, MD 27, and Observation Drive - some of the major roadways that were master planned to provide access, circulation, and emergency services to its residents - are still many years from being completed, despite Clarksburg paying the highest transportation and school impact taxes.

The benefits of M-83 will be far-reaching, as it will enhance economic options not just for residents of Clarksburg, but also for communities to the southeast and southwest in Germantown, Gaithersburg and Montgomery Village and communities to the northeast and northwest of Clarksburg extending into Damascus and Frederick County. The master plan alignment of M-83 is essential for the economic well-being of Montgomery County. Without the new roadway, the ensuing congestion will only ensure that Montgomery residents will travel to Frederick County instead of spending their dollars in Montgomery. It's already happening with increasing frequency.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lynn Fantle  
12711 Clarks Crossing Drive  
Clarksburg, MD 20871  
301-515-7471

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Caroline Woods [woodscar@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:48 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No to M-83

Dear Mr. Dinne,

I am writing to let you know that I am strongly opposed to construction of Mid-County Highway Extended. I am convinced that M-83 will pollute our air, further reduce our property values, destroy valued wildlife areas, and diminish the quality of our lives. My neighbors and I love the park and wooded areas near our homes. We are also worried about the potential danger to school children if this highway is extended. People purchasing property in more remote areas should expect longer commutes using established routes, instead of opting for the encroachment of others' property and communities to reduce their own travel time. Thank you for letting concerned residents voice their opinions.

Sincerely,  
Caroline Woods

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** ellen ruby [ellen.ruby@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:46 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov;  
Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Alternative 9A

Gentlemen,

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

My row of townhouses faces Snouffer School Road and the Alt. 4 plan would negatively affect our property values and safety, as well as quality of life. The Glenbrooke community was never designed to be bombarded by the amount of traffic that the Alternates and Options would bring. Our County Executive has long since ignored the needs and opinions of the East Village as a whole. It is time to be supportive of those of us who will be directly affected by your decisions.

Sincerely,

Ellen Ruby  
8810 Dowling Park Place  
Montgomery Village, Md 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Scott Kelly [stkelly3@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:23 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Midcounty Highway

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

Please stick to the master plan and keep midcounty highway on the master plan route, Alternative 9A (M-83).

I'm not even sure why this is a major discussion. People plan their lives and homes based on master plans submitted to the county. I know when I purchased my home I confirmed there weren't any road expansions planned around my home. What's the point of having a Master Plan if there is no intention to abide by it?

Stick to the plan and please stop destroying peoples homes and lives because people who purchased homes next to a master planned proposed road don't want it in their back yard.

Regards,  
Scott Kelly



## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Robin Foster [robin@roocreative.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:12 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** oemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] NO TO ALT. 4!

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

My house faces Snouffer School Road and the Alt. 4 plan would negatively affect my neighborhoods property values, safety, as well as quality of life.

Sincerely,  
Robin Foster  
8816 Dowling Park Place  
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Robin Foster  
RooCreative  
OptimaDesign  
Working America Production Consultant

Proud member of the Graphic Artist Guild  
and AIGA

[robin@roocreative.net](mailto:robin@roocreative.net)  
[www.roocreative.net](http://www.roocreative.net)

240-888-3378  
fax: 866-234-1017

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** TAME Coalition [tamecoalition@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:19 PM  
**To:** TAME Coalition  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M-83 Extended: Suicide of Our Community

Mark Firley's profile photo

<<https://apis.google.com/c/u/0/photos/private/AIbEiAIAAABDC00Bu42HrLCTViILdmNhcmRfcGhvdG8qKDDhODkxZjVhNDkyYmJmNmU1ZjIzMzA4MDRmMTAxZjliYjZmNTFmOWMwAb55tBCGgIDUq1zPbx1Di3Hg6MkU?sz=90>>

Article by Mark J. Firley

When one confronts the scene of a suicide, there is an almost obscene intimacy that results from being forced to contemplate that most personal act of what was once another life. There are parallels in the life of a community, moments when one identifies a trajectory that ultimately leads to prosperity or ruin.

Watching the August 7 hearings held by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding the proposed extension of MidCounty Highway (M83) was one of those occasions. Montgomery Village and North Germantown-Greenway Park effectively ended their existence to the benefit of a cadre of unelected bureaucrats.

How did that happen? The Montgomery County Department of Transportation selected the old "Master Plan Route" for M-83 (the so-called Alternative 9) that would effectively split Montgomery Village physically and sacrifice it (and its residents) to service the myth that developers pay for infrastructure in the county. To satisfy the technical requirement to produce alternatives, MCDOT whipped up a giant "poison pill" in the form of Alternative 4, which cut through historic neighborhoods, destroyed numbers of homes, and generally could not have been approved by any sane agency.

But the pretense of an alternative was enough. Opposition to M83 coming from Germantown, Gaithersburg and Montgomery Village instantly fractured into two competing "not-in-my-backyard" camps. Instead of focusing on what should be done instead (the so-called "demand management option" or SR355 improvements), the community opposition to this concrete constrictor broke in two - with people agreed only on the fact that they didn't want it in their part of the community, but happy to throw their neighboring subdivision under the non-existent bus of transit we deserve and still don't have.

It was a masterwork of political engineering - MCDOT divided the community and reduced its net message to "NIMBY" all the while knowing that the "Master Plan Route" gained credibility by being the default. By focusing opposition on Alternative 4, the shell game advanced Alternative 9, which is the only "alternative" that has ever been given serious consideration by MCDOT. Montgomery Village, Gaithersburg, and east Germantown will pay the price in noise, pollution, congestion, and aggravation to give no more than a few years' reprieve to Clarksburg, where the cycle of insufficient transportation alternatives is starting all over again. If the consequences were any less awful, one could almost applaud the gamesmanship.

For the citizens of Clarksburg, the consequences may well look like sweet victory - the stars are lining up to give the long-suffering residents some hope that transportation relief will

be coming in the form of a big new road. But the benefits will be short lived, since the existence of that road will open the way to even more density and development, until the situation returns to the misery they endure today and worse. They too, are about to offer millions of tax dollars on the altar of road construction which will quickly consume even more of their substance in a loop from which there is no credible exit.

Gaithersburg and Rockville will suffer as the southern end of M83 will have to be rebuilt to accommodate the traffic we're about to pour onto it, not to mention millions more in parking garages if any of the "connectivity to Metro" will work. Remember: even though the Corridor Cities Transitway is also in plan, it will have no impact on the need or use of M83 Extended in any form, at least according to the zampolits running this operation.

Within a year or so of its opening, M-83 extended will be as much of a nightmare as anything that preceded it, but development will have moved on, the county will have opened new tax mines in the form of shiny new subdivisions, and the bulldozing and redevelopment of Montgomery Village into a new revenue source and even more supine polity will be well on the way.

And the game will continue: the County will continue to pretend that "developers" are responsible for the infrastructure costs of new communities, while bankruptcy and other means assure that the real net cost is where it was all along - with the taxpayers. The show will go on, many "leaders" will posture and the county's citizens will pay double and triple to clean up the mess.

The "Frakking" of political opposition [in both senses of the word] means we are to be burdened with hundreds of millions of ultimately wasted tax dollars and no credible way to stop the tarmac from metastasizing. What will be sacrificed to keep the concrete flowing? More schools, library hours, public safety? The benefits of all this asphalt include more carbon emissions, more pollution, more disturbed land, and more congestion. Such a deal!

I want to shout "We can do better!" but then again, I am reminded that in a democracy, in the long haul, you get the government you deserve.

Mark Firley is a resident of Montgomery Village, former board member of Montgomery Village Foundation, member of the Upcounty Citizens' Advisory Board, TAME Coalition contributor.

\*\*portions edited by TAME

Respectfully,

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:** Tatay@worldbankgroup.org  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:03 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I strongly support Alternative 9 A (M-83), the Master Plan route.

Good Afternoon,

As a lifelong resident of The Goshen Area, I support the master plan route 9(A) for the M-83 and strongly oppose the Alternate 4 route. The M-83 9(A) plan has been in place for a long time, the land has been allocated and it makes the most sense to stick with this plan that was implemented many years ago. It is the safest most efficient and economical route to take. The other alternatives would truly destroy many neighborhoods, green spaces, historic sites and wetlands. It is disturbing that while the rest of our Nation is desperate to preserve historical sites, rural areas and the environment that the illogical alternative such as 4 was even considered. The route 4 option which would have major negative impacts on the environment and the neighborhoods that would be destroyed by its creation. The master plan 9(A) is the best solution, it goes through areas where people have moved to have the convenience of public transportation, major roads and shopping areas, there is high density housing and a commuter route would fit into such an environment perfectly and logically.

Thank You

Turan Atay

MIS  
TIALES  
3/2/13 email



404. That's an error.

The requested

URL /c/u/0/photos/private/AlbEiAIAAABDCOOBu42HrLCTViILdmNhcmRfcGhvdG8qKDdhODkxZjVhNDkyYmJmNmU1ZjlzMzA4MDRmMTAxZjiiYjZmNTFmOVMwAb55t was not found on this server. That's all we know.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Silvia Pillay [boanoite32@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:38 AM  
**To:** Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg)  
**Subject:** Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Hwang,

Please do not continue with permit application for M83, the Midcounty Highway Extended. This destructive new highway project will have serious environmental effects.

My parents live in Montgomery village and their townhouse back into the streams and forest. There are lots of animals that have made it their home there. Lots of deer, rabbits, foxes, blue herons, beavers, ground hogs, and turtles, both big and small. It is also home to a variety of species of birds and humming birds. These lands will be greatly impacted with the new construction. Further the wetlands and the partial forest brings an appeal to montgomery village residents and future residents.

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.

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,

Silvia Pillay  
83 Pontiac way  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Patrick McCue [pm370z@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 2:50 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please support Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

I just learned about this plan recently and enthusiastically support it. We needed this new expressway ten years ago, and the congestion without it only gets worse each year. Every day I make the commute from Clarksburg to lower Rockville/ North Bethesda and it would be very helpful (more direct) for me to take the Mid-County highway rather than come all the way over to I-270.

Also, as an alternate route, I believe it would help alleviate congestion on I-270 caused by local traffic that only needs to go an exit or two.

Before coming to Maryland, I used to live in the Bay area in California, and these types of expressways are all over (2-3 lanes each direction) and they REALLY help to keep congestion at a minimum.

Also, while I have your attention, another thing in California that helps lessen congestion during the rush hours is that they have metering lights on the on-ramps (small red/green lights which switch back and forth between vehicles as they enter the on-ramp) which act to make spaces between vehicles when they enter the highway so that people can merge more easily, and act to prevent a huge mass of cars entering at the same time, which only makes traffic come to a halt. It would be great to have that feature on this road (and on I-270 if possible!).

Thanks for your time,

Dr. Patrick McCue

12464 Horseshoe Bend Circle,

Clarksburg, MD

**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** martyreese@mail.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 2:46 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]  
**Attachments:** M-83.odt

TO: MDE and Corps of Engineers

FROM: Karon de Silva, Clarksburg, Maryland

RE: M-83

I am a lifetime resident of Montgomery County with over 40 years of experience driving in this area. I have seen many new roads built to "relieve traffic congestion". NONE OF THEM HAVE ACCOMPLISHED THIS! (otherwise you would not be considering doing it again) What will be accomplished without a doubt is degradation of the environment (we cannot tolerate any more of this) and irreversible disruption to homes, communities and quality of life. Think. There are better things to do with your expertise. I support alternative #1.

TO: MDE and Corps of Engineers

FROM: Karon de Silva, Clarksburg, Maryland

RE: M-83

I am a lifetime resident of Montgomery County with over 40 years of experience driving in this area. I have seen many new roads built to “relieve traffic congestion”. NONE OF THEM HAVE ACCOMPLISHED THIS! (otherwise you would not be considering doing it again) What will be accomplished without a doubt is degradation of the environment (we cannot tolerate any more of this) and irreversible disruption to homes, communities and quality of life. Think. There are better things to do with your expertise. I support alternative #1.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** BARRY FANTLE [bfantle@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 2:33 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Cc:** councilmember.andrews@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
councilmember.berliner@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
councilmember.elrich@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
councilmember.ervin@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
councilmember.floreen@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
councilmember.leventhal@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
Councilmember.navarro@montgomerycountymd.gov;  
councilmember.riemer@montgomerycountymd.gov; kathleen.dumais@house.state.md.us;  
brian.feldman@house.state.md.us; aruna.miller@house.state.md.us;  
rob.garagiola@senate.state.md.us  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M-83 Letter from Clarksburg Civic Association  
**Attachments:** m83\_letter\_82013.pdf

Please see the attached letter from the Clarksburg Civic Association(CCA) regarding M-83.  
CCA supports M-83 and Alternative 9.

thank you.

Barry Fantle  
President, Clarksburg Civic Association  
301-515-7471

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Charles R. Tilford [charlestilford@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 3:07 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean McKewen  
**Cc:** Greg Hwang; County Executive Ike Leggett; Charles R. Tilford; Greater-Goshen Civic-Assoc.  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments; MCS DEER

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, as the Preferred Alternative in the Midcounty Corridor Study, and reject the other Alternatives and Options. Alternative 4 Modified should be rejected immediately.

Below, please find:

- 1) The need to complete the Midcounty Highway and with it the Eastern Arterial.
- 2) The relative importance of the environmental impacts of Alternative 9A.
- 3) The comparative advantages and disadvantages of the MCS Alternatives

### 1) Need for an improved Upcounty road system

The Upcounty area west of Rockville, now home to 400,000 people and still growing, started 50 years ago with a rural population and a transportation infrastructure limited to the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, the two lanes of Rt 355, and a sparse network of rural roads. The Montgomery County Master Plan process was supposed to coordinate new development with provision of the needed infrastructure. Unfortunately, infrastructure has often lagged the population growth, most notably in transportation. The result is nationally-ranked congestion that clogs all of our roads from historic Rural-Rustic roads to I-270. This is a direct cause of personal frustration, economic inefficiency and increased carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles starting and stopping without going very far. We need better transit but our one Metro station (Shady Grove) is desperately over crowded. The Corridors City Transitway extension to Clarksburg was taken out of the budget the week before your hearing. The glitzy new bus proposals exist only in our dreams. And the hyper-congested I-270/Rt 355 corridor has become a barrier that restricts our access to transportation facilities on the western side

Any transportation system must be reality based. Most of our built communities were designed for and require automobiles for the first and last miles - including access to mass transit. And 150,000 Montgomery County people now live west of Great Seneca Creek and have daily needs to cross the creek. They are joined in this journey by interstate travelers and commuters from neighboring counties. This fast growing population needs a new creek crossing. The Upcounty population daily increases and so of course will the need for continued road and transit improvements. But the immediate priority is to complete the

transportation system that was supposed to be a precondition for the already-built communities and those recently approved and in various stages of development.

From the very beginning the Master Plan included two major highways for local traffic; the Western and Eastern Arterials. The Western Arterial, Great Seneca Highway, has been completed. It is now urgent to complete the Eastern Arterial - Midcounty Highway and Snowden Farm Parkway. This will give us an efficient and safe road system extending from the far northwest corner of Clarksburg to Shady Grove and the ICC. But its most important feature is a design that ties together all of the major local roads into a system allowing local residents to easily move to local jobs, shopping, schools, etc. The high capacity and free traffic flow of the completed Eastern Arterial will draw traffic away from the overcrowded local roads, significantly reducing congestion and its ill effects throughout a large area. To achieve this it is essential to close the gap in the Midcounty Highway between Montgomery Village Ave. and Rt. 27. The different Alternatives proposed to close this gap differ greatly in their effectiveness, as is discussed in 3) below...

## 2) Environmental impacts of Alternative 9A, M-83

Much has been said and written about the effects of Alternative 9A on the natural environment. Some of it is substantially exaggerated but the real effects are not trivial. However, these must be evaluated relative to the environmental cost of the communities it will support. As an example, Montgomery Village in the center of the MCS area houses about 10% of the people in the upcounty and covers 3 square miles with moderate density development. I lived in or next to Montgomery Village during most of its construction. Much of the land was open farm land but there were significant forests and treed areas. Virtually all of the trees were cut down and the chippers ran from dawn to dusk for years. All of the land was scraped clean and contoured, and a large fraction covered with impermeable surfaces. In general I prefer the undisturbed environment, but the net result was housing and a supporting community for an expanding population, 40,000 people in this case. This is only one of the new communities that has already benefitted from the Midcounty Highway for 40 years and will benefit even more from a completed Eastern Arterial. But now we worry about Alternative 9A causing loss of wetlands, parklands, trees, plant and wildlife habitat, and new impervious surfaces and impacted soil, all on the scale of acres—within this context an incremental cost to support the communities already built. And while we worry and study, the congestion grows, excess carbon dioxide emissions increase, we can't find the room for express bus service and we see an increasing disparity between the health of the communities along the completed Western Arterial and those along the fractured Eastern Arterial.

As much or more has been made of the cost to the human environment of Alternative 9A. This is grossly exaggerated. The location of the right of way has been known and publicly available from the beginning of modern development. It was publicly advertised by Kettler Brothers, the developers of Montgomery Village and it is to this day shown on the Montgomery Village Foundation's map of Montgomery Village. Those that prefer a quieter or lesser urban environment were free to find this with the variety of housing on offer, as many others have done. And having lived immediately next to the Watkins Mill Elementary School at the time of its construction I know that the relative positions of the school and the right of way were openly discussed and no problem was found except for one ball field that "temporarily" infringed on the right of way.

## Dinne, John J NAB

*amended  
by email*

**From:** Doug Reimel [doug.reimel@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 3:11 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocmemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Submission of testimony regarding the Midcounty Corridor Study

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

As someone who was unable to speak at the August 7th public hearing regarding the Midcounty Corridor Study because of the large number of speakers and not being able to leave work early enough, I am writing to strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

I live in the brand new Clarksburg Village Phase II near the terminus of the proposed road with Route 27 (Ridge Road) and Snowden Farm Parkway. I have a Master's degree in Resource and Landscape Ecology from Duke University's School of the Environment, so I also have an appreciation for our natural environment and the likely costs of this project.

In my estimation, the bottom line to this issue is this--make the choice that serves the greater good. This road is a vital link in the area transportation network. Previously approved growth and development were built based on the premise of this infrastructure being put into place to support the new residents, commerce, and associated traffic. Thousands of future units will likely be approved based on our current master plan for both Germantown and Clarksburg.

There are some unavoidable negatives involved with the environmental destruction and community disruption that will occur to construct MD-83 alternative 9A. I won't argue that my opponents are making them up--although many of them exaggerate and sensationalize them greatly out of scale to the benefits that would be provided in return. It seems to me that what is required here is to "see the forest for the trees".

The land to be consumed according to the study is between 33-48 acres depending on the alternative 9 option chosen. This acreage of mostly pristine forest will be lost, and that is true. But opponents don't mention that this amount of land is but a drop in the bucket from the North Germantown Park, Seneca Valley Stream Park, and Whetstone Run Park. The total acres of pristine and even environmentally beneficial acreage in those three combined parks is in the thousands of acres. So, the "destruction" as many called it, is in fact a small portion of the total acreage of value.

As someone who understands what "environmental mitigation" means, the speakers at the public hearing on Aug 7 were simply incorrect when they stated "this damage cannot be mitigated" in reference to the damage to natural areas that will result from the construction, staging, and access to the roadway site. However, they are correct that there will be natural land loss, species destruction, and wetland disruption. But again, in the grand scale of the natural areas involved, this is a small area and a relatively small disturbance in light of the benefit to so many.

I have heard speakers and other people decry the impact on many existing communities in Montgomery Village who will be proximate to the new road, particularly in Courthouse Walk. To them, I would say I am sorry for that change and disruption, but that this road has been planned for many, many years, and they should neither be surprised nor disappointed that this road will be built. I did my homework about what the master plan contains for the new area in Clarksburg where I bought my house--so should those who chose to buy a property in Courthouse Walk and other impacted communities.

As a resident in Clarksburg, I believe the proposed MD-83 alignment 9A is the ONLY answer that will both help alleviate traffic in the entire corridor area, but provide the necessary alternatives to the tens of thousands of residents who have not yet moved into the area. Opponents of 9A often argue for Options 2 and 5, neither of which are NOT capable of providing the capacity that will be needed to support our daily lives getting around Clarksburg, Germantown, and Gaithersburg, /let alone the commuter pass-through traffic from Mt Airy and west Baltimore via Route 27, and from the Frederick area on I-270. Simply put, we MUST have both this planned roadway and the planned transit options including the CCT and bus rapid transit options, in order to make the planned "end-state" of our community functional.

There were many, many claims voiced at the public hearing on August 7th that were perfectly true and reasonable, and many others that simply represented extreme, inaccurate, and even inflammatory opinions. One particularly offensive comment that was made, as a resident of Clarksburg, involved Ms. Pizarro (sp?) who stated "Clarksburg was a mistake and it never should've been built". Wow. So basically, because some other area residents feel a particular community being planned, proposed, approved, and built was a mistake, the new residents of that area should not be entitled to have their tax dollars support and provide the planned infrastructure that they need to make their community livable? That is purely prepsoterous. The particular commenter received a lot of applause for that sentiment, and I wanted to get up and testify that as a former resident of Rockville, I really felt when I lived in Rockville, that Montgomery Village was just a huge mistake that never should've been allowed, and how awful it was that Montgomery Village Avenue was constructed!!! That would be the analogous comment...PLEASE ignore the commenters who fail to recognize the valid and critical infrastructure needs of those communities who are currently wholly underserved in the north Germantown and Clarksburg areas!

I hope you will acknowledge the truly unanimous opposition to Alternative 4 and recognize that putting this needed road on the fringe of the corridor area is the least desirable option for a huge myriad of reasons. That corridor's location is simply too far east to make the necessary impact, in addition to the community disruption and numerous access points along the route.

Finally, as a new voter and an active Democrat in state legislative district 39, I was very disappointed to hear the testimony of our state delegation in opposing both Alternative 4 and 9. While I'd previously been told directly by Senator Nancy King herself that the MD-83 road was inevitable and that it would be built, at the hearing she agreed with her colleague Delegate Barkley that Option 2 is the best alternative. It is atrocious to me that she told me something different than what she publicly claimed to support, and that she could be so out of touch with the thousands of new voters in her district who see this transportation link as vital to their current and future community, and their quality of life.

Thank you for listening!

Sincerely,

Douglas Reimel  
22560 Castle Oak Rd  
Clarksburg, MD 20871  
703-447-0438  
doug.reimel@gmail.com

Douglas Reimel  
22560 Castle Oak Rd  
Clarksburg, MD 20871  
703-447-0438  
doug.reimel@gmail.com

--

Doug Reimel  
703-447-0438 mobile  
doug.reimel@gmail.com

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Doug Reimel [doug.reimel@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 3:15 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Submission of testimony regarding the Midcounty Corridor Study

Pardon me, I need to correct an important typographical error in the second sentence of the 8th paragraph of my email:

Opponents of 9A often argue for Options 2 and 5, NEITHER of which are capable of providing the capacity that will be needed to support our daily lives getting around Clarksburg, Germantown, and Gaithersburg.

On Wed, Aug 21, 2013 at 3:10 PM, Doug Reimel <doug.reimel@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen,

As someone who was unable to speak at the August 7th public hearing regarding the Midcounty Corridor Study because of the large number of speakers and not being able to leave work early enough, I am writing to strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options.

I live in the brand new Clarksburg Village Phase II near the terminus of the proposed road with Route 27 (Ridge Road) and Snowden Farm Parkway. I have a Master's degree in Resource and Landscape Ecology from Duke University's School of the Environment, so I also have an appreciation for our natural environment and the likely costs of this project.

In my estimation, the bottom line to this issue is this--make the choice that serves the greater good. This road is a vital link in the area transportation network. Previously approved growth and development were built based on the premise of this infrastructure being put into place to support the new residents, commerce, and associated traffic. Thousands of future units will likely be approved based on our current master plan for both Germantown and Clarksburg.

There are some unavoidable negatives involved with the environmental destruction and community disruption that will occur to construct MD-83 alternative 9A. I won't argue that my opponents are making them up--although many of them exaggerate and sensationalize them greatly out of scale to the benefits that would be provided in return. It seems to me that what is required here is to "see the forest for the trees".

The land to be consumed according to the study is between 33-48 acres depending on the alternative 9 option chosen. This acreage of mostly pristine forest will be lost, and that is true. But opponents don't mention that this amount of land is but a drop in the bucket from the North Germantown Park, Seneca Valley Stream Park, and Whetstone Run Park. The total acres of pristine and even environmentally beneficial acreage in those three combined parks is in the thousands of acres. So, the "destruction" as many called it, is in fact a small portion of the total acreage of value.

As someone who understands what "environmental mitigation" means, the speakers at the public hearing on Aug 7 were simply incorrect when they stated "this damage cannot be mitigated" in reference to the damage to natural areas that will result from the construction, staging, and access to the roadway site. However, they are correct that there

will be natural land loss, species destruction, and wetland disruption. But again, in the grand scale of the natural areas involved, this is a small area and a relatively small disturbance in light of the benefit to so many.

I have heard speakers and other people decry the impact on many existing communities in Montgomery Village who will be proximate to the new road, particularly in Courthouse Walk. To them, I would say I am sorry for that change and disruption, but that this road has been planned for many, many years, and they should neither be surprised nor disappointed that this road will be built. I did my homework about what the master plan contains for the new area in Clarksburg where I bought my house--so should those who chose to buy a property in Courthouse Walk and other impacted communities.

As a resident in Clarksburg, I believe the proposed MD-83 alignment 9A is the ONLY answer that will both help alleviate traffic in the entire corridor area, but provide the necessary alternatives to the tens of thousands of residents who have not yet moved into the area. Opponents of 9A often argue for Options 2 and 5, neither of which are NOT capable of providing the capacity that will be needed to support our daily lives getting around Clarksburg, Germantown, and Gaithersburg, let alone the commuter pass-through traffic from Mt Airy and west Baltimore via Route 27, and from the Frederick area on I-270. Simply put, we MUST have both this planned roadway and the planned transit options including the CCT and bus rapid transit options, in order to make the planned "end-state" of our community functional.

There were many, many claims voiced at the public hearing on August 7th that were perfectly true and reasonable, and many others that simply represented extreme, inaccurate, and even inflammatory opinions. One particularly offensive comment that was made, as a resident of Clarksburg, involved Ms. Pizarro (sp?) who stated "Clarksburg was a mistake and it never should've been built". Wow. So basically, because some other area residents feel a particular community being planned, proposed, approved, and built was a mistake, the new residents of that area should not be entitled to have their tax dollars support and provide the planned infrastructure that they need to make their community livable? That is purely preposterous. The particular commenter received a lot of applause for that sentiment, and I wanted to get up and testify that as a former resident of Rockville, I really felt when I lived in Rockville, that Montgomery Village was just a huge mistake that never should've been allowed, and how awful it was that Montgomery Village Avenue was constructed!!! That would be the analogous comment...PLEASE ignore the commenters who fail to recognize the valid and critical infrastructure needs of those communities who are currently wholly underserved in the north Germantown and Clarksburg areas!

I hope you will acknowledge the truly unanimous opposition to Alternative 4 and recognize that putting this needed road on the fringe of the corridor area is the least desirable option for a huge myriad of reasons. That corridor's location is simply too far east to make the necessary impact, in addition to the community disruption and numerous access points along the route.

Finally, as a new voter and an active Democrat in state legislative district 39, I was very disappointed to hear the testimony of our state delegation in opposing both Alternative 4 and 9. While I'd previously been told directly by Senator Nancy King herself that the MD-83 road was inevitable and that it would be built, at the hearing she agreed with her colleague Delegate Barkley that Option 2 is the best alternative. It is atrocious to me that she told me something different than what she publicly claimed to support, and that she could be so out of touch with the thousands of new voters in her district who see this transportation link as vital to their current and future community, and their quality of life.

Thank you for listening!

Sincerely,

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 3:25 PM  
**To:** Marylou Judis  
**Cc:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Option 9A

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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov) <<mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov>> .

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett

County Executive

cc:

Mr. Jack Dinne, USACE, CENAB-OP-RMN, [john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil) <<mailto:john.j.dinne@usace.army.mil>>

Mr. Sean McKewen, MDE, [Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov) <<mailto:Sean.mckewen@maryland.gov>>

---

From: Marylou Judis [<mailto:mljudis@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 1:22 PM

To: [John.J.Dinne@usace.army.mil](mailto:John.J.Dinne@usace.army.mil); [Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov](mailto:Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov)

Cc: Hwang, Gwo-Ruey (Greg); Ike Leggett

Subject: Option 9A

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options. I am retired. I do not need to fight more traffic than necessary. The 9A plan is definitely an environmentally sound alternative to current traffic.

Yours very truly,

Mary Lou Judis

12608 Horseshoe Bend Circle

Clarksburg, MD 20871

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Teresa Lara [Dee52811@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:26 AM  
**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 highway project will greatly impact our lives as we live in Montgomery village and will be greatly affected if this project is accepted. My family and I and our dog greatly enjoy walking through the forest and appreciate the wildlife there. Every day we walk the trail and we are so glad to have nature in our back yards. Please oppose m83, as this will not only destroy wetlands but also cause traffic noise in our neighbor hood and decrease the value of our homes.

We plan to stay here and have not sold our home due to the fact that we love beign so close to nature.

My family and I agree that improving 355 will be a better option as we travel everyday on it. Why destroy nature, wetlands, neighborhoods when there's a simpler option? Alternative 2.

Please reject the permit for this project. Thank you.

Signed,

Teresa Lara  
19007 Capehart dr  
Gaithersburg, MD 20886

✓

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** jlbuyer@verizon.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 7:31 PM  
**To:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on Midcounty Corridor Study

Mr. McKewen and Mr. Dinne,

These are comments for the record on the Midcounty Corridor Study by Kimball Watts and Janet Buyer. We own a home at 20724 Bell Bluff Road, Gaithersburg MD

We have reviewed the Midcounty Corridor Study and find Alternative 9A to offer the most logical solution to the traffic congestion that exists in this area for the following reasons:

1. The right of way for this alternative exists.
2. Closest to I-270 and MD 355 and therefore the alternative that provides the best relief to those major roads.
3. Impacts to wetlands and other environmental issues have been significantly reduced and minimized.
4. Most consistent with our decision to purchase this home, as the Master Plan alignment has been in the books and has guided all development activities for over 40 years.
5. Safest of all options, as it has limited access only at main intersections. No driveway connections. Improved access response time for our fire and rescue and police services
6. Provides the most support for the orderly economic and residential development of all alternatives.

Please confirm receipt of this e-mail by replying.

Thank you,  
Janet Buyer

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Overlea Watch [overlea@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 8:04 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; Overlea Neighborhood Watch; Northgate HC  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Midcounty Corridor Study - Opposition to Alternative 4

Gentlemen:

I wish to submit my written opposition to Alternative 4 of the Midcounty Corridor Study for a host of reasons from a large number of northern Montgomery Village residents.

I represent an association of approximately 30 households in the Overlea neighborhood of Montgomery Village, which sits at the intersection of Wightman Road and Montgomery Village Avenue. Our association stand united against Alternative 4 for reasons including the following:

1. Overlea has not rebounded from the mortgage crisis of 2008. Alternative 4 will cause the value of our homes to decrease again, and will lead to an increase in neighborhood problems, which we have struggled with since 2005.
2. The curb of this new highway will be about 20 feet away from the decks and front doors of some Overlea homes along Wightman Road.
3. The increase traffic noise will resonate all the way to the southern part of Overlea.

The Northcreek Homeowners Corporation, which supports and represents a host of neighborhoods on the north end of Montgomery Village (including Overlea) also stands against Alternative 4 on the basis of a host of reasons including the following:

- \* 353 pieces of property would have to be acquired
- \* 417 residences would be within the 67 decibel noise contour
- \* 1,282 linear feet of stream would have to be piped
- \* 2 historic residences would be "displaced"
- \* Noise barriers from 5-9 feet high would be installed at various locations
- \* 128 access points (driveways) are along Alt. 4, and we would only be able to turn right due to the new median

The Greater Goshen Civic Association, which includes properties along Wightman and Brink Roads, is against Alternative 4 for the impact it would have on properties within historic Prathertown, and many other reasons.

The Montgomery Village Foundation, representing the 40,000 residents of Montgomery Village, also stands on record in opposition to Alternative 4.

This opposition represents only a sample of the voices that are against Alternative 4. I urge that you listen to the thousands of voices of northern Montgomery County residents who have reported to you and who we have spoken with who stand against Alternative 4.

Thank you,

Kevin Gormley  
Chair, Overlea Neighborhood Watch

20203 Gentle Way  
Montgomery Village, MD

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Michael [mabrown49@netscape.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 7:29 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Written Comments - Midcounty Corridor  
**Attachments:** Midcounty Highway Comments-Corps.docx

Comments to the Midcounty Corridor proposal for Montgomery County are attached.

Michael Brown

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Ike Leggett [Ike.Leggett@montgomerycountymd.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:28 AM  
**To:** Dee52811@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](mailto:greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov).

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Teresa Lara [<mailto:Dee52811@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:26 AM  
**To:** Ike Leggett  
**Subject:** Reject M83 (Midcounty Highway Extended)

Please reject the permit application for M83. This highway project will greatly impact our lives as we live in Montgomery village and will be greatly affected if this project is accepted. My family and I and our dog greatly enjoy walking through the forest and appreciate the wildlife there. Every day we walk the trail and we are so glad to have nature in our back yards. Please oppose m83, as this will not only destroy wetlands but also cause traffic noise in our neighbor hood and decrease the value of our homes.

We plan to stay here and have not sold our home due to the fact that we love beign so close to nature.

My family and I agree that improving 355 will be a better option as we travel everyday on it. Why destroy nature, wetlands, neighborhoods when there's a simpler option? Alternative 2.

Please reject the permit for this project. Thank you.

Signed,

Teresa Lara  
19007 Capehart dr  
Gaithersburg, MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Bob Judis [rjudis@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 9:54 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Option 9A

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options. I am a retired person and I don't need to fight more traffic than necessary.

Yours very truly,

Robert D. Judis

12608 Horseshoe Bend Circle

Clarksburg, MD 20871

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** C. Sadula [csadula@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:46 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please vote for Alt 9A

Dear Mr. Dinne

As a Goshen resident for 23 years, I would like to urge you to vote for Alternative 9A for M-83. Our home backs up to Brink Road. As I stated, we have followed the planned M-83 for all of those 23 years.

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Haber, Martin T [Martin.Haber@fda.hhs.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:41 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.McKewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M-83 Support

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 our small rural roads. Someday, I hope to see one of the "21st century" transit systems for our area, but our transportation problem is here already, the problem is now, it is only becoming worse, and we 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.

I do know that there will be some environmental disturbance in completing M-83. I regret this but feel that it is necessary to complete an effective road system for the large residential and commercial development that has already taken place in Clarksburg. The end result will be a net improvement.

Stick With The Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A!!

Thank you,

Martin Haber, Ph.D.

9700 Wightman Road, Gaithersburg, MD 20979

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Laura Jacob [laura@jacobfam.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:22 AM  
**To:** 'Hank Jacob'; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Cc:** oemail@montgomerycountymd.gov; county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov; greg.hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Opposition to Mid-County Highway Alternative 4 Modified

I am a longtime resident of Montgomery Village and live a block from Wightman Road. I have watched the community grow from a roadside vegetable stand to a Safeway, a Giant etc. Enough is enough. I don't want my property values to go down because of noise and vehicle fumes and I don't want my family to be subjected to these negative influences on our lifestyle too. I have seen the three way stop at Montgomery Village Avenue and Wightman become a fourway stop and then a traffic light. I don't want to see a four lane throughway come through our neighborhood to accommodate my upcounty neighbors in Clarksburg! Let them sit on 270! DO NOT SUPPORT THE MID-COUNTY HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVE 4 - Modified or in any incarnation. Thank you -  
Laura Jacob, 20728 Highland Hall Drive, Montgomery Village MD 20886

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** r3ming@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:21 AM  
**To:** sean.mckewen@maryland.gov; Dinne, John J NAB  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] M-83 Mid- county highway

Dear Mr. Dinne & Mr. Mckewen,

We support the Master Plan route, Alternative 9A, for M-83, the completion of Mid-county Highway.

We are against Alternative 4, Alternative 4 impacts a large number of houses and does not meet the stated needs of the road.

We are against Alternative 9B & 9D.

Please stick with the Master Plan, M-83, Alternative 9A.

Sincerely,

Regina & Shiu-Tong

Shiu Tong & Regina Ming  
21301 Lawland Court  
Germantown, Maryland 20876  
301-972-1135

Sent from my iPad

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** cross.courtney@gmail.com on behalf of Courtney Voigt [courtneyvoigt@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:10 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; Sean.Mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Cc:** Greg.Hwang@montgomerycountymd.gov; oicemail@montgomerycountymd.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]

Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen;

I am a resident of Clarksburg, MD. My husband commutes daily to DC and I commute locally - most commonly using 355. The current traffic in rush hour, as well as off peak times, presents an enormous burden to upcounty residents. The County has allowed explosive growth in these upcounty communities like Clarksburg without first building the supporting road system out to completion.

I strongly urge you to recommend Alternative 9A, the Master-Planned M-83, and reject the other Alternatives and Options. This is part of the existing Montgomery County Master Plan and has offered residents of the county the most transparency in long range planning. I support Alternative 9A, as it leverages the existing highway infrastructure and makes improvements by connecting existing roadways while offering the least amount of disruption to communities. Upcounty residents need traffic relief sooner rather than years down the line.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

Courtney Voigt

[courtneyvoigt@gmail.com](mailto:courtneyvoigt@gmail.com)



**Dinne, John J NAB**

---

**From:** wobfra@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:06 AM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Alternative 9(A) support

Gentlemen,

We commented previously on the wetlands aspects of the alternatives, and now want to lend our support to Alternative 9A (M83) based on a recent online review of sections of the Midcounty Corridor Study report. We both strongly support Alternative 9A because it is an original Master Plan route and because it will have minimal impacts on the County Agricultural Reserve.

Frank and Rita Wobber  
14 Goshen Court  
Laytonsville, MD 20882

## Dinne, John J NAB

---

**From:** Brent Taylor [betaylor2004@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:30 PM  
**To:** Dinne, John J NAB; sean.mckewen@maryland.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Response on Mid County Corridor Study

Dear Mr. Dinne and Mr. McKewen:

I attended July 19, 2013 session held at Seneca High School, and listened to most of the testimonies. I had to leave early though and didn't speak up, but wanted to compliment you and other members of the commission as finding the best approach can be a challenging process that the public may not fully appreciate.

My family has lived on the corner of Glendevon Court and Brink Road since 1998, we have first hand knowledge of how much the traffic has grown on Brink. Traffic is often at very excessive speeds and road noise is continuous. Despite the desires of most people attending the July 19th session, a new road needs to be finished. We support its construction.

More on the personal side, there are many reasons why Alternative 4 should not be selected:

1. Financial - A considerable amount of my personal net worth is invested in that house. Lori and I are in our mid 50's, and will likely be selling it in the next 5-10 years, and a decision to widen Brink Road would cause an immediate, significant financial loss in the value of the house and consequently our retirement plans.
2. Brink Road noise too high - The house is physically close to Brink Road, and for the past several years, we haven't been able to entertain in our back yard or on our back deck due to the road noise. Alternative 4 would make things considerably worse as the house would be inside of the 67 dB line with the road. You can't move the house and noise mediation would be direly needed.
3. Water - Like most everyone else on Brink Road, we are on well/septic. Our well is between the house and Brink Road. It is likely that the well would be lost if Brink is widened and if not recoverable, my home would be lost to the construction as well.
4. Driveway - While my driveway is on Glendevon Court, it's only about 75 feet from Brink Road, and in addition to taking a portion of my property, you will need to move my driveway. The move will probably require the drive to go right through the front of my yard and across the front of my house. It would have an additional negative esthetic impact on my home and a corresponding negative impact on the value of the property.
5. Your budgets for road construction - In my review of the budget, they address the road construction costs, but they don't address the financial ramifications upon home owners and stakeholders of the community being affected (new wells, home value losses, personal hardships due to construction inconveniences, etc..) Please re-look those budget estimates and add the impact of the residents to the cost of the construction and Alternative 4 will become very much less attractive. Consider compensating the stakeholders for their financial losses if the alternative selected affects their financial well being.
6. The house immediately to the west of us on Brink is very close to the road. Either you will need to purchase that house or someone would have to move it's driveway...imposing additional negative ramifications on another neighbor (possibly us) as you will have to force the moving of property lines and sharing of a driveway.

The issues go on, and we expect there are many common themes from all of the people or organizations that have provided you inputs. So I don't want to belabor the points.

In summary, we support the construction of the road from Clarksburg to Mid-County highway. In fairness to us (and all others that purchased houses over a decade ago), we purchased a home with the understanding that the new road would be constructed along the route of what is now Alternative 9A. We are not supportive of your choosing Alternative 4A, but are supportive of your adhering to the original plan (Alternative 9A).

Respectfully,

Brent & Lori Taylor