



# Comments and Coordination

This chapter documents project coordination with agencies, elected officials and members of the public that has occurred since the public hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in June, 2002. A list of relevant correspondence is included in **Appendix D**.

## Summary of Public Hearings and Express Toll Lanes<sup>SM</sup> Workshops

### 2002 Public Hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Public Hearings were held on June 25, 2002 in Montgomery County at Seneca Valley High School and on June 27, 2002 in Frederick County at Urbana High School. Attendees had the option of providing public oral testimony, private oral testimony, and/or written comments. Private oral testimony was received from 13 citizens and written comments were received from approximately 125 citizens, government agencies, and non-profit organizations. The written submissions included 3 petitions, totaling approximately 300 signatures, to avoid and/or minimize impacts to Monocacy National Battlefield. **Table VII-1** lists the written comments collected and the primary concerns cited. Every written comment received an individualized response from the Maryland State Highway Administration/Maryland Transit Administration (SHA/MTA) and the date of this response is noted in the table.

Overall, respondents speaking at the hearings opposed the I-270/US 15 road widening and generally favored new and/or improved transit, with a preference for light rail. Almost all respondents agreed that some form of improvement is needed. Residential, air quality and noise impacts were general concerns of many residents. Written comments were generally similar to spoken comments except that some written comments indicated support for Alternative 5C. Specific concerns and suggestions from the written and oral comments are summarized later in this chapter.

Government agencies and non-profit organizations expressed concerns about socio-economic and natural environmental impacts. Most commented on proposed transit facilities as well as highway widening alternatives. Among these groups, there was more support for Alternatives 3A or 3B than the other alternatives.

### Citizen Comments

#### General Comments [46]

- Opposed Alternative 5 all options (8)
- Supported Alternative 4 either option (7)
- Supported Alternative 5, option A (2), option B (1), option C (6)
- Supported Alternative 3B (5)
- Supported Alternative 3A (4)
- Supported Alternative 1 – No Build (2)
- Supported Alternative 2 (2)
- Supported Alternative 2 with new or improved interchanges (1)
- Opposed Alternative 3A/B (1)
- Opposed Alternative 4A/B (1)
- No loss of open space (1)
- Placement of new and improved sound barriers (1)
- Reduce number of vehicles in the area by limiting population growth (1)
- Build CCT before the highway to promote transit ridership (1)
- Pine trees along the alignment should be cut down and no new pine trees replaced to reduce air pollution (1)
- Need rest area on southbound I-270 close to MD 118 (1)

### Highway-Related Comments

#### General Highway Comments [98, 3 petitions]

- Opposed highway widening (33)
- Supported highway widening (17)
- Opposed to potential impacts to Monocacy Battlefield (3 petitions, 1 organization, and 6 individuals)
- Support of highway capacity improvements north of Clarksburg (8)
- Staleybridge Road (Fox Chapel) residents expressed opposition to residential impacts and support for highway capacity improvements north of Germantown (7)

**Table VII-1: Summary of Written Comments Received at the Public Hearings**

NAME (TITLE & AFFILIATION)	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
Marilyn Prather	Germantown, MD	Concerned about possible impacts to properties along Staleybridge Road	7/17/2002
D.M. Girton	Rockville, MD	Explained reasons for supporting Alternative 4A and Alternative 4B	7/18/2002
Patricia J. Goetz	Frederick, MD	Explained reasons for supporting Alternative 5	7/18/2002
Leonard J. May	Frederick, MD	Expressed support for Alternative 5	7/18/2002
Richard Parsons	Frederick, MD	Expressed support for Alternative 5	7/18/2002
Ron Rogers	Frederick, MD	Expressed support for Alternative 5	7/18/2002
Richard Arkin	Rockville, MD	Does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings; asked when a decision will be made	7/19/2002
Mr. and Mrs. Ted Benz	Germantown, MD	Does not support any alternatives presented at the hearings; asked when a decision will be made	7/19/2002
Charles Flanders Jr.	Montgomery Village, MD	General comment card; asked when a decision will be made	7/19/2002
Thomas Gilliland	Gaithersburg, MD	Concerned about engineering plans, impacts and traffic; interested in the DEIS	7/19/2002
John Hanlon	Gaithersburg, MD	Does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings	7/19/2002
JoAnn E. Keller	Germantown, MD	Concerned about possible impacts to properties along Staley Road	7/19/2002
Mr. and Mrs. Michael Larson	Frederick, MD	Concerns regarding noise levels in community	7/19/2002
Mr. and Mrs. Martin Silber	Frederick, MD	General concerns about the Study	7/19/2002
Bruce C. Strnad	Thurmont, MD	Supports improvements in the city of Frederick area; asked when a decision will be made	7/24/2002
Richard P. Trapani	Frederick, MD	Support for Alternative 2 and Alternative 3B; asked when a decision will be made	7/24/2002
Ricky E. Nanyle	Frederick, MD	Explained reasons for supporting the proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings; asked when a decision will be made	7/31/2002
Darlo Weddle	Frederick, MD	Supports Alternative 1 (No-Build)	8/1/2002

Table VII-1 (cont.): Summary of Written Comments Received at the Public Hearings

NAME (TITLE & AFFILIATION)	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
Darryl Klopper	Monrovia, MD	Explained reasons to support Alternative 5C and Alternative 3B	8/7/2002
Ken Reid	Rockville, MD	Concerned about the impacts to social, economic, natural and cultural resources and communities	8/7/2002
Annette M. Chrisman	Germantown, MD	Concerned about the impact to social, economic, natural and cultural resources, including the communities adjacent to I-270 and to the Monocacy National Battlefield	8/8/2002
Lloyd R. DeVos	New York, NY	General comments regarding the Study; information on travel forecasts, various level-of-services were supplied by SHA	8/8/2002
Carl H. Gaum	Kensington, MD	Does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings; concerned about impacts to the environment and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/8/2002
Kurt Manwiller	Frederick, MD	Concerned about the impact of right-of-way procedures; transportation and safety improvements; asked when a decision will be made	8/12/2002
The Mozie Family	Germantown, MD	Requested a general overview of the project	8/13/2002
Jimmy Pennywell, (President, Brighton West Condominiums IV)	Silver Spring, MD	Concern regarding impacts on the Brighton West Condominium IV owners; does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings; asked when a decision will be made	8/14/2002
Kenneth Starr	Frederick, MD	Does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements along the I-270/US 15 Corridor; asked when a decision will be made	8/14/2002
Paul Timmerman	Issaquah, WA	Concerns regarding the impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield and to social, economic, natural and cultural resources including the communities adjacent to I-270	8/14/2002
Clarita Anderson	Olney, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding the impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
David G. Anderson	Olney, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding the impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
C. Bowling	Richmond, VA	Signed a petition; concerns regarding the impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
William E. Brown	Frederick, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding the impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
Wayne A. Coblenz	Middletown, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding the impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002

NAME (TITLE & AFFILIATION)	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
J.L. Grisson	Roanoke, VA	Signed a petition; concerns regarding the impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
John Halvonik	Rockville, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
James Harris	Smyrna, GA	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
Stephen L. Harris	Rockville, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
Kent M. Husted	North Bethesda, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
Bonnie L. Maidak	Germantown, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
Chris McClaud	Cloverdale, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
Shawn J. Millikan	Hanover, VA	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
Amelia Parbeault	Cloverdale, VA	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
Judy Pulley	Courtland, VA	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
John A. Salerno	Rockville, MD	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
D.C. Thompson	Blond, VA	Signed a petition; concerns regarding impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, parklands, historic resources and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/15/2002
Elliott Perrett	Frederick, MD	Concerned about the impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; concerns regarding Section 106 and 4(f) resources; asked when a decision will be made	8/16/2002



Table VII-1 (cont.): Summary of Written Comments Received at the Public Hearings

NAME (TITLE & AFFILIATION)	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
Larry W. Fogle, (President, Mercer Place Homeowner Association)	Frederick, MD	Concerned about the impacts to their property and noise levels in community; concerns and interest of the Mercer Place Homeowner's Association; asked when a decision will be made	8/19/2002
Juanita Plalero	Gaithersburg, MD	Concerned about transportation and safety improvements; explained reasons to support Alternative 2; and concerned about impacts to social, economic, natural and cultural resources, including open space	8/23/2002
Andrew Taylor	Emmitsburg, MD	Concerned about impacts to the environment and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/23/2002
Esther P. Gelman	Potomac, MD	Provided correspondence, testimony and concern about Kensington Realty, Inc	8/26/2002
Mr. & Mrs. Michael Higgins	Frederick, MD	Concerned about the impact to community property; suggest updating photography maps used of Frederick; asked when a decision will be made	8/26/2002
James V. Rizzo	Frederick, MD	Inquired about the completion of construction and proposed improvements; impacts to environment and surrounding communities	8/26/2002
Deborah Yee	Frederick, MD	Concerned about the impact to their property and the impacts to social, economic, natural and cultural resources; asked when a decision will be made	8/26/2002
Susan Cardenas (President, Brighton West Condominiums III)	Silver Spring, MD	Concerned about impacts to the environment and surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	8/27/2002
William Brinkley	Grasonville, MD	Agrees the DANAC Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) transit stop should be part of the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study; asked when will alternative be identified; funding concerns; impacts to property	8/28/2002
Susana Cardenas	Gaithersburg, MD	Opposes any residential impacts to the Fox Chapel community and supports highway capacity improvements only north of Germantown; noise/environmental impacts	8/28/2002
Timothy Dugan	Rockville, MD	Recommends constructing northbound and southbound I-270/US 15 HOV lanes north of the City of Frederick and the reasons he opposes additional general-purpose lanes on I-270/US 15; transportation and safety improvements; asked when a decision will be made	8/28/2002
Leota F. Hall	Gaithersburg, MD	Does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings; concerns about impacts to social, economic, natural and cultural resources, including the communities adjacent to I-270 and US 15; asked when a decision will be made	8/28/2002
Mr. & Mrs. Kenneth Inn	Germantown, MD	Submitted petition regarding the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study, concerned about impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield	8/28/2002

NAME (TITLE & AFFILIATION)	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
Delia R. Miller	Germantown, MD	Explained reasons to support Alternative 5C in combination with a retaining wall along northbound I-270 near Middlebrook Road and elimination of the proposed I-270/I-370 HOV direct access ramps; asked when a decision will be made	8/28/2002
(Officers and Board of Directors, Brighton West V Homeowner's Association)	Silver Spring, MD	Opposed any residential impacts to the Fox Chapel community and supported highway capacity improvements only north of Germantown; asked when a decision will be made	8/28/2002
Mr. & Mrs. Robert Prien	Germantown, MD	Opposed any residential impacts to the Fox Chapel community and supported highway capacity improvements only north of Germantown; asked when a decision will be made	8/28/2002
John A. Scott	Germantown, MD	Opposed any residential impacts to the Fox Chapel community and supported highway capacity improvements only north of Germantown; asked when a decision will be made	8/28/2002
Randy Willard	Frederick, MD	Does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings; opposes any residential impacts to the community; asked when a decision will be made	8/28/2002
Mr. & Mrs. Roger Starcher	Gaithersburg, MD	Concerned about impacts to the environment and surrounding communities, does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings	8/29/2002
Sandra Painter	Frederick, MD	Explained reasons not to support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings; concerned about impact to surrounding communities; asked when a decision will be made	9/9/2002
Fred Beddall	Frederick, MD	Concerned about impacts to the environment and surrounding communities and air quality	9/10/2002
Kyle Ackerman	Laytonsville, MD	Explained reasons to support the proposed combined highway and transit improvements presented at the hearings; asked when a decision will be made	9/11/2002
Ben Swet	Frederick, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements transfer and walking time between platforms; explained reasons to support Light Rail Transit as the project's transitway mode; funding questions; asked when a decision will be made	9/11/2002
Krisna Becker	Clarksburg, MD	Does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the Hearings, concerned about parking facilities, suggested shuttle programs (TSM/TDM), asked when decisions will be made	9/12/2002
Miriam Daniel	Rockville, MD	Concerned about the impact on Mr. Popore's property, asked when a decision will be made	9/12/2002
Thomas Fuchs	Rockville, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements, parking, funds, types of service; asked when a decision will be made	9/12/2002



Table VII-1 (cont.): Summary of Written Comments Received at the Public Hearings

NAME (TITLE & AFFILIATION)	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
Carl Henn	Rockville, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements, widening of I-270/US 15 and funding	9/12/2002
Lawrence Hierstetter (Manekin, LLC)	Frederick, MD	Concerned about impacts to social, economic, natural and cultural resources, including businesses adjacent to I-270 and US 15	9/12/2002
Barbara Knapp	Germantown, MD	Does not support any proposed highway capacity improvements presented at the hearings; concerned about a rest area on southbound I-270, transit safety, and types of service (LRT, BRT or Premium Bus)	9/12/2002
L. Osborne	Frederick, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements, widening of I-270/US 15, how far it will expand, and when the alternative decision will be made	9/12/2002
Lynne Rosenbusch	Clarksburg, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements, widening of I-270/US 15, future expansion, pedestrian safety, and when the alternative decision will be made	9/12/2002
James Lighthizer (President, Civil War Preservation Trust)	Washington, DC	Concerns about impacts to social, economic, natural and cultural resources, including the communities adjacent to I-270, and the Monocacy National Battlefield	9/16/2002
Michael S. Rempe	Ijamsville, MD	Concerned about impacts to property. Does not support the proposed location of MD 75 interchange	9/20/2002
David & Kristen Crotty	Ijamsville, MD	Does not support the proposed MD 75 interchange alignment (location)	9/23/2002
Gary Goubeau	Potomac, MD	Supports bus rapid transit system along the CCT alignment	9/23/2002
Ira Palmer	Frederick, MD	Concerns about transportation improvements and parking; Recommends widening I-270 to three lanes in each direction throughout the project area	9/23/2002
Joan Postow	Gaithersburg, MD	Concerns regarding which type of service is preferred – LRT, BRT or Premium Bus – and the potential problems associated with an at-grade crossing of the transitway through the intersection of Muddy Branch Road and Great Seneca Highway	9/23/2002
Gail M. Stephens	Severna Park, MD	Shared thoughts concerning impacts to adjacent properties and the Monocacy National Battlefield; parking issues cited and suggested the CCT extend to Frederick	9/23/2002
John Hamilton	Mount Airy, MD	Enquired about transit modes; explained reasons to recommend a Metrorail extension to Frederick	9/24/2002
Harvey T. Kaplan	Rockville, MD	Comment regarding transportation improvements, supports light rail transit	9/24/2002
Anthony M. Natelli (Natelli Communities)	Gaithersburg, MD	Shared thoughts concerning the transit options and impacts to historic sites; inquired about the Urbana Region Plan	9/24/2002
Dr. Goetz K. Oertel	Potomac, MD	Explained reasons not to support any of the proposed highway capacity improvements until construction of transit improvements along the corridor have been completed; asked when a decision will be made	9/24/2002

NAME (TITLE & AFFILIATION)	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
Kirk M. Patton, Sr.	Clarksburg, MD	Interested in transportation improvements, parking facilities; supports Alternative 5A	9/24/2002
Cindy Snow	Damascus, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements, supports light rail transit. Does not support any of the proposed highway capacity improvements until construction of transit improvements along the corridor have been completed	9/24/2002
Ellen Turner	Rockville, MD	Explained reasons to recommend construction of transit improvements before highway improvements, supports light rail transit; widening of I-270/US 15 and transit service; which type of service is preferred	9/24/2002
Richard N. Wright (Montgomery Village Association)	Montgomery Village, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements, walking time between platforms; explained reasons to recommend construction of transit improvements before highway improvements; asked who developed the alternative and why; asked when a decision will be made	9/24/2002
Larry & Rebecca Yates	Germantown, MD	Concerned about impacts to the environment and surrounding communities	9/24/2002
Don Bates, Jr.	Lees Summit, MO	Signed a petition, concerned about impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; concerned about transportation improvements	9/25/2002
William J. Brinkley	Grasonville, MD	Signed a petition, concerned about impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; concerned about transportation improvements	9/25/2002
Alan Chilton	Lamar, MO	Signed a petition, concerned about impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; concerned about transportation improvements	9/25/2002
John H. Fauerby	Clarksburg, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements, station locations, bus service and transit alternatives; funding; concerned about impacts to property and environment	9/25/2002
Arnold W. Schofield	Fort Scott, KS	Signed a petition, concerned about impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; concerned about transportation improvements	9/25/2002
John A. Spencer	Fort Scott, KS	Signed a petition, concerned about impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield; concerned about transportation improvements	9/25/2002
Matthew Schroebel	Keedysville, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements; transitway to local office complexes; weigh-in-motion (WIM); supports Alternative 5	9/26/2002
Michael J. McInerney (Thomas Somerville Co.)	Upper Marlboro, MD	Interested in the proposed Shady Grove transitway yard/shop facility	9/27/2002
Edward K. Cassidy	Monkton, MD	Shared thoughts concerning impacts to property and to the Monocacy National Battlefield; interested in transportation improvements	10/1/2002
Lewis R. Gaty, II	Lexington, VA	Concerns about impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield	10/3/2002
Felix M. Killar Jr.	Monrovia, MD	Interested in transportation improvements, impacts to property and HOV lanes	10/4/2002



Table VII-1 (cont.): Summary of Written Comments Received at the Public Hearings

NAME (TITLE & AFFILIATION)	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
William J. Bradley	Germantown, MD	Interested in transportation improvements	10/7/2002
Dennis P. Graham	Beltsville, MD	Concerned about transportation improvement, impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield	10/21/2002
Garry Viele		Inquired about proposed transportation improvements	10/22/2002
Laura Hansen	Winter Haven, FL	Concerned about the impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield and transportation improvements	10/23/2002
Gail M. Stephens	Severna Park, MD	Submitted a petition of citizens concerned about possible impacts to Monocacy National Battlefield	11/7/2002
Clara Craft	Ijamsville, MD	Concerned about the possible impacts to their property adjacent to southbound I-270, between MD 109 interchange and proposed MD 75 interchange	11/27/2002
William J. Brinkley	Grasonville, MD	Submitted a petition and concerns about possible impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield	11/29/2002
Mr. and Mrs. Frank Adams	Chicago, IL	Submitted a petition concerning transportation and safety improvements, impacts to social, economic, natural and cultural resources, including communities, impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, and parkland and historic resources	12/4/2002
Terry Carr	Schaumburg, IL	Submitted a petition concerning transportation improvements, impacts to social, economic, natural and cultural resources, including communities, impacts to the Monocacy National Battlefield, and parkland and historic resources	12/6/2002
Kent Adcock	Frederick, MD	Inquired about proposed improvements to US 15 in Frederick County and transportation improvements	1/30/2003
Bill Gough	Baltimore, MD	Inquired about proposed improvements to I-270 in Frederick County, transportation improvements, impacts on social, economic, natural and cultural resources, including communities	2/6/2003
Henry S. Hamm	Clarksburg, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements, land use and zoning issues; impacts on the gas line and community property	2/28/2003
Stephen Coulter	Frederick, MD	Concerned about the I-270 Weigh Station, issues related to the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study, and accident history	3/31/2003
Janet Linhart	Wheaton, IL	Concerned about the Monocacy National Battlefield	8/13/2003
Mr. & Mrs. Larry R. Yates	Germantown, MD	Concerned about impacts to Fox Chapel Community and surrounding communities; asked when the project will begin; funding sources	9/4/2003
Carlos Betancourt	Germantown, MD	Concerned about impacts to Fox Chapel Community; evaluation of both transit and highway transportation strategies to improve safety conditions and relieve the current and projected congestion	9/8/2003

NAME (TITLE & AFFILIATION)	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
Christopher Turnbull (Wells & Associates, LLC)	McLean, VA	Shared concepts for the interchanges; impacts to the social, economic, natural and cultural resources, including the communities; asked when a decision will be made	9/10/2003
John Huongnguyen	Germantown, MD	Concerned about the impacts to Fox Chapel Community	10/7/2003
Margaret Tricoli	New Market, MD	Inquired about the purpose of the Study	5/17/2004

- Reduce residential impacts along Mercer Place in Frederick – Fairfield Community (5)
- Traffic impact of this study on future traffic south and north of study area, and secondary roads, such as MD 355 (3)
- Support HOV lanes (southbound and northbound) north of the city of Frederick (2)
- Reduce residential impacts along northbound US 15 (2)
- Include sound barriers along northbound US 15 – Fairfield Community (2)
- The additional interchanges will lead to additional LOS 'F' (2)
- Reconsider HOT lanes (2)
- Limited access/express lanes from Frederick to I-270/I-495 split (1)
- Lengthen acceleration lanes at the weigh stations (1)
- Increase HOV lanes (1)
- Reduce business impacts along northbound I-270 (1)
- Convert HOV lanes to HOT lanes from Urbana to Frederick to avoid widening I-270 through Monocacy Battlefield (1)
- Build circumferential highway around Frederick (1)
- Mitigate light pollution at improved highway segments (1)
- The partial take of the Fireside Condominiums complex as shown in the DEIS is not possible; a full take would be required because the remaining buildings share utilities that are dependent on infrastructure in the buildings to be removed (1)

- Any benefits of widening will largely go to Frederick County residents at the expense of Montgomery County residents (1)

***I-270/I-370 Comments [13]***

- Brighton West Homeowner's Association expressed concerns about right-of-way impacts and proposed displacement in that community. (3 home owners associations and 10 individuals)

***I-270/MD 75 Extended Comments [3]***

- Inquired about any other interchange alternatives, and community and commuters' benefits of having a new interchange (1)
- Inquired about future location and traffic patterns on MD 75 (1)
- Inquired about Lewisdale Rd between MD 355 and MD 75 (1)

***I-270/I-70 Comments [1]***

- I-70 East ramp to MD 355 needs to be lengthened to accommodate morning rush hour traffic (1)

***Transit-Related Comments***

***General Transitway Comments [57]***

- TSM/TDM transit connectivity (15)
- Increase mass transit (12)
- Extend transitway to Frederick (7)
- Extend Metrorail north of Shady Grove (5)
- No I-270 roadway widening until CCT is completed (5)
- CCT alignment should be modified to provide service to Kentlands and Lakelands (2)

- Extend CCT to Clarksburg (2)
- Connect project alternatives with the Shady Grove Metro Station (2)
- Connect transitway with the Shady Grove Adventist Hospital (1)
- Possible impacts to DANAC Corporation Stiles property (1)
- Extend transitway north to Urbana to avoid I-270 congestion from commuters who would enter the highway at COMSAT (1)
- Resident at Game Preserve Road (displacement) opposes the proposed transitway alignment (1)
- Transitway alignment misses much of the business community in Montgomery County (1)
- Light rail on the current alignment near Dorsey Farm would be unsafe for children living in the area: relocate the rail line or use BRT instead (1)
- Provide more bus service for local neighborhoods to transitway stops (1)

*Transitway – LRT Specific Comments [53]*

- Supported LRT (37)
- Opposed (5)
- LRT is not fast enough (4)
- Extend LRT to Frederick (3)
- If LRT is selected, a raised crossing would be necessary at the Great Seneca & Muddy Branch intersection (1)
- Consider LRT to Frederick and Bethesda (1)
- Use I-270 median for LRT (1)
- Add more Ride-On buses to feed into LRT (1)

*Transitway – BRT Specific Comments [26]*

- Supported BRT (15)
- Opposed BRT (11)
- Buses do not attract riders as much as rail lines

*Bus Service [1]*

- Premium bus does not minimize congestion (1)

*MARC Service [1]*

- Daily MARC Service to Frederick and Martinsburg (1)

*Yard and Shop [2]*

- No Yard/Shop facility at COMSAT on LCOR, Intelsat and Lockheed Martin properties (2)

*Land Use/Development Issues [5]*

- Adding more highway capacity to I-270 roadway does not promote Smart Growth (1)
- Wanted to know how existing or proposed land use in Frederick and Montgomery counties will generate traffic and how slower/less growth would reduce traffic demand (1)
- Wanted to see proposal to use the money proposed for construction to buy development rights in the region to reduce demand (1)
- Stop permitting new housing if roads are not built to accommodate the new growth (1)
- Any improvement in traffic flow will only help developers (1)

**Government Agency Comments**

Most of the agencies were concerned about socio-economic and/or natural environmental impacts. Most commented on proposed transit facilities as well as proposed highway improvements. There was more general support for Alternatives 3A or 3B.

*National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), William G. Dowd*

The NCPC commented on possible locations for transitway yard/shop facilities. They prefer Site 1 to Sites 4 or 5 at the Shady Grove location due to better accessibility to Metrorail and to mass transit serving the Washington metropolitan area. Additionally, they indicated a need to study visual and aesthetic impacts of infrastructure required to support a planned transitway yard and storage track configuration especially as may affect the National Institute of Standards and Technology located west of I-270 in Gaithersburg.

*Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), Lori A. Byrne*

The MDNR has indicated that there are no known bald eagle nests in the project area. However, a survey should be conducted for any affected areas of potential habitat that occur for the Short's Rockcress, a state-listed plant species. [Subsequent coordination with MDNR indicates

the species is no longer a state-listed plant species.] Project planners should avoid placement of new roads in the forest interior to minimize project impacts on forest interior dwelling birds species.

*Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), Albert J. Genetti, Jr.*

The DPW&T supports both the CCT alignment and Alternatives 3A or 3B. They do not support Alternative 5 or the Premium Bus (Alternative 5C), due to residential and business displacements and inconsistency with area Master Plans. They favor extending the CCT alignment to north of Clarksburg. The capital cost estimates for the maintenance yards/bus garages as well as annual operating costs for LRT and BRT should have been included in the DEIS. More explanation is needed as to why BRT provides better travel time savings over LRT. The owner and operator of the LRT/BRT and its connection to Metrorail at Shady Grove and with WMATA and Ride On needs to be discussed. The COMSAT location for a potential transitway yard/shop facility should be eliminated. Sites 4 and 5 at Metropolitan Grove and site 1 at Shady Grove are endorsed. The DPW&T is interested in continuous HOV lanes in both directions within Montgomery County and into Frederick County. DPW&T does not support the construction of the entire C/D system; Middlebrook Road to Father Hurley Boulevard is acceptable though.

*US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Ms. Barbara Rudnick*

EPA rated the DEIS “EC” (Environmental Concerns), and “Category 2” (Insufficient Information). EPA favors transit, supports HOV, and recommends avoidance and minimization efforts to impacted parklands, aquatic and terrestrial resources and wildlife. EPA supports US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) comments on the DEIS. EPA asked for more information pertaining specifically to the identification and outreach efforts to date of Environmental Justice communities.

*US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Mr. William Schultz*

USFWS endorses Alternative 3A or 3B and opposes Alternatives 4A, 4B, and 5C. USFWS supports Alternatives 5A or 5B with modifications, especially to

reduce impacts to Seneca Creek State Park. USFWS recommends reorientation of proposed transit facilities at Decoverly Station, generally approves the Shady Grove location, and is not opposed to the COMSAT location for transit facilities. USFWS does not favor sites 4 or 5 at the Metropolitan Grove location for transit yard/shop facilities.

*Maryland Department of Planning (MDP), Ms. Bihui Xu*

MDP prefers Alternatives 3A or 3B and supports expanded bus service and LRT. They recommend preparation of a capacity preservation plan for the highway component of the Preferred Alternative, including an analysis of induced vehicle miles traveled. They request that an overview of the Smart Growth Act be included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), as well as development of the TSM/TDM Alternative. An evaluation of pedestrian access to proposed transit stations should also be included in the FEIS.

*US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Mr. Steve Elinsky*

The USACE is concerned that new interchanges could invite development that will create more congestion, negating the purpose of the project to handle increased congestion along the I-270/US 15 Corridor. The USACE indicated that jurisdictional wetland determinations for transit facilities as well as for any design modifications/refinements should be included in the FEIS. Impacts on hydrology sources for affected aquatic resources need to be included also in the FEIS. Highway access is not shown at School Drive Station and at Decoverly Station. Manekin Station should be relocated. Sites 1 through 3 at COMSAT Station cause excessive aquatic resource impacts. The USACE recommended avoiding impacts to aquatic resources where practicable and feasible and minimizing to the greatest extent practicable where avoidance is not possible. The USACE requested consideration of using Old Baltimore Road instead of Newcut Road for the location of a new interchange. Subsequent meetings between SHA, USACE, and Montgomery County have produced an agreement that the interchange at Newcut Road is needed.

*National Park Service (NPS), Susan Trail*

The NPS favors Alternatives 3A/B and 4A/B, and has determined that Alternatives 5A/B/C will create unacceptable impacts to the Monocacy National



Battlefield. NPS indicates their opinion that the interstate should remain within its present right-of-way to the greatest extent possible and that new visual intrusions, such as high retaining walls, should not be introduced into this historic setting. The document description of the Monocacy Battlefield requires improvement including a summary of the battle and related mapping, as well as an elevated and separate placement, based on its importance as a National Historic Landmark. The potential presence of bald eagles, further noise studies, and the need for landscape surveys should be addressed.

**2004 Express Toll Lane Public Workshops**

Public workshops introducing the ETL concepts (Alternatives 6A/B and 7A/B) and summarizing updated engineering and environmental studies were held on June 29 and 30, 2004 in Montgomery and Frederick counties. Interested persons had the opportunity to offer verbal or written comments for consideration as part of the project record. In all, 105 people attended the workshops and 21 offered written comments. *Table VII-2* provides a summary of the written comments received. All individuals who submitted written comments received individualized responses from SHA/MTA.

The following exhibits describing ETLs and the updated studies were on display at the workshops:

*Express Toll Lane Display Boards*

- An Alternative to Congestion
- Benefits
- Managing Congestion Success Stories
- ETLs in Maryland
- HOT, HOV and ETLs – Differences

*Project Specific Display Boards*

- Introduction/Purpose
- Project Background
- I-270 ETL Concept
- Studies Since Public Hearing
- Next Steps/Schedule

The meetings were set in an “open house” workshop format to provide the best opportunity for the general public to interact with the project team.

At the Montgomery County Workshop there was a relatively even mix of proponents and opponents to the ETL initiative. The primary complaint heard was the perceived notion of additional public taxing due to tolling. There were also equity concerns, primarily questioning the fairness of ETLs. The proponents felt that ETLs were a clever idea and they were supportive of whatever option provided the best opportunity for the project to move forward and for additional capacity as soon as possible. In general, a majority of the general public simply wanted a better understanding of how the ETL technology would work. Enforcement was of particular interest since many in attendance were upset over extensive HOV lane violations. Several residents from the bordering Fox Chapel and Brighton West communities attended and voiced their concern over the potential right-of-way acquisitions and close proximity of the build alternatives to their homes, including noise and home value impacts. The Brighton West community is located in an identified Environmental Justice (EJ) area; outreach will also continue as part of the EJ outreach program for the project.

At the Frederick County Workshop opinions ranged from support of ETL alternatives and overall expansion to concern for the affordability of tolls and increased commute costs. A Sierra Club member and a few other attendees expressed concern about wider roads and whether the ETL alternatives would reduce congestion. As in Montgomery County, the lack of enforcement on the current HOV lanes was widely seen as an issue. A few citizens expressed disapproval of the widening of US 15 through Frederick and insisted on funding other planned roadways shown on Frederick County’s Master Plan. Mostly, the attending citizens were interested in better explanations of the proposed lane configurations, access points and projected traffic data.

Written comments were received from 22 citizens. The number of comments were divided fairly equally in favor of and against the ETL Concept; a ratio similar to that of individuals who spoke with project team members. Funding and equity concerns were prevalent, with alternative suggestions to improve congestion including improvement of Metrorail, and adding a new rail system northward to Frederick. Fox Chapel and Brighton West residents expressed noise and property

**Table VII-2: Summary of Written Comments Received at the ETL Public Workshops**

NAME	HOME CITY AND STATE	COMMENTS/CONCERNS/SUGGESTIONS	DATE OF SHA/MTA REPLY TO COMMENTS
Barry Udvardy	Germantown, MD	Concerns about traffic congestion, Express Toll Lanes (ETLs) value pricing, high occupancy toll lanes (HOT Lanes) and HOV lanes	7/20/2004
Don Linton	Fredrick, MD	Supports improvements in the city of Frederick area	7/21/2004
Saskia Van Oot	Frederick, MD	Concerned about transportation improvements and parking facilities	7/22/2004
R.W. Wolf	Frederick, MD	General inquiries on funding	7/26/2004
Jon Arnold	Frederick, MD	Gave reasons for recommending a MARC system extension to Frederick	7/28/2004
Leonard May	Frederick, MD	Made a comment on building something quickly	7/28/2004
Gary Sandman	Urbana, MD	Gave reasons for recommending a Metrorail extension to Frederick and reversible toll lanes	7/28/2004
Deborah Franklin	Germantown, MD	Comments and inquires on Express Toll Lanes (ETLs)	8/2/2004
David Griffith	Boyds, MD	Opposes the Express Toll Lane (ETL) concept on I-270 (purpose, strategy and pricing)	8/2/2004
Dean Herrin	Frederick, MD	Explained reasons for opposing the replacement of the HOV lane on I -270 with the Express Toll Lane (ETL) option	8/3/2004
Robert Smart	Middletown, MD	Inquiring about Express Toll Lanes (ETLs)	8/3/2004
Mary Robinson	Gaithersburg, MD	Concerns about Express Toll Lanes (ETLs) and value pricing	8/9/2004
Mr. and Mrs. Michael A. Wallace	Rockville, MD	Inquiring about Express Toll Lanes (ETLs) and value pricing	8/9/2004
Kevin Lancaster	Frederick, MD	Suggests ways to improve congestion along the I-270 Corridor and inquires about value pricing for ETLs	8/16/2004
David Franklin	Germantown, MD	Concerned about impacts to property and value pricing for Express Toll Lanes (ETLs)	8/17/2004
Derrick C. Tabor	Gaithersburg, MD	Does not support the Express Toll Lanes (ETLs) concept on I-270	8/30/2004
Karen Lewis	Montgomery Village, MD	Concerns about Express Toll Lanes (ETLs) fee	9/2/2004
Joseph Magluilo	Walkersville, MD	Opposes the Express Toll Lanes (ETLs)	9/2/2004
Sherri Lynn Miller	Frederick, MD	Explained reasons for supporting a light rail system in lieu of Express Lanes (ETLs)	9/3/2004
Creighton & Dana Andes	Frederick, MD	Concerns: value pricing, Express Toll Lanes (ETLs) (benefit, purpose), ultimate goal for Shady Grove Metro Station and the Metropolitan Grove MARC Station	9/8/2004
Lawrence Evans	Germantown, MD	Concerns: traffic volume; highways included in the CLRP (M 83); project studies underway for a new Potomac River Crossing; effect of projects in the CLRP	10/20/2004

depreciation concerns due to the close proximity of the alternatives to their community.

Concerns cited in the written comments include:

**General Comments [4]**

- Start project now/implement as soon as possible (3)
- Build a second crossing over the Potomac River (1)

**Highway-Related Comments [16]**

- Equity concerns for lower income individuals as well as for the general public (5)
- Access issues with ETL (2)
- Exactly how will the addition of ETLs be funded? (2)
- Another means of imposing taxes on the driving community (2)
- Build reversible lanes (2)
- How will tolls be enforced? (1)
- Displays of currently operating tolls in California/Florida may not accurately reflect the future of operating tolls in Maryland (1)
- Support for HOV lanes (1)

**Transit-Related Comments [6]**

- Extend Metro to Frederick (2)
- Build a rail system along I-270 mainline (2)
- Add one non-stop train per hour from Shady Grove to Metro Center (1)
- Improve the MARC line (1)

**Summary of Additional Public Involvement**

In addition to the public hearings and ETL workshops, the SHA and MTA have met with citizens to discuss the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study on 18 occasions since 2002, either at workshops or community civic association meetings that were open to the public. In support of public awareness of these meetings and their purpose, various newsletters and brochures were distributed along with press releases. At the public meetings, citizens were invited to provide verbal or written comments concerning the material presented at the meeting or comments on the project in general.

**General Public and Community Briefings**

The following is a list of meetings and briefings that have taken place since the June 2002 Public Hearings (not including the 2004 ETL Workshops) where members of the project team were present. The list includes any meeting where the public attended.

- November 1, 2002 – Members of the I-270/US 15 Project Team and SHA met with representatives of the Frederick County Public Schools Facilities Services, Urbana Elementary School, Urbana Elementary School PTA, Urbana Softball/Baseball & Urbana Recreation Council, Araby Civic Association and Urbana Soccer to discuss the potential impacts to the recreation fields located just east of I-270 and north of the MD 80 interchange. The impacted area is located within the Urbana Elementary School property. The recreation fields are used by local youth and adult recreation leagues to facilitate their local programs in addition to the use by the Frederick County Public Schools. The sports organization representatives noted their lack of athletic fields in the area that are available for their use. SHA presented several potential concepts to reduce impacts and/or re-orient the athletic fields if the impacts from a build alternative could not be avoided. The local representatives provided their input on the potential concepts.
- May 21, 2003 – Attended a meeting with the Market Square Advisory Group where MTA discussed a realignment proposal introduced by a citizen that lived in the Kentlands. MTA studied the alignment alternatives and reported its findings back to the community in September, 2004.
- August 25, 2003 – Participated in a Fox Chapel Community Meeting to provide an update on the project and present findings of a study to reduce community impacts. Of the 49 entries on the sign-in sheet, approximately ten to fifteen percent represented minority populations. The project team informed the attendees that all 35 residential displacements shown at the 2002 Public Hearings and in the 2002 DEIS could be avoided with mitigation and minimization measures that would include retaining walls. Several citizens inquired about potential impacts to their individual

properties, while others expressed concern with noise impacts. It was explained that further FHWA coordination is required to determine the magnitude of potential impact avoidance or minimization efforts. The project team was able to incorporate a retaining wall into the design that would avoid any displacement and the design was shown at the 2004 Public Workshops.

- March 30, 2004 – The National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, Frederick County Chapter invited SHA to provide a project briefing on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project and to describe the recent consideration of ETLs. Approximately 80 people were in attendance at the monthly chapter meeting. Questions were raised that sought clarification of the project goals, alternatives under consideration, how the ETLs would benefit Frederick County commuters and when potential improvements would be implemented. The project team responded to these questions with the current understanding of the project schedule, as well as an explanation of the alternatives within Frederick County.
- September 23, 2004 – Met with residents of the Kentlands community and City of Gaithersburg representatives to present the results of a CCT mainline realignment study. The study had been requested by the community earlier in 2004 to provide a new station and direct access from the community onto the proposed CCT. The study team determined that it was impractical and not cost efficient to realign the CCT alignment through the Kentlands community due to the additional circuitry of the realignment. Some attendees expressed displeasure with the decision but understood the magnitude of the additional costs.
- October 17, 2004 – The Clover Hill Community Association asked SHA to provide a project briefing on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project and to describe the recent consideration of ETLs. Approximately 20 people were in attendance at the regular community board meeting. The public asked questions regarding the estimated completion date of the study, when US 15 improvements would be implemented and if any homes along US 15 would be displaced. The project team addressed

these questions, discussed the current project schedule and explained that a few homes along US 15 may be displaced but more detailed engineering studies would be completed in the design phase.

- January 24, 2005 – A Clarksburg Civic Association meeting was held where the SHA presented an update on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project and described the concept of ETLs. Most of the public comments were in regard to the slow overall progress of the Multi-Modal Corridor Study and inquiries towards the estimated completion of the Study. Several other comments centered on issues regarding ETLs, including access, enforcement and equity concerns. The project team provided websites for the Association members to find out more information concerning ETLs and Maryland’s overall initiative statewide.
- April 20, 2006 – Representatives of the I-270/US 15 project team met with the Brighton West Community Board to discuss the I-270 widening (shown in all build alternatives) proposed adjacent to this community, located in Gaithersburg. The Brighton West community described existing conditions related to property ownership and utilities. The I-270 Team requested further details on the utility services to each unit/set of units to assist with the identification of building displacements. There is potential for affecting many of the individual utility services without physically displacing a unit through right-of-way acquisition. The board members asked how their individual properties would be appraised and if they should defer improvements or maintenance. The project team responded by indicating a property that is well maintained with improvements would be reflected with a higher appraisal value. He advised the board to make the necessary improvements to protect their real estate investment and not to wait for a project decision. The team recommended the Brighton West Community Board contact SHA’s project manager for a follow-up meeting in Winter 2006/2007 for all interested members of the Brighton West community.
- April 26, 2006 – A meeting was held with the North Bethesda TMD to brief the group on the status of the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study.

The group expressed support towards the study. Comments ranged from understanding ETLs better to questions regarding the CCT.

- May 25, 2006 – Project team representatives provided updates on the CCT to the Clarksburg Civic Association. Association members asked about why the Red Metro Line was not being extended; if express buses could be provided to Shady Grove from points north without stopping; why the northern terminal was at COMSAT; and ETL design details.
- June 28, 2006 – Several members of the project team participated in a public meeting sponsored by the City of Gaithersburg to introduce the proposed CCT realignment option through the England/Crown Farm historic property to the surrounding communities. Residents generally expressed concerns regarding traffic, noise, pedestrian access, and developer benefits.
- September 13, 2006 – Participated in the Germantown Alliance Meeting to present the current status of the study. There were no comments and questions of note.
- September 18, 2006 – MTA representatives participated in Montgomery County’s regularly scheduled Upcounty Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting to present the current status of the CCT as part of the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study. No minutes were reported.
- September 25, 2006 – A Clarksburg Civic Association Meeting was held to present an update on the various transit and roadway improvements proposed for the area. Several elected officials were in attendance and a request was made to determine the travel time difference between the CCT and I-270. The project team has completed this request.
- October 4, 2006 – Project team members, the MTA Planning Director and the SHA’s Director of Planning and Preliminary Engineering participated in a press event and tour of the CCT and I-270 where the State provided an update on the projects and introduced a Public-Private Partnership (P3) initiative to the press. Requests for Expressions of Interest and Proposals have been advertised.

- January 30, 2007 – Participated in a Public Hearing for the I-270/MD 121 interchange project near the northern terminus of the CCT. Displays were set up and staff was on hand to answer any questions attendees had on the CCT. Hearing speakers indicated a need for the interchange improvements and better access to the proposed park and ride lot at the COMSAT transitway station.
- February 17, 2007 – Project team members presented information about the project at a vendor/exhibitor table discussing the project at the Asian Spring New Year Celebration in Frederick. The table received significant attention from some attendees and many questions and comments were fielded. Ten people completed a two-page survey on the project and two were added to the project mailing list.
- March 14, 2007 – Members of the project team met with the Germantown Alliance to update them on the status of the project. Questions regarding scheduling delays, expected completion date, county contributions to the study, and why ETLs were not being considered in southern Montgomery County or at the Monocacy Battlefield were fielded.
- May 7, 2007 – The Frederick Area Committee on Transportation invited SHA to provide a project briefing on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project. Approximately 15 people were in attendance at the monthly meeting. The project team provided an update on the alternatives description and the project schedule milestones. Questions were raised regarding the public sentiment towards transit alternatives in Montgomery County, project construction funding and the ability to break out specific proposed improvements in Frederick County. In addition, the attendees asked if it would be possible to begin formulating project phasing plans. The project team responded to these questions with the current understanding of the project schedule and constraints.
- June 7, 2007 – An informal public meeting was held in which transportation improvement alternatives and corresponding impacts for the US 15/Monocacy Boulevard Project Planning Study was presented. The open house allowed for attendees to conduct a

self-paced review of important project information and meet with representatives of SHA. Frederick County and Frederick City representatives were available to receive comments and answer questions.

- November 14, 2007 – Attended the Observation Drive Public Meeting held in Clarksburg by the Montgomery County DPW&T. MTA presented a display showing the CCT alignment and its relationship to the proposed Observation Drive extension.
- May 14, 2008 – Project team representatives presented a detailed briefing of the Corridor Cities Transitway to the Commercial Real Estate Womens Organization. The presentation included a project overview, a description of both transit and highway alternatives from the DEIS and the AA/EA, and a summary of preliminary ridership results, capital costs and operating and maintenance costs.
- September 28, 2008 – SHA contacted the 4th Annual Festival Latino de Frederick organizers and were granted permission to conduct public outreach to the Hispanic community of Frederick and surrounding areas on behalf of several SHA local projects, including the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study. SHA staff represented the study team by distributing fliers (in Spanish and English), displaying project boards and answering questions from festival attendees. The study team’s goal was to reach out to, and obtain information from, a population that may not otherwise be involved in the project planning process due to government distrust, language barriers and/or economic reasons. Approximately 100 individuals of Hispanic and other ethnic backgrounds visited with SHA staff. More than 24 survey forms were submitted during the festival stating their concerns with existing traffic conditions or their preference to either ETLs or the CCT.
- October 3, 2008 – The Gaithersburg-Germantown Chamber of Commerce asked SHA to provide a project briefing on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project to the study area Chambers of Commerce (including Montgomery County and Frederick County). Approximately 7 people were in attendance at the briefing. The project team provided an update on the alternatives description

and the project schedule milestones. The Chamber of Commerce representative asked how the corridor businesses would benefit by the various transportation alternatives being evaluated. The project team described these benefits and also discussed the project schedule to reach a Locally Preferred Alternative decision.

- October 6, 2008 – Project team representatives presented a detailed briefing of the Corridor Cities Transitway to the Upcounty Advisory Board, an organization of northern Montgomery County businesses and community associations. The presentation included a project overview; description of both transit and highway alternatives from the DEIS and the AA/EA; a summary of preliminary ridership results, capital costs and operating and maintenance costs; and a discussion of the Federal Transit Administration’s New Starts process. Some follow-up discussions centered around bus operations on I-270 and express bus operations on the CCT.
- February 10, 2009 – The Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce invited SHA and MTA to provide a project briefing on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project to their monthly Infrastructure and Transportation Committee meeting. Approximately 25 people were in attendance for the briefing. The project team provided an update on the highway and transit alternatives, the preliminary impacts, construction costs and project milestones/decisions to be completed. Questions from the audience centered on the ability of the CCT to meet transit demand, if the CCT was a funding priority with MDOT versus the Red Line (Baltimore) and Purple Line (Silver Spring), if a Public-Private Partnership was possible, and whether the CCT cost effectiveness values were going to be able to compete nationally with other New Starts transit projects. The project team responded to these questions and clarified other points from the presentation.
- February 10, 2009 – Project team representatives presented a detailed briefing of the Corridor Cities Transitway to the Action Committee for Transit. The presentation included a project overview; description of both transit and highway alternatives

from the DEIS and the AA/EA; and a summary of preliminary ridership results, capital costs and operating and maintenance costs. The group expressed great interest in the project but expressed concerns with regard to limitations of funding and competition with other Maryland transit projects.

- March 9, 2009 – The Frederick Area Committee on Transportation invited SHA and MTA to provide a project update on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project at their monthly meeting. Approximately 30 people were in attendance for the briefing. The project team provided an update on the highway and transit alternatives, the preliminary impacts, construction costs and project milestones, and decisions to be completed in the next few months. It was mentioned the project will be holding a set of public hearings on the AA/EA document in the near future and everyone was encouraged to watch for the meeting announcements soon. Several questions were responded to including clarification of various portions of the alternatives descriptions and the ETL operations. The project team responded to these questions and clarified other points from the presentation.
- April 20, 2009 – SHA was invited by the Frederick County Chamber of Commerce to provide a project briefing on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project at regularly scheduled Trustees Luncheon meeting. Approximately 60 people were in attendance for the briefing. The project team provided an update on the highway and transit alternatives, the preliminary impacts, construction costs and project milestones/decisions to be completed. Several questions were fielded from the audience centered on the project schedule, prioritized identification of I-270 or US 15 sections that may be constructed first, and are other managed lane options being considered such as HOT lane designations. The project team responded to these questions and clarified other points from the presentation.

Organizations commonly represented in the meetings discussed above include representatives from SHA, MTA, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning

Commission (M-NCPPC), Frederick County Division of Planning, Montgomery County DPW&T, Greater Shady Grove Civic Alliance, Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board, Frederick Area Committee on Transportation (FACT), Upcounty Regional Services Center, and Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce.

Public outreach initiatives were extended to further publicize the study activities to the additional civic associations and organizations within the project area. Examples of these groups included the Frederick County Chamber of Commerce, the Urbana Civic Association, the Shady Grove Alliance, and citizens from the Town of Hyattstown.

#### Project Newsletters and Media Outreach

Newsletters and brochures were distributed in May and June of 2004 to coincide with the ETL Public Workshops. These newsletters were distributed to the study's mailing list of approximately 4,500 individuals/organizations. In addition, newspaper articles, advertisements, radio/cable television interviews and press releases were utilized to keep and increase public awareness of the study's activities and progress.

The I-270/US 15 project team has used various methods of advertising project activities to the public including the following newspapers and periodicals:

- *The Baltimore Sun*
- *The Washington Post*
- *The Montgomery Gazette*
- *The Montgomery Journal*
- *The Afro-American (Washington, DC)*
- *El Montgomery*
- *The Asian Fortune*
- *The Washington Jewish Week*
- *The Frederick News Post*
- *The Frederick Gazette*

Public notices were used to announce the 2004 ETL Public Workshops.

Another newsletter was distributed in March 2009 providing additional project updates. This newsletter was mailed to the stakeholders in the project corridor.

## Interagency Coordination

Five interagency review meetings regarding the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor project were held since the June 2002 Public Hearings on July 17, 2002; June 16, August 18, and September 15, 2004; and August 16, 2006. Participating agencies included the MDNR, EPA, USACE, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), M-NCPPC, National Park Service (NPS), Maryland Historical Trust (MHT), Maryland Department of Planning (MDP), USFWS, and National Marine Fisheries (NMF).

### July 17, 2002 Interagency Review Meeting

On July 17, 2002, the project team presented a status update to the agency representatives. The primary project activity discussed was the I-270/US 15 Expert Land Use Panel (Panel) results. Agency representatives were briefed on the composition of the Panel and public involvement associated with the land use forecasting process. The two phase nature of the panel process was also described. The first phase consisted of a qualitative discussion on the transportation factors that affect land use patterns and consensus was reached that transportation is one of many factors affecting land use patterns, highway locations affect population more than employment, and transit impacts will take longer to realize than highway impacts. Phase II involved a quantitative allocation of population and employment to zones for the no-build and build options using the criteria agreed upon in Phase I. It was noted that there were large differences between individual panel responses on some zone allocations.

#### Issues Discussed

The USACE representative asked how the interchanges were considered as part of the study. SHA responded that there was limited discussion regarding access by the panel. The panel members considered interchange improvements to be minor compared to the capacity that would be added to the entire corridor.

The USACE representative also asked about the second graphic that showed the potential for growth associated with build alternatives. Frederick City was not shown as a growth area. SHA clarified that the second graphic shows only those areas that would have a measurable

increase in population over the No-Build Alternative. Frederick City would have a comparable increase with the No-Build and any of the build alternatives. The USACE representative asked about the location of the Priority Funding Areas (PFAs) in relation to the corridor. SHA responded that there are gaps in the corridor, which are shown in the DEIS.

The MDNR representative asked about how the boundary established by the expert panel compared to that established for the SCEA. SHA responded that the SCEA boundary is larger to the south but smaller to the north.

### June 16, 2004 Interagency Review Meeting

On June 16, 2004, the project team presented a status update to the agency representatives. The primary project activity was the development of an environmental reevaluation to document the ETL Option. The ETL Option was then summarized. June 2004 open houses were announced to the agencies. The open house meetings would educate the general public on the ETL option and will inform them of project advancements since the 2002 Public Hearings.

#### Issues Discussed

The USFWS representative asked what prevents people from switching lanes to avoid paying for using the toll lanes. SHA responded that the electronic tolls would be spaced along the length of the toll lanes but that enforcement issues would have to be addressed.

The USFWS representative asked about the effects of the Newcut Road interchange on development. The SHA project manager responded that the proposed development is not dependent upon the interchange and that it is part of the local master plan. SHA added that the interchange is located within a PFA. SHA will present the project information, again, at an Interagency Meeting after the open houses.

### August 18, 2004 Interagency Review Meeting

On August 18, 2004, the project team presented a status update to the agency representatives. The primary purpose of the presentation was to provide an overview of the open houses held in June for the project. The purpose of the open houses was to introduce the ETL

concept to the public and to update the public on the project. There was mixed support and opposition to the ETL concept.

**Issues Discussed**

The USFWS commented that introducing the ETL concept for so many projects at once may be problematic for the public. The SHA noted that it is necessary because of budget constraints and that it is better to let the public know well in advance. The SHA then noted that the public will still have a choice to use general purpose lanes.

The MDP representative noted that Alternative 5 has the maximum widening and is the only alternative that incorporates the ETLs. The SHA stated that ETLs could also be used with Alternative 3.

The SHA facilitator asked if agency representatives would be interested in presentations on managed lanes and continuous flow lanes. The agency representatives indicated that they would be interested.

**September 15, 2004 Interagency Review Meeting**

On September 15, 2004, Parsons Brinckerhoff gave a presentation of Maryland’s Statewide ETL initiative. The I-270 Corridor is an integral component of the initiative and represents one of the first potential projects to be implemented in Maryland.

The comments and questions following the presentation were not specific to the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study. Questions were primarily in regard to the definition of ETLs and how they differ from other managed lane facilities.

**August 16, 2006 Interagency Review Meeting**

On August 16, 2006, the project team presented a status update to the agency representatives. The primary purpose of the presentation was to provide an overview of project activities since the previous status update to the Interagency Review Group, held in August 2004. The project team provided background information regarding the 2002 Public Hearing and the minimization efforts that were presented at the 2004 ETL Public Workshops. The newer issues were as follows:

- The project team has been working to develop the detailed preliminary engineering, operations, traffic forecasting and analysis, and environmental impacts.
- Several community meetings and public presentations to local organizations have occurred since the June 2004 Workshop to describe the ETL concept.
- June 2005, FHWA and FTA agreed that the ETLs shall be documented in an Environmental Assessment document with a public meeting for review and comment.

**Coordination with Local Agencies & Elected Officials**

The I-270/US 15 project team has had extensive coordination with local agencies and provided several briefings to local agency representatives as well as elected officials. The following section provides summaries of the project team’s meetings with local agencies and elected officials including a breakout section at the end dealing with coordination involving the Crown Farm property. A list of correspondence between the project team and local agencies is provided in Appendix D.

- December 9, 2002 – Provided a project update to the Montgomery County Council on the next steps for the project.
- October 11, 2004 – Participated in a meeting with the City of Gaithersburg Mayor and Council to provide an update on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study schedule, the CCT and development coordination, and ETLs.
- November 16, 2004 – Participated in a Frederick County Board of Commissioners Work Session to brief the Board on the status of the project.
- December 6, 2004 – Participated in a City of Rockville Mayor and Council Work Session to brief the group on the status of the project.
- February 3, 2005 – Participated in a meeting with the City of Gaithersburg to discuss a proposed development adjacent to the CCT and to discuss the project needs and transit oriented development (TOD) potential at this location.

- January 11, 2005 – Met with the City of Gaithersburg and a representative from the Maryland Department of Business and Economic Development on to discuss proposed development plans submitted by MedImmune. A proposed parking structure would be directly impacted by two possible Kentlands alignments under study.
- January 13, 2005 – Provided a project briefing to Montgomery County Council members Michael Knapp and Nancy Floreen.
- March 8, 2005 – Met with representatives from USACE and the M-NCPPC to discuss the developments and issues regarding the proposed I-270/Newcut Road interchange and the suggested alternative ramp configurations to limit natural environmental impacts.
- April 27, 2005 – Met with City of Gaithersburg staff following the team meeting on April 12<sup>th</sup> to discuss developer submittals currently being considered by the city. Specifically, the city requested that MTA prepare comments for the Casey West parcel development plan at Metropolitan Grove. A formal letter was prepared by MTA, sent on April 14<sup>th</sup> and entered into the record by the city. Comments related to location of the platform and track alignment, parking needs, vehicle and bus access, and transit oriented development considerations.
- May 12, 2005 – Provided a telephone briefing on the transit project status to a representative from the office of Delegate Galen R. Clagett, District 3A, Frederick County. Referred the representative to SHA for an update on the highway project status.
- July 6, 2005 – Participated in a meeting with Montgomery County Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T) regarding their planning of the Observation Drive extension from its terminus north to beyond COMSAT. The CCT is proposed to travel down the median of this new roadway. MTA will request that stormwater management (SWM) needs and the hiker/biker trail be incorporated into the roadway design. DPW&T is determining the official Master Plan alignment for the roadway and will compare it with the proposed CCT alignment. The CCT alignment can be

adjusted for minor differences assuming project criteria are maintained.

- July 11, 2005 – Participated in a City of Gaithersburg Mayor and Council Work Session where the proposed Casey West development at Metropolitan Grove was discussed.
- August 1, 2005 – Attended a City of Gaithersburg Mayor and Council meeting where the Schematic Development Plan for Casey West was approved.
- October 20, 2005 – Met with M-NCPPC staff to discuss right-of-way concerns regarding a proposed development adjacent to the transitway. The New Covenant Fellowship Church, along Waring Station Road just north of Seneca Creek State Park, is proposing to construct a senior housing facility adjacent to its existing church. Additional right-of-way for the transitway and I-270 widening is needed from the property. Also, construction of the transitway could impact an existing parking lot and SWM pond. Following the meeting, MTA sent a letter to M-NCPPC that listed the project needs.
- October 20, 2005 – Attended a briefing before the Maryland State House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Transportation and Environment, where Secretary Flanagan testified on matters relating to transit funding and planning projects in the Washington, DC region, including the CCT.
- November 28, 2005 – Organized and conducted a meeting with representatives from M-NCPPC, the Cities of Rockville and Gaithersburg, and Montgomery County to present project progress on topics including National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentations, project schedule, right-of-way research, operations and maintenance (O&M) facilities, hiker/biker trail study, and stormwater management. The meeting objective was primarily to discuss the local jurisdictions efforts in preserving the project’s right-of-way needs.
- November 28, 2005 – Met with Montgomery County DPW&T staff and others to discuss Watkins Mill Road Extended. The CCT is proposed to cross under this new roadway. MTA is studying how the proposed CCT underpass can be built under proposed Watkins Mill Road and adjacent to the

proposed Watkins Mill Road bridge over CSX. If Watkins Mill Road and the bridge over CSX are built and opened to traffic prior to the CCT underpass being completed, the CCT underpass would disrupt Watkins Mill Road traffic. This would substantially increase the CCT project costs. The results of the study will be forwarded to the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) for review. The construction and maintenance of traffic costs could possibly be reduced if the CCT underpass could be constructed at the same time as Watkins Mill Road and the bridge over CSX. It was anticipated that MDOT will need to negotiate with the developer on terms to share the CCT capital costs.

- December 20, 2005 – Met with Montgomery County DPW&T to discuss the potential conflict with the county’s proposed police impound lot facility improvements and the CCT’s consideration of the site for its O&M facility. The county has completed plans and is nearly ready to begin construction. MTA proposed a possible relocation of their facility, prior to building the facility, to a site closer to I-270. The county was reluctant to accept this idea and is expected to proceed with its planned improvements at the current site. The CCT will either have to find another site for its O&M facility or pay for the relocation of the police facility. MTA will evaluate this to assess the additional cost of relocating them, how it would affect the project’s cost effectiveness, and how it would affect the implementation of the CCT.
- January 6, 2006 – Provided a project briefing for the CCT (along with Red Line and Bi-County) to Jonathan Martin at the Department of Legislative Services. Of the three projects, Mr. Martin was least concerned about the CCT and indicated that he knew little about the project.
- January 11, 2006 – Met with the City of Rockville and a developer to discuss the developer’s plans for a property adjacent to the transitway. The group discussed what the CCT would look like in this area (structures, grading, etc.) and how the developer could modify his plans to improve consistency with the project. The first phase of construction

will have little impact on the project. The second phase, likely to be approved in summer 2006, will have longer frontage on the CCT and will need to reconsider its open space requirement, as the CCT will impact it.

- January 12, 2006 – Provided a project briefing to the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce – Transportation and Land Use Committee on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study.
- January 26, 2006 – Provided a project briefing to the Montgomery County Council Transportation and Environment Committee on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study.
- March 7, 2006 – Conducted a Local Jurisdiction meeting with the City of Rockville, the City of Gaithersburg, M-NCPPC, and Montgomery County DPW&T to review the project team’s finding on the hiker/biker trail study and to ask for input on alignment options. MTA expressed its concerns regarding project funding and if the trail is considered a project cost, it could affect the project’s cost effectiveness. The group agreed to identify ways to control project costs. As such, several ideas were discussed to reduce the construction cost and utilize existing trails/roadways where possible.
- March 20, 2006 – Conducted a Local Jurisdiction meeting with the City of Rockville, the City of Gaithersburg, M-NCPPC, and Montgomery County DPW&T to review the project team’s finding on the identification of suitable O&M facility needs for both bus rapid transit (BRT) and light rail transit (LRT). MTA identified which sites shown in the 2002 DEIS are no longer under consideration due to development that occurred or engineering issues and presented all of the sites still under consideration including several new sites identified for a BRT facility. One new site off Gude Drive near the City of Rockville was deemed viable by both the city and M-NCPPC as it is in an industrial area. Another site on Crabbs Branch Way is also being considered by SHA and the Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA) for a CCT maintenance yard.



- April 26, 2006 – Presented project status to the North Bethesda Transportation Management District (TMD) Advisory Committee.
- June 1, 2006 – Met with M-NCPPC and a developer to discuss a development plan for the DANAC property on Decoverly Drive. Typical sections were presented that show a minor impact on a proposed structure. MTA recommended that the developer slightly shift the structure (approximately two feet) to keep it out of the required setback restrictions imposed by Montgomery County. In addition, the group discussed the proposed driveway entrance from Decoverly Drive across the transitway. MTA concluded that the entrance could be signal controlled without significant problem. MTA has asked the developer to submit a letter acknowledging the frequency of transit operations adjacent to the proposed building and expressing support, and possible funding, for the controlled crossing of the driveway entrance.
- June 21, 2006 – Presented project status to the Fort Detrick Alliance, focusing on potential improvements to the interchanges and intersections along US 15.
- August 23, 2006 – Provided a project briefing to the City of Frederick Mayor and Aldermen.
- February 2, 2007 – Joined the MDOT Secretary in a meeting with the Montgomery County delegation in Annapolis. Presented the status of

the CCT and pointed out that the project schedule could be delayed by about twelve months due to problems with the travel demand forecasting efforts. Questions/comments from the delegation related to 1) create a project web site as a way to provide more project information to the public and 2) better explain tolling and how the private sector would recoup its investment on the highway and transit components. Mike Knapp, Montgomery County Councilman, requested that the P3 proposals be provided to him when possible.

- March 27, 2007 – Participated in a meeting at the Secretary’s office with representatives from the city of Gaithersburg including Mayor Sidney Katz. The city is planning to study possible improvements to the Kentlands Boulevard Commercial District and asked the Secretary if he would reconsider studying a possible realignment of the CCT to better serve the Kentlands community. The city had eliminated two of the four previous realignment options. MTA informed them of the issues related to studying alternate alignments, possible schedule implications and additional evaluations that would be needed. The meeting attendees agreed that the city would present the idea to the community while performing its commercial area redevelopment. If the idea receives full support from the community, MDOT and MTA would reconsider including the realignment as an option in later stages of the study.
- May 24, 2007 – Provided a project briefing to the City of Frederick Mayor and Frederick County Commissioners at the Frederick County Commissioners’ meeting with the municipalities.
- June 12, 2007 – Met with M-NCPPC to discuss the proposed Century XXI development on Century Boulevard. It was proposed that the Montgomery County standard typical section be changed to improve urban design aspects envisioned for the roadway. Montgomery County DPW&T and MTA indicated a strong reluctance to allow any reductions in the roadway width.
- June 16, 2007 – Attended the Four-State Transportation Summit hosted by Frederick County. Henry Kay, MTA, presented information on the CCT and current MTA operations within the county.

- July 12, 2007 – Conducted a project briefing to the Montgomery County Council Transportation and Environment Committee.
- September 12, 2007 – Participated in a meeting with M-NCPPC to discuss growth possibilities for the Germantown area. MTA described how proposed changes in the zoning would take a long time (2+ years) before being recognized by the regional model and transit ridership forecasts.
- December 12, 2007 – A briefing was held with the Clarksburg Chamber of Commerce on the CCT alignment. SHA provided costs and project schedule along with a discussion of the extension of Observation Drive to Stringtown Road. The five to six attendees expressed a desire and urgency to get the CCT built and felt that it would help to lower traffic volumes on locally congested roadways.
- September 24, 2008 – Project team representatives presented a detailed briefing of the Corridor Cities Transitway to the invited elected officials and the general public at a meeting hosted by the City of Gaithersburg and the Gaithersburg-Germantown Chamber of Commerce. The presentation included a project overview; description of both transit and highway alternatives from the DEIS and the AA/EA; and a summary of preliminary ridership results, capital costs and operating and maintenance costs. Discussions focused partly on the proposed construction schedule and the limited funding for the project.
- December 18, 2008 – SHA presented a project update to the Frederick County Municipalities including the Frederick County Board of Commissioners and the City of Frederick Mayor and Board of Aldermen. Approximately 30 people were in attendance and the presentation was broadcasted live on the Frederick County Government Cable TV channel. In addition, the presentation was recorded for internet access and podcast playback from the County’s website. The project team provided a detailed update on the highway and transit alternatives, the preliminary impacts, construction costs, project milestones and decisions to be completed in the next few months. It was mentioned the project will be holding a set of

public hearings on the AA/EA document in the near future and everyone was encouraged to watch for the meeting announcements soon. Several questions were responded to including clarification of various portions of the alternatives descriptions and the ETL operations. The project team responded to these questions and clarified other points from the presentation.

- January 21, 2009 – Project team representatives presented a detailed briefing of the Corridor Cities Transitway to the Montgomery County delegation and other interested elected officials in Annapolis. The presentation included a project overview; description of both transit and highway alternatives from the DEIS and the AA/EA; and a summary of preliminary ridership results, capital costs and operating and maintenance costs. One attendee recommended that typical sections for various scenarios be prepared to help visualize the transit alternatives.

#### *Crown Farm Development and Annexation Coordination*

- April 27, 2005 – Met with the City of Gaithersburg to discuss the potential sale and development of the Crown Farm near Shady Grove Road and I-270. The CCT alignment currently bisects this undeveloped property. M-NCPPC is developing concept plans to lay out the property into an efficient street network and has asked MTA to consider realigning the CCT to better follow the layout.
- September 24, 2005 – Participated in a Charrette Work Session on Transportation and Transit for the Crown Farm Property. Although the Maryland Historical Trust lists Crown Farm as a National Register Eligible property, a private developer proposes to purchase the property. The proposed CCT alignment would impact Crown Farm.
- February 6, 2006 – MTA representative attended the Crown Farm Public Hearing at the City of Gaithersburg Mayor and Council Meeting. Provided a short testimony on the issues regarding the proposed annexation of the property and CCT realignment.

- March 13, 2006 – Participated in a City of Gaithersburg Mayor/Council/Planning Commission Work Session where the Crown Farm development was discussed. MTA testified and laid out its position on items related to the proposed realignment of the CCT.
- March 16, 2006 – MTA representatives attended the Montgomery County Planning Board Meeting where the proposed Crown Farm annexation was introduced.
- April 3, 2006 – Attended a Montgomery County Council Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee Meeting where the Crown Farm annexation request was discussed. MTA testified and presented the issues related to the proposed CCT realignment.
- April 3, 2006 – Participated in a City of Gaithersburg Mayor and Council Meeting where MTA was invited to present its concerns regarding the proposed realignment of the CCT.
- April 18, 2006 – Attended the Montgomery County Council Meeting where the proposed Crown Farm annexation was introduced.
- April 25, 2006 – Attended the Montgomery County Council Meeting where the proposed Crown Farm annexation was debated and approved by a 7-2 vote.
- July 17, 2006 – Attended the City of Gaithersburg Mayor and Council Meeting where the resolution to annex the Crown Farm was officially introduced.
- August 7, 2006 – Attended the City of Gaithersburg Mayor and Council Meeting where the annexation and zoning change for Crown Farm was unanimously approved.

#### **Focus Group Meetings**

An I-270/US 15 Focus Group, composed of local residents, community leaders, and business owners, met on March 7, 2002. The Focus Group is intended to allow local stakeholders to assist in developing the improvements in the corridor. The Focus Group met to discuss the proposed highway and transit alternatives, preliminary impacts and costs, schedule issues, the CCT, and post location/design public hearing decisions. In attendance were representatives of the Kentlands

Citizens Assembly, the Urbana Civic Association, the Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board, the Clarksburg Civic Association, and the Action Committee for Transit along with members of the M-NCPPC, the Transportation Services Advisory Council, Montgomery County DPW&T, and the Upcounty Regional Services Center.

