



# CIVIC FEDERATION NEWS

Official Publication of the Montgomery County Civic Federation

Serving the Public Interest Since 1925

Peggy Dennis, Editor Phone: 301-983-9738 Email: hotyakker@aol.com

No meeting this month

montgomerycivic.org

December 2002

## ExComm Meeting Minutes

Nov. 21, 2002

—by Peggy Dennis, Acting Secretary

**MCCF 7:47** meeting called to order, Cary Lamari presiding, and we have a quorum. Announcements: Stan Schiff; neighborhood problem: the Navy, concerned with homeland security is building a fence that will have a impact on the neighborhood in the immediate area. The community wants Park and Planning to intervene and cause Navy to work with neighborhood. The community is also concerned with the general lack of consideration of both the Navy and NIH about development and its impact on local neighborhood. They feel there needs to be more cooperation.

Agenda adopted with addition of discussion of AGP, and procedures for new members at meetings.

Minutes, changes made by Stan Schiff and Mark Adelman. Page 4 at top recollects slightly differently: “no responses to a request for additional members”. Schiff: concern with respect to Planning Board, should read “TPR report”, not “the Civic Fed report”. Minutes accepted as modified.

Treasurer’s report: materials made available. Sandy Spring Bank will give us a checking account with .25% interest. With balance of about 6-7 thousand dollars, it may not be reasonable to keep two accounts. We are normally above the minimum amount of \$2,000 required for advantageous terms. Luella moved we transfer funds to an interest bearing account at Sandy Springs Bank. The Federation should support local businesses. Montgomery County Bank motion approved unanimously.

Stan Schiff: TPR Forum: we had previously agreed to hold one in the future. Suggestion: that we hold a couple of preliminary events before the forum to update us on

where we stand with the AGP –Karl Moritz – about one full hour. AGP should go to the Council next summer, we cannot postpone until late in the spring. (2) key people from VA who were involved in the Transportation Debate should be asked to give us a presentation Montgomery County Citizens should be educated by their experience. (3) The event would be a Forum (evening or Saturday) on Transportation Policy. Dan suggest having AGP in January so we can make our wishes known to the Planning Board, talk to Skinner about February program & move mono-beam Program to March. Luella questions wisdom of moving things that have already been scheduled. Mark Adelman wants education program in April. Is there a time factor? Topic: 3 student sectors competing for limited resources; Mark suggests three possible speakers. MCPS budget is presented in Dec. It’s being prepared now. Pat Cummings feels Stan Dorr should get a chance to speak in January She feels that Monobeam discussion is important. Do we really need a whole program for the VA perspective? Motion to extend time. Motion: Pat to keep Mono-beam in January, seconded, Stan thinks we should talk to Stan Dorr and see if he objects to postponing his program until Feb or March. Charlie suggests friendly amendment to allow Cary to talk with the principals about rescheduling mono-beam program. Vote: unanimous in favor. Cary spoke to Mr. Dorr and Mr. Dorr kindly agreed to the change from January to March.

### In This Issue ...

ExComm Meeting Minutes	Page 1
Study Circles	Page 3
Green Space	Page 5
Annual Holiday Reception	Page 5
Letter to the Editor	Page 6
From the President	Page 7
Directory of Officers & Comm. Chairs	Page 8

VA discussion could be done on Saturday. They will need more time than a one-hour program. Special program will be Scheduled for either Saturday or evening, to be scheduled by Stan S.

April meeting: Adelman wants education program as stated above. Motion: that the April delegates meeting have a three member panel on the three competing needs of students: (1) low achievers/tracking (2) Gifted and Talented (3) the average Student sometimes considered the forgotten student. Vote: unanimous in favor

Wilhelm: Maryland smart growth collaboration update: Lamari: When there are specifics, we should publish in newsletter. Wilhem says they will not be there until before Christmas. Dan will email specifics to Ex-Comm. as they arise.

The Annual Holiday reception is in conflict with new delegates to Annapolis going on bus tour around state. They will be unable to attend. Cary feels they will attend if they really want to, our Reception begins at 7:00 PM there is time to attend, but there may not be energy. Our Reception has been scheduled for months and cannot be changed. Response to Luella: people must pay in advance or at the door. Pritchard suggests we should split up list of member organizations and call them to get people out to the party.

President's report: much concern about ICC.

There was discussion on voting machine and election problems asserted by individuals to the Republican Central Committee and members of the Federation. Cary suggests a letter to Board Of Elections requesting explanation about problems experienced with the new machines. Seconded. In favor all but Sauer who abstained.

Tom DeGraba: Emergency Bill 33-02: PHED committee. Bill gives developers right to get density bonus by putting in MPDUs voluntarily. Will allow density bonus for small developments. Originally it was for developments of 50 or more, then 35 or more. There was much testimony by citizen groups to the Council and the PHED committee. Silverman introduced bill to benefit a few developers of which the Elm Street Developers were one. Howard Denis voted against. Silverman for, Mrs. Praisner abstained her position is: it's already going on in practice and that this would change how we do zoning in the County. Will come before the Council on November 26. Tom does not believe Silverman has six votes in favor at this time and

may push bill back as a non-emergency bill to be voted on by new Council. Question as to whether Council will be using proper process. Lamari wants a strongly worded letter to the County Council saying this is NOT a good idea! Motion made by Pritchard to that effect. Peggy seconded. Discussion: Tom should have authority to draft letter to Council and Journal (and other papers after the fact). No vote taken as we have already voted to oppose the bill.

Jay Keller did not make it tonight.

Procedures: Fifa- for new members. Want them to be able to introduce themselves and explain what issue(s) they are concerned with.

Community hero: January meeting - Pat/Pastor T.J. Baltimore of Norwood community Church for the Wellness Center a resource that has helped many residents of the Community. Cosponsored by Cary- Lois Sherman as a tireless activist working on behalf of the County even when she was sick. Agreed Lois for January and Pastor Baltimore for February to be worked on by pat Cummins and presented in January for award in February.

*Committee reports:*

Education Ademan: - study circles. Article in newsletter for info purposes.

Environmental – Pritchard: Deplores abandonment of many land acquisition programs and environmental programs and services. Gutting funding for Legacy Open Space program. Needs letter to that effect in newsletter. A symbolic gesture.

Land use & planning: Sierra Club holding conference on how to win land use fights. Civic Fed may want to co-host in the future The Federation Had Land Use participation Forums in the Past.

Legislation: Mrs. Praisner & Phil Andrews co-sponsoring a bill on campaign finance reform. Strombotne: committee on referendum reform was not successful in getting the number of signatures, but all signatures can be used in future and added to for the next general election.

Membership: Need membership drive in January. Wants to drop newsletters to organizations that do not re-up by the appropriate date.

---

Public Finance & Utilities: Chuck. Budget situation very serious. Both governor and assembly have been irresponsible in handling the budget. Need constructive suggestions on how to meet the budget constraints. Budget projected to only get worse. Many State and County Programs are in Jeopardy.

Respectfully submitted,  
Peggy Dennis  
Acting Secretary

## Study Circles: A Call for Dialogue and Involvement

—by Mark R. Adelman, Chair,  
MCCF Education Committee

The Montgomery County Public School (MCPS) system is gearing up another round of Study Circles (SCs). If you are concerned about our schools (and who isn't?), but don't know about the Study Circles Program, this article may be of interest to you. My thesis is that this is another opportunity to learn (and that is always fun) and an opportunity to help people deal with education-related problems (and that is a goal to which we all subscribe).

Study Circles are a type of community dialogue program promulgated by the Topsfield Foundation, of Pomfret, Connecticut. Study Circles can be (and have been) used in any setting to facilitate dialogue amongst different members of a community about any "issue" of concern to that community. In recent years many communities throughout the US have used Study Circles to focus on problems in local public schools. In the late fall of 2001, IMPACT Silver Spring and MCPS partnered in a pilot Study Circles Program to address the "achievement gap", with special focus on several down county school clusters. I participated in one of these Study Circles (there were about ten, with a total citizen participation of about 120), meeting at Crossway Community (Kensington/Wheaton), and focusing nominally on the Einstein Cluster.

I'd like to explain how a SC works, so you understand the strengths and weaknesses of this program, but before I do that, permit me to make a brief digression about an AYPF (American Youth Policy Forum) I attended on November 22. It focused on three school districts that are part of a network of schools pooling data and

information on what does and doesn't work with respect to "closing the achievement gap" while simultaneously "raising the achievement bar" for ALL students. Each district was represented by its Superintendent (all three were quite knowledgeable and impressive speakers) and all three conveyed some common points. One seems especially relevant here: all of them recognize that our current public school problems are multi-factorial, that there is no one quick fix, and that they have chosen to focus their energies and resources on what CAN be done within the school environment, *with the expectation that at least some of the other issues will be tackled by the broader community*. I view the SC program as part of that "other issues" window, as well as an opportunity to guide the MCPS professionals as to what they should focus on within the school environment.

So, briefly put, an SC is a small group (about ten) of interested members of the community who agree to come together, for FOUR sessions, each lasting about TWO hours. Each session is moderated by two facilitators who are present NOT to express specific points of view but rather to assure that all participants are heard, that no one participant controls the dialogue, and that the group more or less "covers" an agenda described in the "instruction" booklet, which is distributed to all participants prior to the first session. The goal of the SC is to allow people with common concerns, but different backgrounds and perspectives, to engage in frank discussion of the "problems", to develop a consensus, to agree on some goals, and to come up with some "plans for action". The first session ("Meet each other") allows each SC member to state who s/he is, why they are there, and what they see as the problem(s) with one or more of our schools. Dialogue is not prevented, but it is the job of the facilitators and the SC participants to assure that argumentative members do not prevent less forceful members from fully describing their point of view. The second session is devoted to discussion of issues raised in the first; the discussion can be heated and facilitators struggle to guide the participants along a fine line between open disagreement and outright haranguing as people with divergent views and backgrounds "wrestle" verbally. It is to the credit of the SC process that most participants report that, although this phase is stressful, it is also very worthwhile and points of consensus begin to emerge, as well as mutual respect. Session three seeks to build on points of agreement (found during session two) and use such points to "set goals", i.e. to define a picture of how the community (in this case the MCPS and its various stakeholders) should "look" when its various problems are resolved. In the fourth and final session, SC participants try to come up with one or more "plans

for action” - recommendations as to how the “goals” might be achieved.

Since the pilot group of SC’s ended late last year, the follow-up has been somewhat spotty: that is my appraisal and one that was shared by the some 20 people who gathered last week, at the invitation of John Landesman, to discuss our experiences and help in the planning of a new round of MCPS Study Circles. Mr. Landesman has been hired away from the Topsfield Foundation, to become the first Director of Study Circles for MCPS. His appointment is a joint one involving both MCPS and the Montgomery County Business Roundtable for Education (I’m not completely clear on the details) and he is working vigorously with IMPACT Silver Spring, NAACP, and a host of other civic groups to drum up enthusiasm for a new - and much larger - round of SCs - at least one for each of some 60 underachieving schools identified by MCPS. At that meeting last week, I found that almost all of us who had taken part in the first round of SCs identified similar pluses and minuses to the program. We felt that the meetings (and confrontations) with people of diverse backgrounds and perceptions had been valuable and had given us not only respect for one another but also appreciation for alternative perceptions of “the problems”. The very effort to identify elements of consensus had been illuminating and the fact that we had been able to agree upon a number of goals and plans for action was deeply pleasing and encouraging. But we all identified a fundamental disconnect between what WE thought MCPS intended to do and what MCPS thought we had committed to doing: WE had been under the impression that we were making recommendations to MCPS as to what they (the professionals) should do, whereas MCPS officials thought they were helping us identify plans of action that we intended to carry out primarily as a continuation of the SCs - with perhaps a little assistance from MCPS. Things got a little hazy over the last 8-10 months and in the discussion last week, but what became clear was that the only organized continuation of the SCs was a series of “action groups”, loosely organized under the title “School Circles”, which met sporadically and exchanged ideas via a LISTSERV. What I found very encouraging was how many of the “pioneer” SC participants, finding little support from MCPS, and recognizing that there was a mutual failure to communicate, had taken it upon ourselves to tackle “small projects”, most of which involved one-on-one help of students (and parents) who needed help navigating the maize of the education system in our county. And we all had had some successes; and we all were energized by those successes. Enough so that we came to Mr. Landesman’s meeting and responded quite

frankly to his request for feedback about our experiences - what was good and what was not so good.

A couple of us were sufficiently energized by our experiences and impressed by John Landesman that we attended a second SC discussion a few days after the first. This was a much larger group, including many MCPS staff, members of the Board of Education, representatives of the various groups “backing” the SC approach, and some additional potential volunteers. We discussed the good and the bad and then were asked to “commit” to help with a second, more extensive round of SCs - drawing on what had been learned from last year’s pilot program. I volunteered to serve on the steering committee that is being set up (to recruit participants and to identify and train facilitators) and to help make clearer the communication between those who join a Study Circle and the professionals of the MCPS system. I also hope to participate in another SC. We’ve already begun to define such things as the notion that sponsoring organizations need to prepare a list of resources so that SC “graduates” understand what others will/will not do with their recommended “action plans” and what support is available to help us do some of the things we CAN do “on our own”. Perhaps now the reason for my digression (above) about that AYPF meeting is more obvious. I am no longer so naive as to think that the SCs will identify problems and recommend solutions that “the system” will carry out. I accept the notion that some problems **can** and **should** be fixed by “the system”, but others can only really be fixed by the community. It was worthwhile spending those four evenings last fall “discussing” shared concerns about MCPS with strangers, some of whom became friends, but all of whom had valuable perspectives about what needs fixing. And it was valuable to experience both the frustration of not having the tools to fix **anything**, but then finding a way to help fix a few things. As we all know, the problems in our public schools did not happen overnight: the decline has occurred over decades and involved the mistakes of many. It will take us years to turn things around and some of our efforts will yield only small steps forward. But the need to fix things is so obvious to so many of us, and the pleasure of helping even one person is so real, that I feel we cannot reject even one opportunity out of hand.

So think about becoming involved in the next round of Study Circles. Contact me by Email ([adelman3@erols.com](mailto:adelman3@erols.com)) and I’ll let you know of the progress of the Steering Committee. Or contact John Landesman (301-517-5875; [John.Landesman@FC.MCPS.K12.MD.US](mailto:John.Landesman@FC.MCPS.K12.MD.US)). Or call the Study Circles Office of

---

the Montgomery County Business Roundtable for Education (301-279-3100). The problems with our public schools are **our** problems; some of them can only be solved by others, others can only be solved by us. I believe that the Study Circles approach is one means by which each of us who wants to, can be a part of **our** solution.

## Real Investment in Montgomery County

—by Charles Pritchard  
Chair, Environmental Committee

Following the election of Tom Erlich as the new governor of Maryland, he has met with outgoing Governor Parris Glendenning to consider and implement means for reducing the current deficit in the state treasury. In these difficult financial times, with the national, state and local governments struggling to come out of a recession, these talks must be viewed as ominous to various special interest groups, including the environmental movement.

There are already reports in the media that several land acquisition and preservation programs enacted in recent years, many on Glendenning's watch are scheduled for reduction or elimination under the new regime. These reductions will please those who have considered Glendenning's program for land acquisitions profligate and wasteful. A majority of the electorate appears to feel that state monies should be reserved for highway and transit projects that eclipse any expenditures contemplated by Glendenning. His program allotted relatively modest funds to protect our water and air quality, rare and endangered flora (trees and plants) or simply to provide enclaves of nature in the midst of what may become a concrete and asphalt jungle.

In our county and nation at large, there are great needs represented by interest groups. Education, health (including mental health) and public safety must all compete in a financially austere climate for funds. We do not envy our governor-elect in his difficult choices. There is, however, in his entourage an element of gloating that is distasteful. There should be no joy in the dumping of projects that have produced true treasures for the County.

The Montgomery County Civic Federation has long supported such programs as the County *Legacy Open*

*Space* Program and state-funded programs such as *Rural Legacy*, *Program Open Space*, *Green Print* and others. A current majority of the Federation believes that preservation and protection of the environment and remaining green space is a truly useful legacy for future County generations. Clean water at the turn of a wrist in our house taps is not an esoteric frill. One has only to look around the world to appreciate this boon. We deplore deep cuts in environmentally protective programs made out of long simmering revenge or a hope for short-term gains.

## December 8 Reception Guests and Awards

—by Charles Pritchard

Following the community parade honoring our Montgomery County Police Department, the Civic Federation will honor Police Chief Charles A. Moose and other organizations and persons involved in the October 2002 "Sniper Crisis" at our annual December Reception for Elected Officials on 8 December 2002.

Chief Moose led the *Montgomery County Sniper/Homicide Task Force* in the investigation and termination of the crisis, which set off one of the most intensive police investigations in the history of the Montgomery County Police Department. Also participating in the Task Force were the *Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)*, the *Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) Administration*, *Secret Service* and *Maryland State Police* as well as law enforcement agencies of many jurisdictions nationwide. We will also honor a largely unrecognized and deserving element of the Task Force, namely, the *Maryland Army National Guard*, which by agreement between with Task Force Director Moose and Lt. Gen. (M) James F. Fetterd, Adjutant General of the Maryland Army National Guard, deployed two Guard aviation units: the *Reconnaissance and Interdiction Detachment (RAID)* and elements of the *Aviation Support Facility*, from their home base at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, to the Norwood State Police heliport in Montgomery County.

Montgomery County lacks its own police helicopter unit, but can call for very limited support from the *Maryland State Police Helicopter Unit* stationed at Norbeck heliport. The state unit concentrates on medical evacuation and search and rescue missions but does not

provide routine proactive support of our own police department.

From the beginning of the Sniper Crisis, the Task Force and police emergency communications systems were flooded with sniper-related calls, including erroneous or bogus reports of a “white van,” stimulated by evidence that the snipers were highly mobile and firing from an auto-mobile in parked and/or concealed positions at apparently random victims. The serious wounding of a school child in Prince George’s County and a sniper threat against schools provoked an immediate requirement for rapid and wide spread aerial surveillance at the Task Force Command Center.

Luckily Chief Moose is himself is an officer in the District of Columbia *Air National Guard*, two of his police officers are rated helicopter pilots in the *Maryland Army National Guard* and the commanding officer of the *Guard Aviation Support Facility* at Aberdeen Proving Ground is a former Montgomery County police officer. These officers and representatives of the Maryland State Police decided that aerial coverage of the County could be best achieved by deploying the RAID unit with elements of the Aviation Support Facility to Montgomery County and to use two County police officers as observers and pilots.

National Guard RAID units are small (nine-member) helicopter units whose aircraft are equipped with sophisticated surveillance and observation means, including video up and down links, communications, forward looking infrared (FLIR) observation and powerful night searchlights. The RAID missions consist in counter drug and law enforcement support, and more recently, *Homeland Security*. They operate under *posse committatus* regulations, which allows US military units to carry out certain support functions but rules out such activities as arrests, searches or direct action against suspected criminals.

In addition to honoring the Montgomery County Police Department, the Federation will present awards to its two officers, who volunteered over and beyond their normal official duties to fly joint missions with the National Guard, supporting the Task Force and contributing to the successful termination of the crisis. We felt it equally important to recognize the role of the *Maryland Army National Guard* units who served in cooperation with our Police Department. We would like to commend the National Guard aircrews in person but due to the security reasons cited above, we have invited General Fretterd to

attend our December Reception personally or send a representative to receive awards for his two units.

The Montgomery County Civic Federation salutes all members of the Task Force and our Police Department for their diligence, cooperation and concentrated efforts to end one the most serious domestic violence events ever to trouble our County.

**[The Reception will be held at Antonia’s Trattoria, 11222 Grandview Ave. Wheaton MD, 7-9:30 PM on 8 December 2002. Reservations can be made sending a check to Fifa Northrup at 6920 Old Stage Drive Road, Rockville MD 20852 by 26 November. Cost \$25 per person; \$30 per couple. Further information can be obtained by calling Fifa at 301-984-9424].**

## Letter to the Editor

### On Wheaton Redevelopment

The presentation by principals of the Wheaton Redevelopment Office at the November meeting apparently impressed most of the MCCF membership. I found very little to applaud. As a member of the Wheaton Redevelopment Steering Committee (WRSC), I did not think it was appropriate for me to comment on what my colleagues have endorsed. These comments are, therefore, personal and do not necessarily represent positions of other members of the WRSC.

The presentation was missing maps showing the locations of the proposed new developments, almost all of which are housing. With three major state roads converging in the Wheaton Business District and a very busy Arcola Avenue a half-mile away, the impact of the congestion is more easily overlooked without street maps. There are approximately 1000 new housing units proposed at the different sites. For each proposed site the WRSC was informed that impact on traffic AND school congestion was insignificant. Perhaps, but when one adds the total to already congested roads and schools, how can anyone claim “insignificant impact?”

The Main Street program was a major attempt to getting residents to comment on what changes they want to see in Wheaton. Some wanted more upscale housing; some wanted more unique shops and others saw a future as an entertainment Mecca. There may be a long-range plan to bring all these things to fruition, but, at least so far, the negotiations have centered on getting opportunities for

developers to exploit the space available for highly profitable housing. One example is the commercial site of Wheaton Lumber. It is planned to have more than 40 townhouses built there rather than continue to use the site for a commercial use as currently zoned. The proposed townhouses will have a beautiful west view of the Wheaton water tanks. WRSC members were told that no attempt was made to seek a commercial entrepreneur because developers find commercial development less profitable than upscale housing.

Am I the only person against many of the proposed changes? Ask the citizens living near the Good Counsel site. This land is zoned R-90 with room for 60 homes. The site will be transformed to 220 townhouses. The residents nearby are strongly opposed to the change and plan to fight it at the Park and Planning Commission.

–*Bob Abrams*  
*District 4 Vice President*

## From the President

The Elections are over and the Electorate has spoken. Changes will occur and we need to be ready to deal with whatever happens. Unfortunately with change comes anxiety, and I have seen the beginning of that recently in the many E-mails sent to me. Transportation and increased, uncontrolled growth seem to dominate the concerns of many Civic activists. I know transportation is a great concern for many of you as it is for the Federation and we are still committed to completing our recommended transportation approach for Montgomery County. Soon we will be completing our report on transportation with the County Policy Elements chapter. County Policy is crucial to a Comprehensive approach in dealing with transportation Congestion.

The Montgomery County Council is also considering a new bill that may have a major effect on how we view our Neighborhoods and Master Plans. This Bill is known as 33-02. It effectively gives property owners the right to develop using an optional method that changes the setbacks and types of structures allowed in our neighborhoods. The Goal for this proposal is to create affordable housing options, a noble goal, however I believe that not enough thought is being given to the potential adverse effects of this proposal.

This bill could have the effect of allowing multifamily housing in the middle of neighborhoods that have been

and were planned as single-family detached housing and increasing the development yield of the property with its affordable housing bonus. However there is a monetary buyout to replace the additional housing stock so neighborhoods may not realize the benefit of increased affordable housing.

Individual property owners could never rely on the zoning ordinance in buying their homes to be assured the neighborhood homes would be consistent with each other.

I foresee many creative proposals being put on the table in the coming years that will increase development in Montgomery County in the name of Smart Growth. My problem with this concept is there appears to be a misconception to Smart Growth. Smart Growth was designed to place growth where infrastructure exists that could support it. Not to place Development in our urban Core regardless of the necessary infrastructure, there also must be a clear understanding that Urban Revitalization must not be confused with Smart Growth which is a Phenomena that seems to be occurring in our Urban commercial areas like Wheaton and Silver Spring. We must be sure to not create undesirable Neighborhoods where Schools are overcrowded, there are not enough Recreation and Health and safety services and Roads that are operating at levels of Gridlock in the Name of SMART GROWTH. It is our responsibility to be the watchdogs of our Government to make sure Montgomery County is a Quality community for many generations to enjoy.

I also would like to wish all of you peace, joy and happiness in this holiday season. I hope to see many of you at our holiday reception on December 8, 2002 from 7:00 to 9:30 p.m. at Antonia's Trattoria Italian Restaurant.

The Annual Reception is one of our long-established traditions. It allows us to meet and thank our elected officials for their commitment to public service, It is a Special Honor this Year to celebrate the Revitalization of Wheaton and all our Urban Centers This is one reason for choosing the Wheaton location.

We also feel it important after such a difficult time in our History to come together, Elected Officials and Citizens to thank Chief Moose and our Police Dept. for doing such a professional job in protecting our Community. Happy Holidays to you all and best wishes in the coming Year.

–*Cary Lamari*

*Delegates Meeting*

**There is no delegates meeting this month.**

*Holiday Reception*

**Sunday, December 8<sup>th</sup>-7: 00 to 9:30 PM**  
**Antonia's Trattoria Italian Restaurant**  
**11222 Grandview Avenue Wheaton MD.**  
**20902**

**AGENDA**

7:00 Call to order: meet, greet, eat, drink and be merry; see you there.

9:30 Adjourn to our Families.

The **Montgomery County Civic Federation**, a nonprofit, educational, and advocacy countywide group, was founded in 1925 to serve the public interest. The monthly Delegates Meeting is open to the public and it is held on the second Monday of each month (except for holidays, July, August and December) at 8:00 p.m. in the First Floor Auditorium, County Office Building, Rockville, MD.

The **Civic Federation News** is published monthly. It is mailed to Delegates; associate members; news media, and local, state, and federal officials. Permission is granted to reprint any article provided proper credit is given to the "*Civic Federation News* of the Montgomery County Civic Federation." Deadline for submissions for the next issue: 5 p.m. Saturday, Dec. 21. Attach submission to e-mail to: Hotyakker@aol.com file in fully justified 11-point Times Roman font (preferably as a Word document.) Send editorial content to Peggy Dennis, 1111 Fawsett Road, Potomac, MD 20854.

**Please send all address corrections to Steve Howie**, P.O.Box 325, Clarksburg, MD 20871, 301-972-2736, [stevehowie@aol.com](mailto:stevehowie@aol.com).

**Next Executive Committee Meeting**

Thursday, Dec. 19, 2002, 7:45 p.m.

**Red Brick Courthouse**

29 Courthouse Square, Rockville

(Note: there is parking lot in front of the courthouse.)

**Montgomery County Civic Federation**  
**Steve Howie, Database Manager**  
**P.O. Box 325**  
**Clarksburg, MD 20871**

*Address Service Requested*

**First Class Mail**