



15411 Bailey's Lane
Silver Spring, MD 20906
July 1, 2002

County Council
Attn: Steve Silverman, President
100 Maryland Ave
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear Council President Silverman and Councilmembers:

The Montgomery County Civic Federation (MCCF) testified last February that we and other citizens needed time and a hearing process to allow time to fully air the policy and project issues raised in the Planning Board and Task Force TPR reports. As you surely know, MCCF has been active at its monthly meetings and at a special all day meeting on June 15 discussing the issues and projects. MCCF membership has taken a number of positions but has had insufficient time to address everything. This letter provides you with positions we have taken so far.

The positions MCCF has taken so far largely focus on projects. While there has been discussion on many of the policy issues, including funding, we have not yet developed positions on them. We are planning a second Saturday membership meeting on September 14 for fuller discussion of the issues and to develop more positions.

Attached for your information is a summary of the policy presentations made at our Saturday June 15 forum. There are many important facts and some individual opinions expressed in this attachment. The September 14 membership meeting will focus on the following topics:

- Land Use Strategy and Visions for County Corridors such as MD 355
- Transportation Demand Management
- Growth Management
- Regionalism
- Transportation Infrastructure Funding

Table 1 is a list of the Federation's priorities of projects the membership does not oppose. We have not had sufficient time to address all the projects identified in the TPR reports. Projects of which we have not taken a position are included at the bottom of the list and are so identified. MCCF bylaws

require a 60% of those voting and a majority of those present must support a motion to take a position for or against a project. Unlike the Council's focus that is on state projects, the MCCF has focused on all projects, both those that would be done by the state and those that would be done by the County. The MCCF list includes more projects than can likely be funded within the next decade but we want to propose the long-term direction the county and state should take.

The Council needs to understand what supporting a project means. By supporting a project, we are indicating that the benefit the project would provide is worth the community and environmental impacts that we expect to accompany it. Projects that we oppose may provide a transportation benefit, but the adverse community, taxing, and/or environmental impacts are so great that they should not be built regardless of the alternatives or the design.

Unless explicitly specified otherwise in our statement of support, our support for a project does not signify our support for any build alternative that is considered during the project planning phase or even the details within a given alternative. Two recent examples make this point. We support widening MD198-MD28 but oppose alternatives being proposed by SHA that run counter to the master plans. Second, the civic community supported the Md198/US29 interchange, but about a year ago the community objected to one part of the selected alternative. Based upon a hearing before the Planning Board, SHA adjusted the design with the result that the community supported the selected alternative.

At the special June 15 membership meeting, members were asked to grade projects in order to establish priorities. The average grade is given in the table and projects have been prioritized by grade except that the approved projects has been placed ahead of the projects on which we have taken no position. In many cases, projects that were related to one another were grouped together and people were asked to vote for that group. The membership voted on a total of 42 project groups. The results of the voting are provided with each project. The results show the average score each group received. People voted for each group by rating it on a scale of 0 to 4, where voters were advised that 4 should signify top priority, 3 high priority, 2 approval if money is available, 1 "take it or leave it" and 0 severe opposition. Based upon the voting, the Council should proceed with projects in the following category order:

- Provide safety improvements on Muncaster Mill and Brookeville Bypass (priority 3)
- Improve local bus service (priority 3 and other votes in 2001 and 2002)
- Fund additional rail cars needed by Metro (priority 3)
- TPR recommendations concerning transportation for elderly and handicapped (vote 2/02)
- Build Interchanges (21 had priority 3 and 5 had priority 2) and intersection improvements already on Council Priority list (Priority 3)
- Widen road for projects under construction or ready to start construction (priority 3)
- New transitways: CCT, red line extension from Shady Grove and Georgia Ave Busway received priority 3; the Inner purple line (with conditions) including extension to White Oak and Tysons Corner received priority 2
- Widen I-270 and non-interstate roads (priority 2 and 1)

The above project categories provide a consistent theme:

- Safety is the highest priority
- Bus service is the favored mass transit

- Getting more benefit from the existing Metrorail system by adding cars is preferred to non-safety road improvements
- Improve local bus transit by providing feeder routes to homes and businesses from transfer nodes, and creating major routes between nodes.
- Adding high speed transitways with few stops is preferred adding freeways
- For roads, the priorities are getting more benefit from existing roads by improving intersections (a grade separated interchange where two 6 lane roads cross could add as much capacity as 5 in one direction to 3 lanes in the other) and improving existing signal controlled roads by adding lanes or making short extensions.

There are a small number of major projects that MCCF either opposes or could not find enough votes to support.

- Oppose ICC (position held for decades)
- Oppose Techway (2/02)
- Oppose widening Beltway for either HOV or general purpose lanes (6/02)
- Oppose Montrose Parkway (6/02)
- Support the Inner Purple line with the our conditions, otherwise oppose it (6/02)
- Insufficient support for any of four western connection options (6/02)
- Insufficient support for eastern connector (6/02)

MCCF urges the Council to move forward with the supported projects. We urge the Council to avoid the controversial projects, especially the five that MCCF opposes since (1) they delay other projects where there is general agreement and (2) there are insufficient funds within the foreseeable future to build those projects where agreement exists. For example, undertaking the ICC EIS could delay the widening of MD 28-MD198, which is one of several major east-west improvements required to address severe congestion. Every effort needs to be made to keep the project from being delayed.

As MCCF develops further positions, we will keep the Council informed. If you have questions on the projects, please contact Stan Schiff, Dan Wilhelm, Dean Ahmad or me.

Sincerely

Cary Lamari
MCCF President

Table 1. MCCF Transportation Priorities

MCCF Supports?	Grade	Group	Project	Improvement	Status	CLRP	Master Plan	Planning Board Recommended	Cost
Yes	3.5	1	Muncaster Mill Rd	Safety improvements MD 28 to MD 124	CTP, Engr complete FY03, Construction FY04				\$10M
Yes	3.5	2	Local Bus Transfer Centers	Assume 35 total, 5 per year for 7 years		N/A	N/A	X	\$80M
			Additional Ride On Buses	Assume 200 total, 20 per year for 10 years		N/A	N/A	X	\$50M
			Bus Support Facilities	Implement over 10 years		N/A	N/A	X	\$100M
Yes	3.4	3	Additional Metro rail cars				Not addressed	\$1540M for region after 2005	
Yes	3.3	4	Georgia @ Randolph	Build interchange	CTP Engr starts FY03, Alt C	X	X	X	\$46M
			Georgia Ave @ Norbeck	Build interchange	CTP, Engr FY03-05	X	X	X	\$48M
Yes	3.2	5	US 29 @ Fairland/Musgrove	Build interchange	CTP Engr thru FY04	X	X	X	\$59M
			US 29 @ Tech Road, Industrial Parkway	Build interchange	CTP Engr thru FY04		X	X	\$37M
			US 29 @ Greencastle	Build interchange	CTP Engr thru FY04		X	X	\$37M
			US 29 @ Stewart Lane	Build interchange	CTP Engr thru FY04		X	X	\$37M
Yes	3.2	6	Silver Spring Transit Center	Build Center	CTP/CIP - FY02 Start Utility work	X	X	X	\$40M
			US 29 @ Briggs Chaney	Build Interchange	CTP Construction begins 2003	X	X	X	\$35M
			US 29 @ Randolph/Cherry Hill	Build interchange	CPT- Construction started	X	X	X	\$52M
			US 29 @ MD198/Blackburn/Dustin	Build interchanges	CTP- Construction starts 2002	X	X	X	\$55M
			E-W Intersection Improvements	Widen various intersections	CTP - Depends upon intersection		Not addressed	Planning Board doesn't address	\$69M

			I-270 @ Clopper	Upgrade Interchange, add park& ride	CTP, Construction in FY02	X	X	X	\$9M
			I-270 @ Old Georgetown Rd/Rockledge	Build new interchange at Lockledge and rebuild intersection at Old Georgetown	CTP -Funded for Construction	X	X	X	\$27M
			I-270 Spur @ Fernwood (now called Westlake Terr) - Democracy	Rebuild Democracy interchange and build new interchange at Westlake Terr	CTP - Funded for Construction	X	X	X	\$20M
			MD 28 Darnestown Rd	Widen to 4 lanes, Key West to Riffleford	CTP - Under Construction		X	X	\$40M
			Shady Grove Rd	Widen to 6 lanes I-370 to Muncaster Mill	CIP	X	X	X	\$3M
			Germantown Rd	Extend Rd to Watkins Mill	CIP Construction starting FY02				\$3.8M
Yes	3.0	7	MCPS Metro Station	New proposal				X	\$40M
Yes	3.0	8	MD 355& Ridge	Build interchange			X	X	\$66M
			MD 355 & Gude	Build interchange			X	X	\$66M
			MD 355 & Montgomery Village	Build interchange			X	X	\$66M
Yes	2.9	9	Randolph @ Viers Mill	Build interchange				X	\$29M
			Randolph @ Connecticut	Build interchange				X	\$29M
			Randolph @ New Hampshire	Build interchange				X	\$29M
Yes	2.9	10	Connecticut at Plyers Mill	Intersection Improvement				X	\$5M
			Connecticut at University	Intersection Improvement				X	\$5M
			Georgia Ave	Widen to 6 lanes MD28 to MD 108			X	X	\$59M
			Layhill Rd	Widen to 4 lanes Park Vista to Norwood			X	X	\$24M
			Summit at Knowles	Intersection Improvement				X	\$5M
Yes	2.8	11	MD 355 @ Middle Ln, MD 355 @ MD 28, & MD 355 @ MD 586	Build interchange	CTP, Planning Complete FY02, Not funded for Engr		X	X	\$200M
Yes	2.8	12	Brookeville Bypass (Georgia Ave)	Build Road	CTP, Planning Complete FY02, Not funded for Engr		X	X	\$33M

Yes	2.8	13	I-270/Watkins Mill Road Extended	Build interchange	CTP, Planning Complete FY02, Not funded for Engr	X	X	X	\$100
Yes ¹	2.7	14	Corridor Cities Transitway	Shady Grove to Germantown	In Planning Stage		X	X	\$700M
Yes	2.7	15	Georgia Ave Busway	Glenmont to Olney	Not Funded		X	X	\$69M
Yes ²	2.5	16	Inner Purple Line, conditional upon stations at Piney Branch/Flower and Piney Branch/University	Silver Spring to New Carrollton	In Planning Stage			X	\$934M. SS to College Park (\$476M)
Yes	2.4	17	Norbeck Road & MD 198	Widen to 4 lanes Georgia Ave to US29	CTP, Planning thru FY04		X	X	\$113M
Yes ²	2.4	18	Inner Purple, conditional upon underground and no Chevy Chase Lake Station	Bethesda to Silver Spring	Funded for EIS	X	X		\$256M
Yes	2.3	19	Woodfield Road	Widen Road Midcounty Highway to Warfield Rd & extend to Ridge	CTP Engr starts FY03, CIP for extension	X	X	X	\$170M (CIP \$8.3M)
Yes	2.3	20	River Rd	Widen Beltway to DC line			X	X	\$81M
Yes	2.3	21	I-270 @ Newcut extended	Build interchange			X	X	\$41M
			Key West @ Great Seneca	Build interchange			X	X	\$66M
			Ridge @ Observation	Build interchange			X	X	\$29M
			Sam Ekg Hwy @ Great Seneca	Build interchange			X	X	\$66M
			Shady Grove at Darnestown & Wooton Pkwy	Build interchange			x	x	\$66M
Yes	2.3	22	Citadel Rd Extension (Rockville)	Extend Rd	CIP for Planning in FY07		X	X	\$1.3M
			Chapman Extended	Extension		X	X	X	\$63M
			Nebel St	New Road Randolph to Chapman		X	X	X	\$10M
			Rockville Pike at Mannelli	Intersection Improvement			X	X	\$5M
Yes	2.2	23	Inner Purple Line Spur	Langley Park to White Oak	Not Funded			X	\$198M

¹ Although it is not a condition of support for the Corridor Cities Transitway, note that the federation voted to support a terminus located north of Route 121 with easy access to Route 355 and I-270 (11/01).

² If the conditions for support of the Inner Purple Line are not met, the Federation explicitly opposes the Inner Purple Line.

Yes	2.2	24	A-287	New Road from FDA to Powder Mill Rd	FDA to Study		X	X	\$28M
			Briggs Chaney	Widening to 4 lanes Castle Blvd to County Line	2 lane improvement CIP	X	X	X	\$15M
			Fairland Road	Widen 4 lanes US 29 to Randolph	2 lane improvement CIP		X	X (Has US29 to Paint Branch)	\$6M
			Greencastle	Widen to 4 lanes US 29 to County Line	2 lane improvement CIP		X	X	\$20M
Yes	2.2	25	Ridge Rd	MD 355 to MD 108 in Damascus			Recommends MD 355 to Skylark @ \$33M	\$106M	
Yes	2.1	26	Darnestown Rd	Widen to 4 lanes Key West to Riffle Ford			X	X	\$40M
Yes	2.0	27	Clopper Road	I-270 to Seneca Park	Funded for Design				Note 1
Yes	1.9	28	Great Seneca	Widen to 6 lanes Darnestown Rd to Middlebrook		X	X	X	\$18M
Yes	1.9	29	Muddy Branch	Widen 6 lanes West Diamond to Darnestown			X	X	\$60M
Yes	1.7	30	I-270 West Spur	Add one lane in northern direction				Further Study Required on both spurs in both directions @ \$251M	\$68M
			I-270	Add 2 HOV lanes MD 124 to MD121			X	X	\$420M
			I-270	Add 2 HOV lanes MD 121 to I-70			X	X	\$735M
No Position	2.6	31	Red Line extension	Shady Grove to Metropolitan Grove				No	\$924M
No Position ³	2.2	32	MD 355 & Nicholson	Build interchange			X	X	\$66M
No Position	2.1	33	Midcounty Highway from	MD124 to MD 27			X		\$207M
No position	2.0	34	Gude Dr	Extend Shady Grove to Key West			X	X	\$10M
			Hyattston Bypass	2 lanes			X	X	\$5M
			Longdraft Rd	Widen to 4 lanes MD 124 to MD 355			X	X	\$20M
			MD 118	Widen to 6 lanes & extend I-270 to Watkins Mill		X	X	X	\$6M

			MD 118	Widen to 6 lanes Clopper to Seneca Creek			X	X	\$78M
			MD 121	Widen Stringtown to Newcut Rd Ext			X	X	\$21M
			MD 355	Widen to 4 lanes Brink Rd to Midcounty			X	X	\$40M
			MD108	Widen to 4 lanes Laytonsville Town Line to Onley Mill Rd			X	X	\$55M
			Midcounty Hwy	New Road Stringtown to MD 355		X	X	X	\$14M
			Middlebrook	Widen to 6 lanes MD 118 to Midcounty		X	X	X	\$12M
			Newcut Rd	Widen extend MD 121 to MD 27			X	X	\$63M
			Shady Grove	Widen to 6 lanes Briardale to MD 115		X	X	X	\$5M
			Snouffer School Rd	Widen to 4 lanes Goshen to Woodfield		X	X	X	\$22M
			Stingtown Rd	Widen to 4 lanes I-270 to Midcounty Hwy		X	X	X	\$20M
			Watkins Mills Rd	Extend MD 355 to Clopper		X	X	X	\$34M
No Position ³	1.9	35	MD 355 @ Cedar Lane	Build interchange				X	\$66M
No Position	1.8	36	Extend Inner Purple Line to Tyson's Corner						\$963M
No Position	1.6	37	Eastern Connector	New 6 lanes US29 to US1 on ICC ROW				X	\$116M
No Position	1.5	38	Midcounty & Muncaster Mill	New 4 lanes Shady Grove to Muncaster Mill; Widen Muncaster Mill to MD 28				Recommends study of two different configurations	\$34M +~\$33M
No Position	1.5	39	River Road \$42M	Beltway to Falls				No	\$42M
No Position	1.5	40	Clopper	Widen to 6 lanes MD 121 to MD 124				No	\$190M
No Position	1.0	41	Outer Purple Line						\$4.2B
No Position	0.9	42	Georgia Ave	widening MD 28 to Howard Co)			X	No	\$304M

3. There was confusion at the meeting about the position of the neighboring citizens associations. Additional votes are planned for the fall.

ATTACHMENT

SUMMARY OF CIVIC FEDERATION FORUM

Cary Lamari, Civic Federation President, in his opening remarks stressed the attention transportation problems are now getting in the County. Four years ago, education issues dominated the public agenda. Now the focus is being expanded to include transportation. In a sense, this is not surprising since all of us are stuck in traffic while 25% of our households have children in school.

In organizing this Forum, the Civic Federation's overarching goal was to ensure that its members and the public at large were fully aware of the breadth and complexity of the issues raised in the Transportation Policy reports. Until now too much of the debate and press coverage has focused almost exclusively on a few major controversial road and transit projects. As Lamari stated, "our objective is to develop a balance strategic plan for addressing congestion. To satisfy this objective, the discussion needed to be broadened.

In testifying at the public hearing on the TPR reports, the Civic Federation made clear our reservations about the Planning Board's report because of its almost total neglect of critical policy issues. We would have preferred to organize this forum to concentrate on those issues. Regrettably, the Council's decision to address the transportation facilities this summer before getting to the broader policy issues obliged us to frame our forum agenda so that the product of our discussions could be fed into the council's deliberations on projects.

The problem included four speakers that addresses policy issues -- Council President Steve Silverman, former Task Force co-Chairman Stan Schiff, Marsha Kaiser of the Maryland Dept of Transportation, and Edgar Gonzalez of the county Department of Public Works and Transportation..

COUNCIL PRESIDENT SILVERMAN

The council President commented that while Montgomery County is generating a large proportion of new jobs in Maryland, the surrounding jurisdictions are putting up new homes at a very rapid pace. "The explosion in job growth and the attractiveness and competitiveness of housing in neighboring jurisdictions has induced many of those who find employment here to settle elsewhere and become commuters." This has had an appreciable effect on traffic congestion. This situation, in his view, will not change.

Silverman maintained that a focus on "over development" would not solve traffic problems, arguing that neighborhoods are changing as older residents move out and are replaced by younger families with more children, which is the root cause of overcrowding in schools. Concentrating attention on land use will not help. He also cautioned against down zoning in some areas and shifting higher densities to transit centers.

Among the other salient points President Silverman made were these:

- Single occupancy driving is a critical problem. To make serious inroads into the congestion problem, we are going to have to change mind sets and behavior patterns.

- A significant contributing factor to the problems on MD 355 is the independent land use powers of Rockville and Gaithersburg. The County should pool resources with the two communities for transit facilities;
- Many of the transportation projects will take years to build. We need to see what we can do in the next 10 years;
- We should be more strategic in our thinking about buses;
- He stressed importance of expanding the Fair Share program and putting more money into it;
- Access to Metro is of major importance. Need to look at expanding shuttle links to transit centers.

STAN SCHIFF, CIVIC FEDERATION

Mr. Schiff emphasized the fact that even after investing \$8-9 billion in road and/or transit facilities over the next 50 years, congestion would be worse than today. This fact, coupled with enormous gap between funds likely to be available and that which would be needed, plus lengthy time required to complete major projects, all strongly argue for considering other measures.

Mr. Schiff underlined the crucial influence job growth has on county's traffic conditions. Due to lack of desirable housing in county, many new employees become commuters, swelling traffic on roads. Two major concomitants of rapid rise in jobs are vast increase in population and in car population (roughly 10,000 cars a year over period of 20 years).

He outlined the kind of other policy measures favored by some in the Civic Fed that will be discussed more in the fall:

- Create a new kind of regional organization with growth management powers, since forces within region are too powerful to be effectively managed on county basis;
- Create a land use strategy that includes as one of its basic aims a better balance in the distribution of jobs and housing between the I-270 corridor and the eastern section of the county as a means of reducing the flow of east-west commuter traffic. Another aim is to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the transit system through higher density, more compact development with easy access to transit centers.
- Assign a high priority to developing a new vision for the County's main street which is known by four names and a number: Wisconsin Ave., Rockville Pike, Hungerford Drive, Frederick Ave and MD355. This vision needs to include a high priority for the grade-separated intersections that the Task Force had recommended.
- Elaborate transportation system that responds to the needs of those with low incomes who don't own cars as well as the elderly and disabled. This transportation system would be achieved through a much expanded bus system and a 24/7 service being developed by the Aging and Disabled Services Agency for the elderly and handicapped.

THE MONEY PROBLEM

The subtitle of this section might be called "the unwelcome confronting of reality." It's a subject that has not received nearly as much attention as its crucial importance warrants.

The need for funds doesn't much matter whether the transportation emphasis is on roads or on transit. The price tag the Task Force put on its transit-oriented and road-oriented scenarios was about the same - \$8-9 billion. This range is far more than current investment level.

Council President Silverman drew attention to the fact that the county's transportation spending now was about the same as it had been 10 years ago and that we would have to recognize the need to invest more into transportation infrastructure. A significant increase in the gas tax would seem to make the most sense. The county would have to put pressure on the state to take such action. It's an item the next governor would have to think about although the real test would come in the legislature.

Two speakers dwelt at some length on funding, past, present and future prospects. The speakers were Marsha Kaiser of the State Department of Transportation and Edgar Gonzalez of the Department of Public Works and Transportation

State View. Governor Glendening and the state legislature had established a Commission on Transportation Investment in 1999 which concluded that by the year 2020 the state would have unmet capital investment needs of \$27 billion. This figure that the state DOT considers conservative does not include funds for system preservation. The system preservation needs will also be increasing.

The \$27 billion investment shortfall number is based on growth projections of: population, growth of 1 million; jobs growth of 700,000 and total vehicle miles traveled growth close to 30% (an increase of 20 billion miles). Traditional funding sources would be insufficient to meet the need identified by the commission. Their recommendations were:

- The state should aim for a funding level of \$1.5 billion in capital investment in FY 2004 (Kaiser noted the state had already reached that level this year.);
- The \$1.5B level should be increased by 4% annually after 2004 which over the 20 year period would fill 70% of the \$27 billion in unmet needs;
- A variety of revenue raising measures should be considered.

County View. Edgar Gonzalez underscored the dramatic decline in spending on transportation over roughly the past 15 years.

- Today's CIP spending level is 38% of what it was in the FY1990-95 CIP plan;
- In the 1988-93 period, transportation represented 35% of the total county Capital Investment Program while today it is down to 17%.
- At the same time the CIP spending has decreased. The county has grown. Since 1988 our population had increased from 586,000 to 873,000, employment had jumped from 319,000 to 569,000;

Spending will have to increase if we were to relieve congestion, and he listed a number of possible sources of funds that represented his personal views (and not necessarily those of the County

Executive). These included an increase in the state sales tax, a local sales tax, an increase in state gas tax, vehicle registration fees, titling fees and an increase in property taxes.

In preparation for the forum the Planning Department and DPWT had submitted a report to Council President Silverman identifying projected capital transportation spending levels for the period 2002-2025. The combined federal, state and local funds for the period ranged from a low of \$3.7 to a high of \$5.4 billion. Even the high figure is about \$3 billion less than the Task Force's two scenarios called for. The report also drew attention to the fact that they had not included funding projections for system preservation, "which will increase over time." They went on to add, "A more thorough analysis that focused on system preservation needs would likely have yielded different results. We would strongly recommend that the two agencies be requested to prepare such a report. The subject is too important to be overlooked.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

What emerges with abundant clarity from the foregoing is that an escape into transportation never-never land where the landscape is covered with glistening new rail lines or beckoning 8 lane uncongested highways is only achieved with the right kind of pill or drink which conjures up a fantasyland where money is not a factor. The Civic Federation must confess; it knows not which pill or drink will ensure the effortless trip to transportation nirvana.

The Task force modeled two scenarios -- one road-oriented, the other with an emphasis on roads. Both envisaged investment in infrastructure of \$8-9 billion. Yet neither succeeded in reducing congestion by 2050. The obvious question was "why?" The answer -- growth, specifically job growth. And that poses some agonizing choices- Do we essentially allow growth to create an unfettered demand for a continually expanding transportation system (whether road and/or transit) or do we consider a range of other measures, including growth management, as a means of containing the growth in demand not only for new facilities but also for the money needed to pay for them.

Money is obviously a critical factor, and underlying that statement is an unavoidable unpleasantness -- how much are we willing to tax ourselves (and let us not assume as some so facilely do that a toll is somehow less painful than a tax or other fee).

Thus the kind of transportation system we can have is a function of three things: our rate of job growth; our ambitions in terms of the extent of roads and transit we want; and our willingness to raise the resources to pay for them. Let us add a fourth for the sake of realism -- how much congestion are we willing to tolerate.

There is much in Mr. Silverman's presentation with which we agree, but there is one major area where some have decidedly a different view. He stated that with the continuing imbalance between job creation in the County and tempo of homebuilding in surrounding jurisdictions, the number of people commuting into the county would continue to increase, and implied we could not do anything about it. Not doing anything about it represents a conscious choice, but it is not the only one. We believe we should do something about it, but short of building a moat around the county, we can probably not do it alone. We have got to think regionally.

There is still much to debate and reflect on before critical decisions are made. The issues are

- Land Use Strategy and Visions for County Corridors such as MD 355
- Transportation Demand Management
- Growth Management
- Regionalism
- Transportation Infrastructure Funding

All should be considered in the formulation of a response to our transportation problem. We'll hope to get into all of them in some depth in our second forum on September 14.