

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Subject:** Item 7 Clarksburg to Montgomery Village Transportation Study - Scope of Work  
**Date:** Monday, March 16, 2026 2:08:10 PM  
**Attachments:** [Clarksburg to Montgomery Village Study.docx](#)

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Attached is written testimony for the March 19 Planning Board agenda Item 7 from John Parrish.

March 19, 2026

RE: Item 7

Clarksburg to Montgomery Village Transportation Study – Proposed Scope of Work

To: Montgomery County Planning Board

Dear Board members,

I am writing to urge you to focus the scope of work on transit-oriented solutions and intersection improvements and not focus on building new roads. Traffic congestion in the Up-County I-270 and MD 355 corridors is the result of too much housing growth and not enough transit incentives and transit opportunities for residents of these communities. Building new roads and interchanges will cause enormous negative environmental impacts and continue to encourage residents to drive. All of this is happening at a time when we are not meeting climate goals nor are we meeting County forest preservation goals and our water quality is in decline.


In my opinion it is extremely shortsighted to continue to foster the 1950's ideal of single-occupant vehicle transportation when our society is facing steep increases in the cost of gas and electricity as well as facing forecasted shortages in the supply of gas and electricity in the near future.

I, like you, were born into the carbon pulse age where we take for granted that we will always have a constant supply of cheap gas and electricity to fuel our consumption. Please do not assume that we will continue to have abundant supplies of energy. We need to think and plan in a different way if we expect to lessen traffic congestion and have clean air and water and a livable climate. We need to model a different approach to mobility as our society faces the end of the carbon pulse.

I am a 67 year resident of Montgomery County that cares deeply about the quality of life for all of us. I want my tax dollars to support increased transit opportunities. How to expand the Ride-On bus network should be a primary focus of your study.

Thank you for considering my views.

John Parrish

  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

**From:** [Ann Smith](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Cc:** [Ann Smith](#)  
**Subject:** The March 19, 2026 MV Clarksburg Study  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 17, 2026 3:28:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [MV Clarksburg Study.docx](#)

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear MCP-Chair,

I missed the 12:00 timeline to testify for the March 19, 2026, planning board public discussion about the study between MV and Clarksburg. Below I have attached my statement for the public record and for the planners to consider.

I'm going to amuse you a little. Last Month I was driving on Watkins Mill Road, and there were around 10 kids doing "Hang Ten" with their toes at the curb, then a few hundred yards up were 15 more kids at another ride-on stop. At the intersection with Apple Ridge near the High school a Ride on bus went by and passed all the screaming kids at the intersection. There was not enough room on the bus to pick them up! This is what is really happening since we created free rides.

Ann Smith



Montgomery Village, Md. 20886

March 19, 2026

Comments on Study being done by the MCDOT planners for the area between Montgomery Village, Md. and Clarksburg, Md.

If we enhanced transit on existing County roads and created transit on the existing State Road (Route 270 Exits 10,11,12,13,14,15) then we can improve road capacity between Montgomery Village and Clarksburg. Let's expand circuit buses to travel from each high school to local colleges, and local shopping centers. We don't need to study circuitous routes on non-existing roads (Observation Drive) and non-existing transit systems (CCT). Instead, this study would use what infrastructure we have to improve ridership and reduce traffic jams. The shortest transit route between MV and Clarksburg is 270.

Existing streams and ecosystems will benefit from less disruption and better stormwater management engineering from future development. Reports from the state show that the Seneca Stream Valley has recently seen reduction in Phosphorus and Nitrogen (Pollutants to the bay) and the results for majority of stream sampling of invertebrate (IBI) status as fair.

Master Plans such as the MPOHT and Thrive, MV Master Plan and the Greater Clarksburg Master Plans should be followed by the developer starting at the initial drawing. Instead of multiple resolutions for change, I would like the planners to look at what currently exists in these plans and keep it. The vision of the greater Clarksburg area as a Transit hub should still exist, and Montgomery Village should expand its ride-on system with more centers like Lake Forest

**From:** [Tame Coalition](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Cc:** [TAME Coalition](#)  
**Subject:** Testimony for Clarksburg-Montgomery Village Transportation Study  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 9:08:35 AM  
**Attachments:** [M.Schoap\\_PB testimony\\_C"burg-MV Transportation Study\\_03192026\\_pdf.pdf](#)

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Chairman Harris,  
Attached is my testimony for Thursday, March 19th.

Respectfully,  
Margaret Schoap  
TAME Coalition

Clarksburg to Montgomery Village Transportation Study

Montgomery County Planning Board

Testimony

March 19, 2026

Good afternoon, I'm Margaret Schoap speaking for the TAME Coalition/Transit Alternatives to Midcounty Highway Extended.

Thank you for beginning the Clarksburg to Montgomery Village Transportation Study.

All Montgomery County Master Plans, as well as Council-voted legislation require transit to be prioritized first over building new highway construction.

This priority was written in the Clarksburg Master Plan (1994); Climate Action Plan (2021); and states in Thrive Montgomery 2050 that transit is the first priority and new highway construction is the last priority.

The upcoming Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan mentions BRT to be in operation only after a new major roadway, Observation Drive Extended, is completed, on or after 2035. That is not putting transit first, as the master plans and legislation require.

Despite the decades of policy mandates calling for Transit First, the Upcounty remains under-served, and needs your attention for more transit alternatives to be operating on existing roads.

We ask that the Clarksburg to Montgomery Village Transportation Study focus on these four (4) relevant transit alternatives for Upcounty residents:

1. Prioritize expanded and improved Ride On bus service on state highways in the upcounty, making transit alternatives its top priority over building new roads. One expansion can be extending Ride On Express Route 101 from Gaithersburg all the way to Clarksburg, staying on Rt. 355.
2. Allow two mid-day MARC trains that CSX has agreed to, but the state has not funded. Study how to accelerate full funding of MARC station parking

upgrades to support increased ridership at Germantown and Boyds; these are master-planned improvements waiting to be funded and built.

3. Combine transit choices with pedestrian and cyclist safety measures to provide mobility for young people, elders, and people with disabilities, many of whom lack a safe route from home to the bus stop.
4. The Clarksburg to Montgomery Village Transportation Study must note the three (3) recent decisions and positive trends affecting Upcounty transportation:
  1. The removal of M83 highway northern section from the Master Plan of Highways and Transitways, by Council vote on July 29, 2025, supported by the County Executive and the Planning Board.
  2. The decision to make Ride On buses fare-free for all riders, combined with a 20% ridership surge in 2024.
  3. The creation by DC, Maryland and Virginia in 2018, of a permanent dedicated capital fund for the WMATA system, which reported 10% ridership growth last year.

Respectfully Submitted,

Margaret Schoap, Organizer  
Coalition for Transit Alternatives to Midcounty Highway Extended/TAME



Transit Alternatives to Mid-County Highway Extended

[tamecoalition.org](http://tamecoalition.org)  
[tamecoalition@gmail.com](mailto:tamecoalition@gmail.com)

**From:** [Diane Cameron](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Cc:** [TAME Coalition](#)  
**Subject:** testimony for tomorrow's hearing on the Upcounty Transportation Study - draft Scope of Work  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 11:53:30 AM  
**Attachments:** [Diane Cameron testimony to Planning Board Upcounty Transportation Study draft Scope of Work 3.19.2026.pdf](#)

---

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Chair Harris,

Attached is my one-page written testimony for tomorrow's hearing on the Upcounty Transportation Study - draft Scope of Work.

Although I understand the normal rule is to submit written testimony by two days prior to a hearing, the draft was only published last Friday, less than a week ago.

In consideration of the unusually-short lead-time to prepare, I would greatly appreciate if you would accept this testimony for the record for tomorrow's hearing, and to put it on screen during my spoken testimony.

Thanks for considering my request.

Diane Cameron

Upcounty Transportation Study - Scope of Work  
 Planning Board hearing March 19, 2026 – Testimony of Diane Cameron

*This Upcounty Transportation Study must fully evaluate Transit First  
 - and compare it to the Highway Expansion program (March 13 Draft Scope of Work).*

**Travel Needs**

- I. Congestion Relief
- II. Mobility for All Residents

**Highway Expansion**

*Primary Objective: Expand highway capacity.*

- \* Highway expansions including new lanes, interchanges
- \* Intersection improvement projects
- \* Bus Rapid Transit on Route 355 (Central portion)

**Transit First**

*Primary Objective: Double Upcounty transit ridership by 2031.*

- \* Ride On Bus service expansion – Ride On Reimagined
- \* MARC train service expansion
- \* Pedestrian, cyclist and transit rider safety improvements

***Evaluate How Well Each Program Meets the Needs:***

- (1) Who - what portion and what specific sub-groups of the upcounty population – does the program serve?
- (2) How does the program make upcounty travel more convenient, faster, & safer for each sub-group?
- (3) When will the program’s elements (e.g. projects & system expansions) be completed and in-service?
- (4) How much does the program cost? Public and private costs; unit cost of dollars per passenger mile.
- (5) How & to what extent does it meet major master plan, racial equity/social justice, clean water, & climate commitments?