



**Howard County Citizens Association**

*Since 1961...*

*The Voice Of The People of Howard County*

**TESTIMONY: CB 47-2010  
Amended Adequate Public Facilities Act**

Presented to  
the Howard County Council  
July 19, 2010

**POSITION: OPPOSE**

HCCA recommends the following changes to the bill:

**1600 CLV.** Rockville Pike's CLV is 1550; do we want to have Rockville Pike in our Downtown? Instead, we suggest linking any additional CLV to specific levels of improvement in transit and bus service and otherwise leaving it at 1450 CLV, the current maximum.

Alternatively, the bill allows for a transition period (unspecified) which would rise above 1450 in increments of 50 up to no more than 1600. Why not increase to 1500 CLV in the bill, then have a comprehensive county traffic study when that level is reached at key intersections, to ascertain if more is tolerable and does not degrade the quality of life. If it is, then the APF can be amended again. Approving 1600 now is too big a jump at one time, with permanent consequences; buildings will not be razed when the CLV reaches 1600 if traffic has become unbearable. It will be too late and we will all have to live with it indefinitely. If getting in and out is unpleasant, it will deter businesses from locating Downtown; they will continue to go to Gateway instead because of traffic.

We understand part of the rationale for increasing CLV is to slow down traffic on Little Patuxent Parkway (LPP) to make Downtown a destination, not a pass through. However, the two critical intersections for ingress and egress from Route 29 are on LPP: LPP/Broken Land and LPP/Governor Warfield north. The only solution would be to have grade-separated intersections at those points, which would be incongruent juxtaposed with a slow-moving Downtown main street intended for relaxation. We cannot have it both ways.

A better solution is to retain 1450 CLV while improving LPP crosswalks, bike lanes, as well as providing a free shuttle.

**County 5-Year Studies.** We welcome comprehensive county studies that include CLV impact, interchanges, regional impacts, etc. This is excellent but should be tied to the number of residential starts and commercial developments. Five-years is arbitrary and has no meaning; there may be a burst of development when economic conditions are good or if opportunities occur, necessitating a study sooner than 5 years.

**Grade-Separated Intersections.** It appears development projects may go forward if a grade-separated intersection or improvements to arterials are needed, even though the developer is not obliged to provide these. We suggest importing the provision in CR 97 that makes clear that development cannot proceed unless a cost-sharing agreement is reached with the county and state, and any costs are in an approved capital budget. See CR 97, pp. 14-15.

**"Transportation" v. "Roads."** We oppose substituting "transportation" for "roads" because it causes confusion. "Transportation" includes cars, mass transit, buses, light rail, etc. In fact, the legislation deals with roads. There is no definition of "transportation" in the bill, and no chart of equivalencies to roads.

**Impact Area.** The bill exempts Downtown traffic studies from the requirement to include either a 1 and 1/2 mile area or two intersections not beyond a major arterial. Instead, in CR 97 Downtown traffic studies do not require study of roads outside the Downtown cordon line which excludes Route 29 and its interchanges. In fact, Route 29 and its interchanges are key to adequate ingress and egress to Downtown. The 1 and 1/2 mile area should be retained for Downtown or increased to ensure all development projects include the nearest interchange.

Respectfully submitted,

Bridget Mugane  
Board Member, delegated to testify

9250 Red Cart Ct.  
Columbia, Md. 21045  
301-596-4547  
fsatty@comcast.net