

White Flint Sector Plan Advisory Group

**Report from Meeting on
September 23, 2008**

Presented by Barnaby Zall
Sept. 29, 2008

Table of Contents

The Advisory Group	3
Caveats	5
The Goal	6
“An Innovative, Spectacular, Inviting, Green, Transit-oriented Urban Destination”		
The Vision	7
“A Green, Walkable, Fun and Friendly Place to Live, Work and Play”		
Specific Issues		
Mobility: Fix the Pike	8
Image and Identity	8
Walkability	8
Street-level Shopping	9
Sustainability and Environment	9
Incentives for Architectural Innovations and Excellence	9
Public Safety and Vibrant Streets	9
Entertainment, Dining, Arts and Culture	9
Underground Utilities	9
Schools	10
Parks	10
Community Facilities	10
Financing and Density	11

Districts	11
Phasing and Timing of Implementation	.						12
Design Guidelines	12
TMX Zone	12
Compatibility with Existing Communities	.						12
Rockville Pike							
Design of the New Pike	14
Functioning of the New Pike	14
Phasing of the Construction of the New Pike							15
Transportation							
Pedestrians	16
Bicycles	16
Metro	16
Bus Service	17
Shuttle Bus Service	17
Additional Road Network	17
Parking District	18
Marc Station	18
The Staff Draft Proposal	19
Appendix One: Author and Process	20

The Advisory Group

The White Flint Sector Plan Advisory Group was convened on November 6, 2006. <http://www.mc-mncppc.org/planning/community/whiteflint/background.shtm>. “The concepts and ideas produced by the groups paint a picture of a vibrant White Flint as a special place centered on the White Flint Metro. Groups envisioned a greener White Flint Station, friendly to pedestrians and bicyclists, with numerous choices of places for people to live, work, shop and dine. All of the plans and ideas that came from those groups are forming the framework for our development of the White Flint Sector Plan.”
Id.

Membership

The most current membership of the Advisory Group is available at: http://mcparkandplanning.org/planning/community/whiteflint/advisory_group.shtm (last updated: July 28, 2008).

Structure

In its earliest phases, the Advisory Group was divided into four geographically-based “neighborhood” discussion groups, which reviewed concerns centered on those areas. (The membership list linked above continues those geographic identifications.) Then these sub-groups joined the overall discussions and reported their concerns. As the process continued, the divisions were eliminated and the entire group discussed the Sector Plan as a whole. The Advisory Group functioned as an advisor to the Staff, providing comment and reactions to Staff proposals.

Meetings

The Advisory Group has held sixteen formal meetings, most at the Silver Spring headquarters offices of MNCPPC. The Advisory Group meetings have been open to the public and most have included opportunities for public comment. In addition, the formal meetings have been reported in the media. The materials and, in most cases, the reports and analyses produced in the Advisory Group meetings are available on-line. www.whiteflintplanning.org.

Members of the Advisory group have also held dozens of informal meetings; some of these meetings were attended only by business representatives, others only by community group representatives. During the most recent round of outside meetings, in September, members of the business group held four meetings with community group representatives and members.

Independent Research

In addition, members of the Advisory Group conducted outside research and analysis. One of the most significant was the hiring of an outside traffic and walkability consultant by a group of business members. The consultant, Gladding-Jackson of

Orlando, Florida, produced a traffic and transportation study recommending a method to address congestion on Rockville Pike. In September, community groups had a “balloon test” near Rockville Pike to determine the visual impact of proposed building heights.

The September 23, 2008, Meeting

The September 23 meeting was called on very short notice. On September 15, the Staff announced the meeting, saying “This meeting is to discuss how the Advisory Committee would like to present its comments and issues regarding the Sept 11, 2008 staff presentation to the Planning Board on the preliminary recommendations for the White Flint Sector Plan. The Planning Board Chairman suggested that the comments be separated into overall and specific issues.”

In response, the Advisory Group met as a separate entity on September 23, 2008. Staff provided only timing information and answers to questions; the Advisory Group prepared its own agenda and conducted its own meeting. Staff was provided with copies of the meeting agenda and questions for discussion.

The Advisory Group agenda included discussions of a Goal, a Vision for what White Flint would look like if the Goal was achieved, and the Elements necessary for achieving that Vision and Goal. In the September 23 meeting, however, and given the press of immediate deadlines, the “Elements” discussion evolved into the review of general and specific issues suggested by the Chairman. There was insufficient time during the September 23 meeting to fully discuss all the items on the agenda, and one series of insufficiently-discussed issues in particular – Compatibility with Existing Neighborhoods – has sparked substantial e-mail traffic following the meeting.

This Report

This report describes the points discussed, and, where appropriate, any resolution or consensus reached at the September 23 Meeting. As noted in the Appendix, the discussion here was written by one member of the Advisory Group, and other participants may have additional or differing views. Given the inadequate time to prepare a comprehensive report, the Advisory Group has encouraged all members to provide any separate thoughts directly to the Planning Board.

Caveats

The Advisory Group has been hobbled by two overriding factors:

- 1) **The lack of specific information** on which to comment. For example, one of the integral parts of the Sector Plan will be separate, but integrated design guidelines. The design guidelines were described in general terms to the Advisory Group, but we have not seen them in sufficient detail to provide more than general comment. The same is true for the plan for Rockville Pike, which, as noted below, may be the single most important feature of the Sector Plan.
- 2) **The lack of sufficient time** to prepare thoughtful and complete comments. Since the Advisory Group operates by consensus, without any hierarchy or organizational structure, adequate time is necessary for any comprehensive comments. Adequate time is especially important since a substantial amount of the Advisory Group's activities are carried on by volunteers, some of whom are residents whose jobs have no relationship to the assistance they provide to the Staff.

In addition, this report must be read in conjunction with the Staff Draft Proposal, which is a necessary part of our discussion. Many vital components of the proposed Sector Plan are not treated in this report, since the Advisory Group either agreed with the Staff's position without a need for further comment, or could not come to a consensus about additional comments.

The Goal

The Advisory Group has long debated and shaped its goal for the White Flint Sector Plan. The Advisory Group's first discussions in November 2006 were centered on finding a central purpose and goal, and those articulations have stayed remarkably consistent throughout the process.

The basic description of what the Advisory Group wants is:

“A Sense of Place.”

The Advisory Group wants to see a “there” in White Flint. Something which defines the community and generates a common understanding of what is to be found there. The “sense of place,” however, is subjective, so the Advisory Group sought a more concrete goal which would encompass the “there” it hopes to create.

One early articulation of the concept was “urban life, with an emphasis on life.” This phrase became an “urban village:” a self-sufficient area in which persons would not need a car to reach all the desired amenities, or even to access opportunities outside the Sector. Over time, however, the term “village” came to be seen as unnecessarily limiting, and the concept of “destination” was substituted.

Thus, the most recent definition of the goal, adopted by the Advisory Group on September 23, 2008, is:

**An Innovative, Spectacular, Inviting, Green,
Transit-oriented Urban Destination**

There is some continuing debate about the goal, especially the “urban” aspect of the description. The Advisory Group was divided about how to translate the goal into more concrete proposals. It chose to do so by articulating two further levels of detail:

Specifying a more detailed **VISION** of what it hopes its urban destination would look like if the **GOAL** were achieved; and

Responding to the Chairman's September 15 suggestion by describing the **GENERAL** and **SPECIFIC ISSUES** which will likely affect the plans to move the Sector toward the Vision and Goal.

The Vision

A Green, Walkable, Fun and Friendly Place to Live, Work and Play.

- A pedestrian-oriented community of mixed use development
- Taller buildings and higher densities near Metro tapering to lower densities at the borders with surrounding neighborhoods
- More housing in the sector
- Encourage different income and lifestyle levels of housing in the sector
- More local streets that invite and protect pedestrians with sidewalks, trees, street level retail, and facilities for bicycles
- Efficient, frequent and diverse modes of transit
- The Pike becoming a tree-lined boulevard to calm, yet move, traffic
- New buildings constructed to green standards
- New open spaces and parks connecting people
- Extensive opportunities for arts, culture, dining, entertainment, and recreation
- A variety of non-residential uses, including different types of retail opportunities, such as automobile dealerships

Specific Issues

Mobility: Fix the Pike

This topic is so important that we mention it **twice**, here for emphasis and again separately with its own section below. There is a consensus that Rockville Pike is the single most important stumbling block to efficient and desirable development in the Sector. An early video presentation to the Advisory Group called Rockville Pike “The Beast that Ate White Flint.”

Conversely, Rockville Pike offers a huge potential for improving the entire Sector. Bringing “life” to the Pike is an essential element to achieving the Advisory Group’s Goal and Vision. Thus, fixing the Pike is the single most critical element for success. Unfortunately, the plan for the Pike is not finished, so we cannot provide specific comments on it.

As described in more detail in a separate section below, there is a consensus that we do not support the Staff’s proposal to leave the renovation of the Pike until Stage Three. We believe that the renovations and changes to the Pike are so essential to the implementation of any Vision and Goal that:

The Pike must be addressed as soon as possible.

Image and Identity

There is a consensus on the need for a unifying identity, but no consensus on what that name or identity should be. The Advisory Group put off further discussion on this point. There was a proposal to create a separate working group to create an image and explore means to “brand” the image; the working group could review information such as the public opinion work done by some developers in creating their project names (which include both White Flint and North Bethesda in titles).

Walkability

There was a consensus strongly in favor of pedestrian-friendly streets. Components of this element would likely include: short blocks, slower traffic, retail opportunities close to the street, and design elements such as street structures and equipment. There was some division in the Advisory Group over the specific elements proposed in the Staff Draft Proposals, but no consensus on particular comments was developed.

Street-level Shopping

There was a general consensus on consumer-friendly retail shopping opportunities. There was a concern that street-level retail should be available, but only where feasible, and not mandated as a universal requirement. There should be some exception to a street-level retail requirement for such necessary street-level facilities as loading docks, parking entries, and sides of retail spaces; some public works requirements and easements which push retail back from the street may conflict with this goal and should be applied sensitively in particular circumstances.

Sustainability and the Environment

The Advisory Group strongly supports the concept of green design for buildings in the Sector. There was a consensus that the green design description in the Staff Draft Proposal should be changed to: “21st Century approach to sustainability and the environment.” There was discussion about whether this change was substantive.

Incentives for Architectural Innovations and Excellence

Throughout the Advisory Group’s existence, its members have pressed for architectural distinction in the Sector. There is a consensus that this factor is insufficiently highlighted in the Staff Draft Proposals, and that more should be done to encourage innovation and excellence in architecture.

Public Safety and Vibrant Streetscapes

Public safety is an important part of urban design and vibrant streetscapes are an important element of safety-oriented design. The Advisory Group recommends that the Sector Plan encourage the presence of people on the street, design elements which emphasize and enhance public safety, public lighting, and other safety-related elements.

Entertainment, Dining, Arts, and Culture

The Advisory Group strongly supports the promotion of these specific elements in any design plan. White Flint is fortunate to have Strathmore Music Center and Mansion, a world-class arts and music center, right next door. The Advisory Group would like to capitalize on that foundation by encouraging galleries and public art, especially in areas designed as private green space open to the public. In addition, there was discussion about relaxing rules on parking for restaurants.

Underground Utilities

The overwhelming number of utility poles and overhead wires in White Flint is a blight and an impediment to achieving the Goal and Vision. Cables block the sky in some areas. The Advisory Group supports efforts to require underground utilities.

Schools

The need for schools is a contentious issue, which has arisen in virtually all meetings with community members. The Advisory Group recommends that this issue be reviewed and addressed again. Early in its deliberations, the Advisory Group did not receive significant cooperation from Montgomery County Public Schools, but MCPS has been providing more information recently.

The Staff Draft Proposal recognizes a need for an additional elementary school, but, guided by input from MCPS, has proposed that the new school be within the boundaries of the Sector. There is a strong consensus on the Advisory Group that this boundary requirement may not be realistic, given the cost of land acquisition and the small likelihood that a needed large parcel will become available in the near future.

The Advisory Group does not agree with the two proposed sites for new schools in the Staff Draft Proposal. The Advisory Group recommends looking into alternate sites both within and immediately outside the Sector with a focus on existing or prior school sites. For example, one site which has been consistently proposed by members of the Advisory Group is the old Rocking Horse Elementary School site, now being used by MCPS for office space and an international school. A member of the Advisory Group noted that MCPS has expressed interest in relocating the office space and international school to a Metro-accessible location within the White Flint Sector. Although the Advisory Group was informed that this site is deemed not available for a school, the site is being offered for recreational field use in the Staff Draft Proposal.

Parks

There is one existing, and one proposed public park in the Staff Draft Proposal. There are also several green spaces (which have been called by varying names, such as “neighborhood park”) in the Staff presentations. These additional green spaces are on private land, but with public access. There was substantial discussion in the Advisory Group concerning the distinction between public and private parks.

The Advisory Group is concerned because of the degree of uncertainty over the actual amount of parks to be included in the Sector Plan. The Advisory Group wants to encourage design of open space so that it is larger, useable, and more consolidated than would be the case through isolated private spaces. The Advisory Group does not support the Parks Department’s proposal to place ball fields and similar facilities at the Rocking Horse site in lieu of providing park space within the Sector.

Community Facilities

The Advisory Group recognizes that additional growth may require additional public facilities to provide services such as fire protection and libraries. The business

members of the Advisory Group want to stress the need for public financing of such facilities, rather than placing all the costs on private land owners. For example, the proposed site for a library at the North Bethesda Town Center met with substantial resistance, but placing it across the Pike at Mid-Pike Plaza might be a better solution.

Financing and Density

The Advisory Group has serious concerns about the financing proposals in the Staff Draft Proposals. We would like the opportunity to participate in or express our views in the October 30, 2008, meeting on this topic.

The Sector Plan, particularly if modified to encompass the Advisory Group's proposed Goal and Vision, will include expensive innovations such as green buildings, consolidation of property to provide green space, and improved rights-of-way on Rockville Pike. The Advisory Group has a consensus, even among those most opposed to increased density, that proposed public needs require compensation, and that compensation may come in the form of increased density. The Advisory Group differs on particular density proposals, but has a consensus that additional density is appropriate in some circumstances. The final form of the consensus statement adopted at its September 23 meeting is that:

The Advisory Group will support certain levels of density necessary for development but only in conjunction with the infrastructure necessary to protect against congestion.

The Advisory Group is concerned, however, that we do not have the information necessary to respond to the Staff Draft Proposal, although that information might be available after the October 30 meeting. In brief, the Advisory Group does not know how much money will be needed to fund the planned improvements. The Advisory Group wishes to participate on the particular calculations raised by specific proposals for improvements and compensating density.

Districts

The Staff Draft Proposal discusses several types of proposed implementation or financing mechanisms, including governmental districts for particular purposes, such as parking or taxing for implementation. The Advisory Group has a consensus in favor of two or three (depending on implementation) types of districts:

- A development district to deal with infrastructure improvements to support the density levels being proposed.
- A parking district.

- A Business Improvements District to manage community facilities in the future, similar to the Bethesda Urban Partnership. This may or may not be part of the parking district.

The Advisory Group also supports the creation of an implementation committee. The exact form of this committee may depend on the specifics of the financing mechanisms chosen, but the Advisory Group believes that there is a need for some type of continuing oversight and maintenance on a plan as innovative and complex as the proposed multi-stage Sector Plan.

Phasing and Timing of Implementation

Several questions arose in the Advisory Group's consideration of the phasing and timing of implementation steps in the Staff Draft Proposal. One question is whether the timing stages are mandatory, so that development of a particular area could not proceed until the time specified in the Sector Plan. Staff informed the Advisory Group at its meeting on September 23, 2008, that the phasing referred only to infrastructure investments, and that development could move forward based upon the fact that this would be a taxing district into which the land owners are paying. The Advisory Group generally opposes requiring development to wait simply because of geography; the Advisory Group would support restrictions based on infrastructure, but believes that infrastructure should be programmed with development.

Design Guidelines

The Staff Draft Proposal contemplates a separate set of design guidelines which may encompass the Advisory Group's Goal and Vision. The Advisory Group would like to import guidelines, similar to those in Bethesda and Silver Spring, into this Sector Plan to encourage a more urban treatment of utilities, streetscapes, and other design-related elements.

The Advisory Group has not seen the proposed design guidelines and so cannot respond to them. We would like to review and comment on any such proposal. Members of the Advisory Group would like to see building heights reflected in the Sector Plan.

TMX Zone

Business members of the Advisory Group have substantial concerns with the specifics of the TMX zone. We anticipate seeing further developments in this area in the future.

Compatibility with Existing Communities

The Advisory Group agreed that impacts on existing communities should be minimized, and requested that the Sector Plan include explicit consideration of such

impacts. In several meetings and in numerous discussions, the Advisory Committee considered several possible impacts and remedial measures, including density, height, mobility, linkages with existing communities (including bikeways and greenways), and parks, open spaces and public facilities. Resident representatives have expressed a belief that insufficient time and resources have been devoted to this particular set of issues.

The Advisory Group did not have time to discuss these matters at its September 23, 2008, and will likely revisit these questions if given an opportunity to do so. Members of the Advisory Group are likely to provide additional views on these subjects.

Rockville Pike

Throughout its existence, the Advisory Group has focused on one specific aspect of life in White Flint: the Pike. As noted above, the Pike is critical both in the current problems with White Flint and in possible solutions. The Advisory Group considered three primary questions regarding the Pike: the design proposals; the functioning of a renovated Pike (focusing on transit questions as part of an evolution from a car-oriented to a transit-oriented area while maintaining throughput on the Pike itself); and timing the changes to the Pike.

Design of the New Pike

The Advisory Group supports the concept of converting Rockville Pike into a boulevard, as proposed by the Staff Draft Proposal. The boulevard concept, in conjunction with the strengthened road network discussed below, is crucial to handling the predicted traffic needs while supporting the type of people-friendly development sought in the rest of the Sector Plan.

The Advisory Group, however, has not seen the complete design for the boulevard concept. We have been informed that the plans are not complete.

We have some specific concerns which have not been fully addressed in our discussions with Staff. We would, for example, like to see how the new Pike Boulevard transitions to the rest of Rockville Pike at the north and south ends of the Sector. Some members of the Advisory Group also expressed concern about the impact on Rockville Pike of the convergence of the upgraded road network at the southern end of the Sector.

The Advisory Group has requested that, before the plan goes to the County Council, the Advisory Group see the design of Rockville Pike, including:

- Sections with dimensions showing existing conditions, expected easements, and how the new Pike overlays on properties
- The full plan from Edson Lane to Montrose Parkway
- Treatment of utilities
- Setbacks
- A complete description of the streetscape
- A complete description of parking
- Bus lane locations

Functioning of the New Pike

Since the Advisory Group has not seen completed plans for the new Pike, it can't determine how the new Pike will actually function. We have several specific concerns which should be addressed in the Sector Plan:

First, the Advisory Group supports Bus Rapid Transit on the new Pike, and believes that BRT should be incorporated in the design of the new Pike.

Second, the Advisory Group is concerned about spill-over from the new Pike and road network onto local neighborhoods; the Advisory Group wishes to encourage drivers to use the new road network, but not to spill over and cut-through existing neighborhoods.

Third, the Advisory Group is divided over the possibility of parking on the Pike itself; business representatives have argued, for example, that without on-street parking, it is unrealistic to expect retail opportunities which open directly onto the Pike. Other members of the Advisory Group, however, stress the transit-oriented nature of the proposed development and would prefer to utilize that space for BRT or other transit.

Phasing of the Construction of the New Pike

The Staff Draft Proposal projects construction of the new Pike in the third and last phase of the implementation of the Sector Plan. Staff explained that this was due to timing of financing and other implementation conditions. The Advisory Group disagrees with this timing, and strongly urges the renovation of Rockville Pike at the earliest possible time. The Advisory Group feels that delaying the Pike may result in not achieving the conditions in the prior two phases, meaning that the Pike will not be reconstructed since its preconditions will never be met. Never addressing the Pike is unacceptable to the Advisory Group.

Transportation

Rockville Pike is the most important, but not the only, transportation question for White Flint. We view the transportation changes proposed in the Staff Draft Proposal to be partly a mechanism to address problems on the Pike, but also to address other non-Pike-specific issues, such as pedestrian-friendly streets, and East-West circulation patterns. There was no consensus on the standard to use to measure congestion or on the question, standing alone, of accepting more congestion, but there was consensus in the Advisory Group on a number of other important transportation issues.

Pedestrians

The Advisory Group wants to reiterate its strong support for pedestrian-friendly policies in the Sector Plan. The lack of walkability is one of the weakest points of the current road network in White Flint.

Bicycles

Similarly, the Advisory Group wants to reiterate its strong support for the bike-friendly network envisioned by the Staff Draft Proposal. In addition, however, the Advisory Group would like to suggest more consideration for evolving concepts such as bicycle rentals (“flex-bike”), and for the placement and utilization of safe bike racks and covered bike parking.

Metro

The Advisory Group has long sought another entrance to the Metro Station. There has been substantial discussion about the placement of this additional entrance. The current Staff Draft Proposal is to place the new entrance at the northern end of the platform. The Advisory Group has been informed that a second alternative – placing a new entrance on the west side of Rockville Pike – would be too expensive because it would have to go under the tracks; we believe this alternative should continue to be reviewed in light of impending changes to the Pike. If a western entrance is not included in the Sector Plan, the Advisory Group suggests that the existing pedestrian walkway under the Pike at Marinelli be retained and, if appropriate, improved, during any renewal of the Pike.

A second issue discussed by the Advisory Group was the current Metro practice of turning trains around at Grosvenor, and not providing a full schedule of trains to the White Flint Station. Given the increased density planned for the area around the Metro Station, the Advisory Group recommends increasing service to the White Flint Station.

Bus Service

The Advisory Group recommends that bus service be increased on the Pike. In light of the increasing density of the area and the discussion surrounding BRT on the Pike, the Advisory Group believes that service to the area should be reviewed and adjusted accordingly. In addition, the Advisory Group recommends that, as part of the shift from car-orientation to transit-orientation in the Sector, bus service, including BRT, be reviewed and increased in both north-south and east-west directions in the Sector.

Shuttle Bus Service

The Advisory Group reviewed plans for increasing shuttle bus service throughout the sector. Some proposals suggested using the larger Metrobus or Ride-on buses to service neighborhoods or areas beyond Rockville Pike; the Advisory Group is strongly in favor of additional transit options, but believes that these longer-chassis vehicles would be best suited for service on the Pike. Instead, the Advisory Group would support a renewed shuttle bus service throughout appropriate areas of the sector. The Advisory Group is concerned, however, that the shuttle routes not be excessively long or intricate.

Additional Road Network

The Advisory Group strongly supports the increase in the road network planned for the sector. Additional robustness in the road network should both relieve congestion on Rockville Pike and provide additional options for travels throughout the Sector. It was the Advisory Group's business members who hired an independent traffic and walkability consultant to make exactly this sort of suggestion.

In addition to the road network proposed in the Staff Draft Proposal, however, the Advisory Group has long pressed for a solution to the problem of "Old" Old Georgetown Road. This truncated street runs behind the Mid-Pike Plaza shopping center, and no longer connects to any of the road network. In the revised plan, it will carry some Sector traffic. Yet the portion of "Old" Old Georgetown Road north of Montrose Blvd has not been tied into the Sector's new road network. The Advisory Group was told that this is solely because that portion is outside the boundaries of the Sector. The Advisory Group, however, notes that this portion can be an integral part of solving the transportation problems of the Sector and should be included.

Similarly, during the analysis by the independent traffic consultant Gladding-Jackson, a significant traffic impediment was identified where Old Georgetown Road dead-ends into the railroad tracks. If a bridge were constructed connecting this dead-end with Randolph Road, the consultant projected, traffic could be eased throughout the Sector. The Staff Draft Proposal, after consultation with the State and other agencies, however, does not include that improvement. The Advisory Group recommends that, if feasible, that additional portion of road network be constructed to relieve traffic burdens in the Sector. There was some dissent to this proposal.

Parking District

As noted above, the Advisory Group supports the creation of an entity to provide and maintain parking in the Sector. Parking is an integral part of both the transportation improvements and the increased livability of the Sector. In an area such as White Flint, where a significant number of people come from adjacent areas, providing parking will both attract customers and ease traffic within the Sector. In the absence of some other mechanism to provide and coordinate parking across the Sector, the Advisory Group recommends creating a Parking District.

Marc Station

There was consensus in the Advisory Group on the need for a Marc (or similar commuter rail) station in the Sector, as part of a multi-modal transportation network. The Staff Draft Proposal contains two possible sites for a Marc station, but no clear choice between the two sites. The Advisory Group does not have a consensus on which site is preferable. There was some concern about the possible loss of the existing Marc station at Garrett Park.

The Staff Draft Proposal

The MNCPPC Staff has provided diligent and professional assistance to the Advisory Group throughout its existence. They have been unfailingly polite and helpful in their interactions with us. They have met with us late into the night, and outside their offices. They have answered countless questions and listened calmly to heated complaints about their proposals. We believe that they have made a sincere attempt to incorporate all of our suggestions into their Draft Proposal, tempered by their professional opinions and their interactions with other government agencies. Even though we may disagree with some of their recommendations (as discussed in the preceding sections), we respect and support their views. We could not have done our jobs without their assistance, and we thank them.

The Staff Draft Proposals have evolved over time. All the proposals presented to the Advisory Group and to the Planning Board are available on-line at: www.whiteflintplanning.org. We were informed that the draft presented to the Planning Board on September 11, 2008, had not been changed before our meeting on September 23, 2008, and we are commenting on that draft. That draft can be found on-line in three sections at:

Staff Report

http://www.mcparkandplanning.org/planning/viewer.shtm#http://www.montgomeryplanningboard.org/agenda/2008/documents/20080911_white_flint1_sector_plan-staff_report_print.pdf

Staff PowerPoint Presentation

http://www.mcparkandplanning.org/planning/viewer.shtm#http://mcparkandplanning.org/planning/community/whiteflint/documents/PBSeptember11-revised-2_opt.pdf

Staff Preliminary Draft Recommendations

http://www.mcparkandplanning.org/planning/viewer.shtm#http://www.montgomeryplanningboard.org/agenda/2008/documents/20080911_whiteflint_attachment1_print.pdf

Appendix One:

Author and Process

The author of this report is Barnaby Zall, bzall@aol.com, 301-231-6943. He is solely responsible for its content.

Zall is an original member of the Advisory Group, and moderated the discussions at the September 23, 2008, Advisory Group meeting.

Zall is a tax and appellate attorney with an office in the White Flint Sector and a residence in one of the affected adjacent communities. www.wjlaw.com. He has no clients or business interests in the Sector and does no land use or development-related law. He is a former consultant to the federal National Commission on Neighborhoods, and worked for the National Congress for Community Economic Development (part of the federal anti-poverty effort supported by the Ford Foundation and the Community Services Administration), but has no prior urban planning experience in Montgomery County.

Notes of the meeting, relied upon in the drafting, were taken by Evan Goldman, a business representative, and Ken Hurdle, a resident representative. Essential comments were provided by Natalie Goldberg, a resident representative. Other Advisory Group members provided additional comments.

This report was sent to members of the Advisory Group on Thursday, September 25, 2008, for review and comment, but on a very short deadline for responses. A revised version was sent out for review and comment on Saturday, September 27, 2008, again on a very short deadline for responses. Other members of the Advisory Group may have different views on both the meeting and the outcomes presented in this report. Additional time to respond to the Planning Board's request would likely have resulted in a better, more comprehensive and more richly-detailed report. In light of the brief time available, all members of the Advisory Group have been encouraged to provide their views directly to the Planning Board.