

**QUESTION** a) Do you support adding a third track to the MARC Brunswick Line north of the Beltway and running MARC trains all day in both directions?

b) Do you support any plan to widen I-270? (If yes, feel free to specify which plans you do and don't support.)

c) If your answers to (a) and (b) are both yes, which is a higher priority?

Candidate		Party	Verbatim response
County Executive			
Robin	Ficker	R	a) Yes. b) Yes. I support improving capacity of I-270 as fast as possible. c) The priority that will move the most people the fastest.
Roger	Berliner	D	a) Yes. If MARC is going to become a more viable option for those living in Germantown, Gaithersburg, Watkins Mill, White Flint, Kensington, and others it must have a third track so it can provide all-day, two-way service. b) I support creating two peak direction and reversible high-occupancy toll lanes on I-270 that would also include bus service. Whether creating these two lanes could be done in the existing I-270 right-of-way or require some physical widening of the highway would need to be figured out in planning for the project. I do not support adding more all-vehicle travel lanes to I-270, because it will simply induce new traffic congestion. c) I don't believe we need to choose between them.
Marc	Elrich	D	a) Yes. b) Yes, but only if we do two reversible lanes and one of those has express bus priority. c) Honestly, I'd have to see ridership projections for both scenarios. It depends on how many cars are removed from the road by the MARC rail extension and the express buses. I'd pick the option that reduces the greatest number of auto trips.

**QUESTION** a) Do you support adding a third track to the MARC Brunswick Line north of the Beltway and running MARC trains all day in both directions?

b) Do you support any plan to widen I-270? (If yes, feel free to specify which plans you do and don't support.)

c) If your answers to (a) and (b) are both yes, which is a higher priority?

Candidate		Party	Verbatim response
County Executive (cont)			
Rose	Krasnow	D	<p>a) Yes. When I worked at the Planning Department, the MARC Brunswick Line was the quickest way to get there, but service was only available during peak hours, which limited my ability to use it. I also support a third track north of the Beltway which would allow passenger trains to pass freight trains. As County Executive I would work to get the state to put additional dollars into the expansion of MARC rail.</p> <p>b) I-270 is so congested because other infrastructure, such as the Corridor Cities Transitway, was never provided. Today many of our upcounty residents have no choice other than I-270 to get to work and other destinations, and the delays they experience are unacceptable. However, I would limit improvements to the addition of reversible lanes, which I believe can be done within the existing right of way, thereby minimizing impacts. Funding would need to come from the state. County resources should be used to solve more local congestion issues through the development of transit as outlined in the County's transit master plan.</p> <p>c) I don't see their development as an "either or" situation. We need both. The congestion on I-270 is increasing the frustration level of our residents and making it harder for us to keep existing businesses or attract new ones to the County. Increasing MARC rail service would help us get cars off our roads. We need to work with our state delegation and the governor to make sure that they understand that Montgomery County is the economic engine of the state, which makes it particularly important for them to provide enough transportation dollars to make both improvements.</p>
George L.	Leventhal	D	<p>a) Yes.</p> <p>b) I am open to dialogue with the State of Maryland regarding how to add capacity to I-270. Any plans for added capacity on I-270 should include a dedicated rail or bus line.</p> <p>c) I am a strong and forceful advocate for alternatives to the automobile.</p>

- QUESTION**
- a) Do you support adding a third track to the MARC Brunswick Line north of the Beltway and running MARC trains all day in both directions?**
  - b) Do you support any plan to widen I-270? (If yes, feel free to specify which plans you do and don't support.)**
  - c) If your answers to (a) and (b) are both yes, which is a higher priority?**

Candidate		Party	Verbatim response
Council At-Large			
Robert	Dyer	R	<p>a) Yes.</p> <p>b) Yes. I specifically strongly support Gov. Hogan's I-270 Express Lanes plan.</p> <p>c) They are equally important. However, if budgets only allow one, I would prioritize I-270, because it would have a greater impact, with virtually no cost to taxpayers.</p>
Marilyn	Balcombe	D	<p>a) Yes, I do support increased capacity of MARC service. Running trains all day in both directions would have a significant positive impact for getting cars off the road and for the economic development of the North 270 Corridor.</p> <p>b) Yes, increased capacity on I-270 is necessary. In addition to widening I-270, I would also want to add express bus service and study the option of reversible lanes.</p> <p>c) I've lived in the Upcounty for over 20 years and have a good understanding of the transportation needs of the area. Increased capacity of I-270 is a higher priority because it will have the most impact in moving people from point A to point B. I believe both projects could proceed together given that they have different funding sources. The widening of I-270 will not happen without a public-private partnership. It is too costly to be done without significant private investment.</p> <p>I also support the Corridor Cities Transitway and have been a lead advocate for the project for the past 12 years.</p>
Hoan	Dang	D	<p>a) I support expansion of the MARC Brunswick line and if funds can be found to increase service, it could take some of the burden off METRO north of Shady Grove. However, I believe a higher priority should be in completion of the Corridors Cities Transitway (CCT) as a light rail from Shady Grove to Clarksburg.</p> <p>b) I do not believe widening I-270 before constructing the CCT or adding service to the MARC system will have the desired impact on reducing commuter ride time or frustration. What would help I-270 is if Frederick County would agree to widen their section of I-270 to I-70.</p> <p>c) I believe the public transportation options (CCT and MARC) are the priorities.</p>
Lorna Phillips	Forde	D	<p>a) Yes, I support this proposal.</p> <p>b) I am open to increasing the capacity of I-270, but would first need to spend time reviewing and analyzing detailed plans to assess the impact on business and the environment.</p> <p>c) The MARC option ((a) above) is the higher priority.</p>

**QUESTION**

**a) Do you support adding a third track to the MARC Brunswick Line north of the Beltway and running MARC trains all day in both directions?**

**b) Do you support any plan to widen I-270? (If yes, feel free to specify which plans you do and don't support.)**

**c) If your answers to (a) and (b) are both yes, which is a higher priority?**

Candidate		Party	Verbatim response
<b>Council At-Large (cont)</b>			
Jill Ortman	Fouse	D	<p>a) Yes. We need to get more out of MARC.</p> <p>b) I support maximizing use of the existing right-of-way on I-270. Widening I-270 has some potential expensive challenges, including interchanges. I favor two reversible lanes to better handle congestion as traffic heads mostly south in the morning, and north in the afternoon.</p> <p>c) I would prefer to add transit, including MARC service, Bus Rapid Transit on Route 355, and the CCT before widening I-270.</p>
Evan	Glass	D	<p>a) Yes.</p> <p>b) I believe there is room to create two reversible lanes on I-270 within the existing right-of-way. But any expansion must be accompanied by a robust public transportation component.</p> <p>c) While I want to examine the cost effectiveness of each project as part of any thoughtful deliberation process, expansion of public transportation options is my top priority.</p>
Richard	Gottfried	D	<p>a) Yes I do support this idea.</p> <p>b) My suggestion regarding I-270 is to utilize the two already existing inner service lanes as real lanes during the rush hour times during the day to add (like they have on Route 66 in VA a red x and a green x) for those lanes. The upper part of I-270 from Frederick to Clarksburg does need to have more lanes. By not widening the Frederick-Clarksburg area road this creates every day a bottleneck for rush hour commuters!</p> <p>c) I believe but have not researched this idea but my answer to (B) would be my higher priority. I believe that this could be done within one year and not at an expensive price versus adding another whole lane or two to I-270 plus the time to complete this project.</p>
Seth	Grimes	D	<p>a) Yes. Expanded MARC service will increase mode choice for people traveling during non rush hour times in both directions and permit transit oriented and affordable development near MARC stations.</p> <p>b) No. Widening roads does not eliminate congestion and may make regional congestion, on other roads, worse.</p> <p>c) N.A.</p>
Will	Jawando	D	<p>a) YES.</p> <p>b) NO, not at this time.</p>

**QUESTION** a) Do you support adding a third track to the MARC Brunswick Line north of the Beltway and running MARC trains all day in both directions?

b) Do you support any plan to widen I-270? (If yes, feel free to specify which plans you do and don't support.)

c) If your answers to (a) and (b) are both yes, which is a higher priority?

Candidate		Party	Verbatim response
Council At-Large (cont)			
Danielle	Meitiv	D	a) YES. Both-way, all-day MARC transportation is critical to encourage economic growth in the county, relieve traffic on I-270, and connect important population centers in the county. b) NO for cars. (I would to support the expansion of public transit, i.e. adding a reversible lane for buses/BRT). c) N/A
Hans	Riemer	D	a) Yes b) Yes I support the Council's adopted vision c) MARC expansion is a higher priority
Michele	Riley	D	a) Yes. We would need to address some of the potential impacts to historic districts like at the Boyds and Germantown stations. In the meantime more frequent and weekend service should be added and we must improve pedestrian and bike mobility near the MARC stations in the near term. b) I support the County's current proposal for the reversible lanes on I-270 that would include bus transit. I would like to see what the State's latest RFP solicitation for I-270 comes up with to see if widening is actually necessary. c) If we can work out the issues with CSX, having all day MARC service in both directions would be a major improvement to our transportation system.
Steve	Solomon	D	a) Yes, more MARC service and availability would lead to easier commutes and less 270 traffic. b) Yes, I believe we need express lanes on 270 like on I-95 south. But with much lower tolls. If we had 25 or 50 cent tolls on 270 express lanes, more people would use them and not feel like they are getting gouged like the I-95 south express lanes. c) A

**QUESTION** a) Do you support adding a third track to the MARC Brunswick Line north of the Beltway and running MARC trains all day in both directions?

b) Do you support any plan to widen I-270? (If yes, feel free to specify which plans you do and don't support.)

c) If your answers to (a) and (b) are both yes, which is a higher priority?

Candidate		Party	Verbatim response
<b>Council District 1</b>			
Bill	Cook	D	<p>a) Yes, the MARC train is a great option for commuters and we should continue to improve upon its effectiveness to get more cars off the roads.</p> <p>b) I support the idea, introduced by the council several years ago, to add two directional lanes. This would be the most efficient use of funds to alleviate traffic on I-270.</p> <p>c) Since I-270 is a greater priority for District 1 residents, I would have to say I-270.</p>
Pete	Fosselman	D	<p>a) Yes, I believe adding a third track along the CSX rail line between Silver Spring and Point of Rocks should be a priority so MARC trains can run all day in both directions. We need this sooner than the proposed 2030 date. While Mayor of Kensington, the Town partnered with County to add more parking at the Kensington MARC Station. We now have several hundred daily train commuters.</p> <p>b) Yes, as a supporter of increasing our public transit options in the county, I also believe that widening parts of I-270 should be part of a plan to allow people in our county to commute and travel easier. While studies show that building highways lead to more traffic and congestion, it is also a reality that public transit is not easy for some to navigate. Additionally, one-third of our residents live in the northern half of the County. Two significant parts of I-270 have never been widened since its original construction in 1960, while the population adjacent to these areas near the Beltway and the northern area into Frederick have increased in population by 300%.</p> <p>c)</p>
Andrew	Friedson	D	<p>a) Yes.</p> <p>b) I support utilizing reversible lanes on 1-270 to relieve congestion during commute times. Additionally, when 1-270 goes from 4 lanes to two lanes, it creates a sudden bottleneck, which has long been a transportation challenge and is overdue to resolve.</p> <p>c) While I don't believe in false choices that pit one transportation project over another, and rather view transportation as a comprehensive, multi-modal system that should efficiently move people from where they are to where they're going, I'm an unabashed supporter in transit-oriented development and believe transit provides economic, environmental and quality of life benefits that roads do not, and it should be prioritized.</p>

**QUESTION** a) Do you support adding a third track to the MARC Brunswick Line north of the Beltway and running MARC trains all day in both directions?

b) Do you support any plan to widen I-270? (If yes, feel free to specify which plans you do and don't support.)

c) If your answers to (a) and (b) are both yes, which is a higher priority?

Candidate		Party	Verbatim response
Council District 1 (cont)			
Ana Sol	Gutierrez	D	a) Yes, I support adding a third track north of the beltway and expanding MARC Brunswick Line services to all-day, two-way, weekday, and weekend services. b) No, I do not support widening I-270 or the addition of toll lanes, as proposed by Governor Hogan. I could support making changes to improve the flow of traffic, such as establishing a bi-directional lane that could improve the flow of traffic during rush hours. I support transit solutions over adding lanes for cars. c) N/A
Jim	McGee	D	a) Seven days a week. Yes. And I would be open to consider a rail connection with VRE as a strategy to avoid an upper Potomac highway bridge and relieve congestion on the American Legion Bidge b) No
Regina "Reggie"	Oldak	D	a) Yes, I support the full MARC growth and investment program for the Brunswick Line. b) I support the Council's plan to add two reversible HOT lanes to I-270. I have concerns about the scope of the Governor's proposal and the absence of transit. Any additional capacity on I-270 should facilitate high quality transit. c) I support prioritizing MARC investments over widening I-270.
Meredith	Wellington	D	a) Yes. b) Not unless doing so facilitates better transit. c) (a)

**QUESTION**     **a) Do you support adding a third track to the MARC Brunswick Line north of the Beltway and running MARC trains all day in both directions?**

**b) Do you support any plan to widen I-270? (If yes, feel free to specify which plans you do and don't support.)**

**c) If your answers to (a) and (b) are both yes, which is a higher priority?**

Candidate		Party	Verbatim response
<b>Council District 2</b>			
Craig L.	Rice	D	a) Yes b) Yes c) For my upcounty region, I-270 is a priority because it could also carry an express lane for rapid transit in addition to added vehicular capacity.
<b>Council District 3</b>			
Sidney A.	Katz	D	a) Yes. When I was Mayor of Gaithersburg, I worked with MARC to get them to run the noon train. Today, we need the MARC train to run all day to Frederick and beyond. Unfortunately, MARC has not been pursuing the idea of additional trains with urgency, but I will continue to engage with them on this. b) If we do build additional capacity on I-270, I support reversible lanes. c) We need to have a multi-modal approach to transportation solutions, and I support prioritizing transit projects over new road construction projects.
Ben	Shnider	D	a) Yes, as documented here . b) No. If it does occur, however, only two reversible lanes should be added with priority given to buses and carpools. c) N/A