

Question 1: Past Votes/Positions

Would you have voted (or did you vote) yes or no on the following: a) the Thrive 2050 master plan b) the More Housing N.O.W. Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA 25-02) c) the University Boulevard Corridor plan

a) Thrive 2050

Yes, with amendments. I support Thrive 2050's goals of adding more housing and creating complete communities by concentrating jobs in employment nodes. However, I have strong reservations about some of the transportation goals that make it harder for vehicles to get around, particularly in the Upcounty and western Montgomery County where transit will never be a realistic option for most residents. I support transit where it works efficiently and there is demand for it, but we also need to provide the necessary road infrastructure to address choke points, move goods and services, and keep our residents from wasting too much time stuck in some of the nation's worst traffic. We need a more balanced approach that serves the diverse travel needs of the entire County. Investing in transit alone is not the right answer.

b) More Housing N.O.W. (ZTA 25-02)

Yes. I strongly support the More Housing N.O.W. zoning text amendment. We face a housing supply crisis, and enabling more missing middle housing is essential to bringing down costs and giving working families more options. Montgomery County's rent stabilization policy has contributed to a collapse in multifamily housing permits, while neighboring jurisdictions without such caps have seen rents decline as new supply comes online. The solution is more housing, and ZTA 25-02 moves us in that direction.

c) University Boulevard Corridor Plan

Yes. I support the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. Transit-oriented development in East County aligns with our broader goals of concentrating housing and jobs near transit infrastructure.

Question 2: Transit and Housing Opportunity Act (SB389)

a) Do you support the Transit and Housing Opportunity Act (SB389) to facilitate transit-oriented development near train stations? b) Do you support amending the bill to include WMATA-owned land?

a) SB389

Support with reservations. I support SB389's housing production goals and the deferral of impact fees to help projects pencil out financially. However, I have concerns about two aspects of the bill. First, while I support *reducing* parking minimums near

transit, I'm skeptical of *eliminating* them entirely. Even residents who live near transit stations often need vehicles to reach jobs, shopping, childcare, or services that transit doesn't serve well. We've seen parking issues spill out of HOA and Condo communities in Gaithersburg due to parking limitations, so this may be taking things too far. Second, I have concerns about state preemption of local planning authority. Counties and municipalities should retain meaningful input over development in their communities.

b) Extending to WMATA-Owned Land

Hesitant. While I recognize the value of developing underutilized WMATA parking lots for housing, extending the same state-preemption framework to WMATA land raises the same local control concerns. I would want to see a process that ensures meaningful county input on development adjacent to Metro stations, and ensures sufficient parking to support current and future growth in Metro system ridership.

Question 3: Reallocating Road Space

Do you support reallocating road space from car lanes to sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and/or bus lanes at the following locations?

General position: No. As a cyclist myself, I strongly support safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists. However, I prefer shared-use paths and added infrastructure over reallocating existing vehicle lanes, especially in corridors that are already heavily congested. Shared-use paths provide separation from traffic, which is both safer and more comfortable for cyclists and pedestrians. Meanwhile, arterial roads in Montgomery County—particularly upcounty—still carry essential vehicle traffic that cannot easily shift to transit and we need to accommodate the diverse needs of all of our residents.

a) Old Georgetown Road: I would prefer shared-use path infrastructure over lane reallocation, which I do not believe is working in this location.

b) University Boulevard near Blair High School: Same—prefer shared-use path approach.

c) Frederick Road (MD 355) between Middlebrook and MD 124: This is my community. I support safety improvements through shared-use paths alongside the roadway rather than reducing vehicle capacity on this critical upcounty corridor. Route 355 often carries rush hour bail-out traffic from I-270, and since M-83 has not been built, there are no other arterial routes north to handle the traffic, so taking lanes away is not only deeply unpopular in the community, it will do more harm than good.

d) Other difficult/dangerous county roads: I support a shared-use path approach on a case-by-case basis, prioritizing safety infrastructure that doesn't come at the expense of vehicle throughput on arterials. When it comes to bike lanes, I believe our focus should be on filling in the missing links in our Bike masterplan for a more integrated system, emphasizing shared-use paths.

Question 4: Purple Line Sidewalks (BiPPA)

Do you support building all the Purple Line sidewalks recommended by the BiPPA program before the line's scheduled opening in December 2027, streamlining the planning process as needed?

Support in principle, with reservations about “streamlining.” I support building sidewalks to ensure safe pedestrian access to Purple Line stations. However, I’m hesitant to commit to “streamlining” planning processes that bypass community input—even when I might disagree with that community’s conclusions. The Takoma-Langley sidewalks were rejected after a public engagement process where the majority of responding residents opposed them. The right approach is adequate funding and proactive community engagement, not top-down mandates that override local feedback.

Question 5: Highway Expansions

Do you support these highway expansions?

a) Midcounty Highway Extended: Support with enhanced design. Midcounty Highway was planned, along with Great Seneca Highway, as a major ladder arterial to provide crucial north-south connectivity in the Upcounty on the east side of I-270. That missing infrastructure raises equity issues, and puts tremendous pressure on MD-355, Goshen Road, Shady Grove Road, Brink Road, and others; and once the redevelopment of Lakeforest is complete, it will cause several surrounding intersections to fail. It also stifles the growth of Clarksburg, which was built under the understanding the infrastructure would come. Midcounty Extended could be done responsibly, similar to the US-202 Parkway in Pennsylvania, protecting natural areas while providing multimodal connectivity between Clarksburg and the Shady Grove Metro, as well as the ICC. The design should include integrated bus transit service and a shared-use path for cyclists and pedestrians. Previous studies by the County show this facility is needed even with other improvements in the surrounding area.

b) Widening American Legion Bridge & Beltway with toll lanes: Support a multimodal approach from the American Legion Bridge to the ICC interchange. I will work with the State to ensure this remains a multimodal project that also includes significant new investments in Transit and shared-use bike and pedestrian paths, as Governor Moore and his team have supported. This is a critical connection for our regional economy. The high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes would provide both the opportunity and the funding mechanism for new travel options that would reduce the current gridlock on this section of the Beltway, provide new transit and ride-sharing options, as well as improved bike and pedestrian connections, including a new shared-use path crossing the Potomac on the bridge itself.

c) Widening I-270 with toll lanes: Support as a multimodal project within the existing right-of-way. Key sections of I-270 were never widened, creating major choke

points, one of them being the section north of Clarksburg, which has remained only two lanes each way since it was built in 1960. Upcounty commuters need relief, and managed HOT lanes can significantly reduce congestion delays, provide new regional bus-rapid-transit options, expand ride-sharing and improve person-throughput in the corridor without drawing funds from other projects. Toll financing offers a realistic way to expand high-quality transit service in this corridor in a way we can actually afford.

d) Widening Beltway between I-270 and Prince George's County with toll lanes: Needs further study. I support retaining this as part of the region's long-range plan for 2050, but will want to see if studies show it effectively reduces congestion, and if concerns over property impacts can be addressed through context-sensitive design, before making a decision on the project itself.

e) Observation Drive Extended: Support. This should be a near-term priority.

f) Montrose Parkway East: Support, with changes. I believe it should be funded through an expanded Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district encompassing Pike & Rose and North Bethesda. The development that benefits from this infrastructure should help pay for it. This approach could also fund improved Metro and MARC access to the White Flint area, creating a more comprehensive transportation solution than just this one project.

Question 6: Bus Frequency vs. BRT Infrastructure

Should the county give a higher priority to frequency of current bus service or to planning and preparation for future BRT infrastructure construction?

Prioritize bus frequency now. Building ridership through improved service today creates the demand that justifies future BRT infrastructure investment. Riders who experience reliable, frequent bus service become transit advocates and regular users. That ridership base then makes the case for capital investments in dedicated BRT corridors. We shouldn't ask residents to wait years for infrastructure while current service remains inadequate.