Executive Board Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2015

CALL TO ORDER
President John Webster called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. GOCA representatives, alternates, invited guests and members of the public introduced themselves.

A motion was made to approve the May 12, 2015 minutes as written. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.

A motion was made to approve the June 9, 2015 meeting agenda. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS & ANNOUNCEMENTS
Jim Smith reported that the Olney Town Center Advisory committee was working to finish the boundary map of HOAs and Civic Associations in the Olney area. He passed around a map to attendees for input on four areas where certain associations might belong.

Bill Calomeris reported that the July GOCA meeting will include a round table forum with six tables and speakers on topics of interest to HOAs. He passed around two folders on the speakers and asked for input from HOAs on questions they would like to discuss with the speakers. He said the speakers will discuss landlord/tenant issues, and there will be an attorney that will discuss legal issues. Also from the County will be a speaker on common ownership communities specifically dealing with HOAs issues with regard to the County. He asked that any suggestions, questions and topics be emailed to him so he can better prepare the speakers.

OFFICERS/COMMITTEE/LIAISON REPORTS
Mid-County Citizen's Advisory Committee,
Greg Intoccia reported that at the last meeting there was an adoption of a letter sent to County Council President Leventhal on predatory towing intended to take "predatory" practices out of towing, eliminate spotters, and ask for greater evidence in terms of record keeping. He passed around the letter for review and said that the County Executive should set a maximum flat rate for recovery on vehicles, define terms, keep records, and distinguish between commercial and public lots.

Lydia Rappolt mentioned that regarding the towing issue, there is a hearing on June 29. She said the full text of the towing bill is on the Montgomery County website. There is also a press release on the bill and Camelback Village HOA has contacted Nancy Navarro's office regarding their concerns on specific standards on parking.

Public Policy and Committee Affairs Committee
Matt Quinn reported that from a land use perspective, Linda Silverstein is looking into the abandoned building on Hillcrest Avenue regarding their plans. Olney Health has lost their food storage building but may have found a new location.

From a legislative perspective, the Committee has scheduled a meeting with Nancy Navarro on June 17. Regarding the towing bill, there are some issues that could impact HOAs. The Committee has made some calls to Roger Berliner's office on that bill and asked to see the changes before they are final. The Committee is meeting with Council President Leventhal to review technical data on the Pesticide Bill to be clear on specifically what pesticides they will recommend. They made a spreadsheet to review with Council President Leventhal.

A new bill has been introduced at the request of the County Executive to reorganize the Economic Development department to make it a non-profit organization. We are not clear why it's being done but to create an independent Office of Agriculture and eliminate the Department of Economic Development as a principal department of the Executive Branch.

He said the Committee has lost some members but has the possibility of some new members. He asked the group to contact him if they have an interest in joining his Committee.

Olney Town Center Advisory Committee
Jim Smith reported the next meeting is July 29. Olney non-profits are invited. The meeting will focus on creating a Town Center concept plan and possible uses and space needs. The Chick-Fil-A proposal has been sent to the Planning Board. The plan is consistent with the OTCAC designs.

Membership Renewals
Greg Intoccia reported that he has received payment from one more HOA and a second HOA payment is promised and a third is expected. We are now only $50 short of the budget.

Correspondence Report
Jackie Benn was not present, but the correspondence binder was circulated.

Chamber of Commerce Report
Joe Buffington was not present, and there was no report.

Olney Days
Helene Rosenheim reported that rain was an issue for only one day on Saturday, which disrupted the "food eating" contest and the Big Band. Everything else went well. Her committee has met and is already planning for next year's Olney Days.

Transportation Committee
Barbara Falcigno reported that her committee has one new member. She said that the Commuter Survey has 749 responses to date. She asked the HOAs to send out the survey again to increase the response rate. There is a link to the survey on the GOCA website at GOCA.org. She said that Old Baltimore Avenue will be open soon. The Transportation Committee is working with State Highway. She said that

in September, there will be a report on all these transportation issues. She said she is also trying to get funding for a left turn lane at the Georgia Avenue North left turn lane onto Route 28.

TRAFFIC CAMERA TASK FORCE REPORT

John Webster introduced Gary Manion, Traffic Camera Task Force Chair, and said that the Task Force investigated the rate of traffic camera citations in Olney and produced a report that was distributed to the community. He said that Manion would update GOCA on the results.

Manion reported that the report is 47 pages, copies of which he brought to the meeting. It is also on the GOCA website under the 2015 Correspondence tab. He will present a 19-slide presentation. There will be time for questions afterward. He said there are six community volunteers on the task force, which met every two weeks. The presentation was based on a 47-page report developed by the Task Force. He highly recommended reading the report to fully understand the County Safe Speed program. May 14 was when the Task Force was formally approved with a charter. The main objective was to put together a report to address three issues: (1) what modifications should be made to the Olney traffic camera program, (2) what modifications should be made to the current county policies, and (3) what modifications, if any, should be made to the current policies that are administered. *(to be continued after the County Executive presentation).*

STATE OF THE COUNTY

John Webster introduced the Honorable Isiah Leggett, Montgomery County Executive.

Mr. Leggett told the group that he would present a look at the County overall and there are two ways to look at it – before two weeks ago and today. Before two weeks ago, prior to the Wynne case, the County was in a very good position financially with high reserves. A budget shortfall of $3 billion had been closed, and, despite all the hardships from the recession, the County emerged in a relatively good position. More than 300 police officers and personnel had been hired, and a number of new fire stations and schools were built in various areas. The County student population has increased by 2500 per year over the past four or five years and will continue at about 2000 per year for the foreseeable future. This has significantly impacted our school enrollment and we need to expand and build new schools and renovate existing schools. This is a real challenge.

He explained the significance of the Wynne case, which was a tax case not specifically about Montgomery County, although Montgomery County has had the largest impact from this case. It was a tax case brought by a Howard County couple regarding a tax credit. Montgomery County did provide a tax credit for out-of-state tax payers but not a local credit. The Howard County couple argued that they should not only get a state-wide credit but a local credit as well. They prevailed in the highest court in the State of Maryland and, ultimately, the State appealed to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision, agreed with the Howard County couple. The result is that the decision will cost the State of Maryland approximately $200 million in lost tax revenue and will impact Montgomery County, disproportionately, with a loss of $115 million in tax revenue and from $20-$30 million per year in perpetuity. We have a real challenge going forward.

He said his most recent budget increased expenditures in the County by only 1.1%. He said that for nine years, all his budgets only increased by less than 2%. They did it by reducing the County workforce by 10%, 1,253 positions, reduced the County's contribution to employee healthcare and retirement, furloughed employees and eliminated COLAs for four years and merit increases for at least three years in order to respond to the challenges of the Great Recession. He said property taxes in Montgomery County have not increased in the last two years, although the County Council wanted to increase expenditures. Last year there was an average $17 reduction in property tax and this year, a $14 increase, so on average, a zero increase in property tax. He said if he had been able to do what he wanted we would have had about a $90 million surplus but the worst possible outcome happened when we lost the Wynne case. So, now we do not have this surplus. For of all these reasons, he said it is very likely that Montgomery County will have a tax increase in 2016.

He reminded the group about the debate a few years ago on the ambulance fee, which was not put through. However, he felt so strongly about it that the ambulance fee has been brought back and has actually been in effect for the past 1½ years. That fee is providing Montgomery County with $18 million/year because insurance companies already cover ambulance fees in the insurance they collect from insured. Most people do not realize this fee is in effect, but this fee has helped the County tremendously. If we had placed the fee in effect six years ago, when he asked for it, we would have had $90 million. He said that because Montgomery County did not have an ambulance fee for 5 years, the County lost $90 million, which can never be recovered. The reserves in the County budget have been eliminated. He said he would try to find budget cuts but cannot make up the shortfall with budget cuts only and will have to increase taxes. He believes we are on the right path for the County's financial future. We have a AAA credit rating and are invested in transportation and working aggressively so that our schools have resources they need.

He noted that crime is down significantly in the County, transportation work is progressing aggressively, and we have increased enrollment in the school system. He was hopeful that the County will receive extra dollars from the State next year.

Questions from the group followed.

Question: What is the state of business development in the County? Leggett responded that businesses fear an increase in fees, regulations and increased taxes, but some perceptions are wrong. But even though some perceptions may be wrong, e.g. the permitting process takes too long, we must work to change the perceptions. He has proposed taking the Economic Development Department out of the County and moving it to a private corporation made up of businesses, which will hire people to run it. It would be a significant change for Montgomery County although it is done in many other areas. He would like to streamline permitting services turnaround to within 30 days. He said that competition in the area is keen. Montgomery County must become much more competitive to insure the jobs and tax base we need. He wants the business community to become an active participant in our effort.

Barbara Falcigno asked why the ITA must be separate from the DOT. Why not let DOT have an emphasis on transit? Leggett said that the ITA must be flexible and independent because transportation is the future for Montgomery County. There is no other way to take care of our existing traffic or have the capacity for future growth. The challenge is how to finance it. He said that we could (1) rely on support from Federal and State for revenue, which is not likely to happen, or (2) try to fund it under the

existing system, which would be hard since transportation is expensive and because of the funding needed for schools, libraries and rec centers, there is no capacity for transit, or push all that aside for buses, which is highly unlikely, or (3) do what we are doing now and have no response to the major challenge. The real challenge is having the financial flexibility to deal with things.

Leggett spoke about issuing bonds, which is the way we fund major projects now. We must stay within certain limits. Montgomery County has a AAA rating, which is one of few in the country and which we have maintained through the recession and he does not want to lose it. He said many jurisdictions have separate authorities for financial flexibility for long term indebtedness. He said we could pay for transit directly, or pay for it by borrowing, but we are at capacity now. But, if we had a separate authority appointed and overseen by the County Council, taxing authority and budget approved by the Council, we could give the authority/flexibility to borrow, up to the limit approved by the Council. The question is where will the money come from to finance the projects? The State may give us $15 million /year for the next 15 or 20 years. The County could contribute $15million for a project, then with authority already from the County Council, another $15million from County households financed through the transit tax (about $1 per household). This would give us $45 million dedicated money, which would allow us to borrow half a billion. This must be approved by Wall Street. He said he likes this approach. Many other jurisdictions around the country are doing this.

We could borrow $50 million and Wall Street would be okay with this approach. But, since we have no budgetary flexibility anywhere else we must get the authority to do this from the County Council, or we could increase the transit tax.

A question arose regarding how other states handle private partnerships to handle transportation projects. Leggett said that what he has described would not be a total privatization, but they are what are called "public/private" partnerships, not a corporation but you build it with the private sector.

Jim Smith asked about possible County help with the proposed Olney Civic Center, which has been a priority for Olney since 2000. A civic center/building would house certain functions in Olney. Through the Town Center Advisory Committee, through the master plan, a concept has been created for a civic center and town center. This would be accomplished through the redevelopment of a major Olney shopping center. He said the Olney Town Center Advisory Committee has developed a concept plan, which is expected to be ready next year, although no major shopping center in Olney is ready to be redeveloped. In June, the group asked the County to take this concept and move it forward. Smith asked for a feasibility study in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to move the Olney civic center concept forward. He said that way there would be a plan to make the Olney Civic Center a reality. Leggett asked Smith to work with Joy Nurmi, Leggett's assistant, on this.

Joe Corbett asked about the negative view of police in the national news recently. He asked specifically about Montgomery County police and whether the department has reviewed their own procedures to deal with violent arrests and to have this negative image problem decrease or disappear. Leggett responded that Montgomery County has a good police department dealing with many different cultures and languages. He said he has no answers, but will go back and review procedures and have the police commanders talk with county people to get their ideas and input. He also said that he is engaged regularly with the community to listen to young people about what they are saying about the Montgomery County police. He said it is not likely that what has happened in other places recently will

happen here in Montgomery County because we have an excellent police department that he is proud of, although we do have room for improvement.

Greg Intoccia asked about the bill on economic development and for examples of what could be accomplished as well as any other efforts on economic development. Leggett spoke about the six or seven point economic plan that he put in place involving a number of initiatives to alter the county and increase technology and entrepreneurship and the small business reserve program. He said the biggest issue is perception, and his plan has caused a real positive effect and created more confidence in the business community. An ombudsman will resolve issues. The County needs better marketing, e.g. keeping Marriott in the County. He will try to keep Marriott in the County, and this change can help.

Several other comments were made on the need for an Olney Town Center building/civic center to house organizations like Olney for Life, the Farmers Market, and the Olney Big Band/Concert Band with a shell for concerts. Project Change also supports an Olney Town Center.

A question arose on whether police resources were sent to Baltimore during the recent crisis. Leggett said that Montgomery County sent 50 to 60 police officers to Baltimore. He felt that the Baltimore crisis has impacted all of us. He applauded the Maryland governor for his quick response to the crisis and felt that this could only help the State since this was not just a Baltimore problem. We will all benefit from a positive outcome in any Maryland county.

A question arose regarding property taxes and tax credits for homeowners. Has the credit been improperly issued to some homeowners who are not principal homeowners? There is about $200 million in improperly issued tax credits. Will this money be retroactively collected? Leggett said there is some confusion regarding this and he would look into it. He will ask Anne Kaiser about this issue. Joe Corbett suggested that the County pursue retroactive collection of these improperly issued tax credits.

Greg Intoccia asked whether the ITA would have authority to issue bonding and any potential for added taxes and whether there should be a referendum on this. Leggett said no, we already have a transit tax. The County has authorized an increase in the transit tax already. The County Council must approve this, but we cannot get large sums of money. He suggested several means to get the money to cover bonds. He said we could borrow over a period of time. A transit tax, however, would be too high if we wanted to produce a large sum of money for a project right now. The ITA creates another way to create money, but would not have any more authority than exists right now.

Matt Quinn asked how an ITA would help those who work in Montgomery County. Leggett said there is no way to resolve how out-of-county traffic flows through Montgomery County, but we would manage the traffic. Out-of-county traffic happens in other counties and jurisdictions as well.

The group thanked Leggett for his excellent presentation.

TRAFFIC CAMERA TASK FORCE REPORT *(continued)*
Gary Manion continued his presentation on the traffic camera study. He presented the 4-page work plan, which he said can be accessed on the GOCA website. He said he met with Captain Didone, Dan McNichols, the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), and the Automated Traffic Enforcement Unit (ATEU) to explain how traffic cameras work. His group looked at the eight primary

Olney traffic cameras, number of vehicle passes and number of citations. They had comparative data for 2013 to 2014. Some data was not available to the Taskforce, specifically, what percentage of citations was associated with those eight cameras with the zip code we would have been able to get that but unfortunately we could not get that. The percentage of vehicle passes associated with Olney residents – we could not get that data. We could not get the distribution of the vehicles speeding. However, exactly 32% of all citations were given to vehicles exceeding the speed limit by 1 mph above that tolerance level.

Joe Corbett said that means that 32% are going 40% above the speed limit, which he felt is misleading in the report because it indicates that 68% of the people are going more than 40% over the speed limit. He felt the emphasis should be on 40% above the speed limit. Manion agreed, point well taken.

He said the report was sent to the ATEU, SHA and others but only the SHA responded that they had read and approved the report. There was a question on what that meant "approved" the report. Manion said it meant they were not in disagreement with the report.

Manion presented graphs, which showed 85,000 speed camera citations issued in 2013 in the Olney/Sandy Spring area with $3.4 million in fines, the highest in the County. The 85,000 speed camera citations in Olney-Sandy Spring accounted for almost 1/5 of the total 475,000 speed camera citations in Montgomery County in 2013. In 2013 Olney had three of the top five grossing speed cameras in Montgomery County and five of the top twenty revenue grossing cameras.

Manion presented slides highlighting the general report findings as follows:

- Olney-Sandy Spring with 85,451 citations and $3.4 million in fines in Calendar Year (CY) 2013 was the geographic area with the highest number of speed camera citations.

- With 85,451 speed camera citations, out of a total of 475,481 in CY 2013, approximately one out of every five camera citations in Montgomery County originated from cameras located in Olney-Sandy Spring.

- In CY 2013, Olney had three of the top five grossing speed cameras in Montgomery County and five of the top twenty grossing cameras.

- In CY 2013, Olney-Sandy Spring received 31 percent more citations than the second highest ranking speed camera locale, Silver Spring, despite having 7.7 million or 30% fewer vehicle passes at the Olney-Sandy Spring camera locations.

- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2014, the single Olney camera (No.1750) eastbound on Olney-Sandy Spring Road, east of Spartan Road (aka- St. Peter's camera) became the #1 citation producing camera in Montgomery County when comparing the citations issued from it to the citations issued by all 167 camera sites in existence in CY 2013. It generated over 27,000 citations and $1.1 million in speed camera revenue.

- Olney-Sandy Spring generated over $3.4 million in speed camera fines in CY 2013, over $800,000 more than the second-ranking area, Silver Spring.

- Olney-Sandy Spring speed camera citations in CY 2013 were 2.1 times greater than the number of citations generated by the third ranking speed camera citation area, Damascus (41,410 citations with 16 cameras).

- Olney-Sandy Spring camera citations in CY 2013 were 5.7 times greater than the overall county average by geographic location.

- In CY 2013, with 13 speed monitoring cameras, the Olney-Sandy Spring area had 2 ½ times more cameras in operation than the overall county average of five for each geographical locale or Census Designated Place.

- One out of every nine vehicles or 11% of all vehicles which passed by a County speed monitoring camera in CY 2013 did so in Olney-Sandy Spring.

- Due to the high concentration of speed monitoring cameras in Olney-Sandy Spring, vehicles in Olney-Sandy Spring were 3.4 times more likely to be monitored for speed than elsewhere in Montgomery County.

- Olney-Sandy Spring has a disproportionately high rate of citations, whether measured by population or by vehicle volume.

- Accident rates in the Olney area, either before or after speed monitoring camera installations, do not explain the high number of Olney-Sandy Spring camera locations or citations.

He added that only 0.1% of all accidents were "definitely" associated with speeds over the speed limit out of the accidents reported.

He noted that Baltimore has stopped their traffic camera program two years ago because it was perceived as associated with revenue generation. He said that Montgomery County's speed camera program lacks transparency in its data and operations. Some data was not accurate or timely or complete. The program lacks some internal controls. The detailed data on citations by time of day is not made public although summary data is published on the ATEU website, but is two years old. Camera placements under consideration are not made public and reasons for location determinations are not made public. These things should be addressed. Comprehensive accident data is neither collected nor analyzed. Data was often erroneous or out of date. Camera installation sites under consideration are not made public. Anyone can request a camera within their locale but is ultimately acted upon by the ATEU. The program needs a citizen advocate.

 Manion presented the Taskforce Recommendations for a GOCA Resolution as follows:

<u>GOCA Resolution on the County Speed Camera Program</u>

Whereas the geographic area within Montgomery County with the highest number of speed camera citations is Olney-Sandy Spring with 85,451 citations and $3.4 million in fines in calendar year 2013, significantly higher than any other locale in the County; and

Whereas Olney had three of the top grossing speed cameras in Montgomery County and five of the top twenty grossing cameras in calendar year 2013; and

Whereas in calendar year 2013 Olney-Sandy Spring received 31 percent more citations than the second highest ranking speed camera locale, Silver Spring, despite having 7.7 million or 30% fewer vehicle passes, and Olney-Sandy Spring citations were more than all ten Bethesda speed cameras combined, and were more than twice the number of tickets than Montgomery Village's six speed cameras combined; and

Whereas Olney-Sandy Spring speed camera citations in CY 2013 were 5.7 times greater than the overall county average by geographic location and vehicles traveling in Olney-Sandy Spring were 3.4 times more likely to pass a speed monitoring camera than elsewhere in Montgomery County, and Whereas accidents in the Olney area, either before or after camera installation, do not explain the high number of Olney-Sandy Spring camera locations or citations;

Now therefore be it resolved that the Greater Olney Civic Association (GOCA) should formally transmit the Camera Task Force Report to the Montgomery County Executive, The County Council, the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) and ATEU, the Montgomery County Inspector General, appropriate District Delegates, and the State Highway Administration, asking that the County's elected officials take action to eliminate the disproportionate impact of the camera program on the Olney-Sandy Spring area by implementing the following recommendations:

1. Consistent with the Montgomery County Executive's stated commitment to transparency, the ATEU should publish to its website on a monthly basis speed camera citations and vehicle pass volumes by camera location.

2. Montgomery County should revise the Citizen 's Advisory Board for Traffic Issues (CAB-TI) applicable to the speed camera program, ensuring the Board is selected independently of the MCPD and ATEU, has established term limits, represents the full spectrum of views on the efficacy of speed camera usage, and that its views shall be considered by the ATEU.

3. Montgomery County should appoint, fully independent of the MCPD, ATEU, and Local Designee, a Citizen's Advocate to represent the citizens and communities regarding speed camera use, placement, and other concerns.

4. Montgomery County should modify the speed camera contract to stipulate that all data captured on each citation shall be the property of the County, not the vendor, and that such data on citations, citation camera location, ticketed speed, etc. will be provided to the ATEU and published on the county website (protecting all Personally Identifiable Information (PII)).

5. The ATEU should be provided with the appropriate funding to implement the internal controls, data integrity, and transparency improvements included in the GOCA Traffic Camera Task Force report. Such funding should come from the positive net revenue generated by the speed camera fines, consistent with the stated public safety purposes for which speed camera net revenues are authorized to be used. This net revenue funding should also be utilized to address the substantial backlog of citizen's requests for speed monitoring cameras.

[Manion noted that 40% of fines collected from traffic camera violations goes to the vendor-(Xerox)]

6. The SHA should modify the speed limit east bound on Olney-Sandy Spring Road, beginning immediately after Spartan Road, to be 35 mph, providing for a safe incremental speed approaching the current 40 mph section of Olney-Sandy Spring Road east of Prince Philip Drive.

7. The Task Force Recommends that SHA return the 40 mph to 30 mph changeover point on Olney-Laytonsville Road (Route 108, near the Post Office) to Homeland Drive for both east and westbound traffic. Moving the 40 mph point back to Homeland Drive returns the Olney-Laytonsville Road speed limit back to what it was in 2009, while maintaining the current 30 mph speed limit before the Olney Library and through the Olney core commercial center.

8. The SHA should modify the speed limit on Georgia Avenue between King William Drive and Sandy Spring Bank to be 35 mph, providing for a safe incremental speed between the existing 40 mph roadway south of King William Drive and the 30 mph area in the core Olney commercial center.

9. Montgomery County should take steps to have a plebiscite determine the future direction of the Safe Speed Program.

Manion ended his presentation and asked for questions and comments.

Joe Corbett felt that the number one slide should have been "the traffic cameras are a great success". He said that page 36 of the report highlighting the reduction in crashes since 2004 after the installation of traffic cameras, should be the major positive outcome of the traffic camera program. He felt that the report does not compare apples to apples in reduction in speed with respect Silver Spring and Olney. He said that the Task Force has come to the wrong conclusion and that speed cameras are doing their job by slowing traffic and improving safety. He urged GOCA to leave the traffic cameras in Olney. He felt that the program increases revenue and public safety.

There was a question from an attendee regarding why the traffic camera flashes when he is running by it every day. Captain Didone said that the traffic cameras are reset every day to recalibrate them and when this is done, they may flash.

Another comment arose regarding speed limit signs that are not clear and that out-of state drivers may not notice them.

Another attendee complimented the Task Force on its great work and providing transparency on the traffic camera issue. He also recommended against raising the speed limit at St. Peters since it is not safe for walkers, bikers and children attending the nearby schools.

Barbara Falcigno said she did not agree with all the Task Force conclusions. She felt the roads used for comparison in the study were not comparable. She suggested that finding similar traffic cameras for comparison would result in a better analysis. She suggested that the speed limits could be painted on the roads like Montgomery Village does. She felt there are many things we can do to slow people down.

There was a question from a member of a cycling group regarding the safety of walkers crossing the road at Olney Elementary where the maximum speed limit is 11 miles over the posted speed limit before getting a citation. As a cyclist he supports an increase in speeds going out of town.

Another attendee felt that sometimes as a driver we don't know what the speed limit is and questioned how many speed limit signs there are and how to make them more visible. Manion noted that we have all changed our behavior due to the speed cameras.

John Webster asked that all comments and suggestions be sent to the GOCA website.

Captain Didone said that the State is working to determine where the speed signs go. Traffic engineers determine where. He said there is one for every mile; more than that would cost too much. There are geographic limits for signs. Speed signs are underrepresented in Maryland. He said that Montgomery County is a model program but that none of programs are developed so we can analyze data. The data belongs to the County but we don't have the money to analyze it. He said there are one million records but no analysis tool, no infrastructure to collect data that we would like. The ultimate goal is to make drivers slow down so crashes go down when we bracket towns. Speed cameras have worked.

John Webster asked the group to review the Task Force's draft resolution for consideration at next month's GOCA meeting and to submit any proposed amendments to John by email.

NEW BUSINESS
There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT
A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
Judy Broseker, Recording Secretary

In attendance:

GOCA Executive Board

John Webster, President - Manor Oaks; Greg Intoccia, Executive Vice President - Ashley Hollow; Matt Quinn, 1st Vice President – Cherrywood; Bill Calomeris, 2nd Vice President - Olney Mill; Judy Broseker, Recording Secretary – Brookeville Knolls; Barbara Falcigno, Immediate Past President - Olney Oaks

Danny Benn (Fair Hill Farm), Dave Rada (Brooke Manor Estates), Lydia Rappolt (Camelback Village), Jonathan Arias (Hallowell), Helene Rosenheim (Highlands of Olney), Perry Buckberg, (Manor Oaks), Ed Weisel (Norbeck Meadows), Dave Miller (Norbeck Meadows), Jon Morris (Oak Grove), Jim Smith (Oatland Farm), Lee Lofthus (Oatland Farm), Diana Littlefield (Olney Acres), Carolyn Knight (Olney Oaks), Meg Pease-Fey (SEROCA), Alden English (SEROCA), Aleka Kapatou (Tanterra), Hector Ortiz (Townes @ Environ), Bob Reel (Victoria Springs), Sharon Dooley (Village of James Creek), Ruth Laughner (Williamsburg Village), Joe Corbett (Williamsburg Village)

Invited Guests
The Honorable Isiah Leggett, Montgomery County Executive
Gary Manion, Traffic Camera Task Force Chair
Della Dorsey, Olney Library Advisory Committee
Terri Hogan (The Gazette)

Public
Capt. Tom Didone, (Montgomery County Police), Amy Lipstein (Olney Concert Band), Art Brodsky (Montgomery County), Tom Brunette (Olney Home for Life), Benson King (Traffic Camera (TF)/Transportation Committee), Tim Stemann (Williamsburg Village), Barbara McClayton (Montgomery County Public Library) , Greg Porter (Olney Chamber of Commerce), Kathy Kidd (OFAM/Farmers Market), Alex Tordella (Traffic Camera TF), Kevin Mell (Medstar Montgomery), Kito James (Direct Energy Solar), Sean Murphy (citizen), Joe Fritsch (Highlands of Olney citizen), Vivian Malloy (Lake Hallowell), Wilbur Malloy (Lake Hallowell), Amanda Huang (Project Change), Robyn Holstein-Glass (Project Change), Kathleen Donodeo (Hallowell HOA), Ira Ungar (rep for Delegate Bonnie Cullison, 19th District)